

**Edward Bishop Elliott**

**Horae Apocalypticae**

Hours with the Apocalypse

**Vol. 3**



*The Standard Work*

— *Charles Spurgeon*

**LutheranLibrary.org ● 450**

# HORÆ APOCALYPTICÆ;

† OR,

## A COMMENTARY ON THE APOCALYPSE,

CRITICAL AND HISTORICAL;

INCLUDING ALSO AN EXAMINATION OF THE  
CHIEF PROPHECIES OF DANIEL.

ILLUSTRATED BY AN APOCALYPTIC CHART, AND ENGRAVINGS  
FROM MEDALS AND OTHER EXTANT MONUMENTS  
OF ANTIQUITY.

WITH APPENDICES;

CONTAINING, BESIDES OTHER MATTER,  
A SKETCH OF THE HISTORY OF APOCALYPTIC INTERPRETATION, CRITICAL REVIEWS OF  
THE CHIEF APOCALYPTIC COUNTER-SCHEMES, AND INDICES.

BY THE REV. E. B. ELLIOTT, A.M.

INCUMBENT OF ST. MARK'S CHURCH, KEMPTOWN, BRIGHTON, PREBENDARY OF HEYTESBURY,  
AND LATE FELLOW OF TRINITY COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.

FIFTH EDITION,

CAREFULLY REVISED, CORRECTED, ENLARGED, AND IMPROVED THROUGHOUT;  
WITH ADDITIONAL PLATES, AND A NEW PREFACE.

VOL. III.

SEELEY, JACKSON, AND HALLIDAY, 54, FLEET STREET,  
LONDON. MDCCCLXII.

“Blessed is he that readeth, and they that hear the words of this prophecy, and keep those things which are written therein: for the time is at hand.” Apoc. i. 3.

“The word of prophecy; whereunto ye do well that ye take heed, as unto a light that shineth in a dark place, until the day dawn.” 2 Peter i. 19.

JOHN CHILDS AND SON, PRINTERS.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

TO VOL. III.

## PART IV.

	PAGE
INTRODUCTION.—RETROGRESSION OF THE NEW VISIONS	1
CHAP.	
I. THE SUN-CLOTHED WOMAN TRAVAILING, AND SEVEN-HEADED DRAGON CAST DOWN .. ..	6
II. HISTORY OF THE WOMAN (THE CHURCH) AFTER THE DRAGON'S DEJECTION .. .. .	39
III. § 1. IDENTITY OF THE WILD BEASTS FROM THE SEA AND THE ABYSS .. .. .	70
§ 2. IDENTITY OF THE LAST RULING HEAD OF THE APOCALYPTIC WILD BEAST FROM THE ABYSS AND SEA, WITH THE LITTLE HORN OF DANIEL'S FOURTH WILD BEAST, ST. PAUL'S MAN OF SIN, AND ST. JOHN'S ANTICHRIST .. ..	87
IV. THE SEVEN-HEADED TEN-HORNED WILD BEAST FROM THE ABYSS AND SEA ..	109
§ 1. THE HEADS OF THE WILD BEAST .. ..	111
§ 2. THE TEN HORNS OF THE BEAST .. ..	132
V. THE BEAST'S DEVELOPMENT, EARLY GROWTH, PRETENSIONS, LEGALIZATION, AND ACTINGS IN THE CHARACTER OF ANTICHRIST .. .. .	147
§ 1. INCIPIENT DEVELOPMENT OF THE BEAST'S EIGHTH HEAD, OR THE PAPAL ANTICHRIST, SYNCHRONICALLY WITH THE RISE OF THE TEN KINGDOMS .. .. .	150
§ 2. UPROOTING OF THREE HORNS OUT OF THE TEN BEFORE THE BEAST .. .. .	167
§ 3. THE BEAST'S PRIDE, SELF-EXALTATION, BLASPHEMIES, AND OPPRESSION OF THE SAINTS,	

CHAP.		PAGE
	AS FULFILLED IN THE FULL-GROWN PAPAL AN- TICHRIST .. .. .	172
VI.	THE TWO-HORNED LAMBSKIN-COVERED BEAST ..	194
VII.	THE IMAGE OF THE BEAST .. .. .	219
VIII.	THE BEAST'S MARK, NAME, AND NUMBER	239
IX.	§ 1. THE YEAR-DAY PRINCIPLE .. .. .	260
	§ 2. THE BEAST'S PREDICTED 1260 YEARS ..	298
X.	THE LAMB'S POLITY OF THE 144,000 ON MOUNT ZION, AND THEIR FIRST OMEN OF TRIUMPH ..	305

## PART V.

I.	ON THE SYNCHRONISMS, AND GENERAL SUBJECT AND EPOCH, OF THE SEVENTH TRUMPET .. .. .	327
II.	EPOCH OF THE SEVENTH TRUMPET'S SOUNDING, OR OF THE FRENCH REVOLUTION, SKETCHED FROM HISTORY .. .. .	341
III.	THE FIRST VIAL .. .. .	351
IV.	THE SECOND, THIRD, AND FOURTH VIALS ..	376
V.	THE FIFTH VIAL ; OR JUDGMENT BEGUN AND PRO- GRESSING ON THE POPEDOM' .. .. .	395
VI.	THE INEFFECTIVENESS OF THE VIALS TO PRODUCE REPENTANCE .. .. .	410
VII.	THE SIXTH VIAL ; OR JUDGMENT BEGUN ON THE MAHOMMEDAN TURK .. .. .	422
	§ 1. DANIEL'S PROPHECY OF THE LITTLE HORN OF THE HE-GOAT .. .. .	423
	§ 2. COMMENCEMENT AND PROGRESS OF THE DRY- ING UP OF THE TURKISH FLOOD FROM THE EUPHRATES .. .. .	447
	§ 3. THE KINGS FROM THE SUN-RISING .. .. .	455
VIII.	§ 1. THE SYMBOLIZED OPENING TO VIEW OF THE REFORMED CHURCH, AND MISSIONARY ACTS AND ANTICIPATIONS OF THE FAITHFUL IN IT, DURING THE VIALS' OUTPOURING .. .. .	461
	§ 2. THE HISTORIC FULFILMENT .. .. .	476
IX.	THE THREE FROGS .. .. .	492

## APPENDIX.

NO.		PAGE
I.	ON THE EPOCH OF THE FIRST ASSUMPTION OF THE DIADEM BY ROMAN EMPERORS .. ..	535
II.	ON THE ABSOLUTE IDENTITY OF THE BEAST FROM THE SEA AND BEAST FROM THE ABYSS ..	548
III.	§ 1. ROMISH PETRINE THEORY UNKNOWN TO THE APOSTLES .. .. .	560
	§ 2. FALSIFIED BY SCRIPTURE APOSTOLIC CHRO- NOLOGY .. .. .	566
	§ 3. UNKNOWN TO EARLIEST CHURCH FATHERS ..	581
IV.	WITNESS OF THE ENGLISH REFORMING FATHERS TO THE FACT OF THE ROMAN POPE'S BEING ANTICHRIST .. .. .	592
V.	ON THE WORD שָׁבוּעַ .. .. .	604
VI.	ON LÜCKE'S COUNTER-PAPAL THEORY OF THE ANTI- CHRIST .. .. .	609
VII.	ON THE PARALLELISM OF THE ACTINGS AND SPEAK- INGS OF THE MODEL INFIDEL SPIRIT WITH THOSE OF THE DRAGON OF ROMAN HEATHENDOM IN THE 3RD AND 4TH CENTURIES .. .. .	616

## PLATES TO VOL. III.

PLATE		
XXIII.	ROMAN ENSIGN OF THE DRAGON; AND MAXI- MIAN'S MEDAL OF THE DESTRUCTION OF THE SEVEN-HEADED HYDRA OF CHRISTIANITY ..	17
XXIV.	THE DRAGON TRAMPLED, AND GLOBE SURMOUNT- ED, BY THE CROSS .. .. .	31
XXV.	VICTORY, IN A COIN OF THEODOSIUS AND GRA- TIAN, WITH HER TWO WINGS INFOLDING AS ONE, AND INDICATING HER JOINT SUPPORT OF, THE TWO EMPIRES AND EMPERORS OF EAST AND WEST .. .. .	55
XXVI.	IMAGINARY SKETCH OF THE SEVEN-HEADED, TEN- HORNED APOCALYPTIC BEAST FROM THE SEA ..	122
XXVII.	THE TEN ROMANO-GOTHIC KINGS DIADEMED ..	145
XXVIII.	THE USURPING VICE-CHRIST'S ASSERTED POWER	

PLATE		PAGE
	OVER THE WORLD OF THE LIVING; EXHIBITED IN PAPAL MEDALS, AND A PAPAL INDULGENCE	180
XXIX.	THE USURPING VICE-CHRIST, IN GOD-LIKE STATE EXHIBITING HIS BREADEN GOD, "A GOD WHOM HIS FATHERS KNEW NOT, GLORIFIED WITH GOLD AND PRECIOUS STONES" .. ..	184
XXX.	THE USURPING VICE-CHRIST'S ASSERTED POWER OVER THE WORLD OF SPIRITS; EXHIBITED IN PAPAL MEDALS, AND WITH HIMSELF EN- THRONED ON GOD'S ALTAR .. ..	185
XXXI.	PAPAL MEDALS OF THE EXPULSION OF BOHE- MIAN HERETICS, AS A WILD BOAR OUT OF THE CHRISTIAN VINEYARD, A.D. 1469, AND OF THE BARTHOLOMEW MASSACRE, A.D. 1572 ..	191
XXXII.	THE TWO HORNS OF THE PAPAL EPISCOPAL MITRE, IN THEIR FIRST SPROUTINGS; AND LAMBS- WOOL ARCH-EPISCOPAL PALLIUM .. ..	209
XXXIII.	ROMAN IDEAL PICTURE OF THE FIRST (SUPPOSED) ROMAN GENERAL COUNCIL, WITH CONSTANTINE ATTENDING AND THE POPE PRESIDING ..	226
XXXIV.	MEDALS OF THE PERSIAN RAM, AND MACEDO- NIAN GOAT .. .. .	427
XXXV.	THE THREE FROGS OF FRANCE .. ..	533
XXXVI.	COINS OF LICINIUS DIADEMED .. ..	547

## CORRIGENDA TO VOL. III.

- Page 16, line 8 from bottom; for referable to the reigns read referable to critical events in the reigns*
- 85, *last line of text but one; for was read must have been*
  - 95, *Note 3; for (ii. 87, 9. v.) read (ii. 87; q. v.)*
  - 103, *Title; for IDENTITY WITH ST. JOHN'S ANTICHRIST read IDENTITY WITH ST. PAUL'S MAN OF SIN.*
  - 106, *Note 3, line 1; dele it*
  - 159, *in heading of page; for DEVELOPMENT read LEGALIZATION*
  - 281, *Note 1, line 5; for unnis diei read unius diei*
  - 557, *line 6 from bottom; for being read begin*
  - 574, *line 11 from bottom; read sailed for Asia.*
  - 577, *last line, for 567 read 576*





# CHRONOLOGICAL CHART OF THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES.

A. D.	ROMAN EMPERORS.	GOVERNORS OF JUDEA.	SCRIPTURE AUTHORITIES.	CHRISTIAN CHURCH.	A. D.
30	TIBERIUS began 19th Aug. A. D. 14.	Pontius Pilate (3rd year of govt.)	<p><sup>1</sup> Acts ii. 42-47; iv. 32-37; v. 13, 14; 34-40.</p>	<p><b>CHRIST'S ASCENSION, May A. D. 30 (?)</b></p> <p>or</p> <p>rather perhaps A. D. 33, or 34.</p> <p>Formation and Consolidation of the Church of Jerusalem.<sup>1</sup> Stephen's Martyrdom.</p>	30
35	C. CALIGULA 16th Mar. 37.	Marullus.	<p><sup>2</sup> Acts ix. 19.</p> <p><sup>3</sup> Gal. i. 17, 19.</p> <p><sup>4</sup> 2 Cor. xi. 32, 33. Acts ix. 23-35.</p>	<p><b>PAUL'S CONVERSION.</b> Damasus.<sup>5</sup> Three years partly in Arabia,<sup>6</sup> partly in Damascus under Aretas.<sup>7</sup></p>	35
40	CLAUDIUS 25 Jan. 41.	HEROD AGRIPPA	<p><sup>8</sup> Gal. i. 18. Acts ix. 26-28; xxii. 17-21. Rom. ix. 32.</p> <p><sup>9</sup> Acts ix. 30; xi. 25; xv. 23. Gal. i. 21. 2 Cor. xi. 23-27. <sup>10</sup> Acts xi. 26.</p>	<p><b>VISITS TO JERUSALEM.</b></p> <p>1st; to see Peter.<sup>8</sup></p> <p><b>MISSIONARY JOURNEYS, ETC.</b></p> <p><b>HOME MISSION</b> in Tarsus and Cilicia.<sup>9</sup> Antioch. for "a whole year."<sup>10</sup></p> <p><b>EPHESUS.</b></p> <p>1st GREAT MISSIONARY TOUR.<sup>11</sup> Cyprus, Perga, Antioch in Pisidia, Iconium, Lystra, Derbe; return by Perga and Attalia.<sup>12</sup> Antioch. "There they abode a long time."<sup>13</sup> (1 year?) Antioch.</p> <p>2nd GREAT MISSIONARY TOUR.<sup>14</sup> Syria, Cilicia, Lycaonia, Phrygia, Galatia, Mysia, Troas, Philippi, Thessalonica, Athens, Corinth, Corinth, 14 year.<sup>15</sup></p> <p>Return by Ephesus, Cesarea, to Jerusalem. Antioch; staid there some time.<sup>16</sup></p> <p>3rd; Council.<sup>17</sup></p> <p>San GREAT MISSIONARY TOUR.<sup>18</sup> Phrygia, Galatia, Ephesus. At Ephesus staid 24 years.<sup>19</sup> Macedonia, Achaia; Corinth 3 months.<sup>20</sup> Return by Macedonia, Troas, Niletus, Tyre, Cesarea, Jerusalem.</p> <p>4th; "the Feast." A. D. 52.<sup>21</sup></p> <p>5th; Pentecost, A. D. 57, &amp; Temult.<sup>22</sup></p>	40
45		Cuspius Fadus	<p><sup>11</sup> Acts xii. 3, 3.</p> <p><sup>12</sup> Ib. xiii. and xiv.</p> <p><sup>13</sup> Ib. xiv. 28.</p> <p><sup>14</sup> Ib. xv. 2-30.</p> <p><sup>15</sup> Ib. x. 40.</p>	<p>2nd; with alms for fuminc.<sup>11</sup></p> <p>Antioch.</p>	45
50	Jews expelled from Rome.	Tiberius Alexander	<p><sup>16</sup> Ib. xviii. 11.</p> <p><sup>17</sup> Ib. 21, 22.</p> <p><sup>18</sup> Ib. 23.</p> <p><sup>19</sup> Ibid.</p>	<p>3rd; Council.<sup>17</sup></p> <p>Return by Ephesus, Cesarea, to Jerusalem. Antioch; staid there some time.<sup>16</sup></p> <p>San GREAT MISSIONARY TOUR.<sup>18</sup> Phrygia, Galatia, Ephesus. At Ephesus staid 24 years.<sup>19</sup> Macedonia, Achaia; Corinth 3 months.<sup>20</sup> Return by Macedonia, Troas, Niletus, Tyre, Cesarea, Jerusalem.</p> <p>4th; "the Feast." A. D. 52.<sup>21</sup></p> <p>5th; Pentecost, A. D. 57, &amp; Temult.<sup>22</sup></p>	50
55	NERO 13th Oct. 54.	Felix	<p><sup>20</sup> Ib. xix. 1-10.</p> <p><sup>21</sup> Ib. xx. 3.</p> <p><sup>22</sup> Ib. xx. 16; xxi. 17, 27.</p> <p><sup>23</sup> Ib. xxiv. 27.</p>	<p>Return by Ephesus, Cesarea, to Jerusalem. Antioch; staid there some time.<sup>16</sup></p> <p>San GREAT MISSIONARY TOUR.<sup>18</sup> Phrygia, Galatia, Ephesus. At Ephesus staid 24 years.<sup>19</sup> Macedonia, Achaia; Corinth 3 months.<sup>20</sup> Return by Macedonia, Troas, Niletus, Tyre, Cesarea, Jerusalem.</p> <p>4th; "the Feast." A. D. 52.<sup>21</sup></p> <p>5th; Pentecost, A. D. 57, &amp; Temult.<sup>22</sup></p>	55
60	Barrhus' death early in 62.	Fratus	<p><sup>24</sup> Ib. xxvii. 9.</p> <p><sup>25</sup> Ib. xxviii. 11.</p>	<p>Return by Ephesus, Cesarea, to Jerusalem. Antioch; staid there some time.<sup>16</sup></p> <p>San GREAT MISSIONARY TOUR.<sup>18</sup> Phrygia, Galatia, Ephesus. At Ephesus staid 24 years.<sup>19</sup> Macedonia, Achaia; Corinth 3 months.<sup>20</sup> Return by Macedonia, Troas, Niletus, Tyre, Cesarea, Jerusalem.</p> <p>4th; "the Feast." A. D. 52.<sup>21</sup></p> <p>5th; Pentecost, A. D. 57, &amp; Temult.<sup>22</sup></p>	60
65	Fire at Rome July, 64.	Albinus	<p><sup>26</sup> Ib. 26, 30.</p> <p><sup>27</sup> Rom. xv. 24.</p>	<p>Return by Ephesus, Cesarea, to Jerusalem. Antioch; staid there some time.<sup>16</sup></p> <p>San GREAT MISSIONARY TOUR.<sup>18</sup> Phrygia, Galatia, Ephesus. At Ephesus staid 24 years.<sup>19</sup> Macedonia, Achaia; Corinth 3 months.<sup>20</sup> Return by Macedonia, Troas, Niletus, Tyre, Cesarea, Jerusalem.</p> <p>4th; "the Feast." A. D. 52.<sup>21</sup></p> <p>5th; Pentecost, A. D. 57, &amp; Temult.<sup>22</sup></p>	65
70	GALBA, Jun. 68 OTHO, Jan. 69. VITEL, VESPASIAN, July, 69.	Jewish war beg.	<p><sup>28</sup> 1 Tim. i. 3. Tit. i. 6; iii. 12; iv. 13, 20.</p> <p><sup>29</sup> 2 Tim. i. 8, 17.</p>	<p>Return by Ephesus, Cesarea, to Jerusalem. Antioch; staid there some time.<sup>16</sup></p> <p>San GREAT MISSIONARY TOUR.<sup>18</sup> Phrygia, Galatia, Ephesus. At Ephesus staid 24 years.<sup>19</sup> Macedonia, Achaia; Corinth 3 months.<sup>20</sup> Return by Macedonia, Troas, Niletus, Tyre, Cesarea, Jerusalem.</p> <p>4th; "the Feast." A. D. 52.<sup>21</sup></p> <p>5th; Pentecost, A. D. 57, &amp; Temult.<sup>22</sup></p>	70
				<p>6th; Jerusalem taken</p>	70

\* The great Lodicean earthquake in the 6th of Nero, or before 13th of October in the year A. D. 60.

# PART IV.

---

APOC. XII, XIII, XIV.

---

SUPPLEMENTAL AND EXPLANATORY HISTORY OF THE  
RISE, CHARACTER, AND ESTABLISHMENT OF THE  
BEAST FROM THE ABYSS,  
OR  
POPEDOM ;  
WITH ITS CHIEF ADJUNCTS :  
AND THE CONTRASTED IMPERSONATION OF  
CHRIST'S FAITHFUL CHURCH.

---

## INTRODUCTION.

RETROGRESSION OF THE VISIONS.

“AND there appeared a great sign in heaven ;—a woman clothed with the sun,” &c.—Apoc. xii. 1.

So we enter on the *Fourth* and *Supplemental* Part of the Revelation to St. John :—a Part, the peculiar characteristic of which was the exhibition of certain *individual figurative impersonations* on the scene, especially that of the *Beast from the Abyss* : whereby not only was an omission in the former Apocalyptic series of visions supplied, but a connecting link also established between them and Daniel's celebrated symbolization of the fourth Beast ; a symbolization easily to be identified with the Apocalyptic.

Before proceeding however to consider the vision here beginning, it will be necessary to call the Reader's attention to the evidence of a *retrogressive* character in both it,

and the two subsequent and intimately connected visions, of the Wild Beast from the Sea, throned on the seven-hilled Babylon,<sup>1</sup> and the Lamb with his 144,000 followers on Mount Zion;<sup>2</sup>—evidence just hinted at, at the close of my last chapter. Hitherto the series of Apocalyptic visions had been, in respect of their development of things future, uninterruptedly continuous and progressive:—the retrospective history of *Christ's two Witnesses* not forming an exception, because *that* was given in conversational explanatory narrative by the Angelic interlocutor. But there now appear in the new vision marks, not to be mistaken, of an interruption and breaking off from the subject next preceding. For the temple, with its ark of the covenant, just said to have been opened in heaven, and the thunders lightnings and voices, that followed thereon, are abruptly left in the sacred description, although evidently indicative of events that were to follow consecutively afterwards; and a vision begins,—the first of a new and continuous series of visions,—apparently quite unconnected and detached.<sup>3</sup> Further, that this series of visions is *supplemental, and explanatory of what has gone before*, appears from the two following characteristic and decisive marks:—*first*, that their grand subject is the development of the rise, establishment, and reign of that *Wild Beast from the abyss, and sea*,<sup>4</sup> which was before spoken of as existing in the time of *Christ's two Witnesses*, and making war upon, and killing them:—*secondly*, that the same remarkable period of 42 months, or 1260 days, which was noted in the *Witnesses' history* as that of heathenized Christians treading down the Holy City, and of the *Witnesses prophesying in sackcloth*, is here spoken of as included in the visions now commencing also; it being that of the *Wild Beast from the abyss and sea* holding investment of the seven-headed *Dragon's* delegated authority, and of the sun-

<sup>1</sup> The identity of this *θηριον from the sea* of Apoc. xiii. and the *θηριον from the abyss* of Apoc. xi. and xvii. being, as I hope soon to show, indubitable: and so the throne transferred by the *Dragon* to the former (Apoc. xiii. 2) the same as the seven-hilled throne (Apoc. xvii. 9) of the latter.

<sup>2</sup> Apoc. xiv. 1.

<sup>3</sup> Vitringa thinks that there was a pause in the representation, the better to mark this break: "Visum hoc est novum; ac proinde probabile est interessisse temporis aliquod intervallum inter illud et superius." p. 691.

<sup>4</sup> See Note 1.

clothed Woman's remaining a refugee in the wilderness.<sup>1</sup> It is surely scarce presumable, even à priori, that there should have been intended in the divine prophetic calendar two different successive periods of 42 months: during the one of which heathenized Christians would lord it over the Holy City, with the Wild Beast from the abyss heading them; during the other the Wild Beast from the sea, (the successor to the Dragon,) as if quite a different Wild Beast, but with a similarly heathenized subject constituency:<sup>2</sup>—two different and successive periods of 1260 days: during the one of which Christ's two Witnesses would prophesy in sackcloth, and be persecuted to death by one Beast; during the other Christ's true Church disappear from men's sight into the wilderness, while witnesses still remaining of her sons, to testify for Christ, became the objects of the same or another Beast's deadly persecutions.<sup>3</sup> Moreover Daniel's mention of but one such period, ere the saints' assumption of the kingdom,<sup>4</sup> seems to put such a supposition quite out of the question.—Hence the periods must be considered coincident: the vision of the Wild Beast from the sea, described in Apoc. xiii, running on in chronological parallel with that of the Witnesses' sackcloth-prophesying; (as also with those of the synchronic external judgments of the Saracens and the Turks;) that of the Woman and seven-headed Dragon, the subject of the preceding or xiith Apocalyptic Chapter, in chronological parallel with visions yet earlier.

A reason quite sufficient for the retrogression at once suggests itself, in the necessity of further information respecting the persecuting *Wild Beast*, lately referred to as the slayer of the Witnesses, in order to its clear elucidation. For (as I intimated at the close of my last chapter) must not St. John, on hearing of their being slain by *the Wild Beast from the abyss*, have necessarily felt the questions rising in his mind respecting it, Who? How? Whence?—Retrogression for explanations like this is a method practised by the best writers (I might instance *Gibbon* or *Hallam*) on modern European history. Having in the

<sup>1</sup> Compare Apoc. xi. 2, 3; xii. 14; xiii. 5.

<sup>2</sup> On the εθνη connected with either Beast see Apoc. xiii. 7, and Apoc. xi. 9, xvii. 15.

<sup>3</sup> See Apoc. xii. 17.

<sup>4</sup> Dan. vii. 25—27.

first instance described the events of some long period of time with reference chiefly to *secular matters*, or *foreign politics*, they return on their steps; in a new chapter or section of their book, to trace the *ecclesiastical history* through the same interval, and bring it up to the same point of time as the *secular*.—And let me add that the *opisthographism*, or *writing without*, as well as *within*,<sup>1</sup> of that seven-scaled scroll in the Lamb's hand, which contained, as we may presume, all the Apocalyptic prophecy, furnished peculiar facility for the exhibition of these retrogressive visions in their chronological parallelism with the visions preceding. On the full, or nearly full unrolling of the scroll, after the seventh trumpet's sounding, the length *without* might be exhibited to the Evangelist's sight similarly divided as the length *within*; and with many marks of parallelism and running correspondence connecting the one and the other. I say *many*, because in effect between the new visions and the old, there are traceable many and striking correspondencies; more, if I mistake not, than have hitherto been thought of: and all in continuous succession; just like the *tuches* and *loops*, to borrow an old comparison, of the hangings of the *Jewish Tabernacle*.<sup>2</sup> Now, supposing the one series to have been written *without*, as the other *within*, and the parallelism marked by corresponding lines in the Apocalyptic scroll, an evident fitness will appear in the opisthographic form of the scroll: a fitness worthy, as it seems to me, of its divine authorship, and such as no other explanation of it can suggest.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> I have already glanced at this view of the *writing without* in the Apocalyptic Book, in my General Introduction, Vol. i. p. 105.

<sup>2</sup> Exod. xxvi. 5, 6.

<sup>3</sup> The usual cause of *opisthographism* was, as Vitringa observes, p. 262, the *redundancy* of the matter beyond what the author, in choosing the length of his roll, had calculated on. "More fere receptum erat ut hujusmodi volumina *intus* tantum, sive *adversâ* parte, scriberentur. Rarius accidebat ut essent *οπισθογραφα*; h. e. parte etiam scriberentur *aversâ*, sive *exteriore*; quod tamen factum ubi materie major erat copia quàm ut interior membrane pars eam admitteret totam." Hence the affectation of it by some writers, as if to mark the overflowing fulness of their thoughts, on which Juvenal observes, Sat. i. 5:

aut summi plenâ jam margine libri  
Scriptus, et in tergo, necdum finitus, Orestes.

Of course no *such* reason could exist for the opisthographism of an inspired Book. And though in *Ezekiel's prophetic scroll*, (Ezek. ii. 10,) which was a collection of unconnected prophecies, it might simply indicate fulness, and in the *flying roll* of Zech. v. 1—3 simply a twofold division of the subject,\* yet something of more exact paral-

\* "This is the curse that goeth forth over the face of the whole earth. For every

To trace these marks of parallelism, as they occur, will be an object with me in what follows: the correspondencies, I mean, between the prophecies of chapters vi, vii, viii, ix, x, xi, on the one hand, and those of chapters xii, xiii, xiv, on the other. So far as they have been fulfilled, —in other words up to the times now present,—to trace them will I think not be difficult: the subject-matter of the one series being chiefly but not wholly *secular*, of the other chiefly but not wholly *ecclesiastical*; and the intermingling of subject in either case just sufficient to mark the parallelism and correspondency.—But of this enough. A sketch of the Scroll itself, thus divided, given near the beginning of my first Volume, best exhibits the whole to the reader's eye. It is time to proceed onward to the first vision of the new series itself.—Let me only, ere doing so, premise one observation. It is probable that the subject may prove one not admitting of so much dramatic interest in the development, as much of what has gone before: the chronological ground having been already once gone over, and the work now required that chiefly of deciphering the particulars of certain complicated hieroglyphics or enigmas. But, even admitting this, I pray the reader to believe that its importance is second to none, in the whole compass of the Apocalyptic prophecy. Especially at the present time there can be no over-estimating of it. “Herein will be wisdom,”<sup>1</sup> to understand the Beast's mystery. “Blessed is he that readeth, and they that [both with mind and heart] observe the things written, in this part of the prophecy.”

lelism might, as I conceive, be expected in that which contained, as did the *Apocalypse*, a continuous connected chain of prophecy. <sup>1</sup> Apoc. xiii. 18.

---

one that stealeth shall be cut off, as on *this* side, according to it; and every one that sweareth shall be cut off, as on *that* side, according to it.” On which Dr. A. Clarke thus comments. “It seems that the roll was written both on the *front* and *back*. Stealing and swearing are supposed to be two general heads of crimes; the former comprising sins against man, the latter sins against God.”

## CHAPTER I.

THE SUN-CLOTHED WOMAN TRAVAILING, AND SEVEN-  
HEADED DRAGON CAST DOWN.

“AND there appeared a great sign<sup>1</sup> in heaven; a woman clothed with the sun, and the moon under her feet, and upon her head a crown of twelve stars. And she, being with child, cried travailing in birth, and pained to be delivered.—And there appeared another sign in heaven: and behold a great red dragon, having seven heads and ten horns; and on his heads seven diadems. And his tail draws<sup>2</sup> the third part of the stars of heaven, and did cast them to the ground. And the dragon stood before the woman who was about to be delivered; for to devour her child, so soon as she may have brought forth.<sup>3</sup>—And she brought forth a man-child, who is destined<sup>4</sup> to rule all the nations<sup>5</sup> with a rod of iron. And her child was caught up unto God, and to his throne.—And the woman fled towards the wilderness;<sup>6</sup> where she hath a place prepared of God, that they should feed her there a thousand two hundred and threescore days.—And there was war in heaven. Michael and his angels fought<sup>7</sup> against the dragon; and the dragon fought and his angels; and prevailed not, neither was their place found any more in heaven. And the great dragon was cast out; that old serpent,

<sup>1</sup> Σημειον. The authorized version *wonder* would rather answer to the Greek *τερας*. The two words are used together in Heb. ii. 4; “*signs, and wonders, and miracles.*” A *σημειον*, or *sign*, is properly some visible representation, bearing resemblance to what the sign is to predict. So Ezekiel laying siege against a picture of Jerusalem; (Ezek. iv. 1—3); “This shall be a *sign* to the house of Israel.” Sometimes it was a living person that might be the *sign*. So Ezekiel xxiv. 24; “Thus Ezekiel is a *sign* ;” and Matt. xii. 39, “An evil generation seeketh after a *sign* ; and no *sign* shall be given to it but the *sign* of the prophet Jonas: for as Jonas, &c.” Also Luke ii. 12; &c.—So Bryce Johnston.

<sup>2</sup> σφρει.

<sup>3</sup> όταν τεκν.

<sup>4</sup> μελλει ποιμαιναι.

<sup>5</sup> Παντα τα εθνη, a word generally used in a bad sense throughout the Apocalypse, as of *heathens, or heathenized Christians.*

<sup>6</sup> εις την ερημον. The reason of my translating *εις* towards, rather than *into*, will be given afterwards. The *article* prefix will be also observed on.

<sup>7</sup> επολεμησαν. So the received text. B has *πολεμησαι*, A and C *τον πολεμησαι*. Which latter Dr. Wordsworth adopts. There is then to be supplied, “*went forth to fight with the Dragon.*” The sense is not affected by these various readings.

called the Devil and Satan, which deceiveth the whole world: <sup>1</sup> he was cast down upon the earth, and his angels were cast out with him.—And I heard a loud voice in heaven saying; ‘Now hath come the salvation, and the strength, and the kingdom of our God, and the authority of his Christ: for the accuser of our brethren is cast down, which accuseth them <sup>2</sup> before our God day and night. And they overcame him by the blood of the Lamb, and by the word of their testimony; and they loved not their lives unto the death. Therefore rejoice, heavens, and ye that dwell in them!’ <sup>3</sup>—Apoc. xii. 1—12.

Thus, as the best and necessary introduction to the prefiguration and history of the WILD BEAST FROM THE ABYSS, the Witnesses’ persecutor and murderer, there was first figured to St. John in vision something of that of an earlier and cognate enemy of the Church, the SEVEN-HEADED DRAGON.

In order to the deciphering of this hieroglyphic vision, it needs that we explain both *abstractedly*, and *historically*, 1. the *persons* or *things* indicated by the two associated symbols of the *woman travailing*, and the *seven-headed dragon* watching to devour her child; together with that of the *man-child’s birth and assumption to God’s throne*:—2. the *war in heaven* then ensuing, and the *dragon’s* consequent *dejection therefrom*;—3. the *song of triumph* celebrating it.

I. THE PRIMARY SYMBOLS OF THE TRAVAILING WOMAN, AND THE DRAGON HER ENEMY:—*considered*,

1st, *in themselves abstractedly*.

And as to that of the *travailing Woman*, first seen in vision, its intent can scarce be mistaken. She is spoken of in the last verse of this chapter as the mother of “those that keep the commandments of God, and the testimony of Jesus Christ.”<sup>4</sup> She was evidently therefore *Christ’s true visible*

<sup>1</sup> οἰκουμένην.

<sup>2</sup> ὁ κατηγορῶς. B, C.

<sup>3</sup> It will be seen that there is no variation in the critical from the received text, in the above verses, of the least consequence.

<sup>4</sup> Compare Gal. iv. 26; “The Jerusalem which is above, and free, and the mother of us all.” On which expression, see my Note <sup>2</sup>, Vol. i. p. 102.—The difference between this ideal mother-church of St. Paul, and the woman or church in the text, is, I conceive, that the *former* includes *all* the Lord’s saints, alike of all the successive



*Church on earth*:—the Church not simply indeed of the 144,000, or *first-born*, whose names were written in heaven; (a body known distinctively to God only;) but that containing and nurturing them: being at the time signified in the vision, it is evident, still generally sound in heart, as well as in the essentials of faith and doctrine; though not without the tarnish, more or less, of some earthly admixture. In respect of its Scriptural *public worship* the temple with its altar-court had been before used to represent it; in respect of *polity*, the symbol of the *holy city*.<sup>1</sup> But there was yet another character in which the Lord seems here to hint its relation to Him; viz. as a woman espoused to him, by virtue of the covenant-relationship entered into by baptism, and still faithfully profest:<sup>2</sup> just like Zion of old, of whom the same figure is so often predicated by the prophets, until Zion's apostasy.<sup>3</sup>—The Woman's clothing with the *sun* as her robe of light, the *moon* (the *crescent-moon*, I conceive) as the sandal to her feet,<sup>4</sup> and the *twelve stars* as her coronal or diadem, must needs have appeared on the scene of vision very beautiful: and it might perhaps recall to St.

generations of the world; the *latter* those only that are alive at any particular time on earth, and this with reference of course to their corporate or church character: also that the *former* (being regarded *anticipatively* as what it will be when fully constituted in the *heavenly state*) is supposed pure from all admixture of evil; while the *latter* has that admixture, not only from the remaining sin of true Christians, but also from the adhesion to it, always more or less, of orthodox but unsound professors.

<sup>1</sup> See Vol. i. pp. 101, 102; also Apoc. viii. 3, xi. 1, 2, &c.

<sup>2</sup> We must here, let me again observe, distinguish between this *earthly* affianced one, and the *heavenly*: the *heavenly* one including *none* but the *faithful in heart*;—all these, and all *perfected*. Such is the impersonation in Apoc. xix. 7; "The marriage of the Lamb hath come, and *his wife* hath made herself ready:" also Apoc. xxi. 2: "I saw the new Jerusalem . . . prepared as a *bride* adorned for her husband."—The 144,000, the only earthly living members of this heavenly bride, are hinted at in this character Apoc. xiv. 3, 4.

<sup>3</sup> Compare Jer. ii. 2, xxxi. 32, Ezek. xvi. 8, &c.

<sup>4</sup> In the Canticles, vii. 1, the *bride's shoes* are mentioned as among her ornaments of dress; "How beautiful are thy feet with shoes." And any one who may have seen the *gold* or *silver-embroidered*, and at one end *crescent-shaped*, shoes of the rich Asiatics, will recognise the appropriateness of this representation of the *crescent-moon* in the vision.—In Isa. iii. 18, Engl. V., "*round tires like the moon*" are mentioned among the ornaments of the daughters of Zion. But the Hebrew word for this is explained by Gesenius as ornaments in the form of a *half moon*; and so too Schroeder ap. A. Clarke. Diodati says, on that verse, that the Jewish ladies "wore such often on their shoes."

So, somewhat similarly, the noble Romans of St. John's time: as Statius expresses it, *Silv. v. 2. 29*;

Sic te clare puer genitum sibi curia sensit;  
Primaque *patriciâ* clausit vestigia *lunâ*.

On which says Domitius: "Lunatis calceis, id est habentibus speciem *medie lune*, utebantur nobiles."

John that description of the Church in the Song of Songs, "Fair as the moon, bright as the sun, and terrible as an host (*the starry host*, surely) with its streamers."<sup>1</sup>—But what the things prefigured hereby? This is the question. And, first, there can scarce be meant by the *solar* emblem, I think, what so many commentators have suggested in explanation,<sup>2</sup>—the Church's investiture with Christ as the sun of righteousness. The sun is nowhere in the Apocalyptic imagery made the representative of Christ. His countenance with *its own intrinsic light* is described as *like the sun*,<sup>3</sup> not as borrowing the sun to enlighten it: and, when fully revealed in the heavenly city, as altogether superseding it to the favoured inhabitants.<sup>4</sup> Not, again, by her having the *moon subjacent* can there be meant a trampling on things *sublunary*. Can the *moon* signify *things under the moon*?<sup>5</sup> Consistency requires that we explain these greater luminaries to signify the chief rulers of the state, according to the general prophetic use of the symbols; <sup>6</sup> and in the same way the *stars*, also seen in symbol, to signify lesser rulers in it. As to the precisely defined number of *twelve stars*,—considering that the professing Church on the Apocalyptic scene, including the *true*, was in an earlier vision (though one depicting somewhat later and worse

<sup>1</sup> Cant. vi. 10. In the authorized version it is "terrible as an army [the word *army*, or *host*, is supplied] with banners:" and it is suggested by learned commentators that the allusion in the word *banners* is to the *distinctive lights* of different companies of a caravan travelling by night, high raised on a pole before each company. See Dr. A. Clarke's note ad loc. But why not rather the streaming lights, or constellations, of the heavenly host;—associated as the figure is with the sun and moon? The word *host* (if that be the one supplied) is applied, alike in the corresponding Hebrew, *סִבְיָוֹת*, and in the English, to the *starry hosts*; as well as to earthly hosts or armies.

<sup>2</sup> For example, among *modern* expositors, Mede, Daubuz, Vitringa, Bishop Newton, Sir I. Newton, &c.—And so too one of the most *ancient*, Hippolytus; whose explanation of the whole symbol I here add. "*Mulierem amictam sole clarissimè Ecclesiam significavit, paterno indutam Verbo, quod sole micantius splendet. Dicendo lunam sub pedibus ejus, cœlesti claritate, lunæ in morem, ornatam ostendit. Quòd autem ait, in capite ejus corona stellarum duodecim, duodecim apostolos designat, per quos fundata est ecclesia.*" Her parturition he explains to be the Church's incessant bringing forth of Christ in the heart of those that believe, as it preaches the Gospel. "*Non cessat Ecclesia ex corde Verbum gignere. . . Dum Christum, Dei masculam et perfectam prolem, qui Deus et homo prædicatur, semper parit docet omnes gentes.*" Combes' Lat. Transl. B. P. M. xxvii. 8.

<sup>3</sup> Compare Apoc. i. 16, x. 1: also Matt. xvii. 2, &c.

<sup>4</sup> Apoc. xxi. 23; "The city had no need of the sun, neither of the moon, to shine in it: for . . . the Lamb was the light thereof:" and so again xxii. 5.

<sup>5</sup> A sandal too is worn not to be trampled, but to protect the foot.

<sup>6</sup> Compare Apoc. vi. 12; viii. 12, &c. See also Vol. i. p. 247.

times<sup>1</sup>) numerically symbolized as the twelve tribes of Israel, we cannot well err, I think, in explaining them to signify the heads, or ecclesiastical rulers, of those twelve tribes. The rather so, since this interpretation agrees with that which is given by inspiration itself of almost precisely the same symbol, in the earliest of all emblematic visions, the dream of Jacob's son Joseph:<sup>2</sup> and indeed with that explanatory note given at the very commencement of the Apocalyptic visions by the revealing Angel himself; "The seven stars are the *angels* [or *chief* and *presiding ministers*] of the seven churches."<sup>3</sup>

And thus we are led to see that the figuration here given of Christ's faithful Church was not one universally, or even generally, true; but designative of it at *some remarkable and particular time and conjuncture*: viz. when the ruling powers in the Apocalyptic world would be associated with it, as its decoration and support; and its ecclesiastical rulers, or bishops, would be recognised as dignified authorities before the world.—And indeed much the same thing is indicated by the very representation of the Woman as *in heaven*. For the *heaven* meant is evidently that of *political elevation*; just as in the vision, a little while since discussed by us, of the *ascent of the witnesses*: it being one in which the *Dragon* might occupy a place, as well as the *Woman*; and one, moreover, the position in which is expressly contrasted with dejection to the earth, as of a change from political power to political degradation.<sup>4</sup>—As to the description of her *travailing*, like a woman at her full time, to bring forth a *male child*, the meaning of this, *considered by itself*, might perhaps at first seem to be simply enough inferable from the very similar imagery in one of Isaiah's visions, descriptive of the yet future restoration of the Jews. For, after the words, "Before she travailed she

<sup>1</sup> Times consequently when a distinction needed absolutely to be made between the *δωδεκαφυλον* of the *professing*, and the *δωδεκαφυλον* of the *true* Israel; the latter taken and marked from out of the former.

<sup>2</sup> Gen. xxxvii. 9, 10; "I have dreamed a dream; and, behold, the sun and the moon and the eleven stars made obeisance to me.' . . . And his father said, 'Shall I, and thy mother, and thy brethren [the heads of eleven of the tribes of Israel], indeed come to bow down ourselves to thee?'"

<sup>3</sup> Apoc. i. 20.

<sup>4</sup> Apoc. xii. 9.—Dr. Todd in his *Apocalyptic Lectures*, p. 230, admits the distinction of this heaven from that of the Divine manifestation: as already observed by me in my Vol. ii. p. 466 Note 2.

brought forth, before her pain came she was delivered of a *man-child*," the explanation is thus given by himself the inspired Prophet; "Shall the land be made to bring forth in one day? or shall a *nation* be born at once? For, as soon as *Zion* travailed, she brought forth *children*."<sup>1</sup> Thus *the male child* of which the *literal Zion* is in the latter time to be delivered, is declared to mean *her children united, and multiplied into a nation, or dominant body politic*; with triumph, glory, and general blessedness accompanying. Whence the natural inference that the *man-child* of whom the *figurative Zion, or Christian Church*, appeared in our Apocalyptic vision travailing to be delivered, might mean probably *her children* united into a *body politic*, and raised to *dominant power*; with the accompaniments of deliverance, triumph, and glory attending their nationalization and elevation.<sup>2</sup>—But, after mention of a great dragon's appearance in the same heaven, waiting to devour the child so soon as brought forth, (of which dragon more presently,) there is added the further and very remarkable particular about this man-child, that when born *he was caught up to God and to his throne*; and that he was destined to *rule all the heathen people, or nations, with a rod of iron*. Might this too consist with the above view of the man-child?—It is to be premised that the context itself, while precluding the idea of reference to Jesus Christ's own birth into the world, and subsequent ascension to heaven, as suggested by certain expositors,<sup>3</sup> excludes also all reference of the symbol

<sup>1</sup> Isaiah lvi. 8, 9, with the context. See also Micah v. 3.

<sup>2</sup> Daubuz (p. 519) compares Cicero's figure of speech depicting the day of Rome's deliverance from Catiline's conspiracy as its *birthday*: "Quem ego diem verè natalem hujus urbis, aut certè salutarem, appellare possum." Orat. pro L. Flaëco.

<sup>3</sup> For 1st, in such a view of the Apocalyptic figuration, it must have retrograded to figure not, as the revealing angel said, "things which are, or things to happen afterwards," but things past 100 years before the vision in Patmos, in a manner quite unparalleled in the whole of the rest of the Apocalyptic prophecy. 2. Christ is nowhere called the *son of the Church*, but its *husband*: Isa. ix. 6, which has been cited, saying only, "To us a child is born, to us a son is given;" not, a child is *born of the Church*. 3. If, notwithstanding this, an expositor will have Christ to be the *son of the Church*, it must be of the *Jewish Church*: and so the woman in the vision will personify the *Jewish Church*, not the *Christian*. But how could the Jewish Church at that time be figured as either in the heaven of *political* or *spiritual* elevation; seeing that, *nationally*, it was then oppressed under Roman masters, and *religiously* it was far gone into formalism, superstition, and apostasy? 4. In this case too the subsequent 1260 days, or years, of dwelling in the wilderness must be assigned to the Jewish Church:—a supposition of course out of the question; unless we suppose the old Jewish, first figured by the woman, to have been changed in the interim

to that ultimate, perfect, and most glorious incorporation into one nation of all true Christians, and exaltation to a place on Christ's throne, which Christ promises to his saints at the consummation;<sup>1</sup> and of which St. Paul too, while depicting *the creation* as a travailing woman, writes in glowing language.<sup>2</sup> For the next figuration of the fortunes of the Woman, or Church, showed that she was immediately afterwards to be persecuted by the Dragon; and then to spend 1260 days, or years, in the wilderness. So that we are forced back from that view of the man-child to the much lower view of an elevation of the Christian body, after prior establishment in the firmament of political exaltation, to some speedily following supremacy of the throne, in the Apocalyptic world. And, as that world has appeared all through the previous visions to be the Roman world, or Roman empire, the view seems as reasonable as natural which expounds the symbol by reference to Constantine's enthronization over *it*, in the character of a *Christian* emperor, inclusive of other orthodox Christian Roman emperors after him. That their throne might thenceforth be called *God's throne* would seem inferable, as I shall soon have again to observe, from David's and Solomon's throne being so called.<sup>3</sup> And we shall also then see reason for their being prophetically designated as the *Woman's* (or *Church's*) *male child*.—On these points however it may be well to defer our remarks till we have considered what is stated about *the Dragon*, the *great red Dragon*, that was figured as waiting to devour the Woman's male child; and the very distinctive chronological indications, which, as I think, are therewith connected.

into the new form of the Christian Church, of which transformation there is not a hint in the prophecy.

<sup>1</sup> Apoc. ii. 26, 27, iii. 21.

<sup>2</sup> Rom. viii. 19, 22, 23.

<sup>3</sup> 1 Chron. xxix. 23, "Solomon sate on the throne of the LORD." A passage explained by 1 Chron. xxviii. 5; "The Lord hath chosen Solomon my son to sit upon the throne of the kingdom of the LORD over Israel." (See p. 22.)

So too Jer. xlix. 38; "And I will set *my throne* in Elam, and will destroy from thence the king and the princes, saith the Lord." On which Mr. Lowth thus comments. "Nebuchadnezzar's throne (after conquering Elam) is called *God's throne*, as Nebuchadnezzar is called God's servant; *one that had an especial commission from God*, to conquer this and the neighbouring countries."

"*To God and to his throne*" seems an *hendiadys* for God's throne: as in Apoc. xiii. 12, "the earth and them that dwell therein," for the earth's inhabitants. This is not uncommon.

Next then as to that other sign in the heaven, “*a great red Dragon*, having seven heads and ten horns; . . . and which stood before the woman who was about to be delivered, for to devour her child, so soon as born.”—In itself, and without the adjunct of some further and distinctive peculiarities, a *dragon* might be considered as the fit representative of *any* heathen persecutor: a persecutor in character resembling Pharaoh of Egypt;<sup>1</sup> and animated by Him who is here set forth as the actor and ruler in all the great heathen powers of this world, viz. that malignant spirit which first tempted Eve in Paradise, the old Serpent, the Devil.<sup>2</sup> But what is added of the Dragon now seen by St. John having *seven heads and ten horns*, marked it (though bear-

<sup>1</sup> The figure is primarily Egyptian; having reference to the *Nile-dragon*, or *crocodile*. So Psalm lxxiv. 13; “Thou brakest the heads of the dragons in the waters:” Isa. li. 9; “Art thou not it that hast cut Rahab, and wounded the dragon?” Ezek. xxix. 3; “I am against thee, Pharaoh, . . . the great dragon that lieth in the midst of its rivers;”—all written of the Egyptian anti-Israelitish power.—The reader will not have forgot that *Egypt* is among the Apocalyptic designations of Rome;—“which is spiritually called Sodom and *Egypt*.” Apoc. xi. 8.

Let me observe that, as in the Greek Sept. and N. T., so in the Hebrew O. T. there are two words translated *serpent* and *dragon*, שָׂרָפָה and תַּנִּינִי. The former is used Gen. iii. 1, and also Exod. iv. 3, vii. 15; the other Exod. vii. 9, 10, 12; and in the two latter chapters, in which alike Moses’ rod is spoken of as changed into a *serpent*, evidently with the same meaning. Hence they seem interchangeable. Now the one, as well as the other, is used to figure Egypt and Pharaoh; and one is also used for the constellation of the *serpent*, or *dragon*. So Job xxvi. 13. Both which allusions, the *Egyptian* and the *astronomical*, as well as the *Satanic* of Gen. iii., seem to me here included.

<sup>2</sup> This is evidently all that is meant by the explanatory observation in verse 9, “the great Dragon, that old serpent, called the Devil and Satan.” Dr. S. R. Maitland indeed observes; “What meaning is there in language, . . . if we can make the dragon *anything but the great enemy of man*; while we read, ‘The great Dragon was cast out, that old serpent called the Devil and Satan.’” Second Enquiry, p. 24. But would he argue that in the passages, “Get thee behind me, Satan,” and, “One of you is a devil,” (Matt. xvi. 23, John vi. 70.) the Devil is meant *abstractedly*, and *personally*; not, as prompting Peter, and animating Judas? “Judas Satanus esse ostenditur,” says Hilary on Ps. cxlii. (Vol. i. 468.) “quia per illum animabatur.”\* Or, again, would Dr. M. contend that the Devil *personally* has seven heads and ten horns? †

\* Similarly Chrysostom, on 1 Tim. iv. 1, says that St. Paul here called Manichean and other heretics πνεύματα πλάνης, *dæmon spirits of error*, as being inspired by those dæmon spirits.

† I must beg particular attention to my explanation here given, which is the same as in my former Editions: because, in spite of it, and of the above reference in my Note to Dr. S. R. Maitland, I have been represented by more than one profest critic as excluding all sense of the *Devil* from the Apocalyptic symbol. So, last, by Mr. C. Maitland, p. 16. In order to support his representation he passes over in total silence my prominent statement of the persecuting power symbolized being *animated by the old Serpent the Devil*.—The only real questions between us are these: 1. Has the Devil *personally* seven heads and ten horns? a question which Mr. C. M. himself would scarcely answer in the affirmative. 2. If not, what symbolic reference have they? To the Roman persecuting power, as in Apoc. xvii. 9? or to what other?

ing indeed in the *diadems* the strange badge of *Asiatic royalty*) as distinctively the persecuting power of *Imperial Rome*. For these heads could scarce be different from the first seven of the *Beast*, the Dragon's successor. And the latter were elsewhere thus *primarily* explained by an Angel interpreter; "The seven heads are *seven hills* on which the woman (i. e. *Rome*) sitteth:"<sup>1</sup>—a *secondary* and figurative meaning being also assigned to them; of which (as well as of the *ten horns*, here figured, I conceive, in connexion with the Dragon's seventh head, but as yet *undiademed*) I shall speak with more advantage in a subsequent chapter; only now observing that this too was characteristic of the Roman empire.—The suitability of this symbol to designate the Roman emperors and empire as a *persecuting antichristian power*,<sup>2</sup> bent as it was, like Pharaoh, on destroying the Christian Israel just on the eve of its political establishment, is evident.<sup>3</sup>—Besides which its *national* appropriateness has been noted by commentators; inasmuch as *the dragon* was one of the military ensigns of imperial Rome. In fact, in respect of both colour and attitude, the dragon of the Roman ensign did not inaptly resemble that of the vision before us.<sup>4</sup>

But now let us look to the *chronological* indications in the imagery of this part of the vision.—And first there seems to me to have been to a certain extent a chronological indication in the very use of the symbol of a *dragon*.

<sup>1</sup> Apoc. xvii. 9, 18.—On the identity of the Dragon's and the Beast's seven heads, see my next chapter.

<sup>2</sup> As a *military power* the *war-horse* was chosen to symbolize it. See Vol. i. 125.

<sup>3</sup> I here use *antichristian*, for want of another word, in its less proper sense of *hostile to Christianity*. See Vol. i. p. 65.

<sup>4</sup> Compare the danger of the Israelitish male children, especially Moses, exposed as they were on the Nile to the Nile-dragons or crocodiles. Exod. i. 22, ii. 3.

<sup>5</sup> See in my Plate at p. 17, the sketch of one from Montfaucon, vii. 403, 405.—Ammianus Marcellinus (xvi. 10) thus describes it: "The dragon was covered with purple cloth, and fastened to the end of a pike gilt, and adorned with precious stones: its wide throat being opened, so that the wind blew through it; and it hissed, as if in a rage, with its tail floating in various folds to the breeze." He elsewhere often gives it the epithet of *purpureus*, purple-red: "*purpureum signum draconis*," &c.—With which Claudian's description well agrees; cited by Lindenbrogue, among other parallel passages, ad loc. Amm. Mare.

Hi volucres tollunt aquilas; hi picta draconum  
Colla levant: multumque timent per nubila serpens,  
Iratu stimulante noto, vivitque receptis  
Flatibus, et vario mentitur sibila flatu.

For the Apocalypse, I think, makes use of no self-adopted symbols of a country, in reference to times earlier than their actual adoption in that country.<sup>1</sup> And, since it was not till near the close of the 2nd century that the *dragon* was first used as a Roman ensign, nor till the third that its use had become common,<sup>2</sup> we might thence probably infer that the time represented in the vision was scarce earlier than the third century.<sup>3</sup>—A chronological indication of the same kind, but yet more restrictive, appears in the use of *diadems*, not *crowns*, on the heads of the dragon, in signification of royal or ruling power. For, as observed in an early chapter of this Commentary, it was not till the time of Diocletian, at, or just after, the close of the third century, that the *diadem* was adopted as one of the imperial insignia:<sup>4</sup> an innovation accompanied with others so important as to constitute, we shall hereafter see,<sup>5</sup> an epoch in the Roman imperial history.—Yet again it is to be observed, as indicative of the precise time referred to, that though the Dragon, or antichristian power<sup>6</sup> of Rome, was still in the political heaven, yet it was only as drawing with his

<sup>1</sup> So in regard of the *horse*, the *crown*, the *sword*, and the *balance* in the three first Seals; also of the *diadem*, as here used, and in ch. xiii. 1.—Compare too Part ii. ch. v. § 1, in my 1st Volume.

<sup>2</sup> In Trajan's time it was a Dacian ensign, not a Roman; as appears from the bas-reliefs on Trajan's arch. A century afterwards it was, as a Roman ensign, sculptured on Severus' arch of triumph.—Later in the third century it had become almost as notorious among Roman ensigns as the *eagle* itself: (see Pollio's Gallienus, c. 8;) and is in the fourth century noted by Prudentius, Vegetius, Gregory Nazianzen, Chrysostom, as well as Ammianus Marcellinus above quoted: also in the fifth, as we have seen, by Claudian, and others.

<sup>3</sup> The Roman appropriateness of the symbol, as early as the first quarter of the 3rd century, appears also from the story of Alexander Severus' mother dreaming just before his birth that she brought forth a *purple dragon*. “Mater ejus pridie quam pareret somniavit se purpureum dracunculum parere.” Lamprid. Vit. Alex. Sev. ch. 14.—Nor is the story out of point, which is told by the emperor Galerius of his mother's conception of him: “Is insolenter affirmare ausus est matrem . . . compressam dracone semet concepisse.” Victor Epit. c. 40.—“*Anguem majorem*,” again, is Cyprian's appellation of the persecuting Decius. Ep. 21.

<sup>4</sup> “Is,” viz. *Diocletian*, “gemmas vestibus calciamentisque inseruit, *diademamque* in capite.” So Jornandes; followed by Tillemont and Gibbon.\* See my Vol. i. p. 136; also my full and critical Essay on the subject in the Appendix to the present Volume.

<sup>5</sup> Viz. in Ch. iv. of this Part iv.

<sup>6</sup> See Note <sup>2</sup> p. 13.

\* In my earlier Editions I had cited Jornandes as, like the younger Victor, ascribing this to *Aurclian*. I so cited from Rasche's Lexicon, who is in error. Subsequently I had the opportunity of consulting Jornandes' own work, and found the statement to be that here given.

The younger Victor is shown by the evidence of medals to have dated the assumption of the diadem by Roman emperors too early.‡



tail a *third part* of the stars of heaven.—So that the intended period would seem to have been some little before the total dejection of heathenism from its supremacy in the Roman empire, in the fourth century: in short, that of the same *crisis of transition* from the heathen supremacy to the Christian that the previous figuration of the *Woman* indicated. To this crisis every indication seems to me to converge. And it is precisely such an one as prophecy delights in depicting.

For the verification both of what was figured of the crisis itself, and of its results in the *Woman's* parturition, her male child's elevation, and then the *Dragon's* dejection from heaven, we now look, as proposed, into history. It is easily seen, notwithstanding Faber's assertion of their incompatibility,<sup>1</sup> how at such a crisis the *Woman's* and *Dragon's* elevation might well have existed contemporarily in the same political heaven. But it is something much more precise and definite respecting their relative positions that we have now to verify in history:—viz. a crisis when not only both the one and the other were elevated in political power, but when the proportion of power was such, that the *Heathen Dragon* held ascendancy in but *one third* of the Roman political heaven, the *Christian Church* in the *other two*. This point is one never yet, I believe, explained by expositors. Yet, on investigation of the history of the times referred to, we shall, if I mistake not, find a solution answering both to this and to all other requirements of the case:—a solution referable to the reigns successively of the two last heathen Roman emperors:<sup>2</sup> the *former* notable, as first distinctly marking out a *tripartition* of the Roman world, well accordant with the Apocalyptic figurations both here and elsewhere:<sup>3</sup> the *latter* yet more so; as answering here not only on that point, but also in regard of what may seem to have been *the final crisis of the mystic woman's travelling, and bringing forth*.


<sup>1</sup> "According to *neither* interpretation of *heaven*" (i. e. as denoting either *secular* or *ecclesiastical* supremacy) "can we place the Christians and the Pagans within the limits of the same heaven. Antecedent to the time of Constantine, though the Pagans were in the secular heaven, the oppressed and persecuted Christians were excluded from all participation in it:" &c. Sacred Cal. iii. 84.

<sup>2</sup> Last, I mean, in the *continuous* heathen imperial line; not including *Julian*.

<sup>3</sup> See my Vol. i. p. 361; also the Paper in its Appendix on this point.



THE ROMAN IMPERIAL ENSIGN OF THE DRAGON.




From Montfaucon

---

MAXIMIAN .

As the destroyer of the Seven-headed Hydra of Christianity.



From a Medal in the Paris Collection.

2. *The historical solutions of the crisis prefigured.*

My *primary* solution, one which, though otherwise less perfect, yet, as illustrative of the *tripartition* so prominent in the vision, I cannot pass over silently, has reference to the earlier crisis of the mystic woman's travailing A.D. 313.—It is to be remarked that in 303, when Diocletian and Galerius published their terrible edicts of persecution against the Christians, the Roman empire was divided into four Tetrarchies, governed respectively by Diocletian and Maximian in the character of the two *Augusti*, or senior Emperors, and Galerius and Constantius as the two *Cæsars*, or junior Emperors: the empire however being considered as still *politically* united and one. Soon after this, Diocletian and Maximian abdicated. And, a few other changes having occurred in the years next following, the empire was at the commencement of the year 311 thus partitioned:—Britain, Gaul, and Spain under *Constantine*, the son and successor to Constantius;—Italy, together with the African Province, under *Maxentius*;—Illyricum under *Licinius*;—the East of Europe with Asia under *Galerius*, now the first in dignity of the *Augusti*;—and Syria and Egypt under *Maximin*: which last of the list had just previously been appointed, with the Syrian and Egyptian Government as his appanage, a fifth Emperor.—During this period what the Church suffered it is needless to recount. The vision of the 5th Seal has depicted it.<sup>1</sup> The sorrows as of a woman in travail had indeed come upon her.<sup>2</sup> Her children were to be crushed, as if one of the hydra-like enemies of the state, by the self-deified champions of Roman Polytheism and the Roman Empire.<sup>3</sup>—

<sup>1</sup> See my Vol. i. p. 209.

<sup>2</sup> Mr. Biley seems to think that the emblem of a woman's childbirth-throes can only be interpreted as meaning *internal* trials and sorrows. But I do not see that we are thus restricted by Scripture analogy. In the case of Zion's travailing-throes, as depicted by Isaiah, (Is. lxvi. 8.) and of the throes of the creation as depicted by St. Paul, (Rom. viii. 22,) the contrary seems plainly the fact. More especially St. Paul, by what he says in verses 18, 36, of the chapter alluded to, shows distinctly that the sufferings of Christians from *external* persecution were comprehended in his view of the creation's throes of childbirth.

<sup>3</sup> See the medal appended; where Maximian appears in the guise and with the name of Hercules, destroying some hydra enemy. Similar in character to which is a medal of Diocletian, as Jove striking down with his thunderbolt a Titan monster, ending in serpents, in place of the lower half of the human body.—The exact year of these being struck is uncertain. Eckhel, viii. 9, 19, places them among the *numi rari* from

In the May following, however, light dawned on the Christians. From his sick and dying bed the conscience-stricken Galerius issued an *Edict of Toleration* in their favour:—an Edict which was published in the names of Constantine and Licinius, as consentient parties, as well as in his own; though not in those of Maxentius or Maximin. And when, in the course of the two next eventful years, the following further changes had occurred,—viz. the European Provinces of Galerius been appropriated, on his death, by Licinius, the Asiatic by Maximin,<sup>1</sup> and those of the Emperor Maxentius, on his defeat and death, by Constantine,—when, in this manner, the Roman empire had for the first time become *tripartited* between three Emperors,<sup>2</sup>—the precedence among whom, I may just observe in passing, was adjudged by the Senate to Constantine,<sup>3</sup>—the Christians emerged from these political revolutions thus variously circumstanced. In *two thirds* of the Empire, embracing its whole European and African territory, they enjoyed toleration; and presently after, by virtue of the celebrated Milan Decree of Constantine and Licinius, issued March 313 in their favour, the imperial kindly recognition and support: in the *other* or *Asiatic third* they were still, after a brief and uncertain respite, exposed to persecution, in all its bitterness and cruelty, as before.

284 to 304 A.D.; including therefore 303, the year of the commencement of their persecution of the Christians.

In the legends the titles *Jovius* and *Herculius* are amply explained from the two emperors' foolish devotion to Jupiter and Hercules; from which gods they affected to be sprung, whom to represent, and as whom to be worshipped. But who the enemies figured as destroyed by them, under symbol of the Titan and the hydra? Were these the barbarian invaders of the empire only? Eekhel (ib. 19) inclines to this notion. On the other hand Spanheim (*De Præst. Diss.* 3, pp. 231, 232) and Beger, (*Thesaurus Palat.* p. 361,) in commenting on the hydra medal, explain it, as well as other writers, with reference to the emperors' persecution of the Christians.—Nor I think without reason. That they regarded the Christians, and thought to have destroyed them, as enemies of the state, appears in their famous inscription; “*Diocletianus Jovius et Maximianus Herculeus . . . nomine Christianorum deleti, qui Remp. evertabant.*” And so Gibbon, quoted Vol. i. p. 210. Compare too Lactantius' boast over the Jovii and Herculii, cited by me, Vol. i. p. 245 Note 2.

A copy of the medal is given by Schwartz in his *Prolegom.* in Mamertin. Genethl. p. 1185, who refers to, and approves, Spanheim's explanation. (Ed. Valpy.)

<sup>1</sup> So Gibbon, ii. 214; “The Provinces of Asia fell to the share of Maximin, and those of Europe augmented the portion of Licinius. The Hellespont and the Thracian Bosphorus formed their mutual boundary.”—Milner (iv. 1) incorrectly assigns Asia Minor to *Licinius* in the partition. <sup>2</sup> See my *Tabular View*, Vol. i. p. 361.

<sup>3</sup> “The Senate past a decree to assign Constantine the first rank among the *three Augusti* who then governed the Roman world.” Gibbon, ii. 234.

And now then was not the state of things in the Roman empire one that well answered to the crisis depicted in the vision?—*First* the Christian Church, united as one in the true Christian faith,<sup>1</sup> and morally bright and beautiful,—abundantly the more so from the purifying effect of the last persecution,<sup>2</sup>—appeared before the world ascendant, for the first time, in the political heaven;<sup>3</sup> with the full sunshine on it of the highest of the three Imperial dignities, the favour of the second, and legal recognition by the whole Roman world:<sup>4</sup> moreover with the chief bishops resplendent at its head, as a starry coronal;<sup>5</sup> the heads, now imperially recognised, of the *δωδεκαφυλον* of the Christian Israel.<sup>6</sup>—The time at which she thus appeared has been observed on as the expiration of her 40th week of gestation, calculated on the year-day prophetic chronological scale from the Lord's ascension.<sup>7</sup> Her travail had begun, above a prophetic week before, in the Diocletianic persecution; and long,

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Burton observes that when Constantine was admitted into the Church, "it was one and undivided as to articles of faith;" and "comprised the whole body of believers throughout the world:" the Novatians, Meletians, and Donatists being rather schismatics than heretics. *Hist. of the Christian Church*, ad fin. pp. 400, 405.

<sup>2</sup> "I have alluded to this need, and purifying effect, of the heathen persecutions of the Christian Church in my Vol. i. pp. 226, 227. "We must not expect," says Neander, i. 278 (Rose), "to find in the then visible Church any community entirely glorious, and without spot and wrinkle. . . On the other hand we should not fail to perceive the heavenly beauty, which really did beam through the stains and blemishes of the early Church."—Compare Milner iii. 21, 22.

I have already observed that it is Christ's *true Catholic professing Church* which seems to me to be specially contemplated all through this Apocalyptic figuration; though with that admixture of orthodox professors *unsound* in heart before God, as well as *sound*, and that admixture too of imperfection in the really good, which must ever characterize it as a *visible corporation* here below.

<sup>3</sup> Compare Gibbon, iii. 278, to the same effect.

<sup>4</sup> See Gibb. ii. 486—489, and iii. 244.

<sup>5</sup> Mr. Biley, p. 167, compares the words of the celebrated Decree of Theodosius II and Valentinian III, address in 445 A.D. to the Bishop of Rome; "sedis sancti Petri qui princeps est *episcopalis coronæ*:" also, from Gregory the Ist's Letter to the Patriarch of Constantinople; "Ille ad imitandum proponitur qui . . . dixit, In cælum ascendam; super astra cæli exaltabo solium meum? Quid enim fratres tui omnes universalis ecclesiæ episcopi nisi *astra cæli* sunt?"

<sup>6</sup> See the Notes p. 22 *infra*, with reference to the epoch of Constantine's final triumph over the powers of Heathenism in the Roman empire, ten years later.

<sup>7</sup> "As the time of gestation, from the conception to the birth, in women with child, is known to be 40 weeks, or 280 days, so . . . from the first rise of our Saviour's kingdom at his resurrection and ascension, A.D. 33, till the famous Proclamation and Edict for the universal liberty and advancement of Christianity by Constantine and Licinius, A.D. 313, which put an end to the pangs of birth in the heaviest persecution that ever was then known, was exactly 280 years." Whiston, p. 247; a passage cited by Bishop Newton. The 39th week expired in the Diocletian persecution.

Compare the Jewish Rabbins' explanation of Micah's prophecy, "Until the time that *she that travaileth hath brought forth*:" an explanation based on the same principle; and which will be given by me in a Note in my Chapter ix. § 1, *infra*.

and painful, and ineffective hitherto, had been her sufferings. She had been with child: she had been in pain: she had brought forth but wind: she had wrought no deliverance on the earth.<sup>1</sup> But now the hour for her deliverance seemed come. The throes immediately preceding child-birth were upon her, and under the best auspices. The imperial edict of favour to the Christians was but the precursor evidently to the *establishment of Christianity*; and so, by speedy consequence, to its *supremacy* in the empire. Might not this be the thing meant by the man-child's birth and assumption to God's throne? Then what next but the ruling of the heathens in the empire with a rod of iron? For it had long been evident that Christianity and Heathenism could not consist together in power; and that, on the elevation of the former, there must needs follow the oppression, and finally the subversion, of the latter.<sup>2</sup>

On the other hand,—to turn to the *second* symbol represented,—the old Roman Heathen power, concentrated for the time in Maximin, the third Emperor of the Roman world, with rule from the Nile to the Bosphorus, itself now under its 7th ruling head,<sup>3</sup> and in closest alliance moreover with the similarly heathen Goths and Vandals on the Danubian confines,<sup>4</sup> by whom it was soon to be aided in its war against Christianity,<sup>5</sup> appeared like a *great red dragon* in the heaven of vision:—the *Dragon* constellation, as it were, in opposition to the constellation of the *Woman*.<sup>6</sup> Infuriate, as if inspired by Satan, at the now imminent prospect of the Christian body attaining supremacy in the empire, Maximin renewed the persecution against

<sup>1</sup> Isa. xxvi. 17, 18.

<sup>2</sup> Even before the Diocletianic persecution, on Constantius Chlorus (father to Constantine) showing favour to the Christians of his government, we are told; "This alarmed the Pagan priests, whose interests were so closely connected with the continuance of the ancient superstitions; and who apprehended, not without reason, that to their great detriment the Christian religion would become daily more universal and triumphant throughout the empire." Mosheim, iv. 1. 1. 1.—It was the conviction of its incompatibility with the old establishment of Heathenism which no doubt originated Diocletian's persecutions. See my Vol. i. pp. 214, 220—222.

<sup>3</sup> See my Ch. iv. § 1, *infra*.

<sup>4</sup> See Gibb. ii. 18, 254, on the treaty of alliance made in 270 by Aurelian with the Goths, and still in force: also my notice of it pp. 60, 61 *infra*.

<sup>5</sup> See my Ch. ii. *infra*, on the floods cast out of the Dragon's mouth; also Ch. iv. § 2, on the 10 horns, which I suppose to be here pictured proleptically on the Dragon.

<sup>6</sup> It should be remembered that ancient astronomers, as well as modern, were used to figure dragons (such as "Ophiuchus huge"), and women, out of the starry constellations. Indeed *our* stellar figurations are derived from *them*.

Christians within the limits of his own dominion; prohibiting their assemblies, and degrading, and even killing their bishops. "He drew with his tail the third part of the stars of heaven, and cast them to the ground."<sup>1</sup> And, as the vital blow against the Christian cause and Church needed to be struck, as he thought, at those Emperors who had adopted and patronized it, he made war against them, and rushed fiercely to the conflict; vowing to Jupiter before the decisive battle, that, if victorious, he would abolish the Christian name. "For the contest between Jehovah and Jupiter was now at its height, and drawing to a crisis."<sup>2</sup>—But what the result? Maximin's fury, as we know, was in vain. On the 30th of April 313 he was defeated by Licinius; and three or four months after died, like Galerius, in agonies, confessing himself vanquished.<sup>3</sup> "His defeat and death," says Gibbon, "delivered the Church from the last [he should have said the last *then apparent* on the scene] and most implacable of her enemies."<sup>4</sup> The Christian Church triumphed. The mystic man-child of a recognised Christian people (if we so understand the symbol) appeared born, as it were, and with the prospect of speedy ascendancy throughout the empire; having attached to it already political power, and the imperial favour.

Not, however, to be advanced to the elevation of supremacy in the empire without yet a further conflict. Ere the elevation of the man-child (so interpreting the symbol) was effected,—ere, to use Gibbon's illustrative language, "*Christianity* [by the aid of Constantine] *was seated on the throne of the Roman world*,"<sup>5</sup>—the Woman, the Church, had the throes as it were of after-birth to experience, in still another crisis of trial and danger: and this, somewhat remarkably, from one who was Maximin's immediate successor, seated in his own station of imperial dignity, acting in his own

<sup>1</sup> "Moveret caudam suam Draco, in quâ vis ejus sita est; eâque, modo explicitâ vibratâque, modo in spiras volutâ, tantos inter celestia corpora motus daret, ut multa sidera de cælo in terram vi deicerentur." So Vitringa, p. 702, on the *figure* represented in the vision. On its *signification* compare Dan. viii. 10; "It" (the little horn) "cast down some of the host and stars to the ground, and stamped upon them."

Compare what I have said of the *fallen star* that opened the pit of the abyss under the 5th Trumpet, Vol. i. pp. 443—445; and of the *falling stars* of the 6th Seal, ib. 246. The same figure was used by the martyr Pionius, says Daubuz, p. 517.

<sup>2</sup> Milner, iv. 1, ad fin.

<sup>3</sup> See my Vol. i. p. 244.

<sup>4</sup> Gibb. ii. 489.

<sup>5</sup> Ib. iii. 276; also ii. 363.



spirit of anti-christian malignity, and by a very singular coincidence, as it seems to me, similarly drawing, like the Dragon with his tail in vision, the *Eastern third* of the stars of the Roman world. For, in the 10th year after Maximin,<sup>1</sup> (during all which interval the Milan Edict, in favour of Christianity and Christians, had been in force “as a general and fundamental law of the Roman world,”)<sup>2</sup> Licinius, then emperor in the East, apostatized from the Christian faith: re-enacted persecutions of Christian churches and bishops, similar to those by Maximin;<sup>3</sup> and at length, the evening before the decisive battle of Adrianople with Constantine, solemnly profest himself at an idolatrous altar the champion of Heathenism, against the disciples and religion of Christ.<sup>4</sup>

At this second crisis, then, mark how the Church still answered to the Woman in vision: her throes renewed, albeit high-raised before men in political elevation, and clothed, yet more markedly than even before Maximin’s defeat, with the sunshine of Constantine’s imperial favour;<sup>5</sup> with the moon too of the civil authorities subordinated to her, and the bright dodecanal crown of the episcopate.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> A.D. 323.

<sup>2</sup> So Gibbon iii. 244. See also Bridges, *Life of Constantine*, p. 192; who states that after the battle of Mardia, A.D. 314, Licinius was bound by solemn pledges not to molest the Eastern Churches. <sup>3</sup> See the account in Eusebius H. E. x. 8.

<sup>4</sup> Bridges, *ibid.* p. 196, from Eusebius and Sozomen.

<sup>5</sup> Mr. Biley, p. 11, gives some striking illustrations of this figure from Eusebius; with reference to the era of the Nicene Council, instantly following on Licinius’ defeat. So especially from the *Vit. Const.* i. 43, 44; “As the sun when he rises on the earth liberally imparts to all of the rays of his light, (ὡςπερ ανισχων ὑπερ γης ἡλιος αφθονως τοις πασι των του φωτος μεταιδωσι μαρμαρυγων,) so did Constantine. . . Such was he generally to all: but he exercised a peculiar care over the Church of God.”

<sup>6</sup> Τοιουτον μονος εξ αιωνος εις βασιλευς Κωνσταντινος Χριστω στεφανω δεσμη σπυνας ειρηνης, τη αυτη Σωτηρι . . θεοπρεπες ανεπιθει χαριστηριον. So Euseb. V. C. iii. 7, of the Bishops gathered by Constantine to Nice. See p. 19, Note 5.

The dodecanal number of the stars is simply and satisfactorily explained from the similar dodecanal number of the Israelitish tribes, the Apocalyptic representative and symbol, as we have seen, of the Christian Church.

An actual ecclesiastical division was soon made not uncorresponding.—In the imperial *civil* division of the empire there were *four* grand divisions (like Diocletian’s) under *Prætorian Præfects*, and *thirteen Dioceses*:—of the first or *Eastern Præfecture*, the Oriental, Egyptian, Asiatic, Pontic, and Thracian Dioceses; of the second or *Illyrian Præfecture*, the Macedonian and Dacian Dioceses, united under *one* exarch; of the third or *Italian Præfecture*, the Italian, West African, and West Illyrian Dioceses; of the fourth or *Galic Præfecture*, the Gallic, Spanish, and British Dioceses.—So the *Notitia Imperii*, said to have been written about the time of Arcadius and Honorius; and abstracted by Gibbon iii. 43, 49, and more fully by Bingham, B. ix. c. 1. The latter adds that an *ecclesiastical* division was made correspondingly into thirteen Patriarchates or Exarchates; but with reference to the last, (the *British*.) says; “Exarch of York *if any*.” Which wanting, the number of Patriarchs, as of Exarchs, would be twelve. (The *civil* origin of the word *diocese* may here be observed.)

—Moreover the Dragon, animating and acting in *Licinius*, just as before in Maximin, stood before her eager to swallow up the child she had travailed with.<sup>1</sup> But as with Maximin, so with Licinius, altogether in vain. Licinius was defeated and slain. The Church triumphed. It remained to the Dragon, and whatever of heathen power survived though broken in the empire, to behold the Woman's man-child wonderfully caught up to God's throne: in other words, to see a Christian emperor, *the son of Christ's faithful Catholic united Church*, elevated over the empire to an avowedly Christian throne,<sup>2</sup> that might well be called the *throne of God*, like Solomon's:—called so not alone because of its being (according to Holy Scripture's own explanation of that phrase) the throne of what had now become by its generally right profession of allegiance and faith *God's kingdom*:<sup>3</sup> but, more especially, because of its being recognised as the throne of *Christ's kingdom*; and their belief of Christ's true Divinity being, very shortly after Licinius' death, solemnly affirmed and proclaimed to the world by both emperor and people, in the first great Christian General Council gathered at Nice. As it is said by the great infidel historian; "*Christianity was now seated on the throne of the Roman world*:" and by Eusebius, contemporarily; "The emperor, dear to God, sustained an empire which was the image of the heavenly empire; and ruled it in

<sup>1</sup> The contest between Constantine and Licinius, A.D. 323, may be looked on as the final struggle of Paganism with Christianity. So Gieseler i. 122.

<sup>2</sup> So, very much, Vitringa, p. 693. "Est symbolum egregium ecclesie Christum mysticè parturientis, et in lucem veluti producentis: quod vel factum est quo tempore Christus Dominus, secundum promissa antiqui temporis, utero ecclesie dudum ejus spe gravidæ exclusus est in plenitudine temporis: vel quo tempore Dominus se ostentare cepit in imperatoribus, regibus, et principibus mundi, et præcipuè Romani Populi." Which latter view he prefers. So, he says, p. 710, the earlier expositor Brocardus. "Intelligit per mulierem gravidam Ecclesiam Christianam Apostolicam, utero gerentem Christum, regem gentium. 'Clamavit ut pareret, dum Ecclesia tot cruciatus sustinuit in strage martyrum, ut Christus . . . oriretur mundo rex, et is solum rex regum regnaret. . . Cruciabatur ut pareret: quia jam instabat partus, quando sedatâ persecutione, et baptizato Constantino imperatore, debuit Christus oriri in Imperio Romano dominus et rex, secundum ejus instituta oportuit imperium deinceps administrari.'" —By not taking the particular *Maximinian* or *Licinian crisis* Vitringa fails of giving a definite sense to "*the third part*." And so too Bossuet; who similarly explains the symbolization, and with similar defect.

<sup>3</sup> 1 Chron. xxix. 23, already cited p. 12. Its intent is perfectly explained by 1 Chron. xxviii. 5, where the same throne of Solomon is called "the throne of the kingdom of the Lord." Compare Exod. xvii. 16, Hebr. where the same phrase, *the throne of the Lord*, is used as in 1 Chron. xxix. 23: the clause, literally rendered, being, "Because the hand of Amalek is upon (or against) *the throne of the Lord*, &c." For the Jewish polity was then a *theocracy*.

*imitation of Him* who is greater than all, the supreme Lord of the world.”<sup>1</sup> Moreover we learn from Ambrose, (a fact hitherto overlooked, but singularly illustrative,) that the very title was now given to the emperor (as being a *Christian* emperor) of *Son of the Church*.<sup>2</sup>—The result, not immediately, but after a little while, (precisely according to the purport of the verb *μελλει* in the prophecy before us,)<sup>3</sup> proved to be this to the Heathens of the empire,—their being ruled as with a rod of iron. At first indeed an equal toleration was accorded by Constantine to Heathens as to Christians. But “the exact balance of the two religions continued but a moment.”<sup>4</sup> As he grew older his discountenance of them became more marked;<sup>5</sup> increasing at length almost into oppression and intolerance. And in fine, though not till after the Dragon had first insidiously, then openly, after Constantine’s death, renewed the fight for supremacy, (of which war more presently,) all toleration of Paganism was, by a later imperial *son of the Church*, Theodosius, put an end to; and its worship and rites interdicted, under pain of the severest penalties.<sup>6</sup>

So did history answer to the prophecy, on the view above given of the symbolic man-child’s birth and abruption to God’s throne. And to my own mind, now that we have Ambrose’s illustration on the point on which illustration was before wanting, it appears thus far strikingly satisfactory:—a satisfactoriness which will, I trust, be soon made complete by the perfectly fitting historic application,

<sup>1</sup> De Laud. Const. c. 1. The passage is cited by Vitringa; and given by me p. 34, Note <sup>2</sup> infra. Compare Augustine Epist. 105. 11; “*Pro juben Imperatores quod jubet et Christus: quia, cum bonum jubent, per illos non jubet nisi Christus.*”

<sup>2</sup> Writing to Valentinian, the then *orthodox* emperor of the Western half of the Roman empire, Ambrose remarks, “*Quid honorificentius quam ut imperator ecclesie filius esse dicatur.*” Epist. 32, Contra Auxent.—On which mark the difference of the title as applied afterwards in the Romano-Gothic kingdoms of the West. The King of France was “eldest son” of the *apostate Roman Church*; not of the *faithful Catholic Church* of Apoc. xii.

<sup>3</sup> *ὁ μελλει ποιμαινειν*, &c.; “the child who *is destined* [as if at some future time, not then far distant] to rule the Heathen with a rod of iron.” Such is continually the force of *μελλω* in the N. T. Of course the phrase “*all the nations*,” or rather “*all the heathen*,” is here to be restricted in sense to the heathen in the Roman empire; just like “*all the world taxed*” in Luke ii. 1. <sup>4</sup> So Gibbon, iii. 276.

<sup>5</sup> It was after his victory over Licinius that he prohibited heathen sacrifices, and distinctively elevated Christians to honours. Eusebius, V. C. ii. 44, 45. From 323, as Eckhel (viii, 79) observes, heathen symbols disappear from Constantine’s coins: and in 325 A.D. was held the Council of Nice.

<sup>6</sup> *Heathenism* was now called *Paganism*. See my Vol. i. p. 246.

in consistency with what has been already set forth, of all that follows about the Woman in the sequel of the Apocalyptic vision.

Objections have, indeed, been made to it, (objections to which I shall presently revert,) drawn chiefly from the fact of its being *Christ himself personally* of whom what is here said of the ascended *man-child*, as destined "to rule the heathen with a rod of iron," is elsewhere predicated in the prophetic Scriptures.<sup>1</sup> And hence, by certain even of historico-Apocalyptic expositors, some counter-view of the vision has been thought requisite; framed on the principle of expounding the man-child as meant of Christ personally. Thus some would refer back its meaning to Jesus Christ's *literal birth* at Bethlehem, and *literal ascension* from Mount Olivet. A view this which, as before said,<sup>2</sup> would make what purports to be a prefiguration of things to come after John's banishment in Patmos<sup>3</sup> to be in fact a retrospective figuration of what had taken place some 90 or 100 years before; and which, on that one account alone, and even were there no other such decisive reasons as there are against it, would, I think, be obviously inadmissible: alike whether the woman be construed (so as it is most consistently with themselves by some<sup>4</sup>) as the *Virgin Mary*;<sup>5</sup> or (so as less consistently by others) as the *pre-Christian Jewish Church*.<sup>6</sup>—Besides which, Mr. Biley, in his very

<sup>1</sup> So, of late, Auberlen at Basle; and in his Apocal. Commentary, just published as I am revising this part of my work for the 5th Edition, Dean Alford.

<sup>2</sup> See p. 11.

<sup>3</sup> Apoc. iv. 1; ἃ δεῖ γενεσθαι μετα ταυτα.

<sup>4</sup> If the man-child be Christ *bodily* and *literally*, ought not the Woman that brings him forth to be his mother, the V. M., *bodily* and *literally* also? And the parituration too similarly *literal*?

<sup>5</sup> So of late by Waterworth and others; (see p. 67 *infra*;) and of old by Arethas, and in part by Ansbert, Bernard (on the B. V.), and Corn. à Lapide, in *loc.* "Posunt hæc aptè etiam accipi et appropriari B. Virgini; præsertim quia B. Virgo mater est, imò avia, Ecclesie." So Cornel. à Lap.—But then if the V. M. was in heaven, and clothed with the Sun of Righteousness, at Christ's birth, was she not longer so after his birth? For this change is implied in the woman's aspect after her descent to earth. Again, so explained, what of her 1260 days' seclusion in the wilderness, and this during the times of Antichrist? Says Arethas, it is, 1st, the V. M.'s flight to Egypt; but, 2ndly, the Church's flight in the last days. And so by Corn. à Lap. the V. M. is now set aside; and the woman is simply "populus fidelis."

<sup>6</sup> So Auberlen and Alford; herein differing from most of the patristic expositors who expound the *Woman*, like them, of the Church; but then consistently make the *man-child* to be *Christ in a mystical sense* only, viz. as brought forth continually in the hearts of believers. So Tichonius, Primasius, Methodius, Andreas, &c.

Of course, in any case, expositors who adopt this theory, though making the woman the *Jewish Church* to begin with, are obliged to make it in the latter part of the

interesting and instructive volume on Apoc. xii, not long since published,<sup>1</sup> has endeavoured more plausibly to connect a view of the man-child as Jesus Christ personally<sup>2</sup> with *Constantinian times*, by reference to the Christian Church's solemn affirmation of Christ's Godhead, made, as a little while since intimated by me, in the great Œcumenic Council at Nice, very soon after Constantine's final defeat of Licinius in the battle of Adrianople, and Licinius' consequent death, A.D. 318. Just before this, he says, Arius had broached his heresy at Alexandria against Christ's co-equal Divinity with the Father.<sup>3</sup> And, under the distress of mind caused by its promulgation and agitation throughout Roman Christendom, the faithful orthodox Catholic Church, he suggests, might be said to have travailed in birth in its longings to have manifested before the world the great truth of Christ's Divinity: also that in the solemn affirmation of it in the Council of Nice, and its reception by the Emperor and empire, there was that which might fitly be supposed to answer to the man-child Christ's birth, and assumption to God and to his throne, in the Apocalyptic vision; the symbols being drawn, so as is elsewhere done in Scripture, from Christ's own personal history.<sup>4</sup>

vision the *Christian Church*. But is it likely that the same Woman unchanged, save only in the putting aside of her heavenly position and heavenly habiliments, should figure two Churches so different in their outward character as the Jewish and the Christian; and that the difference of portraiture should be all in favour of the Jewish, and this at a time of its general formality and corruption?

So, if the Church be taken as the *Church corporate* in either case; as at times it seems to be by these expositors. But if, on the other hand, the Woman be supposed to represent God's true invisible Church, so as at other times it seems to be by them, (*Alford*, "the Church the bride of God," *Auberlen*, p. 276, "the Church of believers in its purity, the invisible Church,") then how does this consist with the wilderness state applying only to it after Christ's birth and ascension, not before? If *Alford* so mean, in calling the Woman "the Church the bride of God," he just after gives a direct contradiction to that view; "We must not understand the Woman of the invisible spiritual Church of Christ:" and, in fine, he inclines to think that after all the Woman probably signifies "*the true visible Church*." This is precisely the view that I have myself given: though, by the most extraordinary possible mistake, he represents me, at p. 670, as expounding the Woman to be Christ's "*invisible Church*."—As to *Auberlen*, he makes the Woman, here God's true invisible Church, to be actually transformed into the apostate adulteress of Apoc. xvii.! Surely this cannot be his theological doctrine! <sup>1</sup> 1849. *Sceley's*. <sup>2</sup> See p. 27 Note 3.

<sup>3</sup> 318 A.D. is *Gibbon's* date of the time of Arius first broaching his Arian doctrine about Christ in that city. In 321 he was expelled from the Alexandrian Church; and one and another synod in that city denounced the heresy. But counter-synods were held the same year in his favour both in Palestine and Bithynia. "The heathen," says *Bridges* in his *Life of Constantine*, p. 324, "beheld and triumphed:" till, in A.D. 325, was held the Council of Nice.

<sup>4</sup> So, for example, in Rom. vi. 4—6, vii. 4, where Christ's death and resurrection

With every desire, however, to do full justice to this the best, as it seems to me, of the three counter-views, and the rather because not only of its being put forward by its author professedly as what would well consist with my exposition of the other parts of the vision, but yet more on account of the beautiful spirit of piety, and literary interest too, which characterises his exposition, I yet cannot, on mature consideration, receive it. And this (independently of the objection suggested by Mr. B. himself)<sup>1</sup> for the reasons following. Because, 1st, to explain the Woman's travailing of the Church's travailing in mind with certain essential truth respecting Christ, is in my opinion inconsistent with explaining what follows in the symbol about the man-child's being caught up to God's throne, and afterwards ruling the nations with a rod of iron, as meant not of Christ's truth, but of Christ himself literally and personally.<sup>2</sup> 2ndly, because the theory seems substantially to identify the symbol of the man-child's birth with that of his as-

used to figure the believer's death unto sin and new life unto righteousness. In Gal. iii. 1, *Christ's* being set forth crucified signifies the doctrinal truth of *Christ crucified* being set forth to the Galatians. And so too Gal. iv. 19; "My little children, of whom *I travail in birth* till Christ be formed in you." On which Glasse thus comments. "A Christo ipso quædam translationes fiunt ad ecclesiam et quæ eam attinent. A Christi conceptione et formatione, ad doctrinæ fidei de Christo solo salvatore instaurationem, et iteratam in corda hominum implantationem, metaphora ducitur Gal. iv. 19." Philol. Sacr. Tr. i. c. 13.

<sup>1</sup> "It has indeed appeared an objection to some," says Mr. Biley, "that the doctrine of the Lord's Divinity was no *new* doctrine in the Church at the period of the Council of Nice, as the symbol of a *new-born* child seems at *first* sight to imply. But the answer is simple. A child exists before it is born. After its birth it becomes openly manifest to the world. So the Council of Nice was an open declaration, before the whole world, of what had all along existed in the bosom of the Church." p. 26.

Certainly that even the *heathen* knew this to be the Christian's faith respecting Jesus Christ, appears from the joint testimonies of Pliny, Celsus, Porphyry.\* And so in Licinius' own act of idol-worship, already alluded to, the night before the battle of Adrianople, we read that he spoke of the Christians' worship of this *foreign Divinity* as a case of hostility against the celestial powers; and how the result of the battle impending would show which gods, his or the Christians', were the proper objects of worship.†

<sup>2</sup> So Biley, p. 50; "He who is to rule all nations with a rod of iron was rapt far above all created beings, to God and his throne."

Comparing the Scriptural examples Is. xxvi. 17, lxvi. 8, and Rom. viii. 22, which

\* "Carmenque Christo, quasi Deo, dicere secum invicem." So *Pliny*, in his celebrated Letter to Trajan about the Christians in Bithynia. *Celsus* similarly speaks of Christians holding the doctrine of Christ crucified, "*the living and true God*, and only Saviour of sinful men." Milner, p. 188. And *Porphyry* makes Apollo say sarcastically of a Christian woman, the wife of one who inquired at his oracle how to treat her; "Leave her in her folly to hymn the *dead God*, who publicly suffered death from judges of singular wisdom." Ib. p. 191.

† So Eusebius V. C. ii. 1—5, and H. E. x. 8, abstracted by Mr. Bridges in his *Life of Constantine*, p. 196.

sumption, as meant of one and the same event, though represented as things successive in the vision : 3rdly, because to expound the man-child's assumption to God's throne in vision as meant of Christ's personal elevation to it in the eyes of Christendom through a Decree of the Nicene Council, is surely inconsistent with the fact of his personal assumption thither 300 years before : a fact ever after confessed by the Christian Church ; and already figured, as what could not even in figure be repeated, at the commencement of the Apocalyptic visions.<sup>1</sup> Besides that the explanation seems really too much in accord with the blasphemous pretensions of heathenism, Pagan and Papal ; as if able to effect the *apotheosis* of a departed man by decree of Senate or of Pope :<sup>2</sup> however revolting such a notion would be to the reverent and pious mind of the excellent author of the theory.

And thus I only fall back with the more confidence on the explanation originally given by me as above. And, as regards the objection urged from the fact of its being Christ *personally* that is elsewhere spoken of in prophetic Scriptures as he that is to rule the nations with a rod of iron, let me just beg the objector to look at the other Scripture passages where the prediction occurs ; and to consider *how*, and *when*, he expects that predicted iron-ruling of the heathen to take place :—1st, whether by Christ personally and visibly, or by Christ providentially, and in part through human agencies ? 2ndly, whether before, or after, the establishment of his kingdom on earth ? I subjoin those passages, which are but three, Ps. ii. 9, Apoc. ii. 27, and xix. 15 ; the two latter taken from the former.<sup>3</sup> And I

have been already referred to, pp. 17, 19, *suprà*, and also Is. xlii. 14, Micah iv. 10, v. 3, Hos. xiii. 13, Gal. iv. 19, Jam. i. 15, I infer that the natural rule (inversely to the case supposed Note<sup>4</sup> p. 25) is followed in Scripture, that, where the travailing is figurative, the thing travailed with, and brought forth, is figurative also.

The same too in examples from the classics:—e. g. Virgil's "gravida imperiis Italia;" Cicero's "Ut aliquando dolor populi Romani pariat quod jamdiu parturit;" (Philip. 2 ad fin.) and again, (Pro Muren. 39.) "Di faxint ut hoc quod conceptum Republica periculum parturit consilio discutiam et comprimam,"<sup>1</sup> Apoc. v. 6, 7.

<sup>2</sup> Compare the expression *συνθηρονος τοις δωδεκα θεοις*, said of the Kings Philip and Alexander of Macedon on their *apotheosis*. Spanheim 657. On the *αποθεωσις* of Roman emperors by Decree of the Senate we read frequent notices in the Roman imperial historians; and, let me add, an interesting pictorial representation of the process is given in Montfaucon, Tom. v. p. 103, from an ancient agate. On the *αποθεωσις* of dead men by Papal decree the reader will find sufficient notice in Chap. v. § 2 *infra*.

<sup>3</sup> Ps. ii. 9 ; "Thou shalt break them with a rod of iron ; (Sept. *ποιμανεις αυτες*, rule them, *ω ραβδου σιδηρα*.) and dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel."

think that the intelligent reader will agree with me as to many good expositors having reason in explaining the first clause in the Psalm, (which is here alone cited),<sup>1</sup> "He shall rule them with a rod of iron," as meant, partly and primarily at least, of Christ's subjugating and ruling heathen powers with the rod of severe repression through human agency. In which case it will as well suit the Roman Christian Emperors, especially Theodosius, as, in older times, David or Solomon.<sup>2</sup> At the last great crisis of the war between Christ and Antichrist, prefigured in Apoc. xix. 15, there will be fulfilled also the "breaking in pieces as a potter's vessel;" still however, it seems likely, by Providential and human agency. But this clause, as I said before, is not cited here. Certainly the prediction cannot be meant of Christ's rule *after that establishment of his kingdom on earth* which is to follow his second coming. For then there are to be no more εθνη, or heathen: and the sceptre of his kingdom is to be the golden sceptre, the ραβδος of righteousness; not that of severity and iron.<sup>3</sup>

## II. THE WAR IN HEAVEN.

But the Dragon was not yet at this point of the prefiguration finally cast out of the heaven of vision. After a previous notice of the Woman's fleeing towards<sup>4</sup> the wilderness,—a notice following, very remarkably, forthwith after the statement of the assumption of her man-child to God and his throne, and of which, on a repetition of the notice in verse 14, more afterwards,—after this, I say, follows the statement, "And there was *war in heaven*: Michael and his angels fought against the Dragon; and the Dragon fought and his angels." The grand antagonistic

Apoc. ii. 27; "To him that overcometh will I give power over the nations (εθνη): and he shall rule them with a rod of iron; as the vessels of a potter shall they be broken to pieces." Where the iron rule is predicated of Christ's saints.

Apoc. xix. 15; "And out of his mouth goeth a sharp sword, that with it he should smite the nations (εθνη): and he shall rule them with a rod of iron; and he treadeth the wine-press of the wrath of Almighty God."

<sup>1</sup> Daubuz observes that the promise of the saints' *ultimate* destruction of opposing heathens is here markedly withheld: it not being said, so as in Apoc. ii. 27, "They shall break them in pieces like a potter's vessel." Compare Christ's partial quotation of Isaiah lxi. 1, 2, at Nazareth. Luke iv. 18, 19.

<sup>2</sup> Dr. A. Clarke and other expositors apply the statement in Ps. ii. 9 to David and Solomon primarily.

<sup>3</sup> Ps. xlv. 6, cited Heb. i. 8.

<sup>4</sup> See my Note<sup>o</sup> p. 46 *infra* on this use of the preposition εις.



principles contending were still evidently *Christianity* and *Heathenism*; and powers invisible, as well as visible, appeared to mingle in the conflict: the one being headed by the Dragon *Satan*; the other by *Michael*, captain of the Lord's host.<sup>1</sup> "And the Dragon," we read, "prevailed not; neither was their place *any more* found in heaven." How was this new war for supremacy fulfilled in history?—No doubt a preparation was made for it by the Emperor Constantius' apostasy to the Arian faith, after the death of his father, and deaths subsequently of his co-regnant brothers Constantine and Constans;<sup>2</sup> through which last he became for nine years sole emperor of the Roman Empire. In fact, his apostasy, as I shall hereafter show, caused the faithful orthodox Church's *primary* fall from her previous state of brightness and elevation, and her first movement towards the wilderness-state. But, as to the war itself, it was fulfilled, doubtless, in the subsequent brief re-elevation of profest Heathenism, (thus prepared for,) to the throne of the Roman world under *Julian*. His reign was brief indeed; for a mere year and a half. But it was long enough to exhibit alike the Serpent's subtlety, and the Serpent's strength, in his efforts for the revivification of Paganism, and depreciation and disproof of Christianity.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> From comparing Dan. xii. 1, "Michael the great Prince which standeth for the children of thy people," with Joshua's vision of Jehovah Captain of the Lord's host (Josh. v. 14), it may perhaps be inferred that under the name *Michael*, (which means *Who is like God?*) *Christ* himself is here signified in that particular character. Such seems Eusebius' view: (see p. 35 Note \* *infra*;) such Lightfoot's: (see his Vol. vii. p. 47;) such Vitringa's, p. 719. And so too Hengstenberg, in Apoc. i. 465—467, alike with reference to this passage, to Dan. x. 21, xii. 1, and to Jude; and Wintle, on Dan. x. 13. Others, as Dr. Mill, Mr. Biley, &c., prefer to understand a created archangel. The historical explanation of the vision is not at all essentially affected by the difference. Only there seems a peculiar force and propriety in representing *Christ* here under the appellation of *Michael*, if he be the one intended; from the parallelism of the purport of that appellation with the true godhead just solemnly affirmed of Christ at the time symbolized.

<sup>2</sup> The following dates may be useful.

A. D.

337 Death of Constantine the Great.

340 Death of Constantine the son; after which the Western "two thirds" of the empire (Gibb. iv. 126) remained subject to the orthodox Constans.


350 Murder of Constans by Magnentius.

353 Defeat and death of Magnentius, and Constantius' sole Emperorship over the whole empire.


<sup>3</sup> The former by his attempt at reforming and philosophizing the heathen theology and worship: (on which see Gibbon iv. 85—97;) the latter, not merely by writing, as well as acting, against Christianity; but also by his very remarkable attempt at proving the falsehood of Christ's prophecy about *Jerusalem*, through the rebuilding of the temple, and re-establishment there of the Jews. On which, and its re-



THE CROSS ERECTED OVER THE FALLEN DRAGON,  
 UNDER CONSTANTINE AND HIS SUCCESSORS.




From Band on




---

THE GLOBE SURMOUNTED BY THE CROSS  
 UNDER THEODOSIUS.



From Coin in the British Museum

Eckhel adds that he had himself seen a perfect specimen of the coin of Constantine given at the top of my Plate, with the legend *Spes Publica*, in Count Waldeck's Collection.



Then came Paganism's final downfall on Julian's death in the Persian war, A.D. 363, (his death-cry being, "O Galilean, thou hast conquered!") and the accession thereupon of the orthodox Jovian. "The Dragon was cast out of heaven, and his angels;<sup>1</sup> and his place never more found therein."<sup>2</sup>

The exactness of the imagery, with reference alike to the Dragon's primary overthrow, as effected in that of *Licinius*, and his second and final dejection, "with all his angels," in the fall of *Julian*, seems indeed very striking: nor was its meaning, at either time of the fulfilment, unrecognised. Who a better commentator on the downfall, when first accomplished, than the great human instrument of it, under God, Constantine himself? In a letter to Eusebius he writes of "*that dragon* having been deposed from the governance of affairs, by God's providence." And Eusebius further relates, that in a picture of himself, elevated by Constantine over his palace-gate, there was represented the cross, the ensign of salvation, above his head; and, beneath, his enemy and that of the human race, (viz. *Licinius*, or rather Satan that had animated him,) under the semblance of *a dragon* precipitated into the abyss:<sup>3</sup> a symbol stamped too on some of the Constantinian medals.<sup>4</sup> How the event was similarly spoken of by Christian writers of the time will appear immediately under the next head.—Nor, on the second and final downfall of Heathenism, upon the death of *Julian*, was the emblem forgotten. It still appears prominently (as we shall also presently further illustrate) in the writings of the then triumphant Trinitarian Christians;<sup>5</sup> and still too in the imperial medals of succeeding Christian emperors, especially of the great *Theodosius*.<sup>6</sup>

markable and repeated discomfiture by something very like supernatural interposition, see Gibbon, *ib.* p. 99—109: also Biley, pp. 60—89; who has a very interesting chapter, full of authorities, upon it.

<sup>1</sup> On the phrase "cast out of heaven," compare Lam. ii. 1, "He hath cast down from heaven to earth the beauty of Israel:" also the references Note <sup>1</sup> p. 21.

<sup>2</sup> Under the reign of Jovian, says Gibbon, "Christianity obtained an easy and *lasting* victory: and . . . the *Genius of Paganism*, which had been fondly raised and cherished by the acts of Julian, *sunk irrecoverably in the dust.*" iv. 230. <sup>3</sup> V. C. iii. 3.

<sup>4</sup> It is described by Eckhel viii. 88; the obverse bearing the legend *Spes Publica*, and the symbol of a "serpens cui insisit labarum, cui superpositum est monogramma Christi." Eckhel observes on its resemblance to the picture of Constantine mentioned by Eusebius. And so too Ranke:—"As we see on the coins of Constantine the labarum with the monogram of Christ above the conquered dragon, even so did the worship and name of Christ stand triumphant above prostrate heathenism." *Hist. of the Popes*. i. 9.

<sup>5</sup> See p. 33 *infra*.

<sup>6</sup> Rasche, on the word *Draco*, observes; "*Draco jacens ac prostratus mysticus re-*

There followed in vision,

IIIrdly, THE ΕΠΙΝΙΚΙΟΝ, OR SONG OF VICTORY.

“ And I heard a loud voice saying in heaven ; ‘ Now there hath come the salvation, and power, and kingdom of our God, and the authority of his Christ : for the accuser of our brethren hath been cast down, which accused them before our God day and night. And they overcame him through the blood of the Lamb, and through the word of their testimony ;<sup>1</sup> and they loved not their lives, even unto death. Therefore rejoice, heavens, and ye that tabernacle in them.”

Such was the song. But from whom, and where? It is said to have been a loud voice *in heaven*. And, adopting the meaning attached to the word *heaven* in the unsymbolic parts of Scripture, it has been explained by *some* interpreters as proceeding from the departed *spirits of the just* ;<sup>2</sup> by *others*, as from the *angels of heaven*. It seems to me however more natural to construe the word of the same *symbolic* heaven of political elevation and power, so frequently referred to in the Apocalyptic figurations ; more especially from its having been spoken of just but a little before, as the seat synchronically both of the Woman and Dragon, and scene of the war that had ended in the Dragon’s dejection. In which case the song of triumph would represent that of the Christian body then living ; elevated by the just recent events to supremacy in the Roman empire. ✓

The expression “ *our brethren*,” used in it, in reference to the saints that had previously suffered martyrdom for Christ, confirms this view of the matter. For, had *angels* been the chanters of it, they would scarcely have called the saints *brethren*,<sup>3</sup> seeing that *they* are not united with

presentatur in numis Christianorum aliquot Cæsarum. Sic Draco sub pedibus in Theodosii numis sepius conspicitur ; pariter ac Valentiniiani Junioris, Libii Severi, Heraclii, aliorumque.”

<sup>1</sup> Δία το αίμα τῆ Ἀρνιῆς, κ. τ. λ. with the *accusative* after the *δια*. But the *efficient cause, means, instrumentality*, is indicated by the preposition with the *accusative*, as well as with the *genitive*. See Schleusner, or Scott and Liddell, in *voc*. So Joh. vi. 57 ; κ’ ἄγω ζω δια τον πατερα also Odys. εἰα Αθηνην νικησαι, to conquer by Minerva’s aid.

<sup>2</sup> So *Vitringa*, p. 729. This explanation is in him the more surprising, as he often elsewhere explains what passed in the Apocalyptic heaven as having reference to things that passed in the Church militant on earth ; and indeed so explains the heavenly song described in Apoc. xiv. 2. See his p. 862.

<sup>3</sup> So I see, somewhat similarly, Tichonius : “ Si, ut quidam putant, *angelorum* vox est . . non dicent *accusator fratrum nostrorum*, sed *accusator noster* : non, *accusat*, [i. e. in the present tense,] sed, *accusabat*.” Hom. ix.

them by the brotherhood of the same flesh and blood;<sup>1</sup> but rather *fellow-servants of Christ*, so as elsewhere in the Apocalypse.<sup>2</sup> Again, had it been the song of the departed *spirits of the just*, they would rather have spoken in the *first person*, not the *third*: and said, "*our* accuser," not "the accuser of *our* brethren," "*we* overcame him," not "*they*," seeing that the martyr-victors spoken of had already become constituent members of the beatified choir.—Thus, on the whole, we may, I think, unhesitatingly conclude on this song in heaven prefiguring some similar song of the Christians of the Roman world, on occasion of their triumph and exaltation over Heathenism in each of the crises lately described:<sup>3</sup> viz. 1st, on its primary dejection, when headed successively by Maximin and Licinius; 2ndly, on occasion of its final dejection, when headed by Julian. It only remains to show the fulfilment of this in the records of history.

1. And, as to the former epoch of triumph, it presents itself, ready drawn out to our hands, in the graphic descriptions of the contemporary historian Eusebius:—those same to which I have already had to refer, in illustration of the parallel part of the *earlier series* (that *within-written*) of the Apocalyptic visions.<sup>4</sup> He tells us how in hymns and choruses the Christians, before cast down, but now with countenances bright and happy, everywhere congratulated each other;<sup>5</sup> and especially in the services of their re-opened churches poured forth their gratitude and joy.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> In Christ's case this assumption of the same nature is noted in Heb. ii. 14, as constituting the foundation of his relation of brotherhood to man. "Forasmuch as the children were partakers of flesh and blood, He also took part of the same;" and (so) verse 11, "he was not ashamed to call them *brethren*." <sup>2</sup> Apoc. xxii. 9.

<sup>3</sup> The analogy is herein followed of the thanksgiving rendered to God by the ascended Witnesses, as described in Apoc. xi. 13; and of that also described in Apoc. xiv. 2, 3. <sup>4</sup> Vol. i. p. 254, &c.

<sup>5</sup> E. H. x. 3: Ψυχη των παντων μια . . . εις εξ απαντων θεολογιας υμνος . . . ομον δε παν γενος ηλικιας . . . ολη διανοιας ισχυι, δι' ευχων και ευχαριστιας γεγηθοσι νη και ψυχη, τον των αγαθων παραιτιον θεον γεραιρον.—So again, V. C. ii. 19: Μειδισι τε προσωποις, ομμασι τε φαιδροις, οι πριν κατηφης αλληλους ενεβλεπον χοροι δ' αυτοις, και υμνοι, τον παμβασιλεια θεου πρωτιστα παντων οντα δη τουτου ειδασκον.

<sup>6</sup> Of the tone of the pastoral addresses, or sermons, on these occasions, we have an illustrious example in Eusebius' own oration on the dedication of the new Church at Tyre: the same to which I have before referred, Vol. i. p. 256. "Formerly," he there observes, "we used to sing, We have heard what thou didst in our fathers' days. But now we have to sing a second song of victory; (*δευτερον υμνον επινικιον παρεστιν αναμελπειν*) our own eyes having seen his salvation." E. H. x. 4, ad init.



He relates how by Emperor, as well as by Christian ministers and people, their deliverance and victory over the Heathen potentates was recognised as the result of the divine interposition, and manifestation of the divine power: <sup>1</sup> how Constantine professed himself to be in his imperial office only the imitator and servant of the King of kings; <sup>2</sup> and so the kingdom administered by him, with Christianity dominant in it, seemed to image the very kingdom of God and his Christ foretold in prophecy. <sup>3</sup> Was not all this the exact echo of the *prefigurative* voice heard in vision, saying, “Now hath come *the salvation*, and *the power*, and *the kingdom* of our God, and *the authority* of his Christ?”—He tells us further, how, in the retrospect of the past persecution, though conducted by earthly heathen Princes, and on the accusations of earthly adversaries, they recognised the instigation and secret acting of their invisible enemy, the accuser of the brethren, the old Serpent, the Devil; <sup>4</sup> and, again, in the casting down of those heathens the casting down of the Devil: <sup>5</sup> just according to

<sup>1</sup> By *Constantine*, V. C. ii. 23: Κάκεινον (that is, *God*) των νικητηριων αιτιον, αλλα μη αυτον, νομιζειν διεμαρτυρετο· τουτο τ' ανεκηρυττε . . . εις εκαστον εθνος εν γραφῃ. And again V. C. ii. 46; Νυνι δε της ελευθεριας υποδοθεισης, και του ερακοτος εκεινον απο της των κοινων διοικησεως του Θεου μεγαιστου προνοια, ημετερα δ' ὑπηρεσια εκδιωχθεντος, ἰγγουμαι και πασι φανερα γεγενησθαι την θειαν δυναμιν. By *Christian ministers and people*, E. H. x. 1: Ασατε τῷ Κυριῳ ασμα καινον, ὅτι θανμαστα εποιησιν. Εσωσεν αυτον ἡ δεξια αυτου . . . εγνωρισε Κυριος το σωτηριον αυτου &c. And Lactantius M. P. ad fin. “Celebremus igitur triumphum Dei cūm exultatione, victoriam Domini cūm laudibus,” &c.

<sup>2</sup> E. g. De Laud. Constant. c. 1: Παρ' οὐ, και δι' οὐ, της ανωτατω βασιλειας την εικονα φερων ὁ τῷ Θεῳ φιλος βασιλευς, κατα μιμησιν του Κρειττονος, των επι γης απαντων τους οικιακας διακυβερνων ιθυνει. Ad fin.

<sup>3</sup> V. C. iii. 15; “It looked like the very image of the kingdom of Christ; and was altogether more like a dream than a reality.” See Vol. i. p. 256, Note <sup>3</sup>.

<sup>4</sup> So E. II. x. 4. Του φιλοπονηρου Δαιμονος . . . δεινα συριγγατα και τας οφιωδεις αυτου φωνας, τοτε μεν ασειβων τυραννων απειλαις, τοτε δε βλασφημοις δυσσειβων αρχοντων διαταξεισιν, αφιεντος.

On the *διαβολιαι*, or slanderous accusations, raised by the Devil's earthly agents against the Christian Brethren, see Walsh's *Christian Medals*, p. 79. I have myself referred to the statements of *Athenogoras* and others on the matter in my Vol. ii. p. 304, Note <sup>2</sup>. *Lactantius* writes to the same effect; and thus notices the change after Constantine's victories; “Sed omnia jam figmenta sopita sunt. . . Jam cultores Dei pro sceleratis ac nefariis non habemur.” Inst. vii. 26.—Compare the same author's exclamation, “Ubi sunt modo magnifica illa Joviorum et Herculiorum cognomina,” in the extract given Vol. i. p. 245, Note <sup>2</sup>.

From comparing Ezra iv. 7—24 with Zech. iii. 1, it seems probable that the vision which represented Satan, the great adversary, accusing the Jewish High Priest in the court of heaven, corresponded with, and had reference to, the accusation of the Jews before the Persian king's court, by their Samaritan adversaries, Satan's earthly agents:—a case very parallel with the present; and which would justify the Constantinian Christians in their judgment.

<sup>5</sup> So Eusebius, E. II. x. 4: 'Ο της μεγαλης βουλης Αγγελος, ὁ μεγας Αρχι-

the next Apocalyptic clause, "The accuser of our brethren hath been cast down, which accused them before our God day and night."—He narrates very fully how, at the same time, there was solemn remembrance of the martyrs and confessors that had illustrated the past persecution, and praise and honour rendered them:<sup>1</sup>—how of those that had suffered unto death public notice was taken, as of heroes that had conquered, specially by the doctrine of the *cross*, in the most excellent combat of witnessing and of martyrdom:<sup>2</sup> ("They overcame him by the blood of the Lamb, and by the word of their *μαρτυρια*, or witnessing; and they loved not their lives," i.e. were prodigal of them, "even unto death:") and how, as a further tribute to their innocence and worth, the property confiscated from them was reclaimed and restored to their surviving relatives, or to the Church:<sup>3</sup>—how, again, to the confessors still living a similar meed of praise was awarded, the *imperial* voice still precenting in the song; (somewhat, I may observe, as in the fulfilment of another *great voice* from the Apocalyptic heaven, heard earlier by St. John in vision;<sup>4</sup>) and Imperial orders were issued for their liberation from prison,

στρατηγος του Θεου\* . . τα μεν εχθρα και πολεμια εις αφανες και το μηδεν κατεστησατο. (This, after noticing the *δαμων* as in p. 34 Note <sup>4</sup>.)—Also V. C. iii. 3; Τον εχθρον και πολεμιον θηρα, τον την εκκλησιαν του Θεου εια της των αθων πολιορκησαντα τυραννιδος, κατα βουθου φερομενον ποιησας, εν δρυκοντος μορφυ· Δρακοντα γαρ αυτον, και σκιδιον οφιν, εν προφητων Θεου βιβλοις ανηγορευε τα λογια. For Constantine's language to the same effect, see the extract from the V. C. ii. 46, in Note <sup>1</sup> p. 34.

<sup>1</sup> See V. C. ii. 24—42, for Constantine's Proclamation and Decrees respecting these Christian martyrs and confessors.

<sup>2</sup> Ib. c. 35: *Ει τινες, τον αριστον υποσταντες και θειον αγωνα του μαρτυριου, . . την αιωνιον ελπιδα παρεσκευασαν ιαυτοις* &c.—On the recognition of the *cross*, as that by which they conquered, see on the *σωτηριον σημειον*, Vol. i. p. 254 *supra*.

"Next to the apostles the *martyrs* must occupy the second place . . among those that were instrumental in bringing about this mighty renovation of society." So Schlegel, Phil. of Hist. ii. 31, speaking of the Constantinian revolution.

Theodoret, H. E. i. 7, mentions that at the Nicene Council there appeared many among the fathers who bore marks on their bodies of the Lord Jesus: some deprived of an eye, some of a leg, some cauterized on the hands: in short a crowd of martyrs, *δημον μαρτυρων*. (A passage this already referred to by me Vol. ii. p. 415.)

<sup>3</sup> The complete fulfilment, let me observe in passing, of that symbolic figuration of the fifth Seal (see Vol. i. p. 233) wherein the *white robes* of acknowledged innocence were represented as publicly given to the souls of the martyrs under the altar.

<sup>4</sup> Viz. that which said to the two Witnesses, Come up hither. See Vol. ii. p. 466.

\* The former a title of *Christ* taken from Is. ix. 6, as in the *Vatican* codex: (for the *Alexandrine* reading see my Vol. ii. p. 537 Note \*:) while that of *Αρχιστρατηγος του Θεου* is a title of *Michael*. Thus Eusebius seems to identify the Michael of this vision with Christ; as observed by me p. 30 Note <sup>2</sup> *supra*.

exile, or the mines, for the restoration of their goods, and their re-admission to every civic honour and privilege.<sup>1</sup> It was indeed acknowledged in the Decree that, their ambition and pursuit being a heavenly one, and their affections set in heavenly places, they *needed* not the solace of human approbation; but with the added declaration that this was no reason why they should not be elevated to higher honour and dignity in (the heaven of) this world.<sup>2</sup> And therefore they were bidden to return rejoicingly from their places of suffering, amidst the public congratulations and applause.<sup>3</sup> It was just the fulfilment of the call to joy prefigured in the last clause, "Rejoice, heavens, and ye that dwell in them:" or as the phrase simply means, "Rejoice, ye that dwell in the heavens."<sup>4</sup>—In which phrase, as reminded by Mr. Daubuz,<sup>5</sup> I have not overlooked the use of the uncommon plural form *heavens*, instead of *heaven*. For, indicating, as it may perhaps seem to do, the rare conjunction, during the then prosperous crisis, of elevation in heart to the spiritual heaven, and elevation in dignity to the heaven of worldly rank, it makes the agreement between the prophecy and the history yet more striking. To the which I may add that the very word *ευφραίνεσθε*, used in the Apocalyptic prophecy to bid the Christian professors joy, was the identical word addressed more than once to them in the Imperial Edict of Constantine.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> V. C. ubi suprâ.

<sup>2</sup> V. C. ii. 29. Οἶδα μὲν οὖν ἀκριβῶς ὡς οὐδὲ τῆς παρ' ἀνθρώπων ἐννοίας χρῆζοιεν ἀν' οἱ τὴν οὐρανόθεν ορθῶς μεταδιώξαντες ἐλπίδα, καὶ ταυτὴν ἐξαιρετόν τε καὶ βασιλίδά, ἀσφαλῶς ἐπὶ τῶν θείων καθιδρύσασμενοι τοπῶν. To which it is added; Ἡ γένοιτ' ἂν ἀτοπώτατον . . ὑπο τῆς θεραπείου τοῦ Θεοῦ μὴ οὐκ εἰς λαμπροτέρου τι καὶ μακαριστοτέρου τὴν δόξαν αὐτῶν ἀρθῆναι.

<sup>3</sup> So V. C. ii. 32, of those that had been ignominiously condemned to the mines; Μετ' εὐφροσύνης τῆς προσήκουσης, οἷον ἀποδημίᾳ τινὶ χρόνῳ χωρισθεῖσαν, τὴν προτιέραν ἀξίαν ἀναλαβόντες, ἐπὶ τὰς αὐτῶν ἐπιγεσθῶσαν πατρίδας. And c. 34, of those that had been degraded into slaves; Οὗτοι τιμῶν τε ὧν ἀπῆλθον προσθεν, καὶ τοῖς τῆς ἐλευθερίας καλοῖς ἐνυφραίνονται, ἀνακαλεσάμενοι τὰς συνηθείας ἀξίας, μετὰ πάσης λοιποῦ εὐφροσύνης βιώντων.

<sup>4</sup> So Apoc. xiii. 6, τὴν σκηνὴν αὐτοῦ καὶ τοὺς ἐν τῇ οὐρανῷ σκηνούντας· and xiii. 12; ποιεῖ τὴν γῆν καὶ τοὺς κατοικοῦντας ἐν αὐτῇ. This figure of the *Hendyad* is not infrequent in the prophetic Scriptures. See Vol. i. p. 103, Note 3.

<sup>5</sup> He observes that, out of above fifty passages in which the word *heaven* is quoted in the Apocalypse, this is the only one in which it is used in the plural. Compare Phil. iii. 20; "We have our conversation (πολιτεύμα) in heaven:" and Eph. ii. 6; "Who hath made us to sit in heavenly places with Christ:" *συνεκαθίσεν ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις ἐν Χριστῷ.*

<sup>6</sup> See the quotations in Note 3 just above. The word is used elsewhere also by Eusebius, in describing the joy of the Christian body on Maximin's overthrow, and

Thus strikingly appears the correspondence of history and prophecy, with reference to the case of the primary fall of Heathenism, on Constantine's dejection of it from its high places in the Roman empire. Nor, as Mr. Biley has shown, is the correspondence to be traced less strikingly with reference to its second and full<sup>1</sup> and final fall, under the headship of Julian, thirty years later, than with reference to its first fall under Maximin and Licinius.—Take first *Theodoret's* general testimony to the Christians' songs of joy and triumph on the occasion. "As soon as the death of Julian was known in Antioch [followed by the accession to the Emperorship of the orthodox Jovian], public festivals were celebrated. And not in the churches and martyr-chapels only, but even in the theatres, the victory of the cross was extolled, and Julian's oracles held up to ridicule. . . They exclaimed, as with one voice, Where are now thy predictions, O foolish Maximus?<sup>2</sup> *God and his Christ have gotten the victory.*"<sup>3</sup> A statement to which double force is given by Sozomen's report, not long after, if we may credit it as authentic, that Julian himself, when mortally wounded in battle, looking up to heaven threw some blood that he had drawn from his wound into the air, and accused Christ as the author of his death.<sup>4</sup>—And so again, at the very time of the occurrence, the eloquent bishop *Gregory Nazianzen*,<sup>5</sup> in a public discourse delivered on the occasion. "Hear this, all ye nations, . . all that now are, and all that shall be hereafter! Hear, *every power in heaven*, even all ye *angels*,<sup>6</sup> whose office was the destruction of the tyrant: not of Sihon king of the Amorites, nor of Og king of Bashan, rulers of little importance, and that afflicted Israel, a small people only of the habitable earth; but the destruction of *the*

the first peace to the Church, E. II. x. 2: 'Ἡμιν, τοῖς ἐπὶ τὸν Χριστὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ τὰς ἐλπίδας ἀνηρημένοις, ἀλέκτος παρῆν εὐφροσύνη.'

This verbal coincidence is the more notable, because the word is not a very common one; being found but twice elsewhere in the Apocalyptic book, viz. xi. 10, and xviii. 20. <sup>1</sup> "The Dragon was cast out *with all his angels.*"

<sup>2</sup> A Pagan philosopher and soothsayer of the time, who was a friend and intimate of Julian. So Theodoret.

<sup>3</sup> H. E. iii. 28; cited by Biley, p. 97.—Compare the words in the Apocalyptic song of triumph, ἀρτί ἐγενετο ἡ δύναμις τοῦ Θεοῦ . . . καὶ ἡ ἐξουσία τοῦ Χριστοῦ αὐτοῦ.

<sup>4</sup> Λεγεται, ὅτε ἐτρωθη, αἷμα ἐκ τῆς ωτειλῆς ἐρυσάμενος εἰς τὸν αἰθέρα ἀκοντίσαι, οἱ ἀγὲ πρὸς φαίνομενον τὸν Χριστὸν ἀφορῶν, καὶ τῆς ἰδίας σφάγης αὐτὸν ἐπαιτωμένος. H. E. vi. 2.

<sup>5</sup> Cited at large by Biley, pp. 93—97.

<sup>6</sup> Compare the Apocalyptic words, "Rejoice, ye heavens, and ye that dwell in them."

*Dragon*, the apostate, the man of great mind, the common enemy and adversary of all; who madly did and threatened many things on the earth, and spoke and devised great wickedness against the height above. . . . Who shall worthily celebrate these things? Who shall declare the power of the Lord, and speak all his praise? Who shivered the armour, the sword, and the battle, and broke the heads [sic] of the *Dragon* in the water? . . . It is the Lord mighty and powerful; the Lord mighty in battle. I find but one voice, one passage, in any way worthy of the present events; that which Isaiah uttered before our day, but which suits it exceedingly, and rivals the greatness of the benefit: viz. Rejoice, O heaven above, and let the clouds rain down righteousness; let the mountains break forth into joy, and the hills into gladness. For all creation and the heavenly powers sympathize, in my opinion, with such things: and the creation does not only groan and travail in pain with what passes below, . . . but also rejoices and exults together with God's children when they rejoice."<sup>1</sup> And, a little later, alluding to the famous frustration of Julian's attempt at rebuilding the temple of Jerusalem, and purpose, if he returned victorious from Persia, to destroy the very name of Christians, he concludes with these remarks, among others: "What will be the end of the heathen, if they turn not to Christ now? Would that they would consent to be ruled, not with *the rod of iron*, but with that of the good shepherd!"<sup>2</sup>

Mr. Biley observes further on the peculiar fitness of the Apocalyptic term *κατηγως*, or *accuser of the brethren*, made use of in the Christian song as applied to the Devil, speaking through Julian.<sup>3</sup> "He was the accuser (*κατηγωρ*), says Cyril, of every saint: the accuser everywhere of the Christians' religion; the accuser of Christ himself."<sup>4</sup>—Moreover, finally, he adds an original and very striking remark respecting the unguarded language of the Christians of the

<sup>1</sup> *εμφρανομενοις*. This verb, and the noun *εφροσυνη*, are used previously also in the oration. Compare Eusebius in Notes <sup>3</sup> and <sup>6</sup> p. 36.

<sup>2</sup> A passage to which I would beg attention, as illustrative of what I have before said on the ruling with the iron rod in Apoc. xii. 5; *ὅς μελλει ποιμαινειν τα εθνη ραβδῳ σιδηρω*. In Gregory Naz. the ideas of *the iron rod*, and the *shepherd's rule*, are both included.

<sup>3</sup> "Το πονηρον και θεομισες εναργετατα δι' αυτην λελαληκε Πνευμα. Cyril ap. Biley, p. 99.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid. 100.

day, in ascribing the glory of the victory, as they did, in no little measure to *the martyrs*, as here pre-intimated in the Apocalyptic song; “*They* (the martyrs) overcame him through the blood of the Lamb, and through the word of their testimony, and they loved not their lives unto the death.”<sup>1</sup> Here was its prefiguration, its “wonderful prefiguration,” as Mr. Biley calls it; not its commendation. “How different,” he observes, “from the doxologies of the saints in bliss; by whom (as in the Palm-bearing vision for example) the blessing, and the glory, and the wisdom, and the thanks, and the honour, power, and might, are ascribed unto God and Christ alone, and for ever.”<sup>2</sup> And he notes how the very disposition, thus prophetically fore-shown, and thus, in fact, manifested in the history of the times of Julian and Jovian, indicated at the least a preparation of mind for an undue veneration of the *martyrs*: an error which speedily had its issue and consummation, as we have seen elsewhere, in the direct worship of deceased martyrs and saints; and substitution of their supposed mediatorship and guardianship for that of Christ.<sup>3</sup>

## CHAPTER II.

### HISTORY OF THE WOMAN (THE CHURCH) AFTER THE DRAGON'S DEJECTION.

“WOE to [the inhabitants of] the earth and the sea!<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> It is not *their own victory* over the Devil in the Christian warfare, let it be well observed, that is here specified; but their victory over him as shown in his downfall from earthly power; and so a proof of their presence and power in the affairs of the world. “Martyrs by whom demons are driven out,” says Cyril, in one of the illustrative citations given by Mr. Biley. In another, after mention of Julian and his adherents’ demolition of the church built over the grave of the martyr Babylas in the grove of Daphne, near Antioch, once sacred to Apollo, his restoration of Apollo’s temple there, consultation thereupon of the oracle, and removal of the martyr’s body, on that being declared by the oracle necessary to its speaking, Mr. B. cites Chrysostom thus speaking of the sequel. “The Dæmon was taught straightway that it is possible to remove the bones, but impossible to *escape the hands of the martyr*: for, as soon as the coffer was moved to the city lightning fell on the head of the statue (of Apollo) and consumed it.” “Nor doth the impious monarch dare to replace the roof of the temple; for he knew that the blow was from heaven. . . . So the ruined walls are still there as a trophy; and tell, by the mere sight of them, of the wrestling (with the dæmon), and grappling limb within limb, and *victory of the martyr*.” *την πλανην, την συμπλοκην, την νικην τε μαρτυρος*. Biley, p. 110.

<sup>2</sup> Biley, pp. 103—114.

<sup>3</sup> Illustrated in Vol. i. pp. 330—336, on Apoc. viii. 3.—At p. 114 Mr. Biley cites Paolo Sarpi writing of Gregory Nazianzen, as the introducer of the invocation of saints.

<sup>4</sup> The words *τοις κατοικοις* are omitted in A, B, C.

For the Devil is come down to you having great wrath, because he knoweth that he hath but a short time.

And when the Dragon saw that he was cast unto the earth, he persecuted the Woman that had brought forth the man-child.—And to the Woman were given the two<sup>1</sup> wings of the great eagle, that she might fly into the wilderness into her place, where she is nourished for a time, times, and half a time, from the face of the serpent.—And the serpent cast out of his mouth water as a flood after the Woman, that he might cause her to be carried away of the flood. And the earth helped the Woman: and the earth opened its mouth, and swallowed up the flood which the Dragon cast out of his mouth.—And the Dragon was wroth with the Woman: and went to make war with that remnant of her seed, which keep the commandments of God, and hold the testimony of Jesus Christ.”<sup>2</sup> Apoc. xii. 12—17.

“Woe to the inhabitants of the earth and of the sea: for the Devil is come down to you in great wrath, because he knoweth that he hath but a short time.”—It surprises me that so many Commentators should have regarded this denunciation as the concluding part of the *ἐπιδικιον*, or song of triumph, just preceding.<sup>3</sup> It is not merely that no such ill-omened anticipations were mixed up with those rejoicings of the times of Constantine and Jovian, to which, on I think abundant evidence, I have referred it. It would surely be a strange appendage to *any* *ἐπιδικιον*. On the other hand, its similarity of expression and form to the several denunciations of coming Woes under the Trumpets,<sup>4</sup> suggests the presumption, (a presumption to which no objection seems to offer,) that this, like them, is to be regarded as a detached and solemn notification by *the dictating prophetic Spirit*, of some woe on the Roman Empire, soon

<sup>1</sup> *αἱ δύο*, A and C.

<sup>2</sup> No other variations of the least consequence in the critical texts.

<sup>3</sup> Ambrosius Ansbertus marks the distinction, by making the denunciation, as I do, the commencement of a new chapter. But I know of no modern Commentator that has done so. [Mr. Biley approves and adopts my arrangement. 4th Ed.]

<sup>4</sup> Apoc. viii. 13; “I heard an angel . . . saying with a loud voice, *Woe, Woe, Woe, to them that dwell on the earth*, by reason of the remaining trumpet-voices . . . that have yet to sound.” ix. 12; “The one *woe* hath past: behold there come yet two woes after this.” xi. 14; “The second *woe* hath past: behold the third *woe* cometh quickly.”

about to follow.—Is it asked, What woe? The answer, we shall immediately see, will be found ready at hand, by reference primarily to *heretical* persecutors *within* the Church and Empire; and secondarily to the *Gothic* scourge, which, first of all *external* judgments, as we know, fell on the Christianized Roman world.<sup>1</sup>—As regards the latter, the *earth* and *sea* denounced as what the *woe* would fall on,<sup>2</sup> construed *geographically* remind one how it was on them in Apoc. vii. that the four winds were to be loosed in the *Gothic* judgments figured under the first four Trumpets; a correspondence well worthy of remark. And, *symbolically* taken, as significant specially of the *earthly-minded*, so as noted elsewhere,<sup>3</sup> in direct contrast here with them who in heart *dwelt in heaven*,<sup>4</sup> we are reminded by their specification how in the same Apoc. vii., and with reference to the same period as here, the sealed ones correspondingly were marked out as having a charter of exemption in the coming storms from *real* evil.<sup>5</sup>

But how different the character of the coming future here foreshown, just as in the parallel previous prophecy, from what was expected by the Christians at this epoch of their triumph! I have once already made the observation, and cannot but now repeat it. They spoke as if the times of promised happiness and glory to the Church were just commencing:<sup>6</sup> but the prophetic vision, on the contrary, spoke of coming *woe and persecution*; of *floods of impious invading enemies*; and *times* impending on Christ's true Church, *of famine, distress, and desolation*. At the same time it revealed too the original author of all the evil; viz. the *Devil*, the Prince of this world, now at length fallen from the Roman mundane heaven, and cast out from his long-held throne of this world, agreeably with the Lord's far-seeing prophecy.<sup>7</sup>—Incapable of repentance, that Evil

<sup>1</sup> If the latter, then the development of this Gothic Woe under *four* successive Trumpets may be compared with that of the last Woe under *seven* successive Vials.

<sup>2</sup> The reading here in the critical editions is simply, as we saw, *Ουαι τη γη και τη θαλασση*. <sup>3</sup> See Vol. i. p. 416, Note 1. <sup>4</sup> So Apoc. xii. 12.

<sup>5</sup> So Apoc. vii. 3. See Vol. i. p. 276, &c.

<sup>6</sup> V. C. ii. 19; *Κακων παλαιων και δυσσεβειας απασης ληθη, παροντων δ' αγαθων απολαυσις, και προσετι μελλοντων προσδοκια*. See too what I have stated more fully to the same effect, Vol. i. pp. 255—257.

<sup>7</sup> John xii. 31; Luke x. 18.



Spirit is represented in Scripture as only gathering fresh malice against Christ Himself, and Christ's cause and Church, from each partial victory they might have gained over him; and the terrible consciousness of the ceaseless shortening of his respite from the sentence of God's final judgment!<sup>1</sup>

But to proceed.—We have here,

I. THE DEJECTED DRAGON'S PERSECUTION OF THE WOMAN. "And when the Dragon saw that he was cast unto the earth, he persecuted the Woman which brought forth the man-child."

It is of course implied in what follows that the Woman no more appeared in heaven, but on earth: indeed, from the *previous* notice of her commencement of flight towards the wilderness, that she had even before the Dragon's final dejection fallen from her first figured state of elevation and glory. But how such a change? And how might the Dragon find means to persecute her, when himself cast down to the ground: especially after her children had just been represented as joining in an *ἐπιθυξίον*, and called on to rejoice and triumph?—The fact however proved as prefigured. The Church soon found herself not only a wanderer again on earth, but persecuted and suffering. The very next point which Eusebius describes, after the Christians' congratulatory songs and rejoicings, consequent on Licinius' overthrow and the first establishment of Christianity throughout the Roman empire,—is a tale of her distress and persecution. And as, after the Dragon's primary discomfiture, (for we must here again bear the two epochs in remembrance,) so also, history tells us, after the Dragon's second, full, and final fall, with the apostate Julian.

In order however to the right understanding of the gist and point of the prophecy, it is essential to mark how in

<sup>1</sup> "Knowing that his time is short." The *knowing* may here mean simply *persuaded*: just as in the case of the unprofitable servant, "Thou *knewest* that I was a hard man;" Matt. xxv. 26. Now it is reasonable to suppose that the Devil knows not, any more than the angels in heaven, the exact time of the last judgment: and might thus anticipate, as the early Christians did, that it would follow speedily on the breaking up of the Pagan Roman empire. (Compare Matt. viii. 29, and xxiv. 36.)

Or perhaps the expression may refer to the really brief remaining time in which *profest heathenism* would be in any measure tolerated in the Roman world.

singularly distinctive phrase it characterises the woman meant as "*her which had brought forth the man-child.*"<sup>1</sup> It was evidently *the true, primitive, orthodox, catholically united Church* which was the object of this persecution: the same that had accomplished the victory over Heathenism; especially as holding even unto death the testimony, referred to in the Apocalyptic song of victory, of a divine atoning Saviour, the Lamb that took away the sins of the world. Indeed there might almost seem in those words an allusive contrast to some *anti-orthodox* Church, or Churches, then risen or about to arise. If so, *they* would not be the subjects of the Dragon's *persecution*; although indeed the chief sufferers from his deceit and guile. Rather they might be in it his instruments and co-operators.—I observe this because, though there may be a partial allusion, in what is said of the Dragon's persecuting the woman, to the bitter mockings of Christians by the Pagans remaining in the Roman Empire, (mockings like as of Isaac by Ishmael,<sup>2</sup>) and, where opportunity might offer, their opposition and even violence,<sup>3</sup>—also to the savage persecutions of Christians by heathen princes without the empire,<sup>4</sup>—yet I conceive, in common with numerous other commentators, that first his persecution of orthodox and true Christians, alike after his primary and then his final overthrow, by bitter *Arian* emperors; next, and connectedly, his *indirect* but not less hostile attack on them through temptations to *superstition*,<sup>5</sup> are the things here primarily prefigured in the Dragon's persecution of the Woman; these being quickly followed by his attempts also to drown the true Christian Church in the Gothic flood, Pagan or Arian in religion, mentioned afterwards.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Vitringa well calls attention to this point. "Non tantum innuit inter causa iræ et odii [Draconis] fuisse conversionem Imperatorum Romanorum ad fidem Christianam: sed precipue ut nos commonfaceret Sp. S. Ecclesiam illam, cui hæc et sequentium temporum intentata est persecutio, fuisse *Ecclesiam veram*, quæ persisteret in fide Apostolicâ." p. 738.

<sup>2</sup> In Gal. iv. 29 this is called a *persecution*; "He that was born after the flesh *persecuted* him that was born after the Spirit:" with reference to Gen. xxi. 9.

<sup>3</sup> See Mosh. iv. 1. 1. 24. Julian's momentary elevation afforded an excellent opportunity of exhibiting the bitter enmity of fallen Paganism against Christianity.

<sup>4</sup> As by *Sapor* the contemporary Persian king, and *Athanasius* the Goth. Mosh. ib. <sup>5</sup> So Num. xxv. 18; "They *vex* (or *persecute*) you with their wiles;" said of the Midianites tempting Israel to idolatry. Heb. אֲרָאָה.

<sup>6</sup> So Tichonius on the later verse xii. 17; "Draco, cum vidisset non posse continuari persecutiones, quas per *Paganos* solebat immittere, . . . *hæreses* concitavit."

Having already noted the manner in which Arianism arose, and was under Constantine put down by the Nicene Council, it needs not that I here do more than briefly allude to that subject. Suffice it to observe that each time when Paganism was cast down, Arianism in a very singular manner was presently raised up to power in its place :<sup>1</sup> alike under *Constantius* some few years after Constantine ; under *Valens* after *Jovian* ;<sup>2</sup> not to add, after a while, under *Arian Goths* also.<sup>3</sup>—And did not the Dragon-Spirit manifest his acting in it? “The *Pagans* took courage,” writes *Milner*,<sup>4</sup> “and assisted the heretics in the persecution ; saying, *The Arians have embraced our religion.*”<sup>5</sup> And again, on another occasion : “Zealous heretics were by force of arms intruded into the places of the exiled [Trinitarians] ; and *Arianism* seemed well nigh to have avenged the cause of *fallen idolatry.*”<sup>6</sup> The real though invisible originator of the heresy and the persecution, noted in this vision, was early recognised by the Christians. “It was *some evil Daemon*,” says *Eusebius*,<sup>7</sup> “that wrought the mischief ; envious of the prosperity and happiness of the Church.” And *Athanasius* ; “Our adversary the Devil, envying us our happiness, goes about seeking to rob us of the seed of the Word.” “The heathens say *Constantius* has become a Greek (or heathen) ; the *Arians* have adopted our religion.”<sup>8</sup>

<sup>1</sup> How might St. Paul's words seem to have been a warning voice by anticipation, against the philosophic speculations that led to it! Col. ii. 8, 9 ; “Beware lest any one spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, . . . according to the principles of the world, and not according to Christ : for in Him dwelleth *all the fulness of the God-head* bodily.” <sup>2</sup> *Constantius* reigned from 337 to 361 ; *Valens* from A.D. 364 to 378.

It was not however till his becoming sole emperor after the defeats of *Magnentius*, the murderer and usurper of his brother *Constans*' Western Empire in 351, 353, that *Constantius*' Arianism led him to active persecution of the orthodox ; and it was only in 360, the year before his death, that he got together a Council of the West at *Rimini* to pronounce the Arian doctrines. Gibb. iii. 350—356.

<sup>3</sup> “The mischief of the Trinitarian controversy,” says *Gibbon*, iii. 314, “successfully penetrated into every part of the Christian world . . . From the age of *Constantine* to that of *Clovis* and *Theodoric* the temporal interests both of the Romans and barbarians were deeply involved in the theological disputes of Arianism.”

<sup>4</sup> Cent. iv. c. 4, p. 226 ; from *Athanasius*. At 222 he notes, also from *Athanasius*, that Jews and Pagans were encouraged to murder Christians.

<sup>5</sup> Pagans united with Arians in the accusation personally of *Athanasius*. Ib. c. 10, p. 248. *Jovian*'s answer to one Pagan accuser is reported : “What business has a Pagan like thee to trouble himself about Christians?”—*Vitringa* observes, p. 738, from *Socrates*, that these Arian persecutors were called *διωγμοι*.

<sup>6</sup> *Milner* ib. c. 4, p. 225.

<sup>7</sup> V. C. ii. 73. Ταυτα μιν ουν φθονος (φθονερους;) τις και πονηρος δαιμων, τοις της εκκλησιας βασκαιων αγαθοις, καταεργαζεται. Quoted by *Vitringa* and *Newton*.

<sup>8</sup> *Athanas.* Op. i. 283, 300, 848 ; &c.

And so similarly, as Augustine, Sozomen,<sup>1</sup> and others tell, did the orthodox suffer from persecutions under Valens.<sup>2</sup>

We are next told of

II. THE WOMAN'S FLIGHT TO THE WILDERNESS, AND THE HELP GIVEN HER IN HER PROGRESS TOWARDS IT.—“And to the woman were given the two wings of the great eagle, that she might flee into the wilderness into her place, from the face of the Serpent:<sup>3</sup>—where she is nourished for a time, times, and half a time.”

1. *The woman's flight towards the wilderness.*

It has been a question among Commentators whether by the woman's *flight into the wilderness* there be meant a change of *state*, or a change of *place*. Vitringa argues against Mede for the latter signification; as that which is necessarily required by the attribution of movement to the woman, in the very terms of the figure:<sup>4</sup>—but, as it seems to me, quite in vain. There is implied movement

<sup>1</sup> “Ecclesiam quam Valens hæreticus, favens Arianis, vehementer affixerat.” So Augustine, C. D. v. 26. 1; xviii. 52. 2. Also Sozomen, II. E. vi. 36.

<sup>2</sup> In a Review of De Broglie's “Church and Roman Empire” in a late No. of the Edinb. Rev. there is a passage descriptive of the Church before and after the Council of Nice, which is so illustrative of my subject that I must quote it. “For the first time the whole Grecian world, drawing along with it its satellites in the West, and some wandering stars in the far realms of space, beyond the limits of Greek or Roman civilization, met in solemn conclave to determine by an authoritative decision the most mysterious subject of metaphysical inquiry. The questions of deepest spiritual interest of the day centered in the nature of the Deity. This was the apple of discord which expiring Paganism had cast into the ranks of the victorious Christians.”

<sup>3</sup> This seems the proper place of the clause, “from the face of the Serpent;” the clause following being parenthetical. So Vitringa, 739.

<sup>4</sup> “Prophetia ipsa nos accuratè hic jubet distinguere terminum à quo, quem vocant, et ad quem: locum ex quo mulier fugit, et ad quem fugiendo pervenit. . . Fuga hæc nos ducit ad cogitandum de mutatione loci, non statûs.” p. 741.—He then explains the flight as made from the Eastern empire, where Arianism first prevailed and subsequently other heresies, to the comparatively barbarous nations of the Franks, Anglo-Saxons, &c.: (p. 745:) who in the 8th, 9th, or 10th centuries in multitudes embraced Christianity; and among whom too, he says, it was destined to be preserved during *the reign of the Beast*, which he makes to begin about the 12th century.

Of course, on the *year-day* principle, (of the truth of which I feel no doubt,) there are decisive chronological objections to this interpretation. And, besides and independent of them, others too occur that seem insuperable. 1. For some time after the flight commencing, (i. e. after the birth of the man-child, or establishment of Christianity in the Roman empire, according to Vitringa's own view of the Apocalyptic symbol,) these nations were not Christians. 2. At the time of their professed adoption of Christianity, their Christian character, both then and afterwards, had as little to do, for the most part, with real religion, as that of the Christians of the Eastern empire, from which Vitringa makes it to flee in the 4th, 5th, or 6th centuries.—Vitringa had better, perhaps, have referred to Constantine's Christian Missions into Armenia, Georgia, and Abyssinia, to make his hypothesis more plausible.

from one local point to another, in the representation just previously given of the Dragon's dejection from the heaven to the earth: yet Vitranga, in common with most other Apocalyptic expositors, explains this of a change of *state* in the same Roman empire; viz. from political supremacy and establishment to political degradation. The same, we may presume, is the case here.—And what then is the state indicated by the figure of the Woman, or Church, i. e. *Christ's faithful, orthodox, and once Catholically extended Church* (for we must never lose sight of the distinction<sup>1</sup>) *being in the wilderness?* Both the figure itself, and the type also that seems evidently referred to of the sojourn of the ancient Israel in the wilderness, imply the *faithful Church's* loss of its previous character of *Catholicity* or *Universality*, its *invisibility* in respect of *true Christian public worship*,<sup>2</sup> and *destitution of all ordinary means of spiritual sustenance*; (I say *spiritual*, because the thing symbolized is the *Church*;) a destitution such as to need God's special interposition to support life.—Such seem the conditions of the Church's *completed* wilderness-state. Of course in proportion as it might *approximate* to this, they must be supposed to have had a *partial* and *approximate* fulfilment. And as, in the Chapter before us, the Woman is described as transferred into the wilderness not *suddenly* but *gradually*,—her first movement thitherwards being represented as begun soon after the man-child's assumption, for it is then that the first mention is made of her fleeing a wanderer towards the wilderness,<sup>3</sup>—and her settlement therein as not completed

<sup>1</sup> See pp. 7, 8, 19, *suprà*.

<sup>2</sup> So Bossuet, the most able of Roman controversialists; and one to whom I have particular reasons for referring. He says, in explanation of the 6th verse; "L'église cache son service dans des lieux retirés. C'est une imitation de l'état où se trouva la synagogue dans la persécution d'Antiochus."—He afterwards indeed observes; "Nourrie;—sous les ordres de Dieu, par les pasteurs ordinaires; comme le peuple dans le désert par Moïse et Aaron, et sous Antiochus par Mattathias et ses enfans sacrificeurs: afin qu'on ne se figure pas ici une *église invisible*, et sans pasteurs." But who the pastors that nourished it? Not those of the world from which it had fled, but those that were exiled in the wilderness with it; such, at last, as of the poor Waldensian or United Brethren Churches described in my Vol. ii, pp. 428, 449. Indeed how, as in Bossuet's own statement before given, could it in respect of its worship be *hidden*, ("L'église cache son service dans des lieux retirés,") and yet at the same time not be *invisible*? I mean *corporately* invisible?—The subject will be recurred to at the end of this chapter.

<sup>3</sup> Εφυγεν εις την ερημον. This may be rendered *towards*, as well as *into*; so indicating the commencement of the movement. So Luke ix. 56, 57; Και επορευθησαν εις ετεραν κωμην: immediately after which we have related sundry things

until after the Dragon's dejection, his subsequent persecution of the Woman, the two wings of the great eagle being given her, the Dragon's casting water out of his mouth to overwhelm her, and the earth absorbing, or at least beginning to absorb, the flood of waters,—such, I say, being the representation here given of her long and as yet not completed flight into the wilderness-state, it is her earlier movement and progress thitherwards that must first and for a while claim our attention.

In proof then that Christ's *faithful orthodox Church*, once cognisable before men as the united body of all professing Christians, and notable for the generally holy and evangelical character of its doctrine, public worship, and life of its members,<sup>1</sup> began from soon after the establishment of Christianity in the Roman empire, and through all the half century following, *to flee towards the wilderness*,—in other words, to vanish rapidly in its distinctive features from public view, become sectional, insulated, desolate, and more and more straitened for spiritual sustenance in the then public means of grace,—I have only to make appeal to the testimony of the most respectable ecclesiastical historians. The period in question is the same, it will be observed, that was before depicted in the two parallel visions of the segregation of the sealed from the unsealed, and of those that adhered to Christ as their Mediator and Atoner, from the apostatised multitudes of the *professing* Israel. And the general view given from history, in my illustrative comments on those visions,<sup>2</sup> of the then state of religion in the

that occurred *in the course of the party's passage to the village* spoken of; *Ἐγενετο δὲ πορευομένων αὐτῶν*, &c. Also Acts viii. 25, xviii. 18, &c.—So again in the Old Testament, Gen. xxii. 3; "Abraham *went into the place* (Greek *ἐπι*) of which God had told him; and on the third day *he saw the place afar off*," &c. : also Gen. xxviii. 5, 10 : "And Isaac sent away Jacob; and he (Jacob) went to (*εἰς*) Padan Aram. . . And Jacob went out from Beersheba, and went towards (*εἰς*) Haran." After which follows the account of his first night on the journey at Bethel.

It will be observed that I do not, like many others, regard this first mention of the woman's flight as *proleptical*; though *prolepses* are not indeed infrequent in Scripture: e. g. in Gen. xxviii. 5, Matt. xxvii. 53, Luke iii. 19, John xx. 3, 4, &c.—Instead of this I look on the prophetic intimation of the Woman's first beginning her flight towards the wilderness almost immediately after the man-child's assumption, and before the Dragon's final war and dejection from heaven, as very remarkably verified in the chronology of Constantius' Arianism, and its consequences to the faithful Church, before Julian and Valens.

<sup>1</sup> We must indeed look to *primitive Apostolic times* for the full realization of this. See 2 Cor. iii. 2.

<sup>2</sup> See Vol. i. pp. 287—296, and 330—341, *suprà*.

Roman empire, I mean after Constantine's establishment of Christianity, might almost be referred to as sufficient to prove the question now in hand. It will doubtless, however, better satisfy the reader to see a few further testimonies, more direct and explicit to the point. I therefore subjoin them from both *Milner* and *Mosheim*; omitting for the most part such as refer to *Arianism*, both because it has been already considered, and because it is obvious that, wherever Arianism was dominant, Christ's *true* Church must needs have become visibly a mere section of Christians, instead of the Church Catholic, and moreover partially hidden and desolate; but begging the Reader not to forget the powerful operation of this cause, as well as of others; and its aggravation of all the rest, through the bitter and contentious spirit, as well as the direct heresies, thereby engendered.

The *former* then thus describes the state of religion, even where Arianism prevailed not, from soon after Constantine's establishment of Christianity, and the Nicene Council, (at which time the symbolic man-child seemed caught up before men to God and to his throne,) and for the next half century. "In the general appearance of the Church we cannot see much of the spirit of godliness. . . . External piety flourished: . . . but faith, love, heavenly-mindedness appear very rare. . . . The doctrine of real conversion was very much lost, or external baptism placed in its stead: and the true doctrine of justification by faith, and true practical use of a crucified Saviour for troubled consciences, were *scarce to be seen* at this time. Superstition and self-righteousness were making vigorous shoots; and the real gospel of Christ was *hidden* from men who professed it." <sup>1</sup>—He afterwards refers to the Council of Antioch, held about the year 370 in Valens' reign: in the which the 140 or 150 Bishops that attended "pathetically bewailed the times, and observed that the Infidels laughed at the evils [prevalent], and staggered the weak; while true

<sup>1</sup> Cent. iv. c. 2, pp. 210, 211.—He here adds, (just agreeably with the chronological position of the Apocalyptic predictive statement that the dragon *after his dejection* persecuted the woman,) that Satan saw it his time to make a direct attack on the dignity of the Son of God; and to stir up persecution against Christians, by means of those that bore the Christian name.

Christians, avoiding the churches, as being now nurseries of impiety, went into deserts, and lifted up their hands to God with sighs and tears.”<sup>1</sup> He elsewhere instances the piety of the monk Antony, to show that “godliness in those times lived *obscure* in hermitages; while abroad in the world the Gospel was *almost buried* in faction and ambition.”<sup>2</sup> At the same time, as if in proof that the true Church had not yet quite left the world for the wilderness, he speaks of “godliness also thriving in some unknown instances in ordinary life;” and refers to Ammianus Marcellinus, (an unbeliever little disposed to speak too favourably of Christians,) as showing that “among the lower orders, and in obscure places, exemplary pastors and real religion were not wanting.”<sup>3</sup> So again; “I am endeavouring to *catch the features of the Church*, wherever I can find her in this obscure region.”<sup>4</sup>

To the same effect is the report of *Mosheim*. Of the *life* and *morals* of the professing Christians of the fourth century he says: “Good men were, as before, mixed with bad: but the bad were by degrees so multiplied, that men truly holy and devoted to God appeared more rarely; and the pious few were almost oppressed by the vicious multitude.”<sup>5</sup> Of the *doctrine* he says; “Fictions, of early origin, [viz. about saint-veneration and relics, a purifying fire, celibacy,] &c. &c., now so prevailed, as in course of time almost to thrust true religion aside, or at least to exceedingly obscure and tarnish it:”<sup>6</sup> adding, with reference

<sup>1</sup> Ib. c. xi. p. 250.

<sup>2</sup> Ib. c. v. p. 229. “We are not,” he observes, “to form an idea of ancient monks from modern ones. It was a mistaken thing in holy men of old to retire altogether from the world. But there is reason to believe that the mistake originated in piety.” p. 228. A sketch of the Monk Antony’s character and faith follows, which should be read. Instead of Antony’s *heading* (as we might perhaps expect from his being a monk) the gathering superstitions of the times, he is actually associated with *Vigilantius* by Mr. Daubuz, p. 538, as an opponent to them.

<sup>3</sup> Ib. c. xii.—The passage from Ammianus, xxvii. 3, is as follows. “They (the Roman Bishops) might be happy if, contemning the splendour of Rome, they lived like some bishops of the provinces; who, by the plainness of their diet, their mean apparel, and the modesty of their looks, make themselves acceptable to the eternal God and his true worshippers.” It a little savours, the reader may perhaps think, of Pagan irony.

<sup>4</sup> Ch. xii. p. 254.

<sup>5</sup> “Mores et vitam Christianorum si spectes, boni, ut antea, malis commisti fuerunt: at malorum tamen numerus sensim ita cœpit augeri, ut rarius apparent homines verè sancti atque Deo debiti.” Again: “Exiguam piorum manum ab illis (agminibus vitiosorum) pœne oppressam fuisse.” iv. 2. 3. 17.

<sup>6</sup> “..... quæ, procedente tempore, ipsam pœne religionem extruserunt; vehem-



to the conduct of *controversies* on doctrinal points, that “the ancient Christian simplicity had almost fled away from them;”<sup>1</sup> and, as to *Scripture interpretation*, that the mystical and allegorizing method of Origen was followed.<sup>2</sup> His account of the *public worship*, as then celebrated, is to the effect that to the hymns, prayers, Scripture-reading, sermons, and ministration of the Lord’s Supper, which had been handed down from primitive times, there were now added various rites and ceremonies, more suited to please the eye than to kindle piety:<sup>3</sup> that, besides this, the *prayers* had greatly fallen away from their ancient simplicity and majesty; that the *sermons* were fashioned rather to excite popular admiration and applause than to edify;<sup>4</sup> and that a mystery and reserve was maintained towards catechumens and the mixed audience, on the subject of the *holy sacrament*;<sup>5</sup> i. e. on a subject involving the vital doctrine of the atonement.—He elsewhere contrasts the zeal of the emperors to exalt the Christian religion, with that of the priesthood to obscure and smother it by multitudinous superstitious rites and ceremonies.<sup>6</sup>

Such are the consenting testimonies of these two ecclesiastical historians to the lamentable state of Christ’s *true-professing Church*, as cognisable before the world through the middle half of the fourth century; even where not oppressed by the deadly *Arian* heresies. And, I ask, can any descriptions more precisely answer to the significant figuration, now under discussion, of the Apocalyptic prophecy? Its *spirit scarce to be seen*, its *living exemplars rare*, the *gospel-faith*, which was a part of its very essence, almost *hidden*,—how can it be denied that Christ’s true

menter saltem obscurarunt et depravarunt.” He adds; “Veræ pietatis in locum ingens variarum superstitionum agmen sensim suffectum est.” iv. 2. 3. 1, 2.

<sup>1</sup> “Aufugit prope prisca simplicitas ex disputationibus cum illis qui divinæ veritatis putabantur hostes esse.” iv. 2. 3. 7. <sup>2</sup> iv. 2. 3. 4.

<sup>3</sup> “. . . . . quibus quidem rebus varii ritus, ad oculorum magis oblectationem quam ad veræ pietatis excitationem, addebantur.” iv. 2. 4. 3.

<sup>4</sup> “Preces à veteri simplicitate ac majestate valdè defecerunt. . . Sermones publici . . . admirationi potius rudis plebeculæ . . . quam mentium emendationi inserviebant.” iv. 2. 4. 4.

<sup>5</sup> “Nec sacri oratores apertè ac simpliciter pro concione de verâ eorum naturâ (i. e. of the sacred clements) disserere audebant.” iv. 2. 4. 8.

<sup>6</sup> “Dum imperatorum favor religionem Christianam extollere studet, antistitum inconsulta pietas rituum et caeremoniarum multitudinem veram ejus indolem et naturam obseurat et opprimit.” iv. 2. 4. 1.

Church, according to these accounts, was receding rapidly into the *invisibility* of the wilderness-state?—Again, as the *doctrine* taught throughout professing Christendom, around it, was more and more corrupted and vitiated by superstitious fictions, the vital dogmas of conversion and justification misrepresented, the public prayers of the church-assemblies deprived very much of their primitive spirituality, a deep reserve maintained by the preachers on the subject of God's great mystery of atonement and redemption, and a false method followed of Scripture interpretation,—forasmuch as the public and visible means of grace were thus vitiated and rendered unnutritious, is it not equally evident that Christ's Church and people were reduced more and more to the wilderness-state of *spiritual want* and *barrenness*?—It has been before noted that some Christians, like the monk Antony, under a sense of the wretched and ungenial atmosphere of professing Christendom, fulfilled the Apocalyptic figure to the letter; and sought in the Syrian or Egyptian deserts the spiritual comforts, nourishment, and peace, that failed elsewhere. But it was only to find, after brief experience, that removal from the world's contentions and bustle is not necessarily removal from its corruptions. Superstition and error insinuated themselves as effectively, ere the end of the 4th century, into the monasteries as into the churches of Christendom.<sup>1</sup> Much more was this the case afterwards. So that at length there, as elsewhere, whatever of Christ's true Church was preserved, was preserved by God's special and extraordinary interposition; even as Israel or Elijah in the wilderness.—But in this I am anticipating. The Church, though advancing towards the wilderness-state, had not yet fully attained it. Its features were still in the fourth century discernible, though faintly. Food was still supplied it, though scantily. And, ere its complete entrance into the wilderness, a partial success was ordained for it. The help of *the great eagle's wings*, as powerful as seasonable, was to be given to the woman, to bear her up triumphant from the first direct attack on her vitality by the fallen Dragon. And, borne up by them, she was yet once again to exhibit

<sup>1</sup> See Mosheim and Milner on this point.

herself (especially in the N. W. African diocese) in not a little of her primitive distinctness of feature and lustre; before she finally disappeared from public view in Christendom; and was for ages, in respect of those things by which alone a *true Church* might be *visible*,<sup>1</sup> no more seen.

Thus we come to consider,

2. *The aptation of the two eagle-wings to the woman.*  
 “And to the woman were given the two wings of the great eagle; that she might fly into the wilderness, into her place, from the face of the Serpent.”

In explanation of the above a reference has been made by Mede and others<sup>2</sup> to God's representation, under similarly emblematic language, of the *assistance and protection* that He had afforded Israel,<sup>3</sup> when fleeing to the wilderness from the persecutions of the Egyptian dragon, Pharaoh. “Ye have seen what I did unto the Egyptians; and how I bare you *on eagle's wings*, and brought you to myself.” It has been further suggested that in a *symbolic* prophecy, like this of the Apocalypse, the symbol of an eagle's wings must be regarded as emblematic of some particular *earthly instrumentality*, appropriate to the emblem, and employed for the sustentation and help of Christ's true Church by divine Providence: that this power is marked out by the eagle standard of Rome as the *Roman*: moreover that the emphatic numeral specification of *the two wings*<sup>4</sup> of the great eagle, given to the woman, is fitly explicable of those two notable divisions of the Roman empire, the Eastern and the Western, which, though once

<sup>1</sup> See, in further explanation, the end of this chapter.

<sup>2</sup> Daubuz, Bishop Newton, &c.

<sup>3</sup> This is evidently the force of the emblem in the passage cited from Exodus xix. 4: as also in that beautiful one of Deut. xxxii. 11: “As an eagle stirreth up her nest, fluttereth over her young, spreadeth abroad her wings, [taketh them, beareth them on her wings,—so the Lord alone did lead him.”—Let me here observe that since these passages suggest protection, help, sustentation, as the thing chiefly intended by the figure, a meaning as suitable here as there, they serve satisfactorily to show the futility of Dr. Maitland's objection to Bishop Newton; to the effect that, having in one place explained eagles' wings as emblems simply of *swiftness*, the Bishop ought also so to have explained them here. Reply to Cuninghame, p. 51. An objection which, considered in another point of view, I shall presently have again to refer to.

<sup>4</sup> Tregelles and Wordsworth insert the article *ai*, which is in both the Codex Alexandrinus and Codex Ephraemi; and, as Bishop Middleton observes, probably the correct reading.

Pagan, did now alike profess and support Christianity.—All this seems plausible, and in the main reasonable. It is true that the figure of the text is somewhat different from that in Exodus. For there the ancient Israel was represented as *borne on eagle's wings*; here the mystic and true Israel as *fitted with the wings* for flight. But the main idea figured out is in either case, as appears from parallel passages, not very different; I mean that of *aid* given to help her escaping alive.<sup>1</sup> Again, it is true that the *eagle* is not distinctively a Roman symbol: it being one of the more general emblems in Scripture;<sup>2</sup> and applied to Babylonians, Egyptians, Persians,<sup>3</sup> as well as Romans. At the same time our Lord's apparent reference to the Romans under it,<sup>4</sup> the notoriety of the emblem as significant of the Roman power, at the period to which this Apocalyptic vision relates, and the fact of no other empire at that time but the Roman even professing, much less assisting and supporting Christianity,<sup>5</sup>—all these considerations unite to point to the *Roman* power as the one intended. Perhaps too we may add as corroborative proof of this, as well as of the eagle's two *wings* meaning the Eastern and Western divisions of the empire, that the opposite extremities, or geographical divisions of a land, are metaphorically designated as *wings* in Scripture elsewhere.<sup>6</sup>—Unlikely, indeed,

<sup>1</sup> Compare Jer. xlviii. 9; "Give wings unto Moab, that it may flee and get away; for the cities thereof shall be desolate:" Isaiah xl. 31; "They that wait on the Lord shall mount up with wings as eagles:" &c. Psalm lv. 6; "I said, Oh that I had wings like a dove; for then would I fly away and be at rest. Lo, then would I wander far off, and remain in the wilderness."

<sup>2</sup> See my observations on Scripture symbols, Vol. i. p. 424.

<sup>3</sup> See Ezek. xvii. 3, 7, referred to in the next paragraph; also Isa. xlv. 11; where Cyrus seems designated as "*the ravenous bird*," or *eagle*, called from a far country against Babylon. Commentators remark on this last quoted passage, that the standard of Cyrus was according to Xenophon a *golden eagle*.

<sup>4</sup> Matt. xxiv. 28; "Wheresoever the carcase is, there shall the *eagles* be gathered together."—Perhaps too there is an allusion to the Roman, as well as Babylonian power, in Deut. xxviii. 49: "The Lord shall bring against thee a nation from far, [as swift] as the *eagle* flieth." On which verse let me observe, in passing, that the similitude, "as the eagle flieth," being at any rate intended of the *Babylonian* destroyers of Judah, well agrees with the symbol of the *two eagle wings* attached to Daniel's first Wild Beast, the Babylonian Lion.

<sup>5</sup> *Sapor*, the great contemporary king of *Persia*, was a savage persecutor for forty years of all that bore the Christian name in his dominions. The *Goths* were all Pagans till after the middle of the fourth century: then part became *Arian* Christians.

<sup>6</sup> So Job xxxvii. 3; "He directeth his lightning to the ends (Marg. and Heb. *wings*) of the earth:" and again Job xxxviii. 13. Also Isaiah xi. 12: "He shall gather the dispersed of Judah from the four corners (Heb. *wings*) of the earth."

it may well have seemed to the orthodox and pious Christians, in the Eastern Empire more especially, when suffering under the persecutions of Valens, that such should soon be the effective help given them by the rulers in both parts of the Empire. But, unlikely as it might have seemed, such proved to be the case. For *after this time* Arianism was altogether renounced; and orthodox Christianity, on the vital point so long disputed, alone professed and upheld by the Roman emperors, above all by the Emperor Theodosius.

And indeed it strikes me that there is an actual *individuality* of application to him shadowed forth as intended, by that remarkable designation of the figured eagle as "*the eagle, the great one.*"<sup>1</sup> Prophetic commentators have, I believe, left this expression quite unnoticed: and, though attention has been called to it by Bishop Middleton, it is only to suggest that the phrase was probably borrowed from the similar symbolic imagery in Ezek. xvii. 3;<sup>2</sup> and to explain *the great eagle* pictured, there and here, *ornithologically* from Bochart, as the *asterius*, or *largest of the eagle tribe.*<sup>3</sup>—But let me add, as an Apocalyptic expositor, that there needs also to be a correspondence in the thing symbolized with the symbol. In Ezekiel, as the eagle just mentioned was the greatest of his species, so the power symbolized was that of the greatest of existing empires,—the as yet unbroken Babylonish power; and as wielded by *Nebuchadnezzar*, the most eminent of living monarchs.<sup>4</sup> This intended appropriateness in Ezekiel's figure is the more marked,

<sup>1</sup> του αετου του μεγαλου. The reading is undoubted. There is no other.

<sup>2</sup> "A great eagle with great wings (Sept. αετος ο μεγας ο μεγαλοπτερυγος), long-winged, full of feathers, which had divers colours, came unto Lebanon, and took the highest branch of the cedar, and cropped off the top of his young twigs, and carried it into a land of traffic," &c.; i. e. to Babylon.

<sup>3</sup> "Why του αετου του μεγαλου? Michaelis observes; 'It must allude to a particular eagle already mentioned in the Apocalypse: yet I do not recollect any other than that which (see Apoc. viii. 13) \* flew through the heaven, and proclaimed the threefold woe, now past.—It is not improbable that the *great eagle*, a species so denominated, may be meant. We find in Ezek. xvii. 3, from whom the expression . . . may be borrowed, ο αετος ο μεγας ο μεγαλοπτερυγος. Bochart tells us that the great eagle of Ezekiel was the *αστερις*, said by Ælian to be *μεγιστος αετων.*" Middleton ad loc.


<sup>4</sup> See the testimonies to this in Bishop Newton, on Daniel's prophecy of the Image.

\* I have given reasons, Vol. i. p. 336, Note 1, for preferring the reading *αγγελου* in this passage.



VICTORY WITH HER TWO WINGS, INFOLDING AS ONE,  
AND INDICATING HER JOINT SUPPORT OF, THE  
TWO EMPERORS AND EMPIRES, ALIKE OF EAST & WEST.

(A Coin of Gratian & Theodosius)



From a Coin in the British Museum.

inasmuch as in the 7th verse of the same chapter "another great eagle" is mentioned, without the distinctive definite article,<sup>1</sup> in designation of another kingdom and king, *that of Egypt*; a king great indeed, but not pre-eminently great as the king of Babylon.—Applying the same rule of interpretation in the present case we may infer that, as "*the eagle the great one*" is the symbol, so there must be meant the Roman empire in its unbroken greatness, or at least in undivided action, albeit with the two wings for characteristics, and as under *some Roman Prince pre-eminently great*, heading and directing it.—And I think we shall find all the figured notifications to meet in the character and acts of the emperor that immediately succeeded Valens, I mean *Theodosius*.<sup>2</sup> First, to him, alone of Roman emperors from Constantine to Charlemagne, the title has attached,—*deservedly* attached, to use Gibbon's expression,<sup>3</sup>—of "THEODOSIUS THE GREAT." Next it was his lot, alone of Roman Emperors after its bipartition by Valentinian, to unite the two divisions of the Empire, the Eastern and the Western, which now, let it be noted, in the very coinage of the empire seemed to be figured as *wings*,<sup>4</sup> under his own sway.<sup>5</sup> Further, it was pre-eminently his character to use all this his imperial power, success, and greatness, as a protector and nursing father to the orthodox Church of Christ. As Gibbon says, "Every victory of his contributed to the triumph of the Christian and catholic faith."<sup>6</sup> Indeed not the *professing orthodox church* alone (contradistinctively to the *Arian*) might claim Theodosius as a friend and protect-

<sup>1</sup> Sept. αετος ἕτερος μέγας μεγαλοπτερυγος.      <sup>2</sup> Reigned from A.D. 379 to 395.

<sup>3</sup> iv. 429; "The *great* Theodosius, an epithet which he honourably deserved on this momentous occasion." And again, p. 421; "The *great* Theodosius; a name celebrated in history, and dear to the Catholic Church."

<sup>4</sup> In certain coins of Theodosius, struck probably during Gratian's co-regency in the West, and some also of his two sons and successors, a figure, not indeed of an eagle, but of Victory, is depicted, with its two wings outstretched, the one over the head of one emperor, the other over the head of the other, as they sit together, and hold the globe between them. See my Plate, and Banduri ii. 506.

<sup>5</sup> His actual reign indeed over the *West* and *East* united, was very short. But even previously his laws were of force through the whole empire. Thus Gibbon, vi. 7, on stating that in the year 425, "the unity of the Roman government was finally dissolved, and by a positive declaration the validity of all future laws limited to the dominions of their peculiar author," adds in a note, that forty years before, 438, i. e. until a little after the death of Theodosius, unity of legislation may be shown to have existed.

<sup>6</sup> v. 103.



or; but Christ's *true* Church also, included in the former. For none, I think, can read his history without the impression of his real personal piety.<sup>1</sup>—More particularly consider his conduct with regard to the errors and hostility of Paganism and Arianism, wherewith the dejected Dragon had been already long persecuting Christ's faithful Church. Against *Paganism* he was an enemy so determined and influential,<sup>2</sup> that it thenceforth never again raised its head. The cross was thenceforth supreme over the Roman world.<sup>3</sup> Again, against *Arianism* this was his as determined language, addressed to certain Arians in the year 383. "I will not permit throughout my dominions any other religion than that which obliges us to worship the Son of God in unity of essence with the Father and the Holy Ghost, in the adorable Trinity. As I hold my empire of Him,<sup>4</sup> and power which I have to command you, He likewise will give me strength, as He hath given me the will, to make myself obeyed in a point so absolutely necessary to your salvation, and to the peace of my subjects."<sup>5</sup> This language was followed up by casting Arian heretics out of the churches, and by severe laws against them: so that, as Mosheim tells us, he was the means of making the dogmas of the Nicene faith everywhere to triumph in the empire; and none could thenceforth publicly profess Arianism, (let the exception be marked by the reader,) but the barbarian Goths, Vandals, and Burgundians.<sup>6</sup>

Thus did Theodosius apply his imperial power to defeat the Dragon's projects, so far as hitherto developed; and, as Augustine observes in language very illustrative of the passage before us, to furnish help to the Church, which had been before grievously deprest and afflicted under the persecutions of the Arian Valens.<sup>7</sup>—And this is to be ob-

<sup>1</sup> See his character as sketched in Milner.

<sup>2</sup> So Mosheim, iv. l. 1. 15, and Gibbon, v. 91, &c.

<sup>3</sup> The globe, which by the Roman Cæsars had been surmounted by an *eagle*, and by the Constantinian family by a *phœnix*, was by Jovian first, and then by Theodosius, (I or II,) surmounted by a *cross*. See my paper on the Roman Coinage, in the Appendix to my Vol. I.—A copy of the Theodosian medal is appended in illustration.

<sup>4</sup> Compare what I have before said, p. 23, of Constantine's throne as like David's and Solomon's: God's throne, because professedly held of Christ, who is God.

<sup>5</sup> Waddington, Hist. of Church, i. 208. See also Gibbon, v. 15, 31, &c.

<sup>6</sup> iv. 2. 5. 15.

<sup>7</sup> "Ex ipso initio imperii sui non quievit justissimis et misericordissimis legibus

served, that it was not by mere individual favour and support,—the which would both during his life have been less influential, and with his life have terminated; but by the solemn act and co-operation of professing Roman Christendom, that is of the Roman world. “The work of Theodosius,” says Dean Waddington, “was considerably promoted by the *Œcumenic Council* which he assembled at Constantinople: <sup>1</sup> the object of which, besides the regulation of several points of ecclesiastical discipline, [and let it be observed that there was no recognition or support given therein to the gathering superstitions of the age,] was to confirm the decision of Nice against the Arians, and to promulgate the doctrine of the Divinity of the Third Person, against the Macedonian heretics.” <sup>2</sup> So that, under Theodosius’ presiding influence, Roman Christendom alike of the East and of the West, (for both assisted in the Council,) did solemnly profess, and thereby uphold, the orthodox and true faith:—in fine, did what the symbol presignified, viz. united with its emperor in applying to the Woman the two wings of the great eagle, to support and bear her up in her flight from the Dragon’s persecutions and projects.—The groundlessness of the objection that this aptation of the two wings of the Roman empire to the Church had nothing to do with the matter of her flight from the Dragon,<sup>3</sup> must be already obvious to the reader. God makes use of means: and the recognition of an essential but previously persecuted truth by a united empire, under a great and pious king, could not but be influential to its, and her, support. Thus of *Arian* persecution from native *Romans* we hear no more. Nor, we may feel well persuaded, did the Council’s solemn recognition of the truth fail to operate to the

adversus impios *laboranti Ecclesie subvenire*, quam Valens hæreticus, favens Arianis vehementer affligerat.” C. D. v. 26. l.—So too Sozomen viii. l. And Bossuet Hist. Univ. Part i. 11, following them; “Maitre absolu des *deux* empires, . . . Theodosie *appuya* la religion.” <sup>1</sup> A. D. 381. <sup>2</sup> Waddington, i. 208.

<sup>3</sup> “The facts are . . . that when she did fly into the wilderness, the eagle’s wings of the Eastern and Western Roman Empire had nothing to do with the matter.” Maitland’s Reply to Cuninghame, p. 52; and Second Enquiry, p. 144: passages already alluded to p. 52 *supra*.—I must observe that Bishop Newton, against whom Dr. M. objects, makes no specification, in his explanatory comment, of Theodosius and the Council gathered by him, for the support of the orthodox church and doctrine. So that Dr. M. would perhaps not urge his objection against the explanation, as here given.

preservation of real religion for ages afterwards. Many doubtless were the pious but timid Catholics, who, amidst the superstitions and darkness of the subsequent middle age, rested on the fundamental doctrines of the *Divinity of the Son of God, and personality of the Holy Ghost*, as dogmas thus early and solemnly professed by the Christian Church and world: and, resting thereon, looked upward to those divine agents of salvation, in spite of their obscurity by the sevenfold incrustations of the prevailing superstition; and, so looking, found life.

Finally, in estimating the importance of the help given to the mystic Woman by the support of the two wings of the great eagle, we must not overlook the consideration of the 16 years of respite given to the Church, as well as empire, through 'Theodosius' instrumentality,<sup>1</sup> from the tremendous and already imminent irruption of the Gothic flood. Had it burst over the empire when first it threatened, at the death of Valens, it might probably have overwhelmed the Church. But through him a respite was secured:—just such a one as the Psalmist prayed for; "Spare me a little that I may recover my strength, before I go hence and be no more seen:"—just such too as was graciously accorded to Judah under the good king Josiah,<sup>2</sup> before its deportation into Babylonish captivity.—And let me not forget to add that, as the respite to Judah through Josiah's instrumentality was blessed with the teaching of that eminent instructor and prophet *Jeremiah*, as if to prepare the pious remnant with spiritual strength and food against their impending 70 years' captivity, such too was the case in the reign of 'Theodosius. Under the wings of the great eagle, the holy *Augustine* entered on his ministry: and alike by his ministry, life, and doctrine, (above all by that his doctrine on the unspeakably important subject of *Christ's true Church* of which I was led before to speak very fully, as itself distinctly prefigured in the Apocalypse,<sup>3</sup>) revived the fainting Church of the Lord Jesus; and both furnished it with present food, and food too against its long

<sup>1</sup> "The public safety seemed to depend on the life . . . of a single man." Gibb. iv. 443.

<sup>2</sup> Ambrose *De Obit. Theodos.* compares the two Princes.

<sup>3</sup> Part i. ch. vii. § 4.

sojourn, now soon about commencing, in the wilderness.<sup>1</sup> In fact under his holy ministry (a ministry instrumentally due to the respite through Theodosius) it exhibited itself in his African diocese in not a little of its primitive and heavenly lustre:—just like the sun's parting gleams at sunset, through a clouded and tempestuous sky; ere his sinking beneath the horizon, and the commencement of a long and dark night.

But I must hasten to that other *direct* attempt made by the Dragon to overwhelm Christ's true faith and Church, while fleeing towards the wilderness, which is next pre-figured.—We were to consider,

IIIrdly, THE DRAGON'S CASTING FLOODS OF WATER OUT OF HIS MOUTH, TO OVERTAKE AND OVERWHELM HER.—“And the serpent cast water out of his mouth, as a flood, after the woman, that he might cause her to be carried away by the flood.”

The image is borrowed from the custom of crocodiles, as also whales and other great fish, drawing in water from the river or sea into their mouths, and spouting it out again.<sup>2</sup> And it seems to me, as to other expositors before me, that there is a double idea suggested in the passage. What flows from the *mouth* is *doctrine*, good or bad, according

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Biley cites two other testimonies to the incalculable and permanent influence of Augustine, which I will here transcribe.

1. Waddington, i. 314. “Augustine maintained the Church doctrines of original sin and saving grace, with great force and zeal, and the most unaffected sincerity; and his writings on this subject continued for above twelve centuries to distribute the waters of regeneration over the barren surface of the Roman Catholic Church.”

2. Milman, *Hist. Christ.* iii. 10. “While Ambrose was deepening and strengthening the foundation of the ecclesiastical power, Augustine was beginning gradually to consummate that total change in human opinion, which was to influence the Christianity of the remotest ages. Of all Christian writers since the Apostles, Augustine has maintained the most permanent and extensive influence. That influence was indeed unfelt, or scarcely felt in the East; but as the East gradually became more estranged, till it was little more than a blank in Christian history, *the dominion of Augustine over the opinions of the Western world, was eventually over the whole of Christendom.* . . . The Greek Church was limited to a still narrower circle. The Latin language thus became almost that of Christianity; Latin writers, the sole authority to which men appealed, or from which they imperceptibly embodied the tone of religious doctrine, or sentiment. Of these, Augustine was the most eminent, the most commanding, the most influential.”

<sup>2</sup> Compare Job xl. 23, of behemoth, or the *hippopotamus*; “Behold he drinketh up a river and hasteth not: he trusteth that he can draw up Jordan into his mouth.”

Heinrichs cites in illustration Bava Bathra, fol. 166: “R. Jonathan vidit piscem quendam, qui è naribus in altum eructavit aquas velut quoddam diluvium, ad instar duorum fluviorum Syriæ.”

to the man's character. "The words of a man's mouth are as deep waters; and the well-spring of wisdom as a flowing brook:"<sup>1</sup> on the other hand, "The mouth of the wicked poureth out evil things."<sup>2</sup> Again, *floods* are a constant Scripture metaphor for the *invasion of hostile nations*.<sup>3</sup> That this *latter* idea was meant in our prefiguration, I infer from what seems probably intimated afterwards, of the sea or inundation thence spreading being that from which the Wild Beast of the next chapter arose;<sup>4</sup> and from the subsequent explanation of the flood on which the woman-rider of the Beast was said to rest, as signifying peoples and tongues and nations.<sup>5</sup> Nor can we well suppose the *former* idea unintended; considering that it is the old Serpent whose mouth is the ejector.—Thus it will be most satisfactory to combine the two ideas, and interpret the prefiguration to signify as follows:—that the Dragon, the old Serpent, failing in the object of the persecution first commenced by him *within the empire* against the Woman the Church, would, just after the two wings of Roman Christendom had been given her, pour forth upon the empire floods of *foreign* invaders, tainted with the same or other doctrinal heresies and errors; in order, by this mixture of physical force and doctrinal error, to overwhelm the true Church and religion with the flood. Perhaps too we might add the supposition that, as the crocodile first imbibes the water, then pours it forth, so the Dragon, acting through the Pagan or Arian instruments that he animated, would first draw in the invaders, as it were, into his mouth, then eject them against devoted Roman Christendom.

Such seems the sense of the emblematic figuration: and how historical events answered to it is well known. The conquests of Trajan having in 106 appended *Getic* or *Gothic Ducia* to the Roman Empire, till Aurelian yielded it in 170 to the Gothic sovereignty, its present population of

<sup>1</sup> Prov. xviii. 4.

<sup>2</sup> Prov. xv. 28.

<sup>3</sup> So Ps. cxliv. 7; "Deliver me out of *great waters*, from the hand of *strange children*, whose *mouth talketh vanity*, &c.;" with the double sense: also Isa. viii. 7; Jer. xlvi. 7; Ezek. xxvi. 3; Nahum i. 8, &c. So the ancient interpreter Tichonius interprets the passage; "Aqua emissa de ore Draconis *exercitum persequentium eam* (sc. Ecclesiam) significat."

<sup>4</sup> Apoc. xiii. 1.

<sup>5</sup> Apoc. xvii. 1, 15.

Ostrogoths, Visigoths, Vandals, Gepidæ, Lombards, Burgundians, Alans, &c.,<sup>1</sup> were prepared by some 300 years of union or intimacy for the part they were afterwards to enact as its invaders and conquerors;—their religious preparation as *Arians* having been effectually accomplished through Valens.<sup>2</sup> Then, when the time had arrived for action, on occasion of the terror of a Hunnish irruption from the far East into Dacia, the Visigoths, one of the chiefest of those barbarous nations, were transported through the infatuation of the Arian Emperor Valens, even as of one demented, across the Danube:<sup>3</sup> those same *Arian* Visigoths<sup>4</sup> under their king Alaric, that forthwith, after the memorable respite just before noticed of the reign of Theodosius, and invited, it is said on credible authority, by Rufinus, Præfect of the East, a worthy instrument of the spirit of evil,<sup>5</sup> were the first to precipitate themselves upon the empire in hostile invasion: and further, innumerable hordes of *Pagan* Goths, Vandals, and Burgundians swept into the Italian and Western Provinces; invited, it was currently reported and believed, by Count Stilicho, with a view to his Pagan son Eucherius' elevation to the imperial throne.<sup>6</sup> It was like a flood drawn in, and regurgitated over the empire, from the overflowing Danube.

<sup>1</sup> See Sir I. Newton on Daniel, chap. v. from Procopius.

<sup>2</sup> Mr. Biley, p. 133, cites Maimbourg's Hist. of Arianism in illustration. "L'empereur (Valens) ne manqua pas à l'occasion qui se présenta . . . d'en faire un mal qui fut la source d'une infinité d'autres : . . . et ce mal déplorable, qui par un juste jugement de Dieu fut enfin très funeste à son auteur, fut qu'il trouva moyen d'engager la nation des Gots dans l'Arianisme. Or . . . cet événement est la cause du prodigieux changement qui se vit après dans l'église et dans l'empire, par les furieuses inondations, et par les conquêtes de ces peuples, et de beaucoup d'autres qui les suivirent."

Again; "Ainsi la nation des Gots, ayant avalé le poison de l'Arianisme sans y penser, par la trahison d'Ulphilas, que Valens avoit corrompu, elle le retint après par opiniâtreté; et le répandit, en faisant couler des ruisseaux de sang, partout où elle poussa ses funestes conquêtes dans les terres de l'empire; et par le commerce que les autres nations venues du Nord eurent avec eux, il s'étendit encore parmi les Vandales, et les Suèves, les Bourguignons et les Lombards."<sup>3</sup> See Vol. i. p. 305.

<sup>4</sup> On the continued *Arianism* of the Visigoths, &c., even under Theodosius, see Mosheim as referred to p. 56 supra.

<sup>5</sup> So Marcellinus Chron. B. P. M. ix. 519. See Gibbon v. 139, 150; who, after sketching his character in black colours, says, "The character of Rufinus seemed to justify the accusation that he had secretly conspired against his sovereign, and invited the Huns and the Goths to invade the provinces of the empire."

<sup>6</sup> Stilicho, Prime Minister of the Western Emperor Honorius, "invited the invasion of the barbarous heathen nations; . . . hoping by their means to raise his son Eucherius to the throne: who from a boy was an enemy to the Christians; and threatened to signalize the beginning of his reign with the restoration of the Pagan, and abolition

It seems to me not unobservable how naturally this Apocalyptic figure has presented itself to historians, alike ancient and modern, in describing those invasions.<sup>1</sup> We see therein its appropriateness.—As to the fury of the flood, it was such as, throughout the length and breadth of the empire, to sweep away all the political bulwarks of Roman authority before it : and thus might well have been deemed sufficient to sweep away also the Christian Church, and Christianity itself, the professed religion of the empire. In fact the Pagan remnant, at Rome and elsewhere, were still not without their hopes of this result. The thought cheered them amidst their own sufferings ; and, to accelerate it, they excited the enmity of the invaders against their Christian fellow-citizens.<sup>2</sup> All showed that

of the Christian religion." So Bishop Newton, after Daubuz and Sir Isaac Newton ; on the authority of *Orosius* ; who (B. P. M. VI. 445) says of Rufinus and Stilicho, "Alius sibi, alius filio suo affectans regale fastigium, gentes barbaras ille immisit, hic fovit : " also *Jornandes*, *Paul Diaconus*, and *Marcellinus Comes* in his *Chronicon*, B. P. M. ix. 520. But the statement seems questionable. See *Gibbon* v. 244. As, however, *Rufinus* had probably invited Alaric, so, notoriously, *Count Boniface* the Vandals, after marrying an Arian Vandal wife, (*Gibbon* vi. 11, *Fleury* xxiv. 51.) and perhaps *Narses* the Lombards. Through these, and such like, we may suppose the Dragon to have spoken.

*Augustine* in his C. D. v. 23 thus describes the loud assertions of the Pagan remnant in Rome as to Rhadagaisus' certain success against Rome, he being a worshipper of the heathen gods : "Propinquate jam illo his locis, . . . cum ejus fama ubique crebresceret, nobis apud Carthaginem dicebatur hoc credere, spargere, jactare Paganos, quod ille, Diis amicis protegentibus et opitulantibus, quibus immolare quotidie ferebatur, vinci omnino non posset ab eis qui talia Diis Romanis sacra non facerent, nec fieri à quoquam permetterent."

<sup>1</sup> So, for example, among the ancients, *Orosius*, Book vii. c. 37 ; (B. P. M. vi. 445) ; "Rhadagaisus, omnium antiquorum presentiumque hostium immanissimus, repentino impetu totam inuudavit Italiam." So of *modern* writers *Gibbon*, iv. 414 ; "The tide of the Gothic inundation rolled from the walls of Adrianople." Also *Görres*, *Christl. Mystik*, p. 235, in an eloquent passage which begins as follows. "When Providence let loose the flood from the forests of Northern Europe, it would seem as if a second time the windows of heaven had been opened, and the fountains of the great deep broken up. Long had the floods of the Germanic migration, rising ever higher and higher, been arrested by the mounds of the Eastern and Western Empires ; and when the Asiatic Huns came to swell the tide of invasion, resistance was rendered impossible. The Western Empire was overflowed. Christianity had to contend, when the inundation came down, with a new species of heathenism." And so elsewhere also : "When the Spirit, breathing from on high, had stirred up a sea of nations that, mounting higher and higher, burst in wild eruption over the continent," &c. So, too, *Schlegel* in his *Phil. of Hist.* ii. 60 ; "The migration of the northern nations . . . was a new *Ogygean inundation of nations*, in the historical ages. . . This vast flux and reflux of nations, rolling in incessant waves from East to West, and North to South," &c. And again at p. 117, in a passage which will be quoted presently, p. 64 infra ; and which applies to the subject at once the former Apocalyptic figure of a *tempest*, (*Apoc.* vii. 1, viii. 7.) and this of a *flood*.—So, too, *Le Bas*, (who seems to have imitated Görres,) *Life of Wicliff*, p. 17 ; *Maimbourg*, cited p. 61, &c.

<sup>2</sup> Thus *Mosheim* v. 1. 2. 1. "Amidst these calamities the Christians were grievous, nay, we may say, the principal sufferers. . . Their cruelty [i. e. of the Goths,

the spirit of the old Dragon, fallen though he was, directed the raging inundation.—But God had his own means of preserving the Church visible, and within it his true Church. The Christian,—the *Trinitarian* faith, had been so wrought into the national minds and habits, as well as institutions and laws, especially from the effects of Theodosius' reign, (for the two wings of the great eagle still helped the Woman,) that to sweep Christianity away it needed to sweep away the Roman population itself. And to effect *this*, though not unthought of by some of the Gothic conquerors,<sup>1</sup> seemed to them not only of doubtful policy, but beyond their power. For, as the Apocalyptic figuration proceeded to foreshow, “the earth helped the woman, and swallowed up the flood.” Superstitious and earthly though the Roman population had become,<sup>2</sup> yet, thus far, they did service to Christ's Church in her present exigency. In those continuous and bloody wars of which the Western world had been the theatre, the barbarous invading population was so thinned, so absorbed, as it were, into the land they had invaded,<sup>3</sup> that it needed their incorporation as

Heruli, &c.,] and opposition to the Christians did not arise from any religious principle, or enthusiastic desire to ruin the cause of Christianity. It was *by the instigation of the Pagans, who remained yet in the empire*, that they were excited to treat with such severity and violence the followers of Christ. The painful consideration of their abrogated rites, and hopes of recovering their former liberty and privileges by means of their new masters, induced the worshippers of the gods to seize with avidity every opportunity of inspiring them with the most bitter aversion to the Christians.”—*Fleury* too, writing on the same subject, speaks of this inundation of barbarians as the occasion of the Pagan remnant renewing all their old bitter calumnies against the Christians, and stirring up the barbarians to persecute them. B. xxiii. 7. Examples of which persecutions are detailed by him as occurring in Portugal and Spain; and, yet more, those by Genseric and Hunneric in Africa. In all which Milner follows him. Cent. v. c. xi.

<sup>1</sup> There is a remarkable passage illustrative of this in Orosius, Bk. vii. c. 43. He states, on the authority of an informant who had been intimate with *Astulphus*, Alaric's successor, that *Astulphus* was in the habit of thus speaking:—“*Se in primis ardentius inhiasse ut, obliterato Romano nomine, Romanum omne solum Gothorum imperium et faceret et vocaret: essetque. . . Gothia quod Romania fuisset, feretque nunc Astulphus quod quondam Cæsar Augustus. At ubi multâ experientiâ probavisset, neque Gothos ullo modo parere legibus posse propter effrenatam barbaricam, neque Reip. interdicti leges oportere, sine quibus Resp. non est Resp., elegisse se. . . ut gloriam sibi de restituendo in integrum augendoque Romano nomine Gothorum viribus quaereret; habereturque apud posteros Romanæ restitutionis auctor, postquam esse non poterat immutator.*”—His second scheme however failed, as well as his first; each being contrary to the prophetic word. The revival of the Western Empire was indeed decreed: but under a *Papal*, not a *Gothic* imperial, head. <sup>2</sup> See Vol. i. p. 416.

<sup>3</sup> So Orosius, *ibid.* of a Letter to the Emperor Honorius from the kings of the Goths, Vandals, and Suevi. “*Tu eum omnibus pacem habe. . . Nos nobiscum conffigimus, nobis perimus, tibi vincimus: immortalis vero quaestus erit Reip. tuæ si utrique percamus.*” On which Orosius exclaims; “*Quis hæc crederet nisi res do-*



one people with the conquered, to make up the necessary constituency of kingdoms. And, in this incorporation, not only was much of their original institutions, customs, and languages<sup>1</sup> absorbed, but their religion altogether. The successive tribes, whether of Visigoths, Ostrogoths, Heruli, Huns, Vandals, Burgundians, abandoned their Paganism for Christianity.—At first indeed it was for the most part *Arian* pseudo-Christianity. Such was their profession in France, Spain, Africa. But, after a century or more of the flux and reflux of the invading flood, this too was abandoned for the more orthodox Trinitarian Christian faith. The influence of the Roman See, which was gradually more and more operative with the barbarians, powerfully tended to this result: also, though in a different way, the victories of Clovis and his orthodox Franks at the close of the 5th century in France; and those too of Justinian and the Greeks, ere the middle of the 6th, in Africa and Italy. At length, in the last quarter of that same century, Recared, king of Spain, having convened a synod of the Arian clergy and nobles of his dominion, set before it that “*the Earth* had submitted to the Nicene synod; that the Romans, the barbarians, and (native) inhabitants of Spain professed the same orthodox creed, and the Visigoths resisted almost alone the consent of the Christian world.”<sup>2</sup> And the appeal was successful. The Visigoths gave in their adhesion to the Nicene faith: and soon after the Lombards of North Italy, the only other Arians.<sup>3</sup> So the *Arianism* of the invading flood, as well as its *Paganism*,—that false doctrine by which, and the secular force accompanying it, the Dragon had schemed to overwhelm the primitive Christian creed and Church, and therein Christianity itself,—was seen no more. It was absorbed, as it were, into the soil, and had disappeared. “The earth (thus far) helped the woman, and swallowed up the flood.”<sup>4</sup>

ceret? . . Manifestavimus . . innumera bella sopita, plurimos extinctos tyrannos, compressas, coangustatas, exivantasque immanissimas gentes, minimo sanguine, nullo certamine, ac pane sine caede.”

<sup>1</sup> Philologists have observed that in all the Western continental languages,—French, Spanish, Portuguese, Italian,—the *Latin* is the basis and predominant. In the English alone the Saxon predominates over the Latin. <sup>2</sup> Gib. vi. 299.

<sup>3</sup> This was not till about A.D. 600. Indeed for some few years after that date Arianism still lingered with some of the Lombard people. See Gib. vi. 302.

<sup>4</sup> So Schlegel ii. 117, 118: “When at last the tempest had disburthened itself of

But it was only to preserve her just *alive*, stript of her character of *Catholicity* (i. e. *universality*), and *in obscurity*. As a *Christian corporate body*, and in respect of those acts by which a true Church is *manifested* to the world, viz. the faithful preaching of the word, evangelic worship, the sacraments rightly administered,<sup>1</sup> and I might add too Christian synods and councils,—in respect of these she became about the time last noted hidden and invisible.—Thus far the Dragon had succeeded; though only according to what was long before foreshown in the Apocalyptic prophecy. And in this wilderness-solitude the same wonderful prophecy declared that she was to be secluded for the long fated period of a *time, times, and half a time*, or 1260 years.—On the dates and details of this period I must not now enter, reserving the subject for a later chapter. Much less may I anticipate by dwelling on the glorious change described as awaiting her at the full end of her time of trial: then when she is to come forth out of the wilderness, to the bridal, leaning on her Beloved; and, the harlot-usurper of her place before the world, the Church of the apostasy, being sentenced in *her* turn, and that for ever, to desolation like as of a wilderness, she, the true Church, is, as never before, to embrace the whole world.—But I must not pass on without pressing on my Readers this notable prefiguration of the temporary seclusion of Christ's Church in the wilderness, connectedly with what is here said, and in ch. xi., about the Woman's witnessing sons, as the fittest answer to the Romish anti-Protestant argument and taunt, "Where was your religion before Luther?" Protestants, I think, have

its fury, and the clouds broken, . . . when the wild waters of that mighty inundation had begun gradually to flow off, then the Germanic tribes, *being incorporated with the Romanic nations, laid the deep firm soil* on which modern European society was to spring up and flourish."

I add Gibbon vi. 268. "The progress of Christianity has been marked by two glorious and decisive victories: viz. over the . . . citizens of the Roman Empire; and over the warlike barbarians of Scythia and Germany, who subverted the empire, and embraced the religion, of the Romans."

<sup>1</sup> So the sixth Article of the Church of England: an Article not unaccordant with the Confession of Augsburg, and other Protestant Confessions; and which describes the Church in respect of its *proper organization*, and of that by which it is made *visible*. Its Liturgy elsewhere speaks of the *inner and individual* constituency of the *true Church*, i. e. true *in heart*, as "the blessed company of all faithful people, and very members incorporate of Christ." In them the *true Church lives*, whether *visible or invisible*. Such is the doctrine of the English Church. It will be seen well to agree with my remarks on this important subject and symbol, pp. 7, 8, 19, *supra*.

not duly noted, or applied it. For the wilderness-life necessarily, I must repeat, (and that on Bossuet's own showing,) implies the *invisibility* of her who lives it. Consequently, instead of the long previous invisibility of a Church like any one of the Protestant Reformed Churches of the 16th century, in respect of doctrine and worship, being an argument *against*,<sup>1</sup> it is an argument *for* it; though each indeed as now but sectional, not united and catholic. The

<sup>1</sup> See Bossuet's *Hist. des Variations*, Lib. xv.—As the subject is one of great importance, and one on which, contrary to the doctrine both of Scripture and of the Anglican Church, misapprehensions have of late days multiplied among us, it may be well to state somewhat more fully Bossuet's argument, in order that the necessity, point, and sufficiency of the Apocalyptic answer may be better seen.

After saying that it is very much from not knowing what *the Church* is that the variations of the Protestants have arisen, and giving what he calls the *Catholic doctrine* on the point,—viz. 1st. that the Church always signifies in Scripture a *visible society*, 2. that it *always* is, 3. that true evangelic truth is professed by the whole society, 4. that it cannot be in error, and (as a corollary) that none may separate from it,—he quotes from sundry Protestant confessions their definitions of "*the Church*." For example from that of *Augsburgh* the following; "There is a Holy Church which must ever subsist:" and, "The Church is the assembly of the saints, where the Gospel is rightly taught, and the sacraments rightly administered:"—also from *Melancthon's Apology*; "The Church exists in true believers: its marks are the pure Gospel and the Sacraments: such a Church is properly the pillar of truth." With the which, Bossuet says, agree also the Confessions of Bohemia, Strassburgh, Basle, and the Helvetic of 1566.—And from all these he infers, as an admission necessarily resulting from the Confessions, not only that the Church always exists, and is essentially composed of pastors and people, among whom the word is rightly taught and sacraments administered, but that it is also therefore always *visible*, always *audible*.

A little after this, he adds, perceiving at length that no such Church was discoverable, great or little, i. e. none which fulfilled in continuity from the first the condition of what Protestants would call right doctrine,—the later Protestants began to speak differently; and to say that, as Israel had no sacrifice during the Babylonish Captivity, and as in Elias' time no outward worship of God appeared in Israel, so by God's just judgment gospel-truth was sometimes so obscured, as to constitute the Church *invisible*, hidden from men's eyes, known to God.—He exemplifies from the *Anglican Article XIX*, just referred to, which defines "the *visible Church* as an assembly of believers in which God's pure word is preached, and sacraments duly administered," &c., without saying that it is *always* visible;—the *Scotch* which says, "It is *invisible* and known to God only;"—and *Calvin's*, which also distinguishes between the Church *visible* and *invisible*, the latter being the society of all the elect. (§ 3—23.)

It seems however that subsequently many Protestants allowed the *continual* and *necessary visibility* of the Church. Bossuet particularizes the *Minister Jurieu*. (§ 82.) And, in regard of all such, supposing them to be *really* Protestant, he introduces them as thus out of their own mouths confessing the absurdity of their doctrine. "Nous disons que l'Eglise est perpétuellement visible: mais la plupart du tems, et presque toujours, elle est plus visible par la corruption de ses mœurs, par l'addition de plusieurs faux dogmes, par la décheance de son ministère, par ses erreurs, et par ses superstitions, que par les vérités qu'elle conserve." (§ 85.) And who can gainsay the justice of his satire?—On the other hand, referring to Bossuet's own explication of the symbol or *the Woman fleeing to and being in the wilderness*, given p. 46, the reader will see how unable he was to explain it, except as a prediction of *Christ's true Church* becoming *hidden* or *invisible*, for the period, whether longer or shorter in duration, of the 1260 days. In which view he only followed the most ancient patristic expositors; \*

\* So the Author of the Computation of Easter, contemporary with Cyprian, ap. Lardner iii. 73; "In quibus diebus [sc. the 1260] Antichristus magnam faciet vas-

Romish Church, which never knew the predicted wilderness-life, could not *for this very reason* be the Woman of the

as well as the dictates of common sense. And, in truth, it seems to me to have been specially as an answer to the Romish objection that the symbol before us was intended; conjointly, as before said, with that of the long usurpation of the mystic temple-court by *Gentiles*, and witnesses sackcloth-robed prophesying, figured in Apoc. xi.

On the whole, after considering the controversies ancient and modern on the subject, I cannot but be struck with three things; 1. The admirable all-sufficiency of Scripture, especially of this wonderful Apocalyptic Book, in furnishing solutions to each apparent mystery of God's dealing with his Church, and answers to each objection of enemies,\* 2. The wisdom of our Anglican Church on this as on other points, as expressed in its Articles and Liturgy. 3. The want of wisdom in those who, though professedly Protestants of the Church of England, do yet depart on this most important point from its doctrine.† I would beg to refer further on it to Hooker's

tationem: et ideo tunc nemo Christianorum poterit Deo sacrificium offerre." And Hippolytus: "Hi sunt 1260 dies quibus tyrannus rerum potietur, persequens ecclesiam, fugientem de civitate in civitatem, et in solitudine in montibus lutitantes." B. P. M. xxvii. 8.

So too Augustine in Ps. vii. 7;—"Dicit, Putas, cum venerit Filius Hominis, inveniet fidem super terram? Item dicit de pseudo-prophetis, qui intelliguntur hæretici, Propter eorum iniquitatem refrigescet charitas multorum. Cum ergo et in ecclesiis, hoc est in illâ congregatione populorum et gentium ubi nomen Christianum latissime pervagatum est, tanta erit abundantia peccatorum, quæ jam ex magnâ parte sentitur, nonne illa hic prædicatur, quæ per alium quoque prophetam denunciata est, fumes verbi? Nonne et, propter hanc congregationem peccatis suis à se lumen veritatis abalienantem, Deus in altum regreditur: id est ut aut non, aut à perpaucis, (de quibus dictum est, Beatus qui perseveraverit usque in finem, hic salvus erit,) teneatur et percipiatur sincera fides?"

\* A notable exemplification of this occurred in the late Hereford discussion. In answer to the Romish priest Waterworth's application of Christ's promise, 'The gates of hell shall not prevail against it,' to a *visible and infallible church*, Mr. Venn having urged (besides St. Paul's prediction of the *apostasy*) this Apocalyptic prophecy also of the woman hiding in the wilderness, and Bossuet's own admission of its meaning, as given above, Mr. Waterworth's reply was twofold. 1. That the woman meant not the *Church*, but the *Virgin Mary*; the child born of her being one that it was said would rule the *æθνη*, or *Gentiles*, with a rod of iron; a thing also predicated of Christ.—But (as before argued, p. 25) was it in *heaven* that the V. M. travailed? Was her child caught up to heaven, *while yet a babe*, just after birth? Was the V. M. 3½ years afterwards in the wilderness, after first escaping floods cast out of the dragon's mouth? And had the V. M. *other children*, (an idea blasphemous surely in Mr. W.'s view!) so as the Apocalyptic Woman, Apoc. xii. 17?—2. That, as to Bossuet's explanation, he had said, not that *the Church was hidden*, but that she hid "*son service dans des lieux retirés.*" But Mr. W. did not consider what I have noted at p. 46, that this is hiding from public view precisely those acts by which alone a Church is made visible. (Hereford Discussion, pp. 172, 183.)

N. B. As this page in my 4th Edition is passing through the press, I observe noticed in the John Bull of Dec. 10, 1849, a "Pastoral" by the R. C. Vicar Apostolic of the Central District of England, with reference to the celebration of the Festival of the Immaculate Conception of the V. M., in which the same view of the travelling woman of Apoc. xii. as Mr. W.'s is affirmed. "It signifies Mary preserved immaculate from Satan." (!)

† In our own days there are many such. The visibility of the Church to which Christ's promises attach, has been especially advocated by the *Oxford Tractarians* and *semi-Tractarians*. So Tract xi. "Why should not the *visible Church* continue? The *onus probandi* lies with those who deny this position." And *Mr. Dodsworth*; "There is no such thing as an *invisible Church*. I protest against the invisible number of persons, whom God shall finally bless and save, being called the Church. The Church is a body of persons called out, and set apart by a *visible order*, from the rest of the world." Again, *Mr. Gresley* says; "The *Evangelicals* are unsound in the

12th Apocalyptic Chapter ; that is, could not be the representative of that *true* primitive Catholic Church of Christ, which fought and overthrew Heathenism in the Roman empire.

For 1260 prophetic days then, or years, she was to disappear from men's view in the Roman world. Is it asked how her vitality was preserved? Doubtless, in her children, known to God, though for the most part unknown to men ; just like the 7000 that Elijah knew not of, who had yet not bowed the knee to Baal : some it might be in monasteries,<sup>1</sup> some in the secular walks of life ; but all alike insulated in spirit from those around them, and, as regards the *usual* means of grace, spiritually destitute and desolate : even as in "a barren and dry land, where no water is."<sup>2</sup>—Besides

Ecel. Polity, B. iii. § 1, who makes the threefold division of the *mystical* Church, the *visible*, and the *sound visible* ; and Mede's Works, B. iii. ch. 10, p. 648.

<sup>1</sup> I fully agree with the sentiment so eloquently expressed by Dr. Maitland, in his Facts and Documents p. 45, as to the piety of many a tonsured monk, &c. Indeed it seems to me so well and beautifully to illustrate the subject before us, that I cannot resist the pleasure of quoting the passage in part. "I will not shrink from avowing my belief that many a tonsured head now rests in Abraham's bosom, and that many a frail body bowed down with voluntary humility, and wasted with unprofitable will-worship, clothed in rags and girt with a bell-rope, was a temple of the Holy Ghost : and that one day . . . these her unknown children will be revealed, to the astonishment of a Church accustomed to look back with a mixture of pride and shame to the days of her barrenness. She may ask, 'Who hath brought up these? Behold I was left alone : these, where had they been?' But she will have learned to know the seal of the living God, and will embrace them as her sons."

Compare however the illustrations in the Note following as to the real spirit of *vital faith* in the persons spoken of.

<sup>2</sup> I may refer to Merle D'Aubigne, Bk. 1, p. 80, (Ed. Brussels,) for a touching exemplification of this, which only came to light on the pulling down, in the year 1776, of an old building that had formed part of the Carthusian convent at Basle. It seems that a poor Carthusian brother, *Martin*, had written the following affecting confession : "O most merciful God, I know that I can only be saved, and satisfy thy righteousness, by the merit, the innocent suffering, and death of thy well-beloved Son. Holy Jesus ! all my salvation is in thy hands. Thou canst not withdraw the hands of

doctrine of the *one Catholic and Apostolic Church* ; confounding it with that of the *communion of saints*, or *invisible* Church : holding it in a manner different from that in which it has been held by the Church Universal from the beginning." (Bernard Leslie, p. 339.)—As to this alleged confusion of ideas on the part of others, and Mr. G.'s own distinction of them, what will he say to *Archdeacon Manning* ? "The whole substance of the Apostles' Creed, as it now stands, except only the Articles of the 'Descent into Hell,' and the '*Communion of Saints*,' was contained in the baptismal profession of the apostolic age. The two excepted Articles are in fact only *explanations* of the articles '*Buried*,' and '*the Church*.'" (Rule of Faith, p. 64.) So that by the rule of antiquity, as Archd. Manning expounds it, "the Evangelicals" would seem to be completely right in identifying the *one Holy Catholic Church* of the Apostles' Creed with the *Communion of Saints* ; Mr. Gresley completely wrong in distinguishing them.

It may be useful to compare my observations in Vol. i. pp. 266—268.

whom some few there were of her children,—some *very few*,—prepared like Elijah of old to act a bolder part ; and to stand forth, under special commission from God, as *Christ's Witnesses* before Christendom. Was not *Vigilantius*, at the very time when the flood from the Dragon's mouth was beginning to be poured forth upon the Roman world, a specimen and prototype of them in one point of view ; and *Augustine* in another ? These were they of whom the sacred prophecy speaks in the *last* verse of the chapter before us, as “keeping the commandments of God, and the *testimony* or *witness* of Jesus :” these they whose faithfulness and courage in after times was depicted in that striking narrative and vision of *the two witnesses*, given in the Part *within-written* of the Apocalyptic scroll, which has been already under our consideration. And the Devil, the animating Spirit of the old Paganism,—seeing that such there were, and that such there would be, in the new state of things just about to be introduced,—is represented as proceeding, with wrath against Christ's cause and Church still undiminished, to plot for their destruction. His *direct* attack against one most essential doctrine of Christianity had failed. His *indirect*, by temptations to superstition, had succeeded so far as to have rendered the *faithful* Catholic

thy love for me ; for they have created and redeemed me. Thou hast inscribed my name with a pen of iron in rich mercy, and so as nothing can efface it, on thy side, thy hands, and thy feet, &c.”—This confession he placed in a wooden box, and enclosed the box in a hole he had made in the wall of his cell ; where it was found on the occasion before mentioned. And the following remarkable words were found also written in his box ; “*Et si hæc prædicta confiteri non possim linguâ, confiteor tamen corde et scripto.*”

Who does not see the solitariness, the *wilderness-state* of this poor monk in that which was his world, *the monastery* ;—perhaps a large and numerous one !

None there with kindred consciousness endued !

This was to be alone ; this, this was solitude.

The correspondent at Rome of the Daily News (Father Prout), in an account of his visit to the prison of the Inquisition there in April 1849, describes a dungeon in which were many bones and relics of the dead ; also various writings of the imprisoned on the walls : and, among them, one to this effect ; “Whatever the caprice or wickedness of men, they cannot shut me out from thy Church, O Christ, my only hope !” Was not this another similar example ?\*

\* Luigi Bianchi in his “Incidents in the Life of an Italian Priest,” p. 148, refers to this also. Speaking of a visit that he made to the Inquisition Palace at Rome in 1849, he says : “There were many inscriptions on the walls, some almost entirely obliterated, while others might be read. One I deciphered with difficulty which said, “*The bigotry of man shall never separate me from thee my Saviour, my Redeemer, Jesus Christ.*” This was in Latin, he writes me ; and that, as he omitted to note down the precise words, the above gives only the substance.

Church which had overthrown him an object no longer visible. This then he saw to be the fittest principle for the new plan of attack. All seemed prepared in the mind of professing Christendom for it. Out of Christendom ecclesiastical itself to perfect an Anti-Christendom, this was the grand problem set before him. And, wonderful to say, the very adhesion of the Roman empire and Church established in it to Trinitarian orthodoxy, *its very confession of Christ's Divinity*, was one element, and an essential one, to the new plan's success. The scheme was developed by the prescient and eternal Spirit to St. John, in the vision of the next chapter. And it was one, indeed, (what was just noticed making it so perhaps more than any other characteristic,) which well deserved the appellation given it by the late Mr. Cecil; I mean that of "*the master-piece of Satan.*"

### CHAPTER III.

IDENTITY OF THE APOCALYPTIC WILD BEASTS FROM THE  
 ABYSS AND SEA WITH EACH OTHER;—AND OF THE  
 RULING HEAD IN EITHER WITH THE LITTLE  
 HORN OF DANIEL'S TEN-HORNED BEAST,  
 —ST. PAUL'S MAN OF SIN,—AND  
 ST. JOHN'S ANTICHRIST.

"AND he stood<sup>1</sup> on the sand of the flood.—And I saw a Wild Beast rising up out of the flood, having seven heads

Nay, may I not suggest *Fenelon* in his latter days, notwithstanding his high rank in the Romish Church, as yet another in point? "Alive," says Sir R. Inglis, "*Fenelon* was condemned and persecuted; and to this day one of his devotional works ('Explication des Maximes des Saints sur la Vie Interieure') is placed in the Papal Index of *Abominations.*" Speeches on the Roman Catholic Question, p. 28.

<sup>1</sup> εσαθη; i. e. *the Dragon stood.* I adopt this reading, in preference to εσαθην *I stood*; because, besides being a reading of the highest manuscript authority, being both in A and C, in the Vulgate Latin, and Æthiopic, Syriac, Armenian, and Arabic versions, and accordingly adopted by Tregelles and Wordsworth, it seems to me to have also much superior *internal* evidence to support it:—seeing that it perfectly accords with the appropriateness of the figure that the *Dragon* should stand on the flood-brink, to make over his empire and throne to the Wild Beast thence evoked by him; while, on the other hand, there could be no reason why St. John, having witnessed from his usual position the flood itself, should need personal transference to its brink, (or the ocean-brink, if so the reader prefer,) to see the Wild Beast rising therefrom.

and ten horns, and upon his horns ten diadems, and upon his heads names of blasphemy ;” &c.—Apoc. xiii. 1.

We are now come to one of the most important of the Apocalyptic predictions. As if with a regard to its great importance, not only is a very full description given of the Wild Beast, its subject, in the chapter now before us; but, in a manner unparalleled in the Apocalypse, this Beast is made the subject of a second figuration in the xviith chapter: the latter figuration being given at the *termination* of its predicted history, as the present is at its *commencement*.—In so speaking, however, I am assuming the *identity of the Wild Beasts*, in the one and the other vision depicted to the evangelist. To prove this will be my *first* object in the present Chapter: my *second*, to prove their common identity, or rather that of the *ruling Head* in either case, with Danicl’s *fourth* or *ten-horned Wild Beast’s Little Horn*, and with the *Man of Sin*, and the *Antichrist*, of St. Paul and St. John:—a point this almost as interesting and important as the former to the Apocalyptic investigator.

§ 1.—IDENTITY OF THE APOCALYPTIC WILD BEASTS FROM THE SEA AND FROM THE ABYSS, OF APOC. XIII AND XVII.

In order the better to exhibit the evidence of this identity, and also to set before the Reader’s eye, preparatorily to our investigation of the subject, every recorded particular of them prefigured to St. John, I subjoin the descriptions of the one Beast and the other in parallel columns.

Apoc. xiii.	Apoc. xvii.
1. And I saw a Wild Beast rising <sup>1</sup> out of the sea, <sup>2</sup> having seven heads and	1. And one of the seven Angels . . talked with me, saying, Come hither ;

<sup>1</sup> αναβαινον.

<sup>2</sup> Greek, θαλασσης: perhaps *flood*, subsiding into a *lake*, as the earth opened to drain off its waters; with reference to the flood told of as cast out of the Dragon’s mouth against the woman, and also the many waters of Apoc. xvii. 1, 15. For θαλασση, like the Hebrew ׀, is a word applicable to any flood of waters, especially one formed by a river’s overflow. So of the overflowing of the *Jordan*, that formed the *Sea of Galilee* or *Tiberias*, John vi. 1, xxi. 1; of the *overflowing Euphrates*, Jer. li. 42; and the *overflowing Nile*, Ezek. xxxii. 2, Nahum iii. 8, &c.

Mr. Barker having disputed the fact of this application of the term *sea* to the overflowings of a river, let me observe that in the passages above cited from Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Nahum, the Septuagint Greek is θαλασση; and also add the following



## Apoc. xiii.

ten horns, and upon his horns ten diadems, and upon his heads names<sup>1</sup> of blasphemy.

2. And the Beast which I saw was like unto a leopard, and his feet were as the feet of a bear, and his mouth as the mouth of a lion: and the Dragon gave him his power, and his throne,<sup>2</sup> and great authority.

3. And [I saw]<sup>3</sup> one of his heads that had been wounded, as it were, to death:<sup>4</sup> and his deadly wound was healed. And all the earth<sup>5</sup> wondered after the Beast.

4. And they worshipped the Dragon, which<sup>6</sup> gave the authority unto the Beast: and they worshipped the Beast, saying, Who is like unto the Beast? and who is able to make war with him?

5. And there was given unto him a mouth speaking great things, and blasphemies; and authority<sup>7</sup> was given unto him to act<sup>8</sup> forty and two months.

6. And he opened his mouth in blasphemies against God; to blaspheme his

## Apoc. xvii.

I will shew thee the judgment of the great harlot that sitteth upon the many waters:<sup>9</sup>

2. With whom the kings of the earth have committed fornication; and the inhabitants of the earth have been made drunk with the wine of her fornication.

3. So he carried me away in the spirit into a wilderness;<sup>10</sup> and I saw a woman sitting upon a scarlet-coloured Wild Beast, full of names of blasphemy,<sup>11</sup> having seven heads and ten horns.

4. And the woman was arrayed in purple and scarlet, and decked with gold and precious stones and pearls: having a golden cup in her hand full of abominations and filthiness of her fornication;

5. And upon her forehead a name written, Mystery, Babylon the Great, the Mother of the harlots and the abominations of the earth.

6. And I saw the woman drunken with the blood of the saints, and with the blood

general statement from Dr. Lowth. Commenting on Jer. xlviii. 32, "Thy plants are gone over the sea, they reach even to the sea of Jazer," he says: "The words imply . . . that the principal inhabitants are carried away . . . and pass over the sea, that is the river of Jazer; a stream that runs into the river Arnon, the border of Moab. All lakes and rivers are called seas in the Hebrew language."—The same of the Greek word *πελαγος*. Says Dion Cass. liii. 20; *ὁ Τιβερις, πελαγισας, πασαν την εν τοις πεδιοις Ῥωμην κατελαβεν, ὡς τε κλεισθαι*. So too Gesenius on *ⲙⲗ*. As a Latin example it may have been observed that the *Geneva lake* is called "*mare Rhodani*," in a Deed cited in my Vol. ii. p. 350 Note 3; "*Valdensium usque mare Rhodani*."

Mr. B. has objected also that *sand* could hardly be the border of such a river-flood. Certainly I have myself seen such, many a time. *Κειμενον εν ψαμαθοισι, δαινε δε μιν μελαν ὑδωρ*, is said by Homer, *Il. Φ.* 202, of the corpse of a man lying on the sandy brink of the flooded Scamander. Again Juvenal, iii. 55, speaks of the sand of the Tagus; Virgil, *Georg.* iii. 350, of the sands of the Danube; and Xenophon *Hellen.* iii. 2. 19, of a *λιμνη ὑποψαμμος*. Any visitant to the Loire will remember the islands of sand caused by its overflowings and subsidings. And, of course, when a river rolling sand, or a lake on a sandy bed, subsides, its margin must be sand.

<sup>1</sup> *ονοματα*. So the critical Editions.

<sup>2</sup> *θρονον*.

<sup>3</sup> *ειδον* is rejected by the critical Editions. An omission which makes the accusative following referable for its government either to the verb *gave* just preceding, "the dragon gave him one of his heads that had been wounded to death," as if to be healed: or rather (as in Tregelles) to *ειδον*, borrowed from the preceding verse.

<sup>4</sup> *ως εσφαγμενην*, in the perf. part. passive. Compare the *ως εσφαγμενον*, said of the Lamb in Apoc. v. 6.

<sup>5</sup> *γη*.

<sup>6</sup> *οτι*. So the critical Edd. as in xvii. 8: "*which gave*;" or, "*because he gave*."

<sup>7</sup> *εξουσια*: which is the word also in verses 7, 12.

<sup>8</sup> A and C read simply *ποιησαι*. B adds *πολεμον*.

<sup>9</sup> *επι των υδατων των πολλων*, with the article. So B, and perhaps most of the critical Editions. A, however, and some critics, omit it.

<sup>10</sup> *εις ερημον*.

<sup>11</sup> *γεμον ονοματων βλασφημιας*. So the received text, Scholz, &c. Tregelles and Wordsworth read *τα ονοματα*.

Apoc. xiii.

name, and his tabernacle, them<sup>1</sup> that dwell in heaven.

7. And it was given unto him to make war with the saints, and to overcome them: and authority was given unto him over every tribe and people and tongue and nation.<sup>2</sup>

8. And all that dwell upon the earth shall worship him, whose name has not been written from the foundation of the world in the Book of life of the Lamb that was slain.<sup>3</sup>

9. If any man have an ear, let him hear.

10. He that leadeth into captivity shall go into captivity: <sup>4</sup> he that killeth with the sword must be killed with the sword.—Here is the patience and the faith of the saints.

11. And I beheld another Wild Beast coming up out of the earth: and he had two horns like a lamb; and he spake as a dragon.

12. And he exerciseth all the authority of the first Beast before him; and causeth the earth, and them which dwell therein, to worship the first Beast, whose deadly wound was healed.

13. And he doeth great signs; <sup>5</sup> and causeth that fire shall come down from heaven upon earth in the sight of men.<sup>6</sup>

14. And he deceiveth them that dwell upon the earth, by means of those wonders which he had power to do in the

Apoc. xvii.

of the witnesses of Jesus. And when I saw her, I wondered with great wonder.

7. And the Angel said unto me, Wherefore didst thou wonder? I will tell thee the mystery of the woman, and of the Wild Beast that carrieth her,<sup>7</sup> which hath the seven heads and ten horns.

8. The Beast which thou sawest was, and is not, and is to ascend out of the abyss, and goeth <sup>8</sup> into perdition: and they that dwell on the earth shall wonder, whose names were not written in the Book of life from the foundation of the world, when they behold the Beast that was, and is not, and shall come.<sup>9</sup>

9. And here is the mind that hath wisdom. The seven heads are seven mountains on which the woman sitteth.

10. And they are<sup>10</sup> [or, there are] seven kings. Five have fallen, and one is, and the other is not yet come: and when he cometh he must continue a short space.

11. And the Wild Beast that was, and is not, even he is the eighth; and is of the seven; and goeth into perdition.

12. And the ten horns that thou sawest are ten kings, which have not yet received a kingdom; but receive authority as kings at one hour [or time]<sup>11</sup> with the Beast.

13. These have one mind, and shall give their power and their authority<sup>12</sup> unto the Beast.

14. These shall make war with the Lamb. And the Lamb shall overcome them, (for He is Lord of lords and King

<sup>1</sup> The *kai* of the received text, prefix to *them*, is wanting in all the critical editions.

<sup>2</sup> *επι πασαν φυλην και λαον*. A and B add the *λαον*.

<sup>3</sup> *ων ου γεγραπται το ονομα εν τη βιβλιω της ζωης του Αρνιου του εσφαγμενου, απο καταβολης κοσμου*. Compare xvii. 8, where the same phrase occurs, only without the words *του Αρνιου του εσφαγμενου*: it being hence evident that the words from the foundation of the world, in Apoc. xiii, apply to the time of the writing in the Book of Life, not to that of the Lamb's being slain.

<sup>4</sup> So C, Scholz, Wordsworth, *ει τις αιχμαλωσιαν συναγει*. Tregelles reads, *ει τις εις αιχμαλωσιαν*, omitting the *συναγει*.

<sup>5</sup> *σημεια*: perhaps rather *signs*. See my Note p. 6 *suprà*.

<sup>6</sup> *ποιει σημεια μεγαλα, και πυρ ινα εκ του ουρανου καταβη εις την γην*. So Griesbach; also Scholz, Wordsworth, &c., only with *καταβαινη* instead of *καταβη*; Tregelles, *ινα και πυρ ποιη*.

<sup>7</sup> *υπαγει*. So A, Scholz, Wordsworth, &c.: Tregelles, *υπαγειν* in the infinitive.

<sup>8</sup> *οτι ην, και ουκ εστι, και παρεσται*. So A, B, and the critical editions generally. The received text is *και περ εστιν*.

<sup>9</sup> So Wordsworth, &c.

<sup>10</sup> *μιαν ωραν μετα του θηριου*. The propriety of my version of this clause will presently be shown.

<sup>12</sup> *εξουσιαν*.

## Apoc. xiii.

sight of the Beast:—saying to them that dwell on the earth, that they should make an Image to the Beast, who<sup>1</sup> had the wound by a sword, and did live. &c. &c.

## Apoc. xvii.

of kings,) and they that are with him,<sup>2</sup> the called and chosen and faithful.

15. And he saith unto me, The waters which thou sawest, where the harlot sitteth, are people and multitudes and nations and tongues.

16. And the ten horns which thou sawest on [or, and]<sup>3</sup> the Beast, these shall hate the harlot, and shall make her desolate and naked, and shall eat her flesh, and burn her with fire.

17. For God hath put it in their hearts to fulfil his will, and to agree and give their kingdom unto the Beast;—until the words of God shall be fulfilled.

18. And the woman which thou sawest is that great city which roigneth over the kings of the earth.

Such were the two figurations and descriptions. And alike in the one case and the other the Wild Beast exhibited had *seven heads* and *ten horns*:—a mark this, let it be well observed, if not necessarily of absolute and complete identity, yet of resemblance so peculiar, as to render it the only other debateable hypothesis whether they might possibly have been, though the same Wild Beast, yet the same *under different heads*. Now, as the Angel interpreter in the xviiith Chapter explained the seven Heads to signify

<sup>1</sup> ὄς, not ὀ. So A, B, C, and the critical editions.

<sup>2</sup> I omit the *are*, which is inserted in *Italics* in our version, as not being in the original: and construe the κλητοὶ καὶ ἐκλεκτοὶ καὶ πιστοὶ in apposition with *the Lamb*, and as partakers in his victory. This seems to me the plain meaning.

<sup>3</sup> καὶ τὸ θηριον. So A, B, and the critical editions generally, instead of ἐπι, as in the received text. But, besides certain ancient codices which give it, the latter reading is found in Jerom's Latin Vulgate as the reading preferred by that most critical of all the Fathers; "cornua quæ vidisti in Bestiâ." And so too by Tertullian, the learned Latin Father, writing about A.D. 200; and Hippolytus, the learned Greek Father, writing about A.D. 230; above a century earlier than the date of the earliest extant Greek MS.

Says Tertullian, cited by me Vol. i. p. 232; "Et prostituta illa civitas à decem regibus (not, from the ten kings and the beast) dignos exitus referat; et bestia Antichristus certamen ecclesie Dei inferat." Says Hippolytus, cited by me Ch. iv. § 1 ad fin; "Antichrist is the Beast (Daniel's 4th Beast) whose head was struck with a sword, and healed, because of the Roman kingdom being divided, and resolved into ten diadems. And Antichrist, being crafty, shall [not destroy, but] heal it, as it were, and restore it to fresh life." These early Apocalyptic expositors looked for Rome's final destruction not from the ten kings, but from some physical volcanic agency, in execution of God's judgments, according to the prediction in Apoc. xviii. Nor, I feel persuaded, without convincing reason. Hence with them, and other of the patristic expositors, as Tichonius, Arethas, &c., I unhesitatingly prefer the reading ἐπι. This I shall have to refer to again, when I come to discuss Apoc. xvii. in my vith or last Part. And let it never be forgotten on this question, that if Antichrist were to be the destroyer of Rome, and raiser up of a new empire at Jerusalem, there would be five great mundane empires, instead of four, as stated in Dan. ii. and vii, before Messiah's kingdom.

seven, or in a certain sense eight, *successive* rulers,<sup>1</sup>—that is, successions or classes of rulers,—under which the Wild Beast was to exist, and stated that but *six* of these eight had arisen at the time of the revelation in Patmos,<sup>2</sup> it might perhaps *at first sight*<sup>3</sup> seem quite supposable that the Wild Beast exhibited next after the Dragon in vision, or that of ch. xiii., was the thing intended under its *seventh* head; while that exhibited *afterwards*, or the Beast of ch. xvii., was the same under its *eighth* and *last*. And thus we need the less to be surprised that the hypothesis should have suggested itself to more than one commentator of respectable name and standing.<sup>4</sup> In order however to decide whether such was really the case, or whether in the *first* symbolization, as well as the *second*, the Beast exhibited was not rather the seven-headed Wild Beast under his *last* Head,—a point of very considerable moment to the Apocalyptic investigator, considering the important conclusions built on their theory by the expositors alluded to,—it will be necessary, first, carefully to note the many marked *similarities* between the two, over and above the fundamental one of their having alike *seven heads and ten horns*; next,

<sup>1</sup> "And there are [rather, *they*, the seven heads, are, or signify\*] seven kings: five have fallen; one is; another hath not yet come: and the Beast which thou sawest (*that from the abyss*) is the *eighth*, and is of the seven, and goeth into perdition;" &c. Apoc. xvii. 10, 11. For the exposition see Ch. iv. § 1.

<sup>2</sup> That this is the *standard time* to which to refer the statement, "Five have fallen, and *one is*, and the other *is yet to come*," will appear in my Note \* p. 85, *infra*.

<sup>3</sup> It will be seen at p. 84 why I thus qualify this statement.

<sup>4</sup> I allude more particularly to the Rev. J. W. Brooks' lately published work on the Elements of Prophetic Investigation, ch. xi. p. 402, &c. He builds upon this basis the hypothesis, that under, and in connection with, the *Beast from the abyss*, the ten horns,—previously *royalties* under *the Beast from the sea*, or *Papacy*,—become *kingless democracies* that tear and desolate the great *Papal* whore; and that the Beast from the abyss himself is (to use his language) the *infidel Antichrist*.—In this *Bengel* and *Irving* have preceded him. *Mr. Irving*, as *Mr. Brooks* observes, p. 399, "considers the French Revolution to have been the death-throe, the last gasp and termination of life, to the *Papal Beast* [*from the sea*]; and the first breath and act of life to another Beast, the *Beast from the bottomless pit*." *Bengel* says, that the time of the *Beast from the sea* is short; and that then the *Beast from the abyss*, supervening, will survive the desolation of the great city. *Walker's Bengel*, p. 299.—*Mr. Hislop*, in his *Red Republic*, follows the same view.

*Mr. Barker*, while similarly supposing this difference between the two Beasts, strangely makes the *Beast from the abyss* of Apoc. xvii. first in order of time, the *Beast from the sea* of Apoc. xiii. second. Of course, to be consistent, he must make the *Beast from the abyss* to precede the *seven-headed Dragon* of Apoc. xii. also; as the *Dragon*, without any other power intervening, transferred his power and throne to the *Beast from the sea* !!

\* In proof that this is the right view of the *εἰσι* see my critical Note ch. iv. § 1 *infra*.

the apparent or real *discrepancies*. And I have little doubt that the result with the intelligent and unprejudiced will be a most clear conviction of the entire identity of the two Beasts; and consequently that all notion of a difference of Heads distinguishing them is a fond and groundless conceit.

The following then are the further *resemblances* notable.

1. They had each a constituency of ten kings or kingdoms:—these being *symbolized* as attaching to the *Beast from the sea* by the *ten diadems*, then first seen upon the ten horns, the which indeed constituted one of its chief distinctives from the seven-headed Dragon its predecessor;<sup>1</sup> and expressly *declared* by the interpreting Angel to attach to the *Beast from the abyss*; it being said that its ten horns were ten *kings*, and that they would give their power and authority to the Beast.<sup>2</sup>—2. They alike bore upon them names of blasphemy.<sup>3</sup>—3. They were alike on their manifestation declared to be the objects of wonder, deference, and submission to all the dwellers on the earth; those only excepted that had their names written in the Lamb's Book of life.<sup>4</sup>—4. They are alike described as making war upon Christ's saints and witnesses, and overcoming them.<sup>5</sup>—5. They are each alike associated with some professedly

<sup>1</sup> Compare xii. 3, where the Dragon's ten horns are spoken of as if without diadems, and xiii. 1, where those of the *Beast from the sea* appeared with diadems.

<sup>2</sup> xvii. 12. Indeed that they would receive their authority at one and the same time with the Beast: *ἐξουσίαν ὡς βασιλεῖς μιαν ὥραν λαμβανουσι μετὰ τοῦ θηρίου*. For, though Bengel, Brooks, and others, would render this, "Receive power as kings only for one hour with the beast," I shall presently show the impossibility of any such sense attaching to the phrase.

<sup>3</sup> So xiii. 1, in the critical editions, *ὀνόματα βλασφημίας*, without the article; and xvii. 3, with the article.

<sup>4</sup> xiii. 3, 4, 8; xvii. 8. The word *θανμαζειν* will be observed on afterwards.

<sup>5</sup> The *Beast from the sea* in xiii. 7: (in which passage this Beast appears fulfilling the Dragon's purpose previously announced in xii. 17, "The Dragon went to make war with them that keep up the witness for Jesus:")—the *Beast from the abyss* in xi. 7; "When they (*the witnesses*) shall have perfected their testimony, the Wild Beast from the abyss shall make war against them, and shall overcome them, and kill them."

Mr. Brooks seems strangely to have overlooked this latter passage; when stating, as a discrepancy between the two Beasts, "Whereas the *Beast from the sea* makes war with the saints, and overcomes them, the *Beast from the abyss* makes war with the Lamb, and is overcome."

It was only by rising again, after being overcome and killed by the *Beast from the abyss*, that Christ's witnesses assumed the ascendant.—And let it be further observed that the 144,000, who are Christ's called and chosen and faithful, (the same that, as stated Apoc. xvii. 14, get the victory over the *Beast from the abyss*.) are expressly noted in Apoc. xiv. 1, as with the Lamb on Mount Zion, in opposition to the *Beast from the sea* in his great city.

Christian, but really apostate ecclesiastical or priestly power, which acted to it as its chief help and minister: viz. the *Beast from the sea* with the *two-horned lamb-like Beast*;<sup>1</sup> the *Beast from the abyss* with what is called “*the false Prophet*.”<sup>2</sup> symbols, alike the one and the other, of a false though professedly Christian priesthood.<sup>3</sup>—Nay, I may add respecting *this* last-noted *false Prophet*, that both by the attachment to it of the definite article, as by way of reference,<sup>4</sup> and by its being specified also as the same that did the signs before the *Beast*, and deceived *them that received the mark of the Beast*, and that *worshipped his image*,—it is positively identified with the *two-horned lamb-like associate* of the *Beast from the sea*: whence, by necessary consequence, the *Beast* it practised before, or *Beast from the abyss*, (being the *Beast in that last form* in which he receives judgment,) is just as positively and expressly identified with the *Beast from the sea* itself, of chapter xiii. For it is said, “The *Beast* was taken, and the *False Prophet* that did the signs before *him*.” and also that this was the same *Beast* whose *image* was worshipped, and whose *mark* received.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> xiii. 11, 12.

<sup>2</sup> xix. 20. Besides that the *Beast from the abyss* supported a *harlot-rider* (xvii. 3); i. e. a corrupt apostate church, including of course an apostate priesthood.

<sup>3</sup> I infer this from Matt. vii. 15; “Beware of *false prophets* which come to you in *sheep’s clothing*, but inwardly are *ravering wolves*.” On this point a full discussion will be found in my Ch. vi. *infra*.

<sup>4</sup> Griesbach’s and Wordsworth’s reading of xix. 20 is, *Και επιασθη το θηριον, και ο μετ’ αυτου ψευδοπροφητης, ο ποιησας τα σημεια ενωπιον αυτου*. Tregelles, *Και μετ’ αυτου ο ψευδοπροφητης ο ποιησας τα σημεια*. The received text, *Και μετα τουτου ο ψευδοπροφητης*. Whichever of these be taken, the article before *ψευδοπροφητης*, and that too before *σημεια*, are necessarily, if I mistake not, *marks of reference*; and the *only possible* reference is to the *lamb-like two-horned Beast*, and the *signs* previously said to be wrought by *him* before the *Beast from the sea*, in chapter xiii.

<sup>5</sup> It may be well to place before the reader the two passages from which I argue, in juxtaposition; the proof of identity exhibited by them being so complete and decisive.

Apoc. xiii. 14, &c.

“And he [the two-horned ‘lamb-like beast’] *deceiveth* them that dwell on the earth by the *signs* which it was given him to do *before the beast* [from the sea]; saying to them that dwell on the earth, that they should make an *image to the beast*. . . And he causeth all both small and great. . . to receive a mark. . . the *name of the beast*.”

Apoc. xix. 20.

“And the *beast* was taken, [i. e. the *beast in his last form*, or *beast from the abyss*,] and with him the *false prophet* that wrought the *signs* before him, with which he *deceived those that received the mark of the beast*, and those that *worship his image*.”

Irenæus (v. 28) recognises the identity of the *Beasts* by a similar parallelizing of these two passages: “Post de armigero *cjus*, [i. e. the armiger of the *Beast from the sea* of Apoc. xiii.,] quem et *pseudopropheta*m vocat [Johannes]:” i. e. in his notice of the *Beast from the abyss* in Apoc. xix.

And what then the *discrepancies* which are to counter-vail this evidence for the identity of the two Wild Beasts? There are *five* alleged: and, somewhat singularly, the *second* and *third* refer to points noted by me as the *two first of resemblance*.

1. The article of reference, it is said, is wanting in the notice of the Beast in Apoc. xvii. 3, "I saw a woman seated on a Beast having seven heads, &c.;" not on *the* Beast, or Beast seen before. And no doubt, *pro tanto*, its absence is against our hypothesis of identity. Yet, where a thing is spoken of under different attendant circumstances, and with regard to quite a different time from what might have characterised it when previously noticed, the absence of the article is not of itself a *decisive* proof of non-identity. Who doubts the identity of the 144,000 of Apoc. xiv. 1, as a body, with the 144,000 of Apoc. vii. 4? Yet in Apoc. xiv. the article is wanting: and its absence explained by the fact of the time, and attendant circumstances, being different in the one case and the other. Just so here.—2. It is said, the diadems, which were stated to be on the ten horns of the *Beast from the sea*, are not noticed as on the ten horns of the *Beast from the abyss*;<sup>1</sup> and that therefore the inference is warranted that these horns were now *kingless democracies*, the same (it is presumed by the objector) that were at the last to hate and tear the Harlot. But can we surely infer from the silence of Scripture, that in the vision of chap. xvii. the diadems were *not* apparent on the Beast's horns?<sup>2</sup> Because in that Chapter the form, or likeness, of the Beast's *body* is unmentioned, are we therefore to suppose it in form quite different from that of the Beast of Apoc. xiii.?<sup>3</sup> Assuredly, whether *diademed* or *undiademed*, the Angel's express declaration, before referred to, decides beyond appeal that the horns *were kings*, (not *kingless* powers,)<sup>4</sup> associated with, and subordinate to, *the Beast from the abyss*; i. e. "until the words of God

<sup>1</sup> xiii. 1, xvii. 3.

<sup>2</sup> Certainly it is my own impression that, as the thing this symbol indicated was declared to attach to the Beast, so the visible symbol probably attached also.

<sup>3</sup> A point this referred to again p. 80.

<sup>4</sup> I mean, not without *ruling chief magistrates*. For it is of course allowed that the word βασιλευς, or *kings*, has the same latitude of meaning here as in Apoc. xvii. 10.

were fulfilled," or sounding and evolution of the 7th 'Trumpet.<sup>1</sup> As to the ten horns tearing the Harlot, I doubt not, and in due time hope to prove, that the time of this tearing was to be in the Woman's *earlier* or *imperial* stage of existence, not its *later* or *Pupal*. Certainly the Apocalyptic *figuration* of the *Beast from the abyss* with *his ten horns upon him*, in Apoc. xvii., as *supporting the Harlot*, down to near the time of her final destruction by God's judgments described in Apoc. xviii., (a *figuration* which has most strangely been either overlooked, or perverted,<sup>2</sup> by the theorists we speak of,) seems of itself to show incontrovertibly that *in and through* the chief period of *their connection with the Beast from the abyss*, these ten kings would, as a part of the Beast's constituency, *support*, not *tear* and *desolate* her. So that our previous conclusion on this point remains unimpeached; as one of marked *agreement*, not *discrepancy*, between the *Beast from the abyss* and *Beast from the sea*.—3. It is said, with regard to their inscription with *names of blasphemy*, "that, whereas the *Beast from the sea* had names of blasphemy only on his heads, the *Beast from the abyss* had his *whole body* full of them." But how does this appear? The Apocalyptic record says nothing about the latter Beast's *body*. It only speaks of that Beast as *full* of names of blasphemy: which it might rightly do, supposing that many such names appeared, so as with the *Beast from the sea*, simply on its *heads*.<sup>3</sup> And,

<sup>1</sup> So I infer from comparison of Apoc. x. 7; "In the days of the voice of the seventh angel, when he may have to sound, and *the mystery of God shall be finished*."

<sup>2</sup> Mr. Brooks really seems to me, however unintentionally, to be among the latter. At p. 408 he writes thus:—"I consider the woman to be represented at the opening of the vision as seated on the Beast [*the Beast from the abyss*] only 'to show the position in which she is left at the termination of the reign of the first Beast; [i. e. the *Beast from the sea*]; not as showing that she continues to exercise the same influence during the career of the second Beast."—That is, she is figured (and this not merely with reference to the *opening* time of the vision, but evidently through its *main course*, compare verse 7) in a particular association with a *certain later* Beast, in order to designate that association with *another previous* Beast, of relations towards her supposed to be the most different and opposite from those of the *later* one! A *figuration* surely, in such case, the most fitted, not to *instruct*, but to *deceive*.

As to the *supposed* fact of the Beast from the abyss, all through, only hating and tearing the Harlot, (i. e. the great city,) its total incorrectness is evident from the declared fact of the court of this selfsame Beast being, on occasion of the death of the Witnesses, held in this selfsame great city. For I consider that I have decisively proved it to be the great city of the Witnesses' death. See my Vol. ii. pp. 433—436.

<sup>3</sup> The critical editions read *ονοματα βλασφημιας* in the plural, it will be remembered, in Apoc. xiii. 1; not, as the received text, *ονομα*.



supposing more represented on the heads of the Beast depicted in the vision of Apoc. xvii., than on those of that of Apoc. xiii., this might be accounted for on the principle of their having accumulated during his long 1260 years' course; without at all impeaching the identity of the *heads* under which the one Beast existed and the other.—4. The *Beast from the sea*, it is said, is described when seen rising from the flood, as like a leopard, bear, and lion, in its several parts; the *Beast from the abyss* simply as in colour red, or scarlet.<sup>1</sup> But how does this prove a discrepancy? Where is it said that the *Beast from the abyss* had a form different from that of the combined leopard, bear, and lion form of the Beast before seen? From the absence of any statement to the contrary, just as in the case of the *diadems*, let me again say I should infer that there was in this respect no difference. Again, where is it said that in the *Beast from the sea* red, or scarlet, was not a characteristic colour? If a *deeper red* than before struck the apostle's eye, and is therefore specially noticed in the later vision of Apoc. xvii., this would be easily accounted for (just as the accumulated names of blasphemy) by the thought of the blood of the saints shed by it in the long interval since its first rise, as in Apoc. xiii.<sup>2</sup>—5. The *duration* in the two cases is said by the objector to be quite different: that of the *Beast from*

<sup>1</sup> xiii. 2, xvii. 3.—The colour *κόκκινος* is the same as that of the royal robe put in mockery on Christ, according to St. Matthew: *Πεποιθησαν αὐτῷ χλαμύδα κόκκινην*. Matt. xxvii. 28. By St. Mark xv. 17, and St. John xix. 2, it is called *πορφύρεην*, a purple robe. In the same manner *πορφύρα* and *κόκκινος* are united together, as characteristics of the woman's dress that rode the Beast from the abyss, in Apoc. xvii. 4.

<sup>2</sup> Besides this it may be well to remember that the latter Beast is depicted as in the act of *being ridden*; and that, when ridden, an animal has on usually its housings: the which, if ample, would hide the Beast's body.\* Supposing this to have been the case in the vision of Apoc. xvii., then *their* colour might be predicated of the Beast itself, by a license not infrequent in poetical or figurative writings.† And in that case, forasmuch as the colour here ascribed to the Beast from the abyss is *purple-red*, or *scarlet*, the usual colour of the trappings of horses or mules ridden by the Popes and Cardinals,‡ (the ecclesiastical rulers of that papal Church and Empire which the objector himself, not without good reason, as we shall soon see, admits the *Beast from the sea* to have prefigured,) the alleged discrepancy should be allowed by him to be rather a point of agreement than disagreement.

\* So the white trappings of the cavalcade of ecclesiastical dignitaries, attendant on the ceremonial of the Pope's assumption, described Vol. ii. p. 52.

† So Horace, "Purpurei metuunt tyranni." So also the *χαλχοί ἀνέρες*, and *χαλχος Ἀρης*, of Herodotus and Homer, referred to in the Notes on p. 430 of my Vol. i.

‡ See my Note <sup>1</sup>, Vol. ii. p. 52.

the sea being *forty-two months*; that of the *Beast from the abyss*, says Mr. B., but *one hour*. But this depends on Mr. B.'s construction of the phrase, *ἐξουσιαν λαμβανουσι μίαν ὥραν μετὰ τοῦ θηρίου*, as meaning, "Receive power with the Beast *for one hour*:"—a meaning impossible, since this *cannot* be the duration of the Beast in question. For, if taken to signify *duration*, the phrase must be construed either *literally* to signify that of *one hour*; or, on the prophetic *year-day* scale, of one twelfth part of a year, in other words *one month* only.<sup>1</sup> Whereas this same Beast from the abyss is said in Apoc. xi. to have existed both all the time of the war against the Witnesses *before* their death; then the three and a half days, or years, *during* their death; and, *after* it, all the time that intervened subsequently till its final destruction, just immediately before the Millennium. Thus the supposed *horal brevity* of the Beast from the abyss receives its direct contradiction from the sacred prophecy itself: and it seems evident that the rendering of the clause in question which I have given, "The ten horns are ten kings which receive power *at one and the same time* with the Beast," is the true, as it is also the most natural, rendering.<sup>2</sup> It is in this sense, I be-

<sup>1</sup> Bengel, in conformity with his singular system of symbolic chronology in the Apocalypse, would indeed have it to signify only *eight days*. But I conceive he stands alone in this notion; and it of course in no wise helps the case.

Mr. Barker again would have the *ὥρα* taken literally, but in a more extended sense of *ὥρα* than *an hour*, e. g. I presume as *one season*. But then it must be so in some definite chronological sense of season. For where shall we find the word in any but a *definite* sense, with a *definite numeral prefixed*, like the *μῶν*? And to give *ὥρα* any such definite chronological value, (excepting in its primary natural sense of *an hour*;) there would need the addition of some adjective to define it: as e. g. *μῶν ὥραν εαρινήν* *one spring season*:—a time far too short, as shown above.

<sup>2</sup> There is no doubt that accusatives of time *may* signify duration; but seldom, I believe, except after verbs signifying action such as *may* imply time: e. g. Matt. xx. 12; *Μῶν ὥραν ἐποίησαν* *They worked one hour*: Matt. xxvi. 40; *Μῶν ὥραν γρηγορήσαι* *to watch one hour*: not often after verbs, like *λαμβάνω*, of action instantly completed. In most cases of the latter character the accusative of time marks the time *at* which, not the time *for* which. So John iv. 52; *Χθες ὥραν ἐβδόμην ἀφῆκεν αὐτὸν ὁ πνεύματος* *Yesterday at the seventh hour the fever left him*: Acts x. 3; *Εἶδεν ἐν ὄραματι ὡσεὶ ὥραν ἐνάτην τῆς ἡμέρας* *He saw at the ninth hour of the day*: Apoc. iii. 3; *Ποιαν ὥραν ἤξω* *At what time I shall come*:—not, *for* what time.

That the numeral *εἰς*, even by itself, often bears the sense of *the same* is indubitable. As the point is one of considerable importance let me give a few examples from both the Old and New Testament. So then, from the Old Testament, in Gen. xli. 11; "We dreamed both of us in *one and the same* night, (*ἐν νυκτι μιᾷ*, Sept.,) he and I:"—Gen. xlii. 11; "We are all the sons of *one and the same* man:" (*ἑνὸς ἀνθρώπου*, Sept.)—And in the New Testament, Phil. ii. 2; *ἵνα τὸ αὐτὸ φρονῆτε*, . . . *συμψυχοί, τὸ ἐν φρονούντες*, "of *one* mind;" or, more literally, "thinking the one and same thing:" Eph. iv. 4, 5; *ἐκλήθητε ἐν μιᾷ ἐλπίδι τῆς κλήσεως ἡμῶν*. *Ἐς Κύριος*,

lieve, that the old patristic expositors generally understood it.<sup>1</sup> And, as regards modern expositors, it has been so

*μία πιστις, ἐν βαπτισμαῖ* where the sense is evidently, not that the Christians had each but one Lord, numerically, instead of the many lords of the heathen; or but *one* baptism, numerically, in contrast with the various baptisms of the Jews: but that they were united by the bond of *one and the same* Lord, *one and the same* baptism, *one and the same* hope. And so, indeed, in the very next verse to the passage under consideration, Apoc. xvii. 13; "These have *one* mind;" *μὴν γνῶμην ἐχουσι* i. e. *one and the same*.\*

To which Scriptural examples let me add two from the Greek Fathers. 1. Irenæus i. 3; Ἡ ἐκκλησία ὁμοίως πιστεῖται πάντοτε, ὡς μίαν ψυχὴν καὶ τὴν αὐτὴν ἐχούσα καρδίαν. 2. Theodoret, Dial. de Sp. S. (12) in reference to the homousian clause of the Nicene Creed: Μίαν λέγεις φύσιν Πατρὸς καὶ Υἱοῦ εἶναι;—Μίαν εἰ λέγω, ὁμοίαν δὲ λέγω. The former opinion being expressed otherwise just after thus; Ὁ Υἱὸς τῆς αὐτῆς ὡν φύσεως τῷ Πατρὶ.

It is to be observed however that in the present instance *μία* does not stand alone, but is associated with *μετὰ τοῦ θηρίου*. This seems to make the phrase yet more clearly indicative of a specific point of time. For *μετὰ* with the genitive following is, as Matthiæ observes, equivalent to *συν* with the ablative, "to express a connexion." And *εἰς, μία, ἐν* before an ablative, with *συν* expressed or understood, is used in the sense of *ὁ αὐτός*. So Phœniss. 157: Ὅς ἐμοὶ μίας ἐγενετ' ἐκ μητρὸς. "Who was born of the *same* mother as myself:"—the *εἰς* and *ὁ αὐτός* being sometimes both used together; as in 1 Cor. xi. 5, ἐν γὰρ ἐστὶ, καὶ τὸ αὐτὸ, τῇ ἐξυρρημένῃ.†—Which being so, the clause under consideration becomes yet more markedly significant of a *point* of time; and the whole passage in sense as translated above, "Receive their kingdom at *one and the same time with the Beast*." A statement exactly accordant with the previous symbolization of the *Beast from the sea*, exhibiting at its first emergence from the flood the ten horns already diademed, as well as its new anti-seventh head.

<sup>1</sup> So Irenæus v. 26; "potestatem quasi reges *unâ horâ* accipient cum bestîâ:" and Primasius; "potestatem regni *unâ horâ* accipient cum bestîâ." So too Jerom's *Vulgate*; only that he seems to have read *μετὰ τοῦ θηρίου*, instead of *μετὰ τοῦ θηρίου*—his whole rendering of the clause being "potestatem tanquam reges *unâ horâ* accipient *post* bestiam:" the kings receiving power all at the same time with *each other*, but *after* the Beast.—Similarly Theodoret, here commenting however on Daniel vii.; τῶς ἑκα βασιλεῖς κατὰ ταυτὸν εἶπεν ἀναστήσεισθαι: and Cyril of Jerusalem; who says of the ten kings, (xv. 12,) Ἐν διαφοροῖς μὲν ἰσῶς τοποῖς, κατὰ δὲ τὸν αὐτὸν βασιλευσούσι καιρὸν.‡

\* In Gen. xi. 1, "All the earth was of *one* tongue and language," (Sept. ἡν πᾶσα ἡ γῆ χεῖλος ἐν, καὶ μία φωνὴ πασι,) the Hebrew is in the plural. And Robertson, in his *Clavis*, thus observes on it. "Hoc plurale non habet rationem numeri, sed *identitatis*, et significat *eadem*. Sic Terentius in Eunucho; 'Aderis una in *unis* aedibus;' h. e. *iisdem*."

† Archdeacon Harrison, (Warburt. Lect. p. 451,) though not disagreeing in the general view of the passage, yet objects to my construing the *μία* and *το αὐτὸ* with the ablatives *ἐμοὶ* and *ἐξυρρημένῃ*, in the illustrative citations made; or with the *μετὰ τοῦ θηρίου* of the text. He would have it that the words *μετὰ τοῦ θηρίου*, &c., must rather be connected immediately with the *verb*. "No instance can be found of such a construction as *συν ἐμοὶ μίας*, or *μετ' ἐμοῦ μίας*:" and, as regards the Latin, to which Matthiæ refers as imitating this Greek construction, it is the *dative* that is used, says Mr. H., not the *ablative* with *cum*; "*nobis* eadem, [meaning *nobis* as a *dative*,] not *nobiscum*."—But what will he say to the following passage from Tacitus, "Hunc eodem mecum patre genitum," Annal. xv. 2? What to the Latin interpreter's rendering of the clause in the Phœnissæ thus, "Ille qui mecum *unâ* natus est *ex matre*?" Facciolati, on *idem*, expressly notes the "sequente *cum* prepositione," as one of its constructions: and I need hardly observe how frequently *cum* follows the adverb *unâ*.—But if *conjointly with the Beast*, or any other such rendering, be preferred, it will not affect my argument.

‡ He proceeds; Μετὰ δὲ τούτους ἑνδεκάτος ὁ Ἀντιχριστός: under the idea of Antichrist following the ten horns, as in Daniel. See my Note <sup>1</sup> p. 91. .

explained by persons of the most different schools of interpretation.<sup>1</sup>—6. The *origin* of the one Beast and the other, it is said, are different: the one being a Beast originating from the *sea*; the other from the *abyss of hell*. But is this a *real* discrepancy, any more than the former; even allowing, as I am quite ready to do, that the word *abyss* signifies the *abyss of hell*?<sup>2</sup> Is it not most supposable that the same Wild Beast, or persecuting Power, might in what was visible to the eyes of *men*, have originated out of a flood of waters, i. e. of invading peoples and nations, in the flux and reflux of their agitation; yet, in what was visible to *God's* eyes, out of the deeper depths of *hell*:<sup>3</sup>—somewhat like those false Jews of whom Christ speaks in the same verse, as being both *of this world*, and also *from beneath*?<sup>4</sup> In fact it is directly inferable from the sacred record that the same *double* origin characterized alike the Beast of chap. xiii. and that of chap. xvii. The *former*, though first seen rising from the *sea*, is yet expressly declared to have had an earlier and *devilish* origin: it being represented as the device and creature of the old serpent the Devil; and that to which he delegated the supremacy long previously exercised by him, through the medium of Imperial Pagan Rome.<sup>5</sup> Again the *latter*, though called the *Beast from the abyss*, is yet so essentially connected with the *Woman seated on it*, that, as the Woman is declared to have had her seat on *many waters*, (indeed “*the many waters*,”<sup>6</sup> as if with reference to some water-

<sup>1</sup> So, of Roman Catholic expositors, *Bossuet*; as well as the Protestants *Mede*, *Daubuz*, *Vitringa*, *Whiston*, &c. So, among living expositors, the futurist *Burgh*, (p. 250,) as well as the anti-futurist *Wordsworth*, and spiritualist *I. Williams*, p. 347.

<sup>2</sup> See on the word *abyss*, Vol. i. p. 440.

<sup>3</sup> Thus a marine volcanic island rises both out of the sea, and out of a deeper depth beneath it. Such, for example, was that which suddenly rose in the Mediterranean in 1831: such that which rose out of the sea, near the isle of Thera, A.D. 726, in the time of the Emperor Leo; noted by *Fleury*, B. xlii. c. 1.—Hence *Schlegel's* comparison; “As volcanic rocks exist in the ocean, or rather at its bottom, and as their eruptious burst through the body of waters up to the surface of the sea.” *Phil. of Hist.* i. 22.

<sup>4</sup> *John* viii. 23, “Ye are from beneath, (*ἐκ τῶν κατῶ ἐστε*.) I am from above: ye are of (or from) this world, (*ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου τούτου*.) I am not of this world.” Compare too *James* iii. 15; “This wisdom descendeth not *from above*; but is *earthly*, sensual, *devilish*.”

<sup>5</sup> *Apoc.* xii. 17, xiii. 2. It will be remembered that the best authenticated reading in *Apoc.* xiii. 1 is *ἑσταθῆν*, not *ἑσταθῆν*. “And he (the Dragon) stood on the sand of the sea, or flood,” &c.

<sup>6</sup> Such seems to be the best authenticated reading. See p. 72 Note 2.

flood such as that out of which the *Beast from the sea* rose,<sup>1</sup> I say, as the Woman was seated on these, so the Beast itself may naturally be supposed to have arisen from, and had its constituent population formed out of them.—7thly, and finally, as to that primary supposed point of discrepancy, on which the whole theory of difference is founded, viz. that of the *Beast from the abyss* being declared the 8th, in chronological succession, of the rulers that the heads symbolized, while the *Beast from the sea* might, it is argued, have answered to the 7th,<sup>2</sup> it will on examination be found wholly to vanish. For, as this *Beast from the sea* had had one of his 7 heads wounded to death, and the deadly wound healed, its 7th visible head (the head regnant on it) must have been in chronological succession 8th; just so as to answer to the regnant head of the *Beast from the abyss*.<sup>3</sup>—Thus, as in the investigation of the *resemblances* we found ourselves lodged at last in not merely an *inferential*, but a *direct* proof, of the perfect identity of the two Beasts, the same is found, if I mistake not, to be the result of our investigation of the alleged *discrepancies*.

After what has been stated it may seem perhaps almost superfluous to add anything further to our argument. Yet, on reflection, considering the importance of the point in question, I think it will not be altogether useless to suggest the following additional considerations, all leading to the same conclusion.—And,

<sup>1</sup> For the *only* waters mentioned as seen by the Evangelist, intermediately between the vision of the *Beast from the sea* in Apoc. xiii., and that of the vision of the *Beast from the abyss*, with its harlot rider, in Apoc. xvii., (the Chapter in which the Angel-interpretor used the phrase referred to,) are the *springs of waters* on which was poured the third Vial of wrath; not any *flood* of waters, or waters connected with a Beast.

If we prefer to understand the *great Mediterranean Sea* as that by which the dragon stood, and whence he evoked the seven-headed Beast, (and this seems to have been the *great sea* of Daniel's vision,) the argument as to reference remains the same.

<sup>2</sup> Mr. Barker, indeed, would somewhat marvellously have the *Beast from the abyss* first in chronological order. But in this, I imagine, he is singular; and the untenableness of the notion is obvious, as I have shown at p. 75.

<sup>3</sup> Connected with this is yet one other point urged by Mr. Brooks in corroboration of his view; which, however, will now I think be deemed scarcely to need refutation.

He says; "From the description of the *Beast from the abyss*, as the *Beast which was and is not*, it is clear that the Beast which *was* is the *Beast from the sea* of Apoc. xiii., who has now passed away, but is to re-ascend into life and power." (p. 403.) But how does this appear? Why may not the *Beast which was* be the *Roman Pagan Dragon*, slain under his seventh head, and the *Beast from the sea* (or *abyss*) that new form and head under which he *revives*? The word *θηριον*, *wild beast*, is applicable to a *dragon*, as well as to other wild beasts; and is in fact so applied by Eusebius. See the top Note, p. 35 *supra*. Such, I have no doubt, is the true explication.

*First*, that of the position of the *Apocalyptic narrative* of the *Beast from the sea* in Apoc. xii., xiii. For, following almost instantly as it did after the story of the two Witnesses' slaughter by the *Beast from the abyss* in Apoc. xi., seemed it not as if in answer to the natural questions thereon arising, respecting that Beast's rise and history, in the minds of both the seer and the readers of this prophecy? Certainly, were it the history of some persecuting Beast that had nothing to do with the slaying of the Witnesses, and the real author of that slaughter was only described long after in ch. xvii., the tendency of the vision and narrative of ch. xiii. would be to mislead, not to instruct.—*Secondly*, there is the consideration that, if the *Beast from the sea* be not identical with the *Beast from the abyss*, we have no account whatever given us of the *end* of the *former*:—an omission scarcely credible, considering the prominence of this Beast in the Apocalyptic revelation; and that both of the *seven-headed Dragon*, its immediate predecessor, and of the *Beast from the abyss*, which the objector would suppose its immediate successor, the ending fates are related so circumstantially.<sup>1</sup>—*Further*, the circumstance of the *Beast from the abyss* being necessarily the immediate successor of the *Beast from the sea*, according to Mr. Brooks' theory,<sup>2</sup> suggests a third consideration alike fatal to his theory, and corroborative of the complete identity of the two Beasts in question. For the head next preceding that of the *Beast from the abyss*, was the original *seventh* head.<sup>3</sup> And this seventh head was to last but a *little space*; <sup>4</sup> whereas the

<sup>1</sup> Viz. of the one in Apoc. xiii. 1, xx. 10; of the other in Apoc. xix. 20.

<sup>2</sup> I say *necessary* on his theory, because the sixth head of the Beast is declared by the Angel to be that which was *then* in existence; viz. at the time of the visions in Patmos.\* Consequently, if the *Beast from the sea* (which was evidently in origin subsequent to St. John's time) preceded the *Beast from the abyss*, forasmuch as the latter existed under the *eighth* and last head, the *Beast from the sea* must have existed under the *seventh*, and (Apoc. xiii. 3) in place of the *sixth*.

<sup>3</sup> xvii. 11.—The reader will see hereafter why I use the phrase *original seventh* head; viz. from regarding the *eighth* head as the *new* or *second seventh*, after the amputation by a sword of the *former seventh*, and in its place. <sup>4</sup> xvii. 10.

\* For the *standard time* to which the Angel's chronological intimations are to be referred of what *had been*, what *then was*, and what was still *future*, must necessarily be either the epoch of St. John's holding colloquy with the revealing Angel in Patmos, or that to which the figuration itself belonged; which latter it could not be; as the Beast was then under his last head, immediately prior to destruction.—I shall have to refer to this point again, at the commencement of § 1 of my next Chapter iv., on the Beast's Heads.

*Beast from the sea* was to continue and prosper for 1260 days, or, in our objector's view, 1260 years.<sup>1</sup>—And indeed, *once more*, it appears from Daniel that it was the selfsame Beast which lasted the 42 months, or 1260 years, under the little horn, that had its body given to the burning flame; without any other form of the Beast, or any other chronological period intervening.

To all which indications,—indications marked in the very text and structure of the Apocalyptic record, and independent of any particular historical explanation of it,—there might be added yet one other, drawn from the historical solution of an earlier part of the Apocalypse already explained; I mean of that which prefigured the slaughter of the two Witnesses. For the *Beast from the abyss*, there spoken of as their antagonist and their murderer, was demonstrated, on I think irrefragable evidence, to be the *Papal* power:<sup>2</sup>—that power which is allowed, as I before observed, by our objector to be prefigured in the *Beast from the sea*.

Such is the conclusion I arrive at:—a conclusion, let me observe, agreeable with that of all the patristic expositors: for such a notion as that of a discrepancy between these two Beasts seems never to have entered their minds.<sup>3</sup> The reader, if acquainted with the present state of prophetic investigation, will be aware of the importance of the point that we have been sifting; and consequently be ready to excuse the fulness of my inquiry on it. Indeed I cannot but feel thankful that a doubt should have been so strongly raised, and by writers so respectable, on the identity of the two Wild Beasts: since we should scarcely otherwise have instituted so full a comparison between them; and therefore not have arrived at so clear, full, and deliberate a conviction of their being indubitably one and the same.

<sup>1</sup> xiii. 5. Mr. B. allows the truth of the *year-day* theory.

<sup>2</sup> See my Vol. ii. p. 424, &c.

<sup>3</sup> See Irenæus, Hippolytus, Victorinus, Primasius, &c.

§ 2.—IDENTITY OF THE LAST RULING HEAD OF THE APOCALYPTIC WILD BEAST FROM THE ABYSS AND SEA ALIKE WITH THE LITTLE HORN OF DANIEL'S FOURTH WILD BEAST, WITH ST. PAUL'S MAN OF SIN, AND WITH ST. JOHN'S ANTICHRIST.

It remains to show the identity of this Apocalyptic *Wild Beast from the abyss and sea* with *Daniel's fourth Wild Beast* in its last or ten-horned state; and also of its *ruling Head* with *Daniel's Little Horn*, and *St. Paul's* and *St. John's Antichrist*. I do this because it will be quite necessary to refer at times to these visions and predictions in our subsequent exposition.

1. *Its identity with Daniel's fourth Beast*.—The sacred description of this I now subjoin; and give the vision and explanation from Dan. vii. in parallel columns, in order to facilitate the comparison.

VISION.

7. After this I saw in the night visions, and behold a fourth beast, dreadful and terrible, and strong exceedingly, and it had great iron teeth: it devoured, and brake in pieces, and stamped the residue with the feet of it: and it was diverse from all the beasts that were before it; and it had ten horns.

8. I considered the horns; and behold there came up among them another little horn, before whom there were three of the first horns plucked up by the roots: and, behold, in this horn were eyes like the eyes of a man, and a mouth speaking great things.

9. I beheld till the thrones were placed,<sup>1</sup> and the Ancient of days did sit, whose garment was white as snow, and the hair of his head like the pure wool: his throne was like the fiery flame, and his wheels as burning fire.

10. A fiery stream issued and came forth from before him; thousand thousands ministered unto him, and ten thousand times ten thousand stood before him: the judgment was set, and the books were opened.

EXPLANATION.

17. These great beasts which are four, are four kings which shall arise out of the earth.

18. But the saints of the Most High shall take the kingdom, and possess the kingdom for ever, even for ever and ever.

19. Then I would know the truth of the fourth beast, which was diverse from all the others, exceeding dreadful: whose teeth were of iron, and his nails of brass; which devoured, brake in pieces, and stamped the residue with his feet:

20. And of the ten horns that were in his head, and of the other which came up, and before whom three fell; even of that horn that had eyes, and a mouth that spake very great things, whose look was more stout than his fellows.

21. I beheld, and the same horn made war with the saints, and prevailed against them;

22. Until the Ancient of days came, and judgment was given to the saints of the Most High; and the time came that the saints possessed the kingdom.

23. Then he said; The fourth beast shall be the fourth kingdom upon earth;

<sup>1</sup> So various ancient Versions and Expositors. See Mede; and compare Matt. xix. 28, Apoc. xx. 4; &c.



## VISION.

11. I beheld then because of the voice of the great words which the horn spak;—I beheld even till the beast was slain, and his body destroyed and given to the burning flame.

12. As concerning the rest of the beasts, they had their dominion taken away: yet their lives were prolonged for a season and time.

13. I saw in the night visions; and, behold, one like the Son of man came . . . to the Ancient of days, and they brought him near before him.

14. And there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages, should serve him. His dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away: and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed.

## EXPLANATION.

which shall be diverse from all kingdoms, and shall devour the whole earth, and shall tread it down, and break it in pieces.

24. And the ten horns out of this kingdom are ten kings that shall arise. And another shall arise after<sup>1</sup> them; and he shall be diverse from the first, and he shall subdue three kings.

25. And he shall speak great words against the Most High, and shall wear out the saints of the Most High, and think to change times and laws; and they shall be given into his hand until a time and times and the dividing of time.

26. But the judgment shall sit; and they shall take away his dominion, to consume and to destroy it unto the end.

27. And the kingdom and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven, shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High: whose kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and all dominions shall serve and obey him.

Now of the exact appearance of the Beast with the little horn we have no particular description; only that it was very terrible, and diverse from the three Wild Beasts before it. So that the strange Apocalyptic combination of the *leopard lion and bear* may very possibly have existed in this *Terrible Wild Beast*, or *Deinotherium*, of Daniel likewise: especially considering that this combination of the lion bear and leopard was formed out of the precise symbols of the three Wild Beasts in Daniel preceding it. However this may have been, the following particulars that *are* noted of it, or of its Little Horn, sufficiently identify it with the Apocalyptic Wild Beast. 1. It was explained, like the Apocalyptic, to be the fourth great mundane empire, i. e. the Roman,<sup>2</sup> in its *last* form, under a

<sup>1</sup> See p. 91 Note <sup>1</sup>.

<sup>2</sup> It is evident from Daniel himself, ii. 37, viii. 20, 21, &c., that, as Babylon was the 1st, so the *Medo-Persian* was the 2nd, and the *Grecian* or *Macedonian* the 3rd, of the four great mundane prefigured empires. Whence the necessary consequence that *Rome* was the 4th. For the opinions of the *Fathers* to the same effect see my Vol. i. pp. 229, 234, 389—394; a list comprehending the names of Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Tertullian, Hippolytus, Origen, Lactantius, Cyril, Chrysostom, Jerome, Augustine, Sulpicius, Theodoret: and for those of some of the *heathen* writers, viz. Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Tacitus, and the geographer Ptolemy, ib. p. 429.—Let me here add to the latter list *Plutarch*: who observes that “Fortune, having past successively from the *Assyrians*, the *Medes* and *Persians*, and the *Macedonians*, after tarrying with each of them for a little while, at length alighted on the banks of the Tiber, and entered

*decem-regal* government ; and as what, on its destruction, would be succeeded, like the Apocalyptic Beast, by the saints taking the kingdom. 2. Its *decem-regal* confederation was described as overseen, and domineered over, by the *Little Horn* : just as the Apocalyptic 8th, or revived 7th *Head* had the power and authority of the ten contemporary kings delivered up to it. 3. This *Little Horn*, having *eyes like a man*, and being said moreover to be *diverse* from the other horns, figured apparently some *ecclesiastical overseeing* or *episcopal* power :<sup>1</sup> just as the ruling *Head* of the Apocalyptic Beast has been stated, and will soon be shown more fully, to have been an *ecclesiastical* power. 4. It was declared of the *Little Horn*, that it would use its power to make war with the saints, and would prevail ; that it would with its mouth speak very great things,<sup>2</sup> even blasphemous words against the Most

*Rome* ; as if resolved to make it her abode for ever :” a passage referred to, I see, in Gibbon vi. 405.

<sup>1</sup> “ It had eyes like the eyes of a man.”—The figure is one applicable in the first instance to governors generally, as overlookers of the charge entrusted to them. So Numb. xxxi. 14, of certain presiding rulers of the host of Israel ; Sept. *επισκοποι της δυναμειως*. Compare 2 Chron. xxxiv. 12, 17, and Nehem. xi. 9, 14. Similarly Demosthenes uses the word of the Athenian *provident* patron-goddess Minerva ; \* and Cicero ad Att. vii. 11, of provincial plenipotentiary superintendants. †

But, the horn in Daniel being diverse from the others, it needed to be a seer or overseer in a different sense : e. g. such as applied to the *prophets* ‡ and *ecclesiastical rulers* of the Jewish people. So, e. g. in 2 Chron. xxxiii. 18 ; “ the words of the *seers* ;” *λογοι των ορωντων, των λαουντων προς αυτον* and Ezekiel iii. 17 ; “ Son of man, I have set thee to be a *watchman* (*σκοπον*) to the children of Israel.” How peculiarly the term was appropriated to ministers and bishops, under the gospel-dispensation, is well-known. How it was afterwards applied by Papal writers and Papal Councils to the ecclesiastical rulers, or bishops, will be illustrated in a later chapter. Says Sir I. Newton on this emblem in Daniel ; (Ch. 7 ;) “ By its eyes it was a *seer* ;” to use the expression of the Old Testament ; or, as he adds, in that of the New Testament, an *επισκοπος*, i. e. an *overseer*, or bishop.—It was certainly a very remarkable and significant characteristic.

<sup>2</sup> A *great mouth*, like the lion's mouth of the Apocalyptic Beast, probably indicat-

\* Viz. in his *Παραπρεσβειας*, quoting Solon's verses ;

Τοιη γαρ μεγαθυμος επισκοπος οβριμοπατηρ,  
Παλλας Αθηναιη χειρας υπερθεν εχει.

A passage ridiculed by Aristophanes in his *Equit.* 1173 ; Ω δημ' εναργως η θεος σ' επισκοπει.

† Let me cite the passage (ad Att. vii. 11). “ Ego negotio præssum non turbulento. Vult enim me Pompeius esse quem tota hæc Campana et maritima ora habeat *επισκοπον*, ad quem delectus et summa negotii referatur.” This was of Caesar's crossing the Rubicon, and the Senators' consequent departure from Rome ; the most eminent with charge over certain districts, for *inspection* and defence against him. Middleton in his *Life of Cicero*, § 7, ad ann. U.C. 704, notices this, and the transference of the term to ecclesiastical episcopacy.

‡ Οι προφηται οφθαλμοι ημων γεγονασι, says Hippolytus De Antiehr. ad init. So in ancient times Pindar, *Olymp.* 6. 26, of the prophet Amphiaraus, *ποθew στρατιας οφθαλμον ιμας, . . μαντιν τ' αγαθον*

High ; and that it would (conjunctly, as would seem, with the ten kings subordinate) reign or prosper *a time times and half a time*, equivalent to 42 *months*, or 1260 *days* : all which three characteristics are characteristics also of the 8th or last *ruling Head* of the Apocalyptic Wild Beast from the abyss and sea. 5. To the which I must add also their similar final destiny, in the divine righteous retribution, viz. to be *destroyed by fire from God*.<sup>1</sup>

Thus there can be no reasonable doubt as to the identity of this decem-regal Wild Beast of Daniel with the decem-regal Apocalyptic Wild Beast from the abyss and sea ; and of the Little Horn of the one with the 8th or last Head of the other.<sup>2</sup>—The difference between the two figurations seems to have arisen hence ; viz. that, as the revelation made to Daniel respecting this last form of the fourth or Roman empire, then all future, was to be less full and circumstantial, it allowed of the revelation being depicted to him under the symbol of the *one* Head of one symbolic Beast : whereas the revelation to be made to St. John, being more full and circumstantial, (as of that of which the history was then already far advanced, and the plot that involved it thickening,) needed, in order to this fuller development, the figuration of seven heads in the ten-horned Wild Beast from the sea ; and also, besides this, the two further symbols of an attendant two-horned lambskin-covered Beast, and an Image of the Beast.<sup>3</sup>—It is remarkable however that there is one important characteristic noticed in Daniel's description, beyond what is found in the Apocalyptic ; namely, that of three of the original ten horns of the Wild Beast being subdued and plucked up before the Little Horn. And there is also this additional explanatory intimation given in Daniel, of which use may perhaps be made to the illustration of the Apocalyptic vision :—viz. that, whereas the fourth or Roman Wild Beast, on final deprivation of power, was to be burned with fire and utterly destroyed, such would not be the case with

ing this. Compare Sophocl. Antig. 127 ; *Zeus γαρ μεγαλης γλωσσης κομπους Υπερεχθαιρει.*

<sup>1</sup> Dan. vii. 11, Apoc. xix. 20.

<sup>2</sup> So the four *heads* of Dan. vii. 6 seem equivalent to the four *horns* of Dan. viii. 8.

<sup>3</sup> So the symbolic image of Daniel's first vision is expanded into the quadruple exhibition of the four Wild Beasts in a vision subsequent.

those three other Wild Beasts that prefigured the three previous great empires of the world; but, on the contrary, though the supremacy was taken from them, their lives would be prolonged for a season and a time.<sup>1</sup>—On each of these points I may have to remark afterwards.

II. I am to show the identity of these Wild Beasts of Daniel and the Apocalypse, or rather of the last *ruling Horn* or *Head* of one and the other, with *the Antichristian Power described in St. Paul's famous prophecy in the Epistle to the Thessalonians*.—The prophecy is one to which I have already more than once made reference.<sup>2</sup> But a fuller sketch of it on the present occasion, though somewhat recapitulative, will be both interesting and necessary.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> In Daniel vii. 24 the little horn is said in our own English Version to rise up *after* the ten horns; whereas in the Apocalypse the Beast rises with its last head and ten horns *all together*. But this does not seem to constitute any discrepancy, such as to affect the identity of Daniel's little horn with the Apocalyptic 8th head. For either the Hebrew word אַחֲרַיִם, rendered *after*, may be rendered *behind*, (so Gesenius,) as I prefer, with some expositors: or else a point of time may have been taken in Daniel's vision a little later than at the opening of the Apocalyptic vision; viz. after the little horn had not only assumed, but had fully recognised its pretensions of superiority, by the ten horns.

<sup>2</sup> See, as before, Vol. i. pp. 229, 230, 234, 389—394.

<sup>3</sup> The following is the prophecy.

“Now we beseech you, brethren, with regard to\* the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, and our gathering together unto Him, 2. that ye be not soon shaken in mind, † or agitated, neither by spirit, nor by word, nor by letter as from us, as that the day of the Lord ‡ is at hand. § 3. Let no man deceive you by any means: for *that day shall not come* except there come the apostasy || first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition: ¶ 4. Who opposeth and exalteth himself above every one that is called god, or an object of worship; \*\* so that he, [as God] †† sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God. 5. Remember ye not that when I

\* ὑπερ; in the sense of περι, quod attinet ad. So Rosenmuller, Schleusner, Macknight, Whitby, &c. For examples I may refer in the Septuagint to Dan. ii. 18, ἐζητούν παρα τῷ Θεῷ ὑπερ τῷ μυστηρίῳ τῶν τῶν; and in the New Testament to Rom. ix. 27, Ἡσαίας κρᾶζει ὑπερ τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ, where our authorized version is *concerning*: also to 2 Cor. v. 12, vii. 4, viii. 23, ix. 3, Phil. i. 7, 2 Thess. i. 4, &c. Whitby quotes Phavorinus, saying that the word is used ὁμοίως τῷ περι. And I observe the old expositor Berengaud so construes it here, “*de adventu.*”

I doubt indeed whether ὑπερ ever bears the *adjective* sense here given it.

† εἰς τὸ μὴ ταχέως σαλευθῆναι ὑμᾶς ἀπο τοῦ νοῦς; a clause which, I conceive, might be rendered thus; “that ye be not soon shaken from a right mind, or judgment;” whether in the abstract, or with special reference to the great subject spoken of. Compare 1 Cor. xiv. 15, προσευξομαι δε και τῷ νοῖ, “I shall pray *with the understanding* ;” i. e. *intelligently*.

‡ τῷ κυρίῳ. So the critical Editions.

§ See Note 5, overleaf.

|| ἡ ἀποστασία. ¶ ὁ ἀνθρώπος τῆς ἀμαρτίας, — ὁ υἱὸς τῆς ἀπωλείας.

\*\* πάντα λεγομενον θεον η σιβασμα. So the received text, and also Griesbach and Scholz.

†† The ὡς Θεον of the textus receptus is rejected by Griesbach and Scholz.

It appears then that partly in consequence of the unauthorized assertions, as if by inspiration, of certain members of the Thessalonian Church, partly of some forged words or letter ascribed to St. Paul,<sup>1</sup> and partly too, I doubt not, from misconstruction of words which he had really written in his 1st Ep. about Christ's coming again to gather to Himself his saints both quick and dead,<sup>2</sup>—I mean those in which he used the first person of Christians that would be *alive* at the Lord's coming,<sup>3</sup>—from these causes, I say, the impression had arisen, and with no little excitement of feeling attending it,<sup>4</sup> that Christ's second advent was imminent;<sup>5</sup>

was yet with you I told you these things? 6. And now ye know what withholdeth \* that he might be revealed in his time. 7. For the mystery of iniquity † doth already work; only he who now letteth will let ‡ until he be taken out of the way. 8. And then shall that lawless one § be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming. 9. Even him whose coming is after the working of Satan, with all power and signs, and lying wonders: 10. And with all deceivableness of unrighteousness to them that perish; ¶ because they received not the love of the truth, that they might be saved. 11. And for this cause God shall send them strong delusion, that they should believe a lie: 12. That they all may be damned who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness." 2 Thess. ii. 1—12.

<sup>1</sup> Macknight well compares St. Paul's caution at the end of this epistle, 2 Thess. iii. 17; "The salutation of Paul with my own hand, which is the token of every epistle," as thus specially needed.

<sup>2</sup> *Tertullian* thus paraphrases this passage: "Ne turbemini neque per spiritum, neque per sermonem, scil. pseudoprophetaum, neque per epistolam, scil. pseudoapostolorum, ac si per nostram, quasi insistat dies Domini." ¶ And *Jerome*, Epist. ad Algas. Quæst. xi., thus observes on it: "Thessalonicensium animos vel occasio non intellectæ epistolæ,\*\* vel ficta revelatio, quæ per somnium deciperat dormientes, vel aliquorum conjectura, Isaie et Danielis Evangeliorumque verba de Antichristo prænunciantia in illud tempus interpretantium, moverat atque turbaverat, ut in majestate suâ tunc Christum sperarent esse venturum." <sup>3</sup> See 1 Thess. iv. 15, &c.

<sup>4</sup> Μη σαλευθῆναι ἀπο τῆ νοοῦ, μηδε θροεῖσθαι. Compare Matt. ii. 3, "Herod was troubled (εταραχθῆ), and all Jerusalem with him;" i. e. at the idea of the birth of Messiah; though by the majority in Jerusalem an event so much desired.

<sup>5</sup> ὡς ὅτι ἐνεσηκέν ἡ ἡμέρα τῆ Κυρίῃ. This verb in the perfect means both *present*, and *imminent*. So *Schleusner*, in verb. "De tempore *presenti*, et *future* *imminente*, usurpatur;" citing, as to this effect, the Greek lexicographer *Hesychius*. So too *Scott* and *Liddell*, and other Lexicons. As an example of the *latter* sense see *Isæus*, de Hagn. Hæred. "My share," says he, "of the inheritance is not yet assured me;" δίκαι γὰρ ἐνεσηκασί ψευδομαρτυρίων so, if any witness in that *impending* trial were convicted of falsehood, the whole inheritance suit would begin anew.—That this is the sense *here* is evident. From Paul's former Epistle, sent them only some few months before, the Thessalonian Christians knew that on the Lord's second appearing (*παρῆσια*), the opening of the *day of the Lord*, which there as here is made to synchronize with it, (see 1 Thess. iv. 15, v. 2), the primary event following would be the gathering of departed saints from their graves, and then of the saints

\* το κατεχον. † τῆς ἀνομίας, as ὁ ἀνομος afterwards: the antinomian mystery.

‡ μονον ὁ κατεχων ἀρτι ἰως ἐκ μεσου γεννηται.

§ ὁ ἀνομος.

¶ I read with *Scholz* τοῖς ἀπολλυμένοις, without the ἐν that precedes in the received text.

¶ De Resurr. Carn. 24.

\*\* viz. as he says a little before, of Paul's words in 1 Thess. iv. 17, "Then we which are alive, and remain, &c."

insomuch that the then existing generation might soon expect to see it. In answer to this he here tells the Thessalonian Christians that it was not so immediately at hand as they supposed. And, while not attempting to unveil to them the times and the seasons, which he himself indeed knew not, and which the Father kept in his own power,<sup>1</sup> he yet, under dictation of the Spirit, declares to them that before that great and blessed consummation there was to be developed in the Church one particular and most extraordinary phenomenon of apostasy:—in effect *the*<sup>2</sup> apostasy from the true faith<sup>3</sup> specially predicted by

living at the time, to meet Christ in the air. And<sup>\*</sup> was it possible for them to suppose that the Lord had indeed come, but totally overlooked both their departed Christian friends, still in their undisturbed graves, and themselves, and even the Apostle Paul?

No doubt the primary meaning of *εἰσθηκε*, just as of its synonym *παρῆσι*, is one significative of things *present*: but, in either case, with a latitude admitting of the word's application to things *near at hand*. Says Alford indeed in loc. "*is present, not, is at hand; for εἰσθημι occurs six times besides in the New Testament, and always in the sense of being present.*" A fortiori, with reference to *παρῆσι* in John xi. 28, "The master *παρῆσι*, and calleth for thee," he might argue thus: "*Παρεμι* is used twenty times elsewhere in the New Testament, and always in the sense of being actually present; therefore it must be so here." But what says verse 30? "Now Jesus *had not yet come to the village,*" i. e. where Mary was. So too in the very parallel passage Joel ii. 1; *ὄτι παρῆσι ἡμεῖς Κυρίου, ὅτι ἐγγυς*.—Need I say that a similar latitude of meaning attaches in English, French, and other modern languages, to similar phrases? Theodoret well paraphrases the saying of the false teachers at Thessalonica thus; *εἰσθηκεῖναι τὸν τῆς συντέλειας χρόνον, καὶ παρανοτικὰ τὸν Κύριον ἐπιφανησῶναι*. And so Jerome, we saw, a little before him. See too, p. 95 Note<sup>1</sup>. <sup>1</sup> Acts i. 7.

<sup>2</sup> On this force of the definite article *ἡ*, prefixed to *ἀποστασία*, see Macknight and Bishop Middleton, ad loc. Our authorized translation unhappily quite overlooks it in its rendering, "*a falling away.*"

<sup>3</sup> The word *ἀποστασία*, with its cognate nouns and verbs, as used in the Septuagint and Greek Testament, signifies (besides its primitive meaning of a *local departure* or *secession*) either a *political* secession and *revolt*, or a *religious* one, as from God and the true faith. The following examples will illustrate the two senses.

1. *Political defection*. So *ἀποστηναί*, Gen. xiv. 4, 2 Chron. xiii. 6, Ezek. xvii. 15, of the revolts of the king of Sodom from Cherdolaomer, of Jeroboam from Rehoboam, and of Zedekiah from the king of Babylon; also Acts v. 37 of that of Judas the Galilean in the time of the taxing. So again *ἀποστασῶ*, Neh. ii. 19, vi. 6; and *ἀποστατίς*, Ezra iv. 12, 15. For examples of the noun used in this sense I may refer to Plut. in Galb., *ἀπο Νέρωνος ἀποστασία*, and Joseph. Antiq. xx. 5, *ἐπὶ τῇ Ῥωμαίων ἀποστασίᾳ*.

2. *Religious apostasy*. So *ἀποστασία*, 2 Chron. xxix. 19, of Ahaz' apostasy, 1 Macc. ii. 15, of the Jews', seduced by Antiochus: *ἀποστασίς*, 2 Chron. xxxiii. 19, of Manasses' apostasy: *ἀποστατής*, Numb. xiv. 9, Josh. xxii. 19, Isa. xxx. 1, 2 Macc. v. 8.—Also, in the New Testament, *ἀποστασία*, as in Acts xxi. 21, *Ἀποστασίαν εἰδασκεις ἀπο Μωσῶς* and *ἀφίστημι*, as in 1 Tim. iv. 1, *Ἀποστησονται τινες τῆς πίστεως*, and Heb. iii. 12, *Ἐν τῷ ἀποστηναί ἀπο Θεοῦ ζωντός*.

Thus *political revolt* and *religious apostasy* are alike admissible, *per se*, by the phrase in the text. But, stated as it is indefinitely, and without specification, of a *Christian Church*, we may surely most naturally construe it of a defection *from Christ's Church and faith*. Moreover the mention of the *mystery of iniquity* in the context, as associated with the apostasy spoken of, and also of the *man of sin* as its head,\* seems to

\* See p. 95 Note<sup>3</sup>.

the Spirit; and which, traced from its earliest infant actings, even then begun, would span the whole interval from

fix the latter sense as the one intended.—Among the Fathers some construed the word one way, some the other: *Tertullian* and *Jerome* of a supposed defection of ten kings, or nations, from the Roman Empire: (a view very forced evidently; as the thing predicted about that empire was not a *defection* from it, but its *change* into a new form with ten kings or kingdoms:) *Cyril*, *Ambrose*, *Augustine*, &c., of a *religious* apostasy from the Christian faith and good works; and so too substantially *Chrysostom* and *Theodoret*, only as summed up in *Antichrist*. See my Vol. i. pp. 229, 389—394.

It is important to observe that in the example from Acts xxi. 21 the phrase was applied by the Jews to designate St. Paul's Christian doctrine as a *defection* or *apostasy from Moses*; though the apostle asserted that it was *no* defection from him. (Acts xxvi. 22, &c.) So that the *open avowal* and *profession of apostasy from the Christian faith* is not necessary to satisfy the conditions of the text.\*—A point this well applicable to the objection against all *Papal* application of the prophecy made in his Rule of Faith, p. 11, by *Archdeacon Manning*. "The *mystery of iniquity*," he says, after a reference to *Chrysostom*, *Cyril*, and *Theodoret*, as authorities for its probably meaning either the Nero-like spirit of heathen persecution, or else religious heresies, "was working *without* and *around* the Church; and *within* it, only so long as *undiscovered*." And he quotes, in support of his view, St. John, "They went out from us; for, if they had been of us, they would have continued with us;" adding, that, if they did not spontaneously go out, they were thrust out as heretics.—If however the Archdeacon had further stated as to *St. John*, that by the word *us* he did not mean the *corporate body of a professing Church*, but *Christ's true spiritual disciples* distinctively, even such as "had an unction from the Holy One," (who during the apostle's life and superintendence constituted no doubt the chief body of the Church address, and exercised a paramount influence in it,) also, as to the *Fathers*, that it was the declared opinion of one of those referred to, I mean *Cyril*, that heresies, and a spirit of hatred, emulation, and disregard to the truth, were then working *in the Church* so as to be preparing for the Antichrist, and of the two others, viz. *Chrysostom* and *Theodoret*, that the temple in which the Man of Sin, or Antichrist, would sit, was the *Christian Church* or *Churches*,—it would, I think, not have failed to strike him how little either the Evangelist or the Fathers helped his argument.† —He refers to *Augustine* also. But, on the very passage quoted by him from St. John, (1 John ii. 19,) the following occurs in *Augustine's* exposition of it, little in accord with Mr. M.'s theory; "Many who are not of us do with us receive the sacraments, . . with us receive the communion of the altar itself, and yet are not of

\* The early Fathers, it may be well to observe, use the word with reference alike to *man's original apostasy from God*, and to *heresies* fallen into by *professing Christians*. So, as an example of the *former*, *Irenæus* iii. 5; "Qui redemit nos *de apostasiâ sanguine suo*:"—for there can be no doubt that the original Greek was *αποστασια*.—And, as examples of the *latter*, *Eusebius*, H. E. vii. 24, speaks of the *σχισματα και αποστασιας ὄλων ἐκκλησιῶν*, with reference to Churches in Egypt that (in his opinion) swerved aside from true doctrine by adopting millenarian views: *Athanasius*, (Op. Vol. i. pp. 303, &c.) of the apostasy of Arians, though pretending, he says, to Christian piety; as also *Cyril*, xv. 9: and *Epiphanius*, (cited by me, Vol. ii. p. 507,) of the Collyridian worshippers of the Virgin Mary.

† Mr. Govett, who is one of the same *prophetic* school of the futurists as, I presume, *Archdeacon Manning*, has a sentence in the Introduction to his Commentary on the Apocalypse, (p. iv.) which seems to me quite illustrative of the subject. "My attachment to the principles of Protestantism is not lessened by the *recession* both from the principles and the name, which is taking place amongst a large body in our (Protestant) Church." He is alluding evidently to the Oxford Tractarians *within* the Church of England.—Just so within the *professedly Christian Church* a *recession*, or *apostasy*, from the principles of Christ and his Gospel began early to work: an apostasy which soon included a large body, and at length had attached to it the great majority of professing Christians; though still called, just as before, the *Christian Church*.

the time then present to the Lord's second coming.<sup>1</sup>—He further notes prominently how it would in due course issue in, and develope as its head,<sup>2</sup> a certain *antichristian person, succession, or power*, whom he designates as *the man of sin, the lawless one, and son of perdition*:<sup>3</sup>—*the man of sin* as

us: \* it being added that temptation is the sifter: (not a Church excommunication:) on the blast of which they fly like chaff from the threshing-floor; though in many cases not ventilated and separated from the grain, till by the testing of the day of judgment.†

<sup>1</sup> So Justin Martyr spoke of *Christ's coming in glory* as only deferred till after the manifestation and reign of the man of the apostasy: (See Vol. i. p. 229:) and Augustine C. D. xx. 19. 2; "To no one is it doubtful that the apostle speaks of *the day of judgment* (for so he means by *the day of the Lord*) as not to come, unless he come first whom he calls an *apostate*, viz. from the Lord God." "Nulli dubium est eum de Antichristo ista dixisse; diemque judicii (hunc enim appellat diem Domini) non esse venturum, nisi," &c. And so too the other Fathers. For the idea of any other *day* or *coming of Christ*, such as has been broached by certain modern expositors, in support of the anti-premillenarian theory, never, I believe, entered the minds of the early Christians.

And, as the Fathers, so *most* of the more eminent moderns. E. g. Rosenmüller, simply on critical grounds, says of the *appearing* meant; "Η παρουσία του Χριστου, adventus Christi ad iudicium extremum;" though he adds that St. Paul might perhaps (from ignorance on the subject) have been thinking of the destruction of Jerusalem. Also, as to *the gathering together to Christ*; "Παρεπισηναγωγή προς αυτον conjuncta erit isti adventui; nec est diversa ab eâ quæ est Matt. xxv. 32."—Indeed this notice of the *gathering of the saints* to Christ fixes the reference to 1 Thess. iv. 14. On which point of the gathering compare further John xi. 52, xvii. 21—24, Heb. xii. 23, Psalm l. 5.

<sup>2</sup> That the Wicked One, or Antichrist spoken of, was to be the *head*, as well as *offspring* of the apostasy, appears clearly from what follows: it being said that his development would result in that of the whole deceivableness of unrighteousness; in other words, of the apostate system in its completeness. Justin Martyr well expresses this his double relation to the apostasy by calling the Antichrist *the man of the apostasy, ὁ ἀνθρώπος της ἀποστασίας*. See, as before, my Vol. i. p. 229. And so too Cyril speaks of the *ἀποστασία* as the *προδρομος* of Antichrist. Ib. 391.

<sup>3</sup> ὁ ἀνθρώπος της ἀμαρτίας ὁ υἱός της ἀπωλείας. The emphasis of the article and singular number is here again to be noted; as also in the ὁ ἀνομός of verse 8.

Bellarmino, Malvenda (De Antichr.), and other Romanists, followed in these latter days by certain Protestants, contend that this use of the singular masculine precludes the latitude of interpretation I have given to the words, as signifying either a *person, succession, or power*, and necessarily restricts the meaning to *one individual person*. But, as Newton, Macknight, Middleton, Hengstenberg, (ii. 87, 9. v.) and others have observed, it is common in Scripture to designate a *class, or succession*, by an individual. In *symbolic* prophecies this is notorious. In the Apocalypse we have already met abundance of examples, as also in Daniel. And even in *unsymbolic* passages the same occurs. So of the *class, order, or succession of Jewish priests*, or, at least, of *the priest for the time being*, throughout the whole duration of the Jewish priesthood, in Lev. xiii. 3, Numb. xxxv. 25, 28, Heb. ix. 7, &c.: of *that of Jewish kings*, Deut. xvii. 14—18, 1 Sam. viii. 11, &c.: of *the Jewish people* designated in Is. v. 3, 7

\* "Multi, qui non sunt ex nobis, accipiunt nobiscum sacramenta, accipiunt baptismum, et . . . ipsius altaris communicationem accipiunt nobiscum; et non sunt ex nobis. Tentatio probat," &c. A passage cited already by me Vol. i. p. 309.

† The reference here made, as well as that at p. 68, to Archd. Manning was made of course before his own apostasy to Rome. An apostasy this which was but the natural result of the principles above noted; especially as accompanied with the vilification of those that hold to our own great Anglican Reformers' view of this prophecy, as if little better than friends to "the Socinian and the Deist."



pre-eminently sin's offspring and patron; the *lawless one*, as above all laws; the *son of perdition*, both as the antitype, it might seem, of Judas, (whose distinctive title alone it was previously,) in his character of a traitor-apostle or bishop; <sup>1</sup> and as also, like him, in some pre-eminent manner doomed to destruction.

Respecting this mysterious person, or power, the following further particulars were also stated. That the mystery of iniquity was even then working which was ultimately to issue in his development: <sup>2</sup> but that a certain particular

(Hebr.) as "the *man of Judah*." and again of the *order*, or *succession of Christian ministers*, 2 Tim. iii. 17, under the designation of *the man of God*. Let me add, as another and different example, Psalm lxxxix. 22, "*The son of wickedness shall not afflict him*:" Sept. *υιος ανομιας*: the *individual for the class*: also 2 John 7; "*This is the deceiver and the Antichrist*;" *ὁ πλανος και ὁ Αντιχριστος*: though in the preceding clause speaking of *many*. Above all, not further to multiply examples, there is the notable one, in *this very prophecy*, of *ὁ κατεχων*, "*he that letteth*," in the masculine singular, used synonymously with *το κατεχων* in the neuter, as of a *power*; and generally understood by the Fathers, as will be soon observed, of the then existing *line, succession, or government* of the Roman Emperors. (See p. 97 Note <sup>1</sup>.) I pray the reader's particular attention to this. It seems to annihilate the arguments of those who would contend, on the ground of this phrasology, for a *personal individual Antichrist*.—In similar manner *ὁ αποσολος*, or *το αποσολικου*, was used by the Greek Fathers for the Apostles, or Apostolic Epistles in the New Testament.

Mr. Govett adds, in his argument against any *Papal* application of this prophecy, that if the phrase *man of sin* indicated a *class connected together by official succession*, so as those other phrases that I have compared with it, *the man of God*, the *high-priest*, &c., and the Popes of Rome were the line intended, then the phrase ought to include the whole *Papal succession*, even from its commencement in Linus and Anaclethus. But I am surprised at any writer of common intelligence thus arguing. The *Papal succession* in their *official* character and pretensions, (if that be the thing meant, a question which is the subject of our coming inquiry,) would be only included *from and after the time of the Popes' development as the man of sin*; obviously not before.

<sup>1</sup> John xvii. 12; "None is lost but the *son of perdition*." In regard of the *episcopate* of Judas, see Acts i. 20.—The allusion to *Judas* in this very remarkable appellation is suggested by Bishop Newton and by Macknight. Nor, I think, without reason: these being the only two passages in which it occurs; and *Judas* and St. Paul's *Man of Sin* the only two characters to whom it is applied.

There is some doubt as to the precise sense to be attached to the appellative, *son of perdition*, which is a Hebraism. The *genitive* following *son* or *sons* in Hebrew,—when neither that of the *originating parent*, or *family belonged to*, but that of some *characteristic or quality*,—means *actively*, for the most part, that which *proceeds from him* who is the subject of the sentence. So *υιοι βροντης*, *υιος ειρηνης*, *υιος παρακλησεως*, (Mark iii. 17, Luke x. 6, Acts iv. 36.) *thunderers*, *imparter of peace*, *consoler*. So too *sons of oil*, said of the two olive-trees that *fed the lamp* in Zechariah's prophecy. See Vol. ii. Note <sup>5</sup>, p. 209. On the other hand *υιοι απειθειας*, said by St. Paul of the wicked, (Eph. ii. 2, v. 6,) indicates *passively* that they were the *subjects of unbelief and disobedience*.—Macknight, in his explanation of the phrase in the passage under consideration, unites the active and the passive meanings: and probably it is so intended, both in respect of *Judas*, and of the *Antichrist* that he prefigured. Destroyers of Christ personally, or of Christ in his members, they were themselves doomed also to a peculiar destruction.—Compare Apoc. xi. 18; "to destroy them that destroy the earth." Also Apoc. xvii. 8, 11; *και εις απολειαν ιπαγει*.

<sup>2</sup> What the *mystery of iniquity* precisely was, we may suppose untold. And hence in the earliest patristic commentators there is nothing of the same decided and definite explanation of *it*, as of the *hindering let*, which we read was revealed: and

*hindrance* then existed, in some *person*, or *power*; (I use the double designation, because it is spoken of alike in the masculine and the neuter gender;<sup>1</sup>) and that what that hindrance was they knew:—that on its removal, but not before, this Man of Sin, the lawless one and Head of the Apostasy, would be developed:—that these three things would be the sign and accompaniment of his revelation, viz. *lying wonders and miracles*; <sup>2</sup> a complete *deceivableness of unrighteousness*; <sup>3</sup> (or exhibition of sin speciously and deceitfully as if religion;) and an *energy of power and success*, such as the working of Satan might alone account for, and which would draw in all to believe in it, except those that took pleasure in the truth, and would be saved.—The *impiety* and *pride* of this Man of Sin were thus predicted;—that he would be pre-eminently an opposer to Christ and his Church;—that he would exalt himself above all that was called god, or an object of worship,<sup>4</sup> i. e. above the gods many and lords many in the gentile heaven and earth,<sup>5</sup> including

some, as Chrysostom, thought it might mean a *persecuting heathen spirit* like what animated Nero; some, as Cyril, the *Arian* and other *heresies*, rise in his days. But, whatever the obscurity, thus much was clear, that it was some principle of iniquity, then secretly working, and which would expand into the system of the *man of sin*.

<sup>1</sup> ὁ κατεχων, το κατεχων, remarked on in a Note just preceding.—Says Bellarmine, de S. P. iii. 5. 4, “ὁ κατεχων; “ideo qui nunc tenet Romanum imperium teneat; id est, regnet donec de medio fiat:” adding, ib. 8; “quod non sit impletum hactenus (sc. the removal of the let) patet: quia adhuc manet successio, et nomen, imperatorum Romanorum.” I cite this to show his admission as to “he that letteth” being a phrase explicable of an imperial succession. The erroneousness of his historical argument will appear abundantly hereafter. See Ch. iv. § 1, infra, ad fin.

<sup>2</sup> It was an early question with the Fathers whether these miracles would be true, or only apparent. Feuardentius, on Irenæus, v. 28, thus comprehensively argues out how they would be *lying* miracles. “1. Ratione *finis*: quoniam juxta Ambrosium et Chrysostomum in 2 Thess. ii. ad mendacium inducunt, nimirum ut impostor ille probet se Deum et Christum esse; sicut Christus noster veris miraculis divinitatem suam patefecit. 2. Ratione *efficientis*, nempe Satane patris mendacii; qui in eo, per eum, perque ministros ejus, sic operabitur. 3. Ratione *subjecti*, seu *materie*; quandoquidem duntaxat illusiones ac prestigie sensus perstringentes, non reipsa erunt miracula. Magnifice quidem videbitur mortuos suscitare, ait Cyrillus Hieros. (Cat. xv.) cæcos illuminare, claudos sanare; eum tamen revera non fiat sanatio. 4. Ratione *formæ*: quoniam non in nomine Patris, Filii, et Spiritus Sancti edent illa; sed in nomine impostoris illius.” Referred to, and abstracted approvingly, by Malvenda, ii. 125.

In his last remark the learned Commentator requires thus far to be corrected. If the *Man of Sin* were (as all allowed and allow) the *Antichrist*, then the *form* and *manner* of his performing his lying miracles would be *professedly* in the name and character of Christ.

<sup>3</sup> Παση απατη αδικιας. Compare the *deceitfulness of riches*, spoken of in Matt. xiii. 22; and the *deceitfulness of sin*, Heb. iii. 13.

<sup>4</sup> So σεβασματα was used by St. Paul of the Athenian objects of worship generally, Acts xvii. 23; θεωρων τα σεβασματα υμων.

<sup>5</sup> 1 Cor. viii. 5; Επερ εισι λεγομενοι θεοι, ειτε εν ουρανω, ειτε επι γης: ωσπερ

the potentates and kings of this world; <sup>1</sup>—that he would sit in God's temple, (a phrase here meaning the Church<sup>2</sup>

ἱεῖς θεοὶ πολλοὶ καὶ κυριοὶ πολλοὶ. The passage is one very illustrative of that before us. We find the λεγόμενοι θεοὶ, "those that are called gods," spoken of, not as including, but contrasted with, the true God: (see the verse following:) and mention moreover expressly made of earthly objects of worship, as well as heavenly; that is, of the kings of the earth. On which latter point see my next Note.

The distinction is noted by Irenæus, and others of the Fathers. So Irenæus iii. 6: "Paulus de Antichristo dicens, 'Qui adversatur et extollit se super omne quod dicitur deus, vel quod colitur, eos qui ab ignorantibus Deum dii dicuntur significat; id est idola. Etenim Pater omnium Deus dicitur, et est. Et non super hunc extolletur Antichristus; sed super eos qui dicuntur quidem, non sunt autem dii.'" On the other hand Jerome explains the phrase in a larger sense thus: "Supra omne quod dicitur Deus; ut eunetorum gentium deos, sive probatam omnem et veram religionem, suo calcet pede." Ad Algas. Quæst. xi.

<sup>1</sup> Σεβασμα, or its cognates, specially suggests to us that chiefest almost of Roman objects of worship, in the Apostle's days and afterwards, the emperors. Of the emperor the Greek title was Σεβαστος, for Augustus; and not seldom, in speaking of him, the θεος was united with the σεβαστος. So Lucian, I think, Θεου Καισαρος Σεβαστε. Indeed the title was chosen by the first Augustus as one of consecration, like as of an object of religious worship. So Dion Cass. liii. 16; Σεβαστον αυτον, . . . ὡσπερ τινα σέπτον, από του σεβαζέσθαι προσειπων. Also Sueton. in Aug. c. 7. See the disquisitions on this title by Spanheim, De U. N. 677, and Eckhel viii. 355.

<sup>2</sup> That the temple of God spoken of might mean the Christian professing Church, as well as the Jewish temple, seems evident from the fact of the apostles often so applying this phrase, or others tantamount, in their Epistles; and its similar application also in the Apocalypse, (if my exposition be correct,) continually. Let me, though I have already cited most of them early in my first Volume, set the following chief passages from the Epistles before the reader's eye.\*

1 Cor. iii. 16, 17; "Know ye not that ye are the temple of God? . . . If any man defile the temple of God, him will God destroy; for the temple of God is holy, which temple ye are." † 2 Cor. vi. 16; "What agreement hath the temple of God with idols? for ye are the temple of the living God." 1 Tim. iii. 15; "That thou mightest know how thou oughtest to behave thyself in the house of God; ‡ which is the Church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth." Heb. x. 21; "Having a great High Priest over the house of God." Heb. iii. 6; "Whose house are we, if we hold fast our confidence firm to the end." 1 Peter iv. 17; "The time is come that judgment must begin at the house of God; and, if it first begin at us," &c. Eph. ii. 19, 20; "Ye are of the household of God, and are built on the foundation of the apostles

\* An ancient and somewhat curious suggestion on this passage has been put forth, I see, by Prof. Lee, on Prophecy, p. 204: as if the εἰς were to designate the character assumed by the Man of Sin; "he shall sit for, or to be, a temple." Now ✓  
 as when a noun significative of character, quality, object, follows the εἰς, the preposition may no doubt, after a suitable verb, be so construed. But when it occurs after such a verb as to sit, and with an accusative noun following of a locality such as may naturally and fitly be the sitting place, where will the Professor find an example with such a sense to the preposition?—The idea however, as before intimated, is not new. See the C. D. xx. 19, 2.

† Ὁ γὰρ ναὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ ἅγιος ἐστίν, οἵτινες ἐστε ἡμεῖς' where mark the definite article. It has been objected by a writer in the Christian Examiner, that the οἵτινες here ought to be rendered, "of which kind are ye." But this is not its necessary meaning. It is often used simply for ὅς. So, for example, Apoc. xvii. 12, τα δεκα κερατα δεκα βασιλεις εισιν, οἵτινες βασιλειαν ουπω ελαβον' &c. So again Matt. xvi. 28, Luke i. 20, ix. 30, Acts xiii. 31, Rom. xvi. 4, 7.—And in other passages, cited above, the statement of Christians being God's temple is unequivocal.

‡ εν οικῳ του Θεου. In proof of οἶκος having here the same sense as ναος, compare Luke xi. 51. "Who perished," says St. Luke, "between the altar and the house," μεταξυ του θυσιαστηριου και του οικου' while, in his parallel history, St. Matthew has it ναου; xxiii. 35.

apparently, as often elsewhere,) and actually there exhibit

and prophets, Jesus Christ being the chief corner-stone; in whom all the building, fitly framed together, groweth unto an *holy temple* in the Lord."

And thus the early patristic expositors, who fully recognised the applicability of the figure to the Christian body,\* quite as generally inclined to *this latter* view of St. Paul's meaning in the phrase under consideration as to that which would explain it of the *Jewish temple*. For, while *Irenæus*, *Ambrose*, and *Cyril* thought that the *Jewish temple* restored would be the one the Man of Sin would sit in,† alike *Jerome Chrysostom*, and *Theodoret* explained it of the Christian professing Church; ‡ and *Hilary* and *Augustine* of both, or either.§

Let me add that the *Church* interpretation has been preferred by sundry later patristic expositors, *Latin* as well as *Greek*.||

Now to the idea of the *Jewish temple* being meant there occur the following objections. 1. After Christ's rejection by the Jews, and his rejection of them, the Jewish temple was, I believe, never called the *temple of God*, or term equivalent; (so Macknight); though often called so in the Old Testament. 2. As the prophecy pointed to a thing and a time subsequent to the subversion of Jerusalem by the Romans, were the Jewish temple meant, it would need to be the temple rebuilt. And so indeed the Fathers who took that view explained it. It was to be the temple re-p built by *Antichrist*.¶ But, so rebuilt, how could it be the *temple of God*? *Irenæus'* argument, v. 25, that, as being called God's temple, it must be one built "per dispositionem veri Dei," so as the *temple of Solomon* was, (an argument repeated by *Augustine*, C. D. xx. 19,) is decisive against his own explanation. For, rebuilt by *Antichrist*,

\* So *Tertullian* De Cor. Mil. c. 9; "Nos enim et templa Dei sumus." *Lactantius* M. P. 1 (ad init.) "Profligata nuper ecclesia [sc. in Diocletian's persecution] rursus exurgit; et majore gloria templum Dei, quod ab impiis fuerat eversum, misericordiâ Domini fabricatur." (Unless, which is very possible, *Lactantius* here refers to the *literal* Christian temple at Nicomedia.) And *Augustine*, C. D. x. 3. 2; "Hujus enim templum simul omnes, et singuli templa sumus."

† *Irenæus*, v. 30, simply and distinctly; "He will sit in the temple, at Jerusalem;" (sedebit in templo Hierosolymis:) *Cyril*, more hesitatingly; "in the Jewish temple; for God forbid it should be that in which we are." Catech. xv.—Again, *Ambrose*, on Luke xxi. 20, referring to this prophecy, says; "Sedebit homo peccati in templo interiore Judæorum, qui Christum negabunt."

‡ "Vel Hierosolymis, ut quidam putant, vel in cœlesiâ, ut verius arbitramur." So *Jerome* to *Algasia*.—*Chrysostom*, Homil. iii. on 2 Thess. ii.: Καθέσθεται εις τον ναον τῆς Θεοῦ ου τον εν Ἱεροσολυμοις, αλλα και τας πανταχου εκκλησιας. And *Theodoret*, also on 2 Thess. ii.: Ναον δε Θεου τας εκκλησιας εκαλεσει εν αὐς ἀρπασει την προεδρειαν, Θεον αυτον αποδεικνυναι πειρωμενος.

§ *Hilary* says; "Because of that Antichrist you do wrong to attach importance to the walls of temples, or to regard a building as the Church of God. Is it then doubtful but that Antichrist may establish his throne there? The mountain, the forest, the cave, are to me safer places." So in *Auxent. 12*. But, on *Matt. xxiv.*, he makes it the sanctuary at Jerusalem.—*Augustine*, in his C. D. xx. 19, says that it is doubtful what temple was meant; whether the ruin of the temple built by *Solomon*, or the *Church*.

|| As a *Greek* example I may refer to *Theophylact*; who, as usual, following *Chrysostom*, says; Ουχι εις τον εν Ἱεροσολυμοις ναον ιδως, αλλα εις τας εκκλησιας ἀπλωσ καθισει. As a *Latin* example let me cite a writer less known; viz. *Radulphus Flaviacensis*, a Benedictine monk of the xiith century. He says on *Levit. xxiv. 10*: "Ea ad Antichristi personam congruentissimè referuntur. Nam . . . præsignare videtur quòd iniquus ille de ecclesiasticis parentibus nasciturus sit, et inter filios matris ecclesiæ fidei sacramenta primo suscepturus. Alioqui fieri non posset quod testatur Apostolus, ut ad ecclesiasticos honores perveniret, et in templo Dei, videlicet in *fidelium societate*, cathedram dignitatis acciperet." B. P. M. xvii. 217.

¶ So the *Pseudo-Hippolytus*: "Iste (Antichristus) Hierosolymis suscitabit templum lapideum: . . . templum construet Hierosolymis; quod confestum excitatum tradet Judæis." De Consumm.

himself as God.<sup>1</sup>—Finally the apostle described the *end* of this Man of Sin; how that he would be consumed<sup>2</sup> by the breath of Christ's mouth, and destroyed even to annihilation<sup>3</sup> by the brightness of his coming:—evidently meaning that second coming of which he had twice before spoken;<sup>4</sup> the same of which the resurrection of the dead saints, and the gathering round Christ alike of these and of such as might be living at the time, were to be the blessed accompaniments.

it would no more be God's temple, in consequence of identity of site with that of Solomon, than the *Mosque of Omar* there standing now: nor indeed if built by the Jews, the *unconverted* Jews, themselves.

Thus the objection made by Todd, Govett, and others, to the construing the phrase of an *apostate Christian Church*, ("If an apostate Church were meant, it could not be called the *temple of God*,") is valid against their own substituted explanation of its being the *rebuilt Jewish temple*, with Antichrist sitting and ruling in it. On the other hand the objection does not properly apply to a Church which, *once true*, has gradually become apostate; yet *not been formally cast out* by God. 'Till Christ's rejection by the Jews the Jewish temple, though grievously polluted, might still, we know, be called *God's temple*: as Christ said, "*My house* shall be called a house of prayer, but ye have made it a den of thieves." And so too the temple of the *professing Church*, until formally rejected by God; even though grievously corrupt and defiled. A supposition this expressly made by St. Paul. For when he wrote, "If *any man defile the temple of God*, him shall God destroy, which temple are ye," transferring what is said in Numb. xix. 20, about any one that defiled the *Jewish sanctuary of the Lord*, to the *Christian body and Church*, he implied that it too was susceptible of defilement; even to a point, we might perhaps add, following out the analogy, that should cause its total rejection at last, just as of the Jewish Church previously, as hopelessly apostate.

And hence a confirmation of my inference from other Scriptures (see Note<sup>2</sup> p. 98), especially 1 Tim. iv. 15, that the term *temple of God*, applied to *Christians*, is not confined to the elect alone, so as Mr. Govett would have it (p. 496). There is a latitude of meaning to the figure; just as to the cognate terms *kingdom of God, Church, &c.* There is Christ's kingdom *special*, consisting only of Christ's true servants; his kingdom *general*, consisting of tares and wheat, good fish and bad, not to be separated till the harvest:—Christ's Church *special*, consisting of the spiritually regenerate and elect alone; and his Church *visible and professing*, of false and true both:—Christ's temple *general*, inclusive of its outward and Gentile court; and his temple *proper*, from which the Gentile outward court is at length excluded.

I here use the Apocalyptic simile, which is admirably illustrative of this important point. And I beg the reader to mark how in Apoc. xi. 1, 2 the professing Church was in respect of its worship designated under figure of the Jewish temple, even when fearfully corrupt; and *only at the Reformation* cast out, under the Divine direction, as excommunicate. Indeed the Apocalypse in its figurative imagery furnishes the best possible comment on the various intents of the phrase, as applied to the Christian Church. I am supposing in this remark that my proof of the explanation of Apoc. xi. 1, 2 in this Work is deemed satisfactory.

It is to be observed further that, supposing there were to arise one Church in its pretensions *universal*, and in point of fact including the mass of Christendom,—that might *pro tanto* have been presumed to be the one intended as the seat of Antichrist.

<sup>1</sup> ὅτι ἐστὶ Θεός, without the article.

<sup>2</sup> ἀναλωσει, a word used both of more slow and of quicker destruction.

<sup>3</sup> καταργησει. Compare Is. xi. 4, "With the breath of his lips shall he slay the wicked."

<sup>4</sup> Compare 2 Thess. ii. 1 and 1 Thess. iv. 14, 15; as observed before, Note<sup>1</sup> p. 95.

I have observed on the Apostle's statement, that the Thessalonian Christians knew what *the hindrance* was that prevented this Man of Sin's development: and we have the consenting testimony of the early Fathers, from Irenæus, the disciple of the disciple of St. John, down to Chrysostom and Jerome, to the effect that it was understood to be *the Imperial power ruling and residing at Rome*.<sup>1</sup> And assuming this to be correct, which we have indeed good reason to do, (for how could so extraordinary a point of knowledge, once received from the Apostle, have become lost in the age immediately succeeding?) the following striking similarities between this Antichristian power and the Little Horn of Daniel, or its equivalent the Apocalyptic Wild Beast from the abyss and sea, will at once present themselves.

1. The former, like the latter, seemed to be a power that would reign at *Rome*: else what the need of the Imperial government, seated when Paul wrote at Rome, being removed out of the way in order to its development? 2. It was to succeed to power soon after the removal of the Roman imperial Pagan dynasty:—just as the Apocalyptic Beast was to succeed soon after the fall of the Roman Pagan Dragon. 3. It was to emanate from Satan, as a power of his devising, and with the energy of Satanic influence attending its establishment:—just as the Apocalyptic Beast was a device and creation of the Dragon, or Devil, that had before ruled in Roman Paganism; and received from him its throne, and power, and great authority. 4. Its manifestation was to be with signs and lying wonders:—just like those with which the two-horned lamb-like Wild Beast, or False Prophet, was to support the authority of the Apocalyptic Beast. 5. It was to arise out of, and then to head, the great apostasy: enforcing a system of spiritual falsehood called “the deceivableness of unrighteousness,” and “mystery of iniquity;” and with such success that all

<sup>1</sup> See the references to *Tertullian, Lactantius, Chrysostom, Jerome*, Vol. i. 229, 234, 389. *Augustine* is the first, I believe, who expresses himself doubtful on the subject. He too, however, while professing his own ignorance, mentions the explanation above given as prevailing; and only adds, as another solution, that he had also heard the *hindrance* (*το κωλυον*) explained as meaning the want, so far, of a sufficient multitude of apostates, to make up for Antichrist the necessary constituency of a kingdom, without which his development could not take place. C. D. xx. 19. 3.

would believe it but they who had the love of the truth, and were heirs of salvation: <sup>1</sup>—just as the Apocalyptic Beast was to be the supporter of the apostate harlot-church that had *mystery* written in her forehead, <sup>2</sup> to head the pseudo-christians of the outer temple-court, <sup>3</sup> and by his ministers to deceive them that dwelt on the earth; and this with success such that all living there would worship him, whose names were not written in the Lamb's book of life. 6. It was to be an *ecclesiastical* power; the *Temple of God*, or *Christian Church*, being the grand scene of his ostentation and pride:—just as the Apocalyptic Beast was to have a *false lamb-like Prophet* for his chief minister; and Daniel's Little Horn to be probably an *ecclesiastical overseer*, or *Bishop of the Church*, having eyes like the eyes of a man. 7. Its *character* was to be emphatically that of the opposer of Christ's cause and people; <sup>4</sup> also of the lawless one, or one above laws; <sup>5</sup> also of the affecter of superhuman self-exaltation above all the authorities and dignities of the world, and this on the blasphemous assumption of being himself "as God:"—just as the Beast of Daniel and the Apocalypse was to war against the saints and overcome them, to think to change times and laws, <sup>6</sup> to domineer over the ten kings as subjects, and to have a mouth speaking great things and blasphemies;—blasphemies against God, his name, his tabernacle, and them also that dwelt in heaven. 8. It was to last till Christ's second coming; and then by the brightness of that coming to be destroyed and annihilated:—just as Daniel's Little Horn was to last until the coming of the Ancient of days, and then to be destroyed and given to the burning flame:—just again as the Apocalyptic Beast, with his False Prophet, was to be cast alive into the lake of fire, on the manifestation of Him that

<sup>1</sup> This is implied in the expression, "With all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish," τοῖς ἀπολλυμένοις and the words, "God shall send them strong delusion, (ἐνεργίαν πλάνης,) that they should believe a lie . . . which believed not the truth," &c.

<sup>2</sup> Apoc. xvii. 5, 7.

<sup>3</sup> Inferred from Apoc. xi. 2, 7.

<sup>4</sup> ὁ ἀντικείμενος, a phrase used Phil. i. 28 of the adversaries of the Church.

<sup>5</sup> ὁ ἀνομος. The classical reader will perhaps be reminded by the expression of the similar phrase *legibus solutus*, applied to the Roman emperors: on which says Gibbon, viii. 17; "The expression was supposed to exalt the Emperor above all human restraints; and to leave his conscience and reason as the sacred measure of his conduct."

<sup>6</sup> Dan. vii. 25.

is King of Kings and Lord of Lords: <sup>1</sup> and thereupon, as Daniel relates, the Son of Man to take the kingdom; or, as the Apocalypse, the millenary to begin of the reign of Christ with his saints. <sup>2</sup>

Such are the resemblances. And well do they justify the early Fathers in unanimously interpreting the person, or power, meant by St. Paul under the title of the *Man of Sin* in this prophecy, as the very same with Daniel's Little Horn, and the Apocalyptic Wild Beast (or rather its ruling Head) from the abyss and sea. <sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Dan. vii. 11; Apoc. xix. 11, 20.

<sup>2</sup> Dan. vii. 14, 27; Apoc. xx. 4.

<sup>3</sup> Let me here add that the *apostasy* prophesied of in 1 Tim. iv. 1, "The Spirit speaketh expressly (*ῥητως*) that in the latter times some shall *apostatize* from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of demons; speaking lies in hypocrisy, having their conscience seared as with a hot iron, forbidding to marry, and commanding to abstain from meats," \* seems, from the apostle's notice of it as an apostasy specially revealed by God's Spirit, to be probably the same as that predicted *here*. Perhaps there may even be a connecting tie between the two prophecies by the word *ῥητως*. Mede supposes an allusion in it to Dan. xi. 36—39. But, if it indicate allusion to former Scripture, and not simply to the *then* expressed voice of the dictating Spirit, we may as probably suppose a reference to *this* prophecy about the apostasy and Man of sin, dictated some few years before to St. Paul.—What is said to *Timothy* of the apostasy being the result of the *teaching by demons* (if we so construe the genitive in *διδασκαλίας δαιμονίων* as in Col. ii. 22) † well answers to what was said to the *Thessalonians* of the *working of Satan* in the deceit *there* predicted. But I am much inclined to take Mede's view of the phrase, as signifying doctrines *concerning* dæmons; being led to this view by the strikingly apposite comment on it, to that effect, of the Constantinopolitan *iconoclastic* Council of A.D. 754; *Ἀπεστηνεν ἡμᾶς ἐκ τῆς φθοροποιῶντων δαιμονίων διδασκαλίας, ἧτοι τῆς τῶν εἰδωλῶν πλανῆς τε καὶ λατρείας*. (Cited by me, Vol. ii. p. 32, from Mansi ap. Gieseler ii. 3.) In which sense of the words the correspondence will be still more striking with the nature of the apostasy predicted in the Thessalonian Epistle, as the preparative to the Man of sin. Again, as to the enforced *abstinence from meats and marriage*, in the system of error denounced to Timothy, it might well be only one particular item in the system of deceit and unrighteousness prophesied of in more general terms to the Thessalonians. And, as these were points of self-mortification specially enforced on the apostate *clergy* and *monks* of after-ages, some particular reference might be made most appropriately to them, in an Epistle chiefly intended for direction of the clergy, and in that part of it where precisely it is most appropriate. ‡

\* . . προσεχόντες πνεύμασι πλανοῖς, καὶ διδασκαλίαις δαιμονίων, ἐν ἑποκρίσει ψευδολογῶν, κεκαυτηριασμένων τὴν ἰδίαν συνείδησιν, κωλύοντων γαμῆν, ἀπεχεσθαι βρωμάτων.

† See on this point of dispute my Paper on *Δαιμονία* in the Appendix of Vol. ii. p. 499, &c.

‡ Mr. Govett, in the Appendix to his Work on the Apocalypse, pp. 473—491, has an elaborate article, chiefly directed against the *Papal* application of the prophecy in question. There are three main points of objection urged, omitting those which concern the peculiarities of Dr. O'Sullivan's view. 1. The prohibition about marriage and meats, he says, is in the prophecy *universal*, in the *Papal* Church *special*. But Mr. G. has answered his own objection by the adduction of the apostolic precept 1 Tim. v. 14, "I will that the younger women marry." For the *command* is as general in terms as the *prohibition*, yet not meant universally. And why Mr. G. should apply his rule to a *prohibition*, and not to a *command*, he has not shown, nor I believe can show. Let it be observed that, as it is the *clergy* to whom the Epistle chiefly relates



It only remains to show,

IIIrdly, *The identity* (agreeably with the unanimous judgment of the same ancient Fathers<sup>1</sup>) of *this so often predicted enemy to Christ himself, and to his Church, with the Apostle St. John's ANTICHRIST.*

The four passages in which the word occurs I append, as before, below.<sup>2</sup> And the following observations, some of which have been already anticipated at the very beginning of this work,<sup>3</sup> are all that will be needed on them. 1. The hostile person, or power, intended by St. John is spoken of as one that had been previously made known to and talked of among Christians,<sup>4</sup> as *the one* pre-eminently great enemy (not one of *two*) that was to come: a charac-

<sup>1</sup> See again my references Vol. i. ubi suprâ, to Tertullian, Cyril, Chrysostom, Jerome, &c.

<sup>2</sup> 1 John ii. 18; "Children, it is the last time: and as ye have heard that the Antichrist (ὁ Αντιχριστος) cometh, even now there are many Antichrists: whence we know that it is the last time." Ib. 22; "Who is the liar (ὁ ψευστης), but he that denieth that Jesus is the Christ? This is the Antichrist, which denieth the Father and the Son. Every one that denieth the Son hath not the Father." iv. 3; "Every spirit that confesseth not Jesus [Christ come in the flesh] \* is not of God. And this is the spirit of the Antichrist, (το του Αντιχριστου.) respecting which ye have heard that it cometh; and it is even now in the world." 2 John 7; "Many deceivers have gone forth into the world, who confess not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh: (οι μη ομολογουντες Ιησων Χριστον ερχομενον εν σαρκι.) This is the deceiver and the Antichrist."

<sup>3</sup> Vol. i. pp. 65, 66.

<sup>4</sup> "Ye have heard that Antichrist cometh." 1 John ii. 18, iv. 3.

---

in the general, so it is of the *marriage* of the clergy specifically that the Apostle was speaking in the chapter immediately preceding, 1 Tim. iii. 2—12. Moreover, in ch. v. next following, the marriage of the younger women, as we have just said, is also generally advised; the prohibition of which by a Romish Church in the innumerable cases of the inmates of its nunneries is as marked a feature of its system as even the prohibition of the marriage of monks and clergy.—2. He says such a prohibition cannot be characteristic of an *apostasy from the faith*. But why not, if the apostasy was to have in it much of the nature of that which St. Paul warned the Colossians against, Col. ii. 20—23; a character of mingled Judaism and Pythagoreism, of will-worship and ascetic mortifying of the flesh? For, as to his notion that the word *apostasy* only applies to *open avowed renunciation of Christianity*, it has been sufficiently refuted in the Note pp. 93, 94 suprâ. 3. That the word *τινες*, "Some shall depart from the faith," implied that it would be an apostasy, not of a mass, but of individuals only. But, if Mr. G. will compare Romans iii. 3, xi. 17, he will find that the word is there used of the *mass* of the Jewish nation; of all in fact but the few that believed the Gospel. So Schleusner; "Interdum *τινες* non *quosdam*, sed *multos, plures*, notat."

In any case I conceive the *κεκαυτηριασμενων την ιδιαν συνειδησιν*, 1 Tim. iv. 2, must be taken as a *genitive*, applying to the *human* teachers of the apostasy. For I do not think it possible that anything about *conscience* can be predicated of *dæmons*, or of *devils*.

\* Χριστον εν σαρκι εληλυθοτα is rejected by Griesbach, retained by Scholz.

teristic which suffices of itself almost to identify it with Daniel's Little Horn, and St. Paul's Man of Sin.—2. The name,—the then new and very singular name, which he gave it, under divine inspiration, of ANTI-CHRIST, while admitting in one particular point of view the secondary sense of an *adversary of Christ*, viz. as a *rival Christ*, (not otherwise,) did moreover primarily indicate, according to the etymological formation of the word, (we shall soon see the exceeding importance of the remark,) that he would be so through his being in some manner a *Vice-Christ*, or one professedly *assuming the character, occupying the place, and fulfilling the functions of Christ*:<sup>1</sup> a representation which well consisted with St. Paul's statement to the Thessalonians that the enemy *he* prophesied of would in the Christian Church show himself *as God*; that is, supposing that the Church, though apostatized, might have retained the dogma of Jesus Christ's Divinity.—3. St. John's declaration that the spirit of Antichrist, and indeed many Antichrists, were even then in the world, with reference to teachers like Simon Magus and other Gnostics, who propounded that Jesus Christ had not come in the flesh, but only as a phantasm,<sup>2</sup> thus doing away alike with his propitiatory atonement by death, and with his fitness as the ascended *God-man* to act the part of Mediator with the Father for his disciples, and, through the Spirit sent forth by Him from heaven, to guide them into all truth,—his functions as the great Prophet and Mediator being thereupon arrogated to themselves by these teachers, as if, in

<sup>1</sup> Schleusner says on the word *Αντιχριστος*: “Vi compositionis eum notare potest qui se gerit *αντι Χριστου*, pro Christo, qui se *Christum* factat: quemadmodum *αντιθεος* (Il. φ. 594) est *ισοθεος*, interprete Hesychio; et *αντιλεων* (Aristophan. Equitt. 1041) est *quasi leo*.”—Suicer, in verb., says; “Exponi potest *Christi Vicarius*: nam *αντι* non solum *contrarietatem*, sed *vicem* quoque, denotat.”—In fuller justice to the peculiar force of the word, I must beg to refer the reader to my tabular view of similar compounds, Vol. i. p. 65: whence he will see that the word cannot mean *simply*, so as some would explain it, *an enemy to Christ*. It either means a *vice-Christ*, or a *false antagonist Christ*, (somewhat as the Syriac Version, *false Christ*,) or *both*.

An excellent comment on its force and significance in the *second* (I might almost say in *either*) sense of the compound, is furnished by the Romanists' appellative, so famous in the middle ages, of *antipope* (Greek, *αντιπαπας*): an appellation given in the sense, not simply of an *enemy to the Pope*, (such e. g. as the German Ghibelline Emperor,) but of a *hostile self-substituted usurping Pope*; one *occupying the proper Pope's place, receiving his honours, and exercising his functions*.

<sup>2</sup> See my Vol. i. p. 65, 66; to which notice on the subject I must beg very particularly to refer my readers.

his stead, the divinely-appointed dispensers of wisdom unto salvation,<sup>1</sup>—I say St. John's statement of this early and partial development in them of the spirit and acts of Antichrist, was certainly not meant by him to represent it as a *completed* and *plenary* fulfilment of the prophecy. If the language here used might at all seem dubious,<sup>2</sup> the undoubted future bearing of the other earlier and parallel prophecies just alluded to, and also of his own subsequent and similarly parallel Apocalyptic prophecy of the anti-christian Beast,<sup>3</sup> decisively negatives such a supposition. What he states as then passing in the world of the spirit and acts of Antichrist, was but to the same effect as St. Paul's previous declaration that the mystery of iniquity did even then already work. That earlier prophecy, so far as regarded the predicted Man of Sin, was evidently left intact, as still unfulfilled and in force. And, while the fact that the Master Spirit of evil was already setting up imperfect *Antichrists* as his agents for deceiving men, just as in olden time he had simply set up *Anti-gods*, is noted by St. John as showing that it was now *the last time*, or *time of the last dispensation*, yet he leaves it here clearly to be understood that the person or power, pre-eminently and above all others *anti-christian*, as pre-eminently *the usurper of Christ's place, functions, and prerogatives*, was still to come.—4. The declaration that this great Antichrist, like his precursors, would deny the Father and the Son,<sup>4</sup> is explained by St. John himself, and by other Scriptures, in such a sense as not to interfere with the view just set forth of the

<sup>1</sup> Compare the Apostle's declaration, "Christ is made unto us *wisdom*," as well as righteousness, &c., 1 Cor. i. 30, and again, verse 24, "Christ the *power* of God and the *wisdom* of God," and Col. ii. 3, "In him are hid all the treasures of *wisdom* and *knowledge*," with the Gnostic pretensions. It is only, I think, when considering Christ in this character, that we can at all see the propriety of St. John's calling the Gnostic teachers *Antichrists*.\*

<sup>2</sup> A *future* reference naturally attaches to the words, "Ye have heard that *the Antichrist cometh*." It is only from the context that they can seem dubious.

<sup>3</sup> I call it the Apocalyptic Beast *antichristian*, from its having for its prime minister a power typified by the *two-horned lamb-like Beast*, or *pseudo-christian* priesthood.

<sup>4</sup> 1 John ii. 22.

\* In proof that *Simon Magus*, and other *Gnostics*, answered in this point of view, see the testimonies in my Note, Vol. ii. pp. 63, 66: to which add Cyril Cat. vi. 14, Jerome on Matt. xxiv. 5, and Augustine De Hæres. 1, saying that Simon profest himself to be *Jesus Christ*, and the *Word of God*.—See too my Foot-Note \* p. 524, Vol. ii, in illustration of the manner in which the chief *Manichee*, as well as the chief *Gnostic*, acted out in this sense of the word the part of Antichrist.

force of the prophetic appellative *Antichrist*:<sup>1</sup>—it being not the *atheistic* denial of a God that was meant; (which could indeed in no wise be charged on the contemporary *Gnostics*, of whom nevertheless St. John speaks as Antichrists;) but a denial as to *practical effect* total, and as *the very essence of the system*.

Such was very much the view given by many of the Fathers. Whether in reference to the prophecies of Daniel, St. Paul, or St. John, they speak of the grand enemy, therein alike prefigured, not as an *atheist* so much, but rather as one, who, while professing Christianity, would be a *usurper of Christ's place* before the world.<sup>2</sup> And soon the appellative

<sup>1</sup> The following is John's own comment on it, ii. 23; "Every one that denieth the Son hath not the Father." So that a professedly *atheist* power is not designated, so as many would represent it, by this verse of the prophecy; but one denying the *Father* by denying *Christ*.—Then, as to the intended manner of denying *Christ*, we may gather information from 2 Peter ii. 1. "As there were false prophets among the people, so there shall be false teachers also among you; who shall bring in destructive heresies (*αἰρεσεις ἀπωλειας*); even *denying the Lord* that bought them, and bringing on themselves swift destruction. And many shall follow their destructive ways; by reason of whom the way of truth shall be evil spoken of." Whence it appears that the deniers of the Lord who bought them, would yet be false teachers in the *Christian professing church*.—Compare Titus i. 16; "They profess to know God, but in works deny him."

<sup>2</sup> So especially the *Greek Fathers*: e. g. *Irenæus* v. 25; "Tentans semet ipsum Christum ostendere;" and again; "In templo Dei sedebit, seducens eos qui adorent eum, quasi ipse sit Christus:" *Hippolytus*; *Εἰς πάντα ἐξισουθαὶ μελλοῦ τῷ Σωτηρῇ*. "He will in everything resemble himself to the Saviour, &c." (See the passage in my Vol. ii. p. 85.) *Cyril*, *Catech.* xv. 11, 15; *ψευδῶς Χριστὸν ἑαυτὸν ἀποκαλῶν* and again; *ὡς Χριστὸς ἐρχεται*. *Chrysostom* on 2 Thess. ii.; *Ἀντιθεὸς τις ἐστίν, . . . καὶ κελύπει προσκυνεῖν αὐτὸν ἀντὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ*. \* And so again *Theodore*t, &c.—The *Latin Fathers* did not so fully enter into the proper force of the Greek compound; and thus expounded it as "*adversarius Domini*;" so *Cyprian* and *Jerome*: or "*contrarius Christo*;" so *Augustine*:—yet with perpetual application to heretics *professedly* Christian, and such as *counterfeited*, or *usurped Christ's place* in the Church. "*Antichristus sub vocabulo Christi*:" "*Christum mentitur Antichristus*:" "*Antichristi multi in Ecclesia*."—So *Cyprian*, *De Unit.*; *Jerome*, *Ep.* 18 ad *Eustoch.*; and *Augustine*, *Tom.* iii. 2507.

Let me add the explanations of *John Damascenus*, a monk of the 8th century, and *Malvenda* of the 17th. "*Antichristus generaliter* qui ea quæ Christi sunt non sentit: *specialiter* qui Christo regiam sedem eripere conatur; sese non illum, Christum et Deum esse mentiens." So the *former*. And *Malvenda* (a little condensed); "*Antichristi nomen apud Patres* significat sevissimum Christi adversarium,—qui se verbis et factis [Deum et] verum Christum constitnet; abnegato et repudiato Jesu Christo, Dei Filio; et Christianam religionem crudelissimâ persecutione extirpare conabitur." And again:—"Antichristi appellatio in eos omnes competit qui quavis ratione Christo Domino adversati sunt; et peculiarius in illos qui se Christos mendacio confinxerunt. Sic Apostoli et sancti Patres hereticos qui Christum oppugnarunt, ejusque

\* In the *Quæst. et Respons.* ad *Orthodox.* appended to the *Cologne Edition* of *Justin Martyr*, No. 108, p. 463, the following illustration of *Chrysostom's* meaning in the *αντιθεος* occurs. *Οὕτως ἐσταυρωσαν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι τὸν Χριστὸν, ὡς γινωσκοντες αὐτὸν ἀντιθεὸν* i. e. not as a profest rebel against God, but a usurper of his place, by blasphemously proclaiming himself equal to God.

in St. John became of all others the most famous. So that from age to age the expectation was revived, and expressed, of some awful *usurper of Christ's place and functions* appearing; some FALSE CHRIST, PSEUDO-VICAR OF CHRIST, ANTI-CHRIST.

---

So we close our analysis and parallelism of this memorable tetrad of prophecies on the great Antichrist. Nor let the reader pass on without running briefly over them retrospectively, and considering what a mass of circumstantialia they present touching this intended Antichristian power; circumstantialia the most singular and definite, as to *time, place, office, character, rule, duration, &c.* All these I shall hope to show fulfilled in the *Papacy*; that power which on evidence not slender, albeit less specific than we are now called to examine into, I have already in the progress of my comment been led presumptively to suspect, and hold up, as the Antichrist. And certainly, if its history and character be found to answer to all the particulars and circumstantialities here set forth, the conclusion must be most sure that our solution is indeed the true one.

Having in earlier parts of my Work traced step by step the gradual expansion of corruption in respect both of doctrine and worship, within the professing Church, especially during the 4th and 5th centuries, into what might at length be deemed an *apostasy from the faith*, answering to the predicted *religious preparation* for Antichrist,<sup>1</sup> and also dwelt somewhat fully on the removal of that old Roman Imperial Government, which was supposed by the early

sacram œconomiam suis erroribus convellere conati sunt, atque eos imprimis qui se Christos esse mentiti sunt, *Antichristos* vocare consueverunt." De Antichr. i. 13, 14.

Mr. C. Maitland on Prophecy, p. 385, says incorrectly that the Greeks all translate the word *Antichrist* simply as "*opposed to Christ.*" But at pp. 407, 411 he himself supplies the correction to his mistake: speaking of Antichrist as he does, like both Greek and Latin Fathers before him, as "*a counterfeit Messiah,*" or *Christ.*\*

<sup>1</sup> See especially my Vol. i. pp. 404—415.

\* In my Critique on the Futurists' Scheme of Apocalyptic Interpretation, in the Appendix to my 4th Volume, I shall enter more at large on the contrast between their imaginary *profest infidel Antichrist*, and the Antichrist of the Fathers.

Christians to be the *political hindrance* meant by St. Paul, as that which stood in the way of his manifestation,<sup>1</sup>—recapitulation on these points seems needless. It is, I think, at the 5th century that I may most fitly take up the historic questions suggested by the predictions about Anti-christ just laid before us; and enter on a detailed comparison of fact and prophecy, on that great subject.

## CHAPTER IV.

### THE SEVEN-HEADED TEN-HORNED WILD BEAST FROM THE ABYSS AND SEA.

PROCEED we then now to the exposition of the two Apocalyptic visions of the *Wild Beast from the abyss and sea*; taking that of the 13th chapter as our basis, but interweaving the important intimations that occur in the vision of the 17th: and also here and there, as occasion may require, making a reference to the other prophecies on the same subject; whether of Daniel, St. Paul, or St. John.—The reader will have observed that in the 13th Apocalyptic chapter this anti-christian power and his actings were exhibited under a *tri-form* configuration: symbols being exhibited not only of the *ten-horned Wild Beast*, but also of a *lamb-like two-horned Wild Beast*, his associate, and of what is called the *Image of the Beast*. Now it seems to me indubitable that of these it is the *Beast first mentioned*, or rather its *ruling Head*, that is the *Principal*: (I pray the reader to satisfy himself on this point, ere he pass on :) the *second Beast* acting declaredly only as his chief minister or agent, and directing his efforts to make the world worship the *first Beast*.<sup>2</sup> And it seems equally indubitable,

<sup>1</sup> See Vol. i. pp. 386—395.

<sup>2</sup> xiii. 12; "He causes the earth . . . to worship *the first Beast*, whose deadly wound was healed." To this decisive intimation on the point referred to I shall revert when treating of the *second Beast*.

The explanation of this first Beast as *the secular Emperor and Empire of Western Christendom*, and of the second Beast as the *Pope and Pontifical Empire*, so as most of our more modern English expositors have taken it, (e. g. Faber, Cuninghame, Bickersteth, &c.) I conceive to have been one of the most plain, as well as most fatal, of Protestant expository errors. Occasion will occur again for noting this. Since my 4th Edition was published Mr. Birks, I am glad to say, has renounced it.

as I have indeed already shown, that it is this first, which, however certain expositors may have otherwise represented it, answers to Daniel's *Little Horn*:—the one, as the other, being said to have the great mouth that spoke blasphemies against God; the one, as the other, to have had the saints given into his hand; the one, as the other, to lord it over the ten contemporary kingdoms, as his inferiors or subjects; the one, as the other, to have had the period assigned him for prospering<sup>1</sup> of forty-two months, or a time times and half a time.—The fulfilment of all this it is now my business to trace in the character and history of the ROMAN POPES and PAPAL CHRISTENDOM:—the *Popes* themselves answering, as I conceive, to the *Beast's last ruling Head* with the *great mouth*; and the *decem-regal empire and power*, subordinate to and inspired by him in Western Europe, to the *Beast's body*:<sup>2</sup>—just according to the explanation that I gave of the same Wild Beast, in the vision of the *Two Witnesses*; it being then and there mentioned anticipatively in the Apocalyptic record, as their persecutor and murderer.<sup>3</sup>

To this the *primary Beast* in the vision I shall confine myself in the present and the next chapter: reserving to a third my explanation of its associate and subsidiary the *two-horned Beast*, as the PAPAL CLERGY; and to yet another my explanation of the *Image of the Beast*, as the PAPAL COUNCILS.

Now, in entering on the consideration of that which, as I have said, is to be alone our present subject, the WILD BEAST FROM THE ABYSS AND SEA, (a *sea*, let me here again observe, that seems probably from the context to mean the *flood* just before mentioned of *invading Goths*,<sup>4</sup>)

<sup>1</sup> Apoc. xiii. 5: *εδωθη αυτω εξουσια ποιησαι μηνας τεσσαρακοντα δυο*. On which word, *ποιησαι*, Vitranga observes that it is taken from the Hebrew *פָּעַל* of Dan. viii. 24, and xi. 7, 28, 30; signifying *rem pro voto et placito feliciter perficere*.

<sup>2</sup> The *Head* is spoken of as including the *body* in Apoc. xvii. 11; "The Beast that was and is not, even he is the eighth." (i. e. *king* or *head*.)—So in the Prophet's explanation of the vision of the *Great Image* it is said, "*Thou* (Nebuchadnezzar) art the head of gold:" although it was also stated by him that the head of gold was one of four great *empires* that were successively to arise. Dan. ii. 38, 39. So again Dan. viii. 21, 22.—The distinction, as well as the union, is noted in Dan. vii. 11; "I beheld, because of the great words which the *Little Horn* spake, till the *Beast* was slain, and his *body* given to the burning flame."

<sup>3</sup> Apoc. xi. 7.—See my Vol. ii. p. 410, &c.

<sup>4</sup> Greek *θαλασσης*. See my Note<sup>2</sup> p. 71, and the remarks p. 84 *suprà*.

l

en  
o-  
se  
o-  
e.  
d,  
all  
re

is,  
a-  
ed  
be


ed

re  
re  
re  
t.  
re

nd  
n's  
za-  
ore  
er,  
is-  
le,  
—  
r,  
a.  
se  
em  
bc  
σ-  
xi.  
y:  
m-  
rse  
ed  
m,

,





Sketch from imagination of the Apocryptic Seven headed Beast from the Sea, having the mark of one head wounded as it were to death, but with the deadly wound healed, and ten horns diademed on the revivred head. Apoc. M.

N. B. Lion, Bear, and Leopard heads suggested by Dan. VII and Apoc. VIII &  
Wolf three Boar, and Bull (for Abomination) by the old Roman military standards

we are met at the very outset by the emblems of the *seven heads* and *the ten horns*. Nor can we advance satisfactorily a step further, until we have discussed and solved those striking symbols; and shown their applicability and appropriateness to the *Roman Popedom*, or *Papal Empire*. They will each furnish matter for a separate Section: and, having discussed them, we shall find then our way well prepared for comparing the *character* and the *doings* of the *Apocalyptic Beast* with those of the *Popedom*.

### § 1. THE HEADS OF THE WILD BEAST.

Now the Heads of the symbolic Beast were, it seems, *seven*, as represented to the Evangelist's eye in the Apocalyptic symbol; though the last of the seven was declared to be in effect in a certain sense the *eighth*, so as will be explained afterwards.

And to these *seven heads* the interpreting Angel assigned a double mystic signification.

1. They signified, he said, *seven hills* on which the Woman carried by the Beast was seated.<sup>1</sup>—Of this the application and the point are very obvious. For the Woman being designated as “the city which [*then*, in St. John's time evidently,<sup>2</sup>] ruled over the kings of the

<sup>1</sup> Apoc. xvii. 9. See p. 73, *suprà*.

<sup>2</sup> The *time present* meant by the Angel, and to which, as a standard, the past and future tenses here used must be referred, can only be either the time of St. John's seeing the vision, which is the most simple supposition, or the time of the realization in the world's history of the state of things marked out in the figuration before them; i. e. of the Beast supporting the harlot-Church of Rome. Now the latter, as already shown, p. 83, (though not altogether unused elsewhere in the Angel's discourse, \*) cannot be the *time present* here intended.—Which being so, *Constantinople*,

\* In verse 8 the usually received text reads thus, *θηριον ο τι ην, και ουκ εστι, και περ εστιν*. But, for the *και περ εστιν*, all the critical texts read *και παρ εστιν*. We have however in verse 11, *το θηριον ο ην και ουκ εστι*. But in each of these cases it is very much as a *title* of the Beast that the three verbs of existence seem strung together respecting it.—A similar intermixture of the *two present times* will be found in Apoc. xiii., where the *προσεκυνησαν* of the 4th verse answers to the *προσκυνησουσιν* of the 8th; and again in the Angel's narrative of the Witnesses, Apoc. xi. (See my Vol. ii. p. 202, Note <sup>6</sup>.) Also in other prophecies not very infrequently: e. g. in Isa. liii.; “Who *hath* believed our report?”—“He *shall* grow up as a tender plant;”—“He *is* despised and rejected;”—“We esteemed him *not*.”—Of course the “*is not*,” literally taken, cannot mark the time answering to the Beast, as figured in vision: because, as figured, he was *existent*, not *non-existent*. It can only mean, —*is not*, in respect of its old form of existence.

earth,"<sup>1</sup> these hills could only mean the far-famed *seven hills of Rome*.<sup>2</sup>—And it is a characteristic as important as it is obvious: for it necessarily and absolutely associates the Wild Beast of the vision, (inasmuch as it bore those seven heads, thus significant,) with the seven-hilled Rome for its capital. I repeat the remark; and must beg the reader well to mark and weigh it. For it binds the power symbolized, *through all its various mutations*, from its earliest beginning to its end, to that same seven-hilled locality; even like one *adscriptum glebæ*, and as a localization essential to his very constitution and life.

How precisely this characteristic answers to the *Roman Popes*, as one of the heads of the Apocalyptic Beast, I need not say.<sup>3</sup> It was the episcopal see of *Rome* that constituted its Bishop *Pope*, and gave him the *throne* of the world.<sup>4</sup> It was from the locality of *Rome*, as the reputed burial-place of the Apostles Peter and Paul, that he gathered round himself, its guardian, those superstitious ter-

the only other city besides Rome famed as built on seven hills, is excluded from the interpretation: it having not then acquired rule, or indeed been built.

<sup>1</sup> "Roma quoque βασιλίδος, vel βασιλευουσης πολειως nomine, pridem . . . passim designata." Spanheim U. Num. 687.

<sup>2</sup> I subjoin, after other interpreters, a few of the many notices of this characteristic of the locality of Rome.

Sed quæ de septem totum circumspicit orbem	
Montibus, imperii Roma Deumque locus.	OVID.
Dumque suis victrix septem de montibus orbem	
Prospiciet domitum Martia Roma, legar.	IB.
Dis quibus septem placuere colles.	HOR.
Septem urbs alta jugis, toti quæ præsidet orbi.	PROPERT.

So again, to give a Christian example, Tertullian: "I appeal to the citizens of Rome, the populace that dwell on the *seven hills*." Apol. 35. And again Jerome (speaking by Paula and Eustochium, c. 7) to Marcella, when urging her to quit Rome for Bethlehem: "Read what is said in the Apocalypse of the *seven hills*," &c.

Mr. E. Clarke (p. 196) objects against the Papal application, that *Papal Rome* does not actually occupy all the old seven hills. But he is mistaken. The walls of Rome still enclose the old seven hills, as every visitor there well knows. Hence the Romish writers themselves speak of the characteristic as still attaching to Papal Rome. I will exemplify from a Romish *Saint*. "In the last persecution of the holy Roman Church, Peter of Rome shall be on the throne, who shall feed his flock in many tribulations. When these are past the *City upon seven hills* shall be destroyed, and the awful Judge shall judge his people." St. Malachy (died A. D. 1148), ap. Burton's Antiq. of Rome, ii. 197.—On a point so notorious it is needless to multiply examples.

<sup>3</sup> So Mede, with a very similar remark to my last; only combining in it the *second* signification, as well as *first*, of this symbol of the seven heads; "This is a *pair of fetters*, to tie both Beast and Whore to *Western Rome*." Bk. v. C. 12. p. 922.

<sup>4</sup> So Gibb. xii. 258; "In the beginning of the 12th century . . . Rome was revered by the Latins as the metropolis of the world, and the *throne* of the Pope and Emperor; who, from the *Eternal City* derived their title, their honours, and the right or exercise of temporal dominion."

rors which constituted the first principle of his power over Western Europe.<sup>1</sup> And a temporary transference of the Papal habitation from *Rome* to *Avignon*, in the middle age, taught the Popes painfully the necessity of actual residence there to their power: their thunders being proved comparatively impotent unless they were the *seven thunders*; i. e., as has been stated in an earlier chapter of this work, unless they issued from the *seven hills*.<sup>2</sup>—On the other hand this single requirement of the symbol is of itself a sufficient refutation, even were there no other objections equally insuperable,<sup>3</sup> of many well-known theories of interpretation. So, first, as to those which, though assigning a *Roman* locality to the Beast's first six heads, have in *Greek Emperors*, *German Emperors*, or *French Emperors*, of quite other capitals, sought to trace the Apocalyptic Beast in its last, or two last phases.<sup>4</sup> So, again, as to another, not a little elaborate, which refers the Beast's first origin, and head, to the *Latin* kingdom and town of *Alba Longa*.<sup>5</sup> So as to yet another, much affected of late by certain German and Anglo-Germanizing expositors, which would explain the Beast and its heads of the seven or eight great successive and *variously located* "world-powers:" of which five had fallen before St. John's time, viz. Egypt, Assyria,

<sup>1</sup> See Gibbon on the revival of Rome under Gregory the First and the Popedom; in a passage to which I shall presently have to refer again.

<sup>2</sup> See Vol. ii. p. 112.

<sup>3</sup> Of some of these, more at the end of this Chapter.

<sup>4</sup> E. g. *Cuninghame* (p. 149), after *Dr. H. More*, explains the seventh head of Constantine, and other Christian emperors before the Gothic invasion; whose residence and capital was in the East *Constantinople*, and in the West *Milan* and *Ravenna*. Again *Faber* would make the seventh head to be the *Napoleonic* dynasty, of whose empire the capital was *Paris*: while others explain it of the emperors *Charlemagne*, *Otho*, and *Otho's* successors in the Germanic throne; \* whose capital was first *Aix la Chapelle*, then for centuries *Vienna*.

<sup>5</sup> I refer to Mr. E. Clark's elaborate Treatise on the Dragon and the Beast. Finding himself unable to explain the seven heads of the *Dragon* on the principle of their being also the *Beast's* seven first Heads, he was led to interpret the *Dragon's* Heads of the seven successive governing Heads of *Rome*, the *Beast's* of the seven or eight governing Heads of the *Latin* kingdom:—that which had its origin in *Alba Longa*; and, having then been conquered and incorporated into the Roman commonwealth, and subsequently partaking of its fortunes and changes, was at length revived as a Latin kingdom, he says, under the German Emperors. This premised, he sets forth the *seven German Electorates*, which for a few centuries elected the Emperors, as the antitype to those Apocalyptic "seven Heads, that were seven mountains on which the woman sitteth."

\* I do not, of course, forget that for a considerable portion of the middle age Rome was considered in a certain sense, viz. *titularly*, the throne of *Emperor*, as well as *Pope*. (See my Note <sup>4</sup> p. 112 from Gibbon.) But it was only so *titularly*, and moreover interruptedly.

Babylon, Persia, Greece; while the 6th, or Roman, (the *only* Roman,) then was; and, as to the one or two more remaining, their site might, or might not, be at Rome.<sup>1</sup>

2. A *second* as important, though less obvious mystery, was declared by the Angel to be symbolized by the Beast's seven heads; viz. the number of *different successive governing heads of bestial character*,<sup>2</sup>—that is, of *lines or classes of heathenlike ruling Governors*,<sup>3</sup> or, as we might say, *forms of Government*,—which (not *another Beast or empire*,<sup>4</sup> but) the *same individual seven-hilled Roman empire* would be under, from first to last, from its early origin to its final destruction:—there being here premised however by the Angel one additional and very important notification, as necessary to be taken into the account in the solution of this part of the enigma; viz. that the *seventh* head visible on the Apocalyptic Beast would be, in *order of existence*, its *eighth*.<sup>5</sup> His meaning in this is easily seen, (as was be-

<sup>1</sup> So first, I believe, Andreas; then Radulphus Flaviacensis in the 12th century; afterwards Daubuz; and, of late, Heugstenberg, Auberlen, Alford, &c. Daubuz himself suggests the Carthaginian empire, Alexandrian, Mithridatean, Macedonian, and Gaulik, "by the fall of which Rome became the mistress of the world." Andreas, instead of Egypt, gives Media. Alford makes his 7th king, or kingdom, to be Rome *Christian*; ✓ as under Constantine and his successors, to begin with, and also as afterwards under the Popes! A strange combination! the very idea of which is self-confuting.

<sup>2</sup> In my opinion the very symbol of a *Dragon*, or *Wild Beast*, necessarily excludes the supposition of its ever representing a *Christian* power; besides which, and as if to force attention the more to the characteristic, it is said of the heads generally, that they had on them names of blasphemy.—This has of course been quite overlooked by those who would make the Roman Christian Emperors, inclusive of Constantine and Theodosius, answer to the Beast's seventh Head.

<sup>3</sup> *Lines or classes*; on the same principle as the symbol of the *riders* in the three first Seals, &c.

<sup>4</sup> Let my reader again well mark this. See p. 112 preceding.

<sup>5</sup> Verse 11; "The Beast that was and is not, even he is the *eighth*, and is of the *seven*, and goeth into destruction."

My critic Mr. Barker would prefer the alternative rendering, "And *there* are seven kings," as if a mere abstract statement by the Angel, to that which I adopt, "And *they* are seven kings;" the nominative, as before, being the Beast's seven heads mentioned in the verse preceding. Indeed he urges the matter as of importance, in order to the doing away with that striking point of identification between the Beast from the *sea* and Beast from the *abyss* already noted by me: viz. that in the one the seventh head, apparent was in place of a previous seventh wounded to death and so in point of succession the eighth; while the other had this predicated of it, that, whereas its seven heads signified seven kings, yet, some way, the king symbolized by the seventh head was in chronological succession the eighth.

But 1st, taken in the insulated form Mr. B. advocates, the statement seems to be not only vague, but even absurd. For it then amounts to just this; There are, or exist, even now, seven kings, somewhere or another in the world: yet out of them five have been and the seventh is future, so that the sixth alone now exists. 2. The statement occurs in the middle of an explanation of the Beast's heads and horns, continuing evidently from verse 9 to verse 13. So that, on Mr. B.'s hypothesis, the statement about some seven kings existent at that time, yet non-existent, would be

fore hinted by me,) in so far as the symbol itself is concerned, by reference to the statement so emphatically made and repeated respecting the Beast, when exhibited in the vision of Chap. xiii., that one of his heads "appeared to have been wounded to death by a sword, but that his deadly wound was healed."<sup>1</sup> For a fresh head had evidently sprouted up in place of the preceding one cut down,—a new seventh in place of the old seventh: so that the last head visible on the Beast, though *visibly the seventh*, was in point of chronological succession the *eighth*.—It was thus indeed that the Beast under its new and last head became what the Angel called it, "The Beast that was, and is not, and yet is:" it having by that deadly wound been annihilated in its immediately preceding *draconic* form; and, through the fresh-sprouted head, revived in its *new* or *ten-horned bestial* form.—I said the *next preceding draconic* form, because it is stated that *the Dragon yielded to it (the Beast)*, on its emergence from the sea, "his power and *his throne* and great authority."<sup>2</sup> So that the transition from the *draconic* state of Rome and its empire to the *ten-horned bestial* was *direct*, and without any other form or head intervening, according to the Apocalyptic representation; though not without the intervention of the Dragon's fall, and doings thereupon, according to the circumstantial narrative already considered of Apoc. xii.—And indeed the same is implied in the *Dragon's* own investment with *seven heads*. For no legitimate exposition can fail to attach the same two-fold symbolic meaning to the *Dragon's* seven heads, as to those of the *Beast from the abyss*, his successor. And, as these were *seven* in number, (not *eight*, in *any* sense, like the Beast's,) it follows that the *seven earliest* of the governing heads, or forms of government, of that empire or power that was sym-

not only absurd, but a strange and violent leap from a continuous chain of explanations about the Beast in vision to an abstract truth quite irrelevant. 3. If the Beast's heads only symbolized Rome's seven hills, how could one be said to be wounded to death, or cut down with the sword? (See the truer view illustrated p. 129 *infra*.) 4. Accordingly expositors in all ages have construed the statement about the seven kings, with reference to the Beast's seven heads as symbolizing them, from Victorinus of the ancients down to the present time; including alike Roman Catholic and Protestant expositors, English, French, and German. So e. g. Malvenda; "Duo igitur, eaque diversa, ait [Angelus] indicari per septem capita; alterum septem montes, alterum septem reges." De Antich. i. 434. On this point, though decisive against himself, Alford does not differ.

<sup>1</sup> Apoc. xiii. 3. See p. 84 *suprà*.

<sup>2</sup> Apoc. xiii. 2.

bolized in its totality of existence by the two conjoint emblems,—I say that the *seven earliest* of these heads must be considered to have belonged to it in its *draconic* form; the *eighth* alone, or *new seventh*, in its *ten-horned bestial* form. All which precisely corresponds also with the Angel's observation; "The Beast which thou sawest is the *eighth*;" i. e. that the eighth head and phase of the Roman Empire was figured by the Beast as seen in vision.

There is yet one further and most important notification made by the Angel, on this subject of the successive governing heads of the Roman Beast; viz. that *five* had fallen before the time then present, (evidently, as before said,<sup>1</sup> that of St. John's seeing the vision in Patmos;)—that *the sixth* was then in power;—that *the next*, or remaining one of the original septenary, was at that time still future, and after coming into existence would continue but a short space;—and that *then* at length there was to come *the Beast from the abyss*: this being the Roman Power under its *eighth* and *last* head; and under which, as before observed, it was to go into perdition.

And now for the general HISTORIC INTERPRETATION.

In explanation then of the *first six heads* I adopt, with the most entire satisfaction, that generally-received Protestant interpretation,<sup>2</sup> which, following the authoritative statements of Livy and Tacitus, (the latter great historian St. John's own contemporary,)<sup>3</sup> enumerates *Kings, Consuls,*

<sup>1</sup> See my Notes pp. 85 and 111 *suprà*.

<sup>2</sup> Daubuz (p. 514) attributes its discovery to *King James*. But I find it noticed in the early Protestant Commentator *Pareus*, p. 422, as the solution of *Arctius, Napier, and Brightman*; each of whom probably, some certainly, preceded King James. Indeed I find almost the same in the yet earlier commentator *Osiander*; the same of whom I have spoken, Vol. ii. p. 141, and who published A.D. 1544. He gives as the seven heads;—1, Kings; 2, Consuls; 3, Decemvirs; 4, Dictators; 5, Triumvirs; 6, Cæsars; 7, External Cæsars, i. e. not of J. Cæsar's family; 8, the Popes.

The same nearly is given by *Fulco* in Apoc. (London, 1573): "Dum omnia expendo, nihil mihi probabilius videtur quàm ut capita septem totidem Romanæ monarchiæ ordines designent, invicem sibi succedentes. Tot enim ejus capita fuerunt; *Reges, Consules, Decemviri, Triumviri, Dictatores, Cæsares*, (qui jam rerum potuntur;) septimus, hoc est *Pontifex*, nondum tyrannidem invasit."—Foxe in his *Eicasm* in Apoc. published 1587, notes this solution, with the addition of the original seventh being *imperatores externi*, as that of *Petr. Artopæus* and *D. Fulco*.

<sup>3</sup> The following are the passages referred to.

1. "Quæ ab conditâ urbe Româ ad captam candem urbem Romani sub *regibus* primum, *consulibus* deinde, ac *dictatoribus, decemvirisque*, ac *tribunis consularibus* gessere." So Livy, vi. i.—And Tacitus: "Urbem Romam à principio *Reges* habuere. Libertatem et *Consulatum* L. Brutus instituit. *Dictatura* ad tempus sumebantur.

*Dictators*, *Decemvirs*, and *Military Tribunes*, as the *five first* constitutional ruling heads of the Roman City and Commonwealth; then, as the *sixth*, the *Imperial* head, commencing with Octavian, better known as Augustus Cæsar.<sup>1</sup>—It has been objected by Dr. S. R. Maitland to the first quintuple, that two other officials are recorded as governing heads of the early commonwealth, viz. *Interreges* and *Pro-Dictators*.<sup>2</sup> But the objection seems quite groundless. For, as their very names indicated,—and indeed Dr. M.'s own authority so states it,<sup>3</sup>—they were but provisional temporary substitutes for the then established constitutional head, during a vacancy of the high office, or absence of him that held it, from the Roman City.<sup>4</sup> And we might as

Neque *Decemviralis* potestas ultra biennium, neque *Tribunorum militum consulare* jus diu valuit. Non Cinnæ, non Syllæ longa dominatio: et Pompeii Crassique potentia cito in Cæsarem, Lepidi atque Antonii arma in Augustum cessere: qui cuncta, discordiis civilibus fessa, nomine *Principis* sub imperium accepit." Annal. i. 8.

So too Eutropius heads his primary chapters thus:—"Rome ruled by seven *Kings*; *Consuls* created; *Dictators* created; *Tribunes of people* created; *Decemvirs* created; *Military Tribunes* created." Of whom the Popular Tribunes were of course not ruling heads.

Very similarly speaks the famous Tablet of the emperor Claudius' Speech, found at Lyons in 1529, and given in an Excursus to the xith Book of Tacitus' Annals by Lipsius. . . . "Quondam *Reges* hanc tenuere urbem. . . . Deinde (postquam . . . ipsius Tarquini et filiorum ejus pertasum est) ad *Consules*,\* annuos magistratus, administratio Recip. translata est. Quid nunc commemorem *Dictatura*, hoc ipso Consulari imperium valentius repertum apud majores nostros? Quid à Consulibus ad *Decemviro*s † translatum imperium? . . . Quid Imp. Vris distributum consulare imperium, *Tribunosque Militum* consulari imperio appellatos?" These are all the changes of the *imperium*, or *supreme power*, mentioned by him.

<sup>1</sup> That the chief executive authorities were named *heads* may be illustrated from Livy xxvi. 16 and 40; "In eos qui capita rerum erant animadversum." Now wherever such is the symbol, the verb *fallen* may fitly be used of the thing's abolition. That this figurative term may be applied not to fall of *empires*, or *individual rulers* only, but also to *constitutional changes of forms of government*, I may illustrate from Cicero, *De Off.* ii. 13; "Ea tua laus pariter cum Republicâ cecidit." The Roman empire then still continued; but the *Republican form of government* had fallen. This in reply to Alford's objection, in loc. <sup>2</sup> Second Enquiry, pp. 155, 161.

<sup>3</sup> "Quos quidem interreges, dum honori præerant, *consulum vicem gerere*, idemque juris et potestatis habere, haud dubium est." Alexander ab Alex. Gen. Di.

<sup>4</sup> So, for example, the *Interrex* in the interregnum after Romulus' death, under

---

\* As regards the Consuls it may be observed that Polybius (vi. 3) speaks of there being three powers in the Roman Constitution; (viz. the *monarchical*, *aristocratical*, and *democratical*;) and that the *monarchical* was represented and exercised by the *Consuls*. Also that Cicero, *De Leg.* iii. 3, gives the *consular* office the title of *regia potestas*. So Gibbon, i. 104.

† "Niebuhr," says Dr. Arnold (*Hist. Rome* i. 297), "has conjectured that the *Decemvirs* were intended to be a perpetual magistracy: the powers afterwards divided among the Military Tribunes, Censors, and Quæstors parricidii being united in a college of ten officers, chosen half from the patricians, half from the plebeians, to remain in office for five years." Dr. A. adds, p. 302, that they exhibited the perfect model of an aristocratical royalty, vested not in one person but several. Livy says of them, "Decem regum species erat."



well speak of a *Regency* as an interruption to the established Kingly headship of a country,—the *reigning Cardinals'* government, after a Pope's death,<sup>1</sup> as an interruption to the Papal headship of the Romish Church,—or that of the *Vice-chancellor* in the Chancellor's absence, to the Cancellarian headship of a University,—as of that of the *Interrex* or *Pro-dictator* being so to the established headship of King, Consul, or Dictator for the time being at Rome. It is evidently not without good reason that both Livy and Tacitus have altogether omitted mention of them.—Again it has been objected,—and *primâ facie*, with more speciousness of argument,—that the *Triumvirate* ought to be regarded as the *sixth* head, the *Imperial* as only the *seventh*. But here too the answer seems to me supplied in the very terms of the reference of Tacitus to it. For, as the learned Dr. H. More justly remarks,<sup>2</sup> his reference is not made to the *Triumvirates*, or *Triumvirs*, as a new constitutional headship to the Roman Commonwealth. But, after a notice of Sylla's and Cinna's *domination*, or unconstitutional exercise of power, albeit under constitutional forms, he simply speaks of the *power* or *political influence* of Pompey and Crassus soon passing to J. Cæsar,—the third of the so-called first *Triumvirate*; and then of the *civil wars* following, during which Antony, Lepidus, and Octavian (or Augustus) Cæsar governed by force of arms, as a transition to the Imperial headship of Augustus. All which is just ac-

the Kings. Under the Republic they were only created to hold the elections, on occasion of the illness or sudden death of Consuls or Dictator, or when these latter were prevented by the intercession of the Tribunes. So Livy, v. 31; "*Consulibus morbo implicitis, placuit per interregnum renovari auspicia.*" See also his i. 17, iii. 55, vi. 36.

<sup>1</sup> Before the institution of the *conclave* by Gregory X., A.D. 1274, there were often long interregnums;—once of three years. Gibb. xii. 301.

<sup>2</sup> I borrow the quotation from Mr. Cuminghame, p. 147. Dr. More, says he, "observes that Tacitus, when he reckons up the forms of supreme power in the Roman State, declines the mentioning of any such *Triumvirate*: *Urban Romanam à principio Reges habuere: Libertatem et Consulatum L. Brutus instituit: Dictature ad tempus sumebantur: neque Decemviralis potestas ultra biennium, neque Tribunorum Militum consulare jus diu valuit*:—which manner of speech implies that he would not leave out any of the forms of supreme government, though of never so short continuance, if sufficiently distinct from others. But now when he falls on those times wherein this *Triumviratus Reip. constituendæ* was to be noted, he runs over it, so as not to be taken notice of; going on in this manner. *Non Cinna, non Sylla, longa dominatio; et Pompeii Crassique potentia cito in Cæsarem*:—which Cinna was only Consul, Sylla first Consul and then Dictator, and Pompey and Crassus Consuls or Proconsuls, and no more. But now, where there is the very nick of naming this *Triumviratus Reip. constituendæ*, he only adds, *et Lepidi et Antonii arma in Augustum cessere; qui cuncta discordiis civilibus fessa nomine Principis sub imperium cepit.*"

ording to the truth of the case. The combination of Cæsar, Pompey, and Crassus, was but the private act of three private individuals of great political influence, albeit one of most important bearing on the subsequent fortunes of the Republic : and which can no more be considered as having constituted a new headship to the Roman State,<sup>1</sup> than the "compact alliance," celebrated in modern times, between certain eminent English politicians and the great democratical leader in the sister island, to our own.<sup>2</sup> That of Antony Lepidus and Octavian was indeed a *Triumvirate*, or *Government of three* ;—the name adopted by themselves, the government sanctioned by a *Plebi-scitum*.<sup>3</sup> But the *Plebi-scitum* was extorted from the Roman people most unconstitutionally ; under the terror of the Triumvirs' present armies, unconstitutionally encamped in Rome, and of a proscription then in process of execution :<sup>4</sup> so that Tacitus might well, in his philosophic view of the matter, designate their rule as the *arms* or *armed domination* of the three : and later writers on the Roman Constitution reject it from lists of the supreme magistrates of Rome.<sup>5</sup> Moreover with the chief of the three, *Octavian Cæsar*, this Triumvirate was but the introduction, after twelve years of civil discord and wars, to his sole supremacy ; insomuch that both ancient and modern historians of authority have dated from it the commencement of Augustus' reign :<sup>6</sup>—that reign in which, uniting as he did the continued title of *Imperator* with a further addition

<sup>1</sup> So *Ernesti* on Tacitus Ann. i. 2 ; "Cæteri triumviratus, (i. e. others besides that of Antony Lepidus and Octavius) qui in vulgaribus libellis historicis traduntur, commentitii sunt. Cæsar, Pompeius, et Crassus tantum privatim potentiam societatem inter se inierant ; neque aut publico aliquo scito acceperere, aut nomine Triumvirorum usi sunt."

<sup>2</sup> O'Connell. This was written in 1841.

<sup>3</sup> "Fuit magistratus cum summo imperio, quem in quinquennium acceperere, ejusque nomine usi sunt ; ut patet ex nummis et inscriptionibus." *Ibid.*

<sup>4</sup> See *Ferguson's Roman History*, v. 4 ; pp. 345, 346. (Ed. in one Volume.)

<sup>5</sup> E. g. Dr. More quotes *Fenestella*, De Magist. Rom. c. 22, stating that he would rather call these triumvirates *tyrannides* than *potestates* or *magistratus*.—See too Vitringa's Note, p. 793.

<sup>6</sup> Of the ancients, *Suetonius*. "Ab eo tempore, exercitibus comparatis, primum cum Marco Antonio Marcoque Lepido, dein tantum cum Antonio, per duodecim ferme annos, novissimè per quatuor et quadraginta solus Remp. tenuit." Vit. Octav. c. 8. On which says Dr. More, *ibid.*, *Naucletus* thus comments ; "Regnavit annis quinquaginta sex ; duodecim cum Antonio et Lepido, solus vero quadraginta quatuor." And Dr. M. adds ; "Chronologers, as well of the Pontifician as of the Protestant party, fix the beginning of his reign ab U. C. Anno 710." Ap. Cuninghame, *ibid.*

of titles and offices of the old republic to make his supremacy virtually absolute,<sup>1</sup> he became the originator of a new, that is of the *sixth*, or *Imperial headship* of Rome.<sup>2</sup>

But, all this being granted, we are but brought by it to that which involves the grand difficulty of the subject; viz. the explanation of the *seventh*, and connectedly with it of the *eighth* head also. At least the difficulty is one as yet altogether unsolved.—To show this it will suffice to mention the three most generally approved solutions given by commentators who explain the *first six heads* as I have. The first is that of *Mede*. He makes the *seventh* head (prior to the *Popes*, as *eighth*,) to be what he calls the *Demi-Cæsar*, or “*Western emperor* which reigned after the division of the empire into East and West:” and which, “after the last division under Honorius and Arcadius, continued about sixty years; a short space.”<sup>3</sup> The second is that of *Bishop Newton*; which regards the *sixth* or *Imperial* head, as continued uninterruptedly through the line of Pagan and then Christian Emperors, until Augustulus and the Herulian and Ostrogothic kings of Italy, *these latter* all inclusive; then the *seventh* to be the *Dukedom* ✓ of Rome, established soon after under the Exarchate of Ravenna. The third is that of *Dr. More* and *Mr. Cuninghame*; who suppose the *Christian* Emperors, from Constantine to Augustulus, to have constituted the *seventh* head, and that this had its excision by the sword of the Heruli.—But against all these alike there stands the objection that they make a *Christian* headship a head of the *Dragon* and of the *Wild Beast*:—that which is a violation of the propriety of things, and of all Scriptural rule and analogy, such as nothing can render credible. Moreover there exists an additional and almost equally insuperable difficulty, applicable to each and all of the solutions, in respect of the *eighth* head, and its enigmatic designation as yet *one of the seven*; the which, as illustrating the point I

<sup>1</sup> Viz. *Consul*, *Proconsul*, *Censor*, *Tribune*; that also of *Princeps Senatûs* being superadded. See Gibbon, ch. i.; and my p. 124 *infra*.

<sup>2</sup> Even some Futurists agree thus far as to the six first heads. So Mr. Trotter; Plain Papers, p. 277.

<sup>3</sup> Works, Bk. iii. Ch. 8, p. 596; also Bk. v. Ch. 12, p. 922.

speak of, it may be well here to specify. The following is *Mr. Mede's* explanation. "The *Cæsars* (the *sixth head*) though indeed but *one*, yet for some accidental respect may be accounted *two*, *Cæsars* and *Demi-Cæsars*: for essence the same, but for extent and some manner of government differing. Now if the *sixth Head* be reckoned for *two*, the *seventh* will be an *eighth*, and yet but one of the *seven*:"<sup>1</sup>—i. e. that the *eighth* would be *seventh*, from the *seventh* being in a certain sense but part of the *sixth*. Of which double view however of the *last head but one*, or *last head but two*, the Angel says not a word. Nor indeed does the enigma turn upon the possible differences of man's opinion as to the numerical position of the Heads. The statements are absolute. The last Head *was* the *eighth*. The same last Head *was* (whatever the right explanation of the Beast's headships) "*of the seven*."—In similarly objectionable manner *Bishop Newton*, who also makes the *Popedom* the *eighth* head, suggests, in explanation of its being *one of the seven*, the reasonable doubt which might be entertained on the question whether the *seventh* was a new government, or not; being as it was, according to him, a *Dukedom* subject through the *Exarchate* to the *Imperial Government* at *Constantinople*. If you say it was *not* a new one, argues the *Bishop*, then its successor, the *Beast* from the *abyss*, will be the *seventh*; if you say it *was*, then this *Beast* will be the *eighth*.—On the other hand *Mr. Cuninghame*, regarding the *Gothic decem-regul confederacy* of *Western Europe* under the *Papacy* as the *eighth* head, explains it as *one of the seven*, by making the *ten horns* branch off from, and grow on the *seventh*, or *Christian imperial head*:—i. e. makes the *ten horns*, growing on the *seventh* head, to be equivalent in a certain sense to an *eighth* head!<sup>2</sup>

Is then the difficulty insuperable? And, having ad-

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.* *Mede* gives an alternative solution. Since the *Popes* and *Demi-Cæsars* were for a short time co-existent, the *Papal headship* might chronologically be viewed as bipartite. So viewed their *sole* rule was the *Beast's eighth* head; otherwise its *seventh*!

<sup>2</sup> p. 150. "This *eighth* form is said to be *of the seven*. It is the *Christian Imperial power* branching off into *ten sovereignties*. The *horns* therefore all grew on the *seventh* head."—In a case like this it is necessary to give the very words of the interpreter; as it might otherwise seem misrepresentation. Has a stag *two heads* because it has both a *head* and *horns*?

vanced thus far on such clear and consistent evidence, must we here stop and confess that the path is hedged up before us? Certainly not. It must already have been observed by the considerate reader that, could some change of government be shown to have arisen in the Roman Empire between the time of St. John's imprisonment, when the imperial or sixth head was in power, and that of the establishment of Christianity by Constantine, there would then open before us a simple solution of all the grand difficulties of the question. For we should then in the first place have *seven Pagan governing heads*, or forms of government, agreeable with that prominent symbol of the *seven heads* seen upon the *Dragon*: we should next have an obvious interpretation of the *wounding of that seventh head*, as effected by the sword of Constantine and the Christian Emperors his successors; and, further, of the manner in which the *seventh head*, seen upon the *Beast* on its emergence, would yet by necessity be chronologically the *eighth*; being the substitute for, and in the place of, *the former seventh* so wounded to death.—Now it has been uniformly taken for granted by expositors that the sixth Imperial head continued unchanged in *Pagan* form till Constantine; and in *Christian* until overthrown by the Goths and Heruli. And so indeed it did, in a certain sense;—I mean as regards the *name* of the thing, the *Imperial title*. But, as regards the *reality* of things, the case was very different. And it needs but for the interpreter to set aside the vagaries of his own imagination, and to follow fully and undeviatingly the guidance, the *wonderful* guidance, of the Apocalyptic emblems, in order to see this reality; and therein, as I hesitate not to say, the unriddling of the enigma.

For what, let me ask, meant those *diadems* on the *Dragon's* heads, as the badge of the power ruling on the seven hills at the epoch figured in Apoc. xii. 3; or epoch just preceding the establishment of Christianity? Was there nothing strange in them to the eyes of one familiar, like St. John, with the Roman symbols of office, and the Roman sentiments too, of the day? Not so. We have already seen the direct contrary.<sup>1</sup> Again, though so strange and new

<sup>1</sup> See Vol. i. pp. 135—137.

a badge to a Roman's eye,—being the badge in fact of *absolute Asiatic sovereignty*,—was it in the present case to be deemed insignificant, and indicative of no change in the ruling power, or form of government? Surely not for a moment could the supposition have been entertained by St. John, considering the precision and significancy of every other symbol thus far depicted in vision: and especially how the *crown* (not *diadem*) was at the commencement of the Apocalyptic visions pictured before him, to signify *the then ruling imperial power*, just agreeably with the received symbolization of the times. The diadem must necessarily, I conceive, have been understood by him to mark the existence of a change in the sovereign power, from the *original imperial character* to that of an *absolute Asiatic-like sovereign*. And we, who at this time are enabled to compare the prophecy with history, need only to consult historic records, in order to find *the exact fulfilment of the symbol*; and this too at the very time that we might from the Apocalyptic figuration have anticipated.

For, on turning to Gibbon,—him whom we have so often found the best assistant to Apocalyptic exposition,—and glancing at that part of his historical Index of Contents which has reference to the æra immediately preceding that of the establishment of Christianity in the Roman empire,<sup>1</sup>—an æra corresponding in history, as we have seen, with the vision of the seven-headed *diademed Dragon* watching to devour the woman's child at birth,<sup>2</sup>—both the *fact* and the *symbol* that we seek arrest the eye connectedly, even as if placed there for the very purpose of illustrating the Apocalyptic enigma: “*Diocletian assumes the diadem, and introduces the Persian ceremonial. New form of administration.*”—The notice thus summarily given is ex-

<sup>1</sup> Vol. ii. ad A.D. 303.

<sup>2</sup> See the illustrative medal of *Maximian*, Diocletian's colleague alike in the empire and the persecution of the Christian Church, given by me p. 17 *suprà*:—a medal in which he appears represented under the emblem of the Pagan god Hercules, (after whom he had named himself *Herculius*,) beating to death a *seven-headed Hydra*, with the legend *Herculi Debellatori*, in memorial of what he regarded as his destruction of *Christianity*. Thus (supposing my view of the Scriptural symbol correct) the lying Satanic Spirit that had animated Roman Heathenism, and which was Apocalyptically symbolized under the emblem of a *seven-headed Dragon*, seized on the Scripture symbol, to avert it from itself, and turn it against the *Christians*.—See Spanheim *De Usu Num.* Diss. iii. p. 231. Also my Note <sup>3</sup> p. 17 *suprà*.

plained and enlarged on in the history.<sup>1</sup> The transition of the Roman empire from its *imperial* or *sixth* head, introduced by *Augustus*, to a new and *seventh* introduced by *Diocletian*, is thus distinctly declared; "Like Augustus, Diocletian may be considered as *the founder of a new empire*:"—and the change is then illustrated somewhat fully, as affecting alike the *official dignity of the Prince governing*, and the *constitution and administration of the empire governed*.—Let us pause a moment; and consider his representation of the change in either point of view.

With regard then to the *former*, the historian intimates how the office of *Emperor* was originally and properly that of General of the Roman armies; only, under and after Augustus, with the various offices of Consul, Proconsul, Censor, and Tribune uniformly and formally<sup>2</sup> attached to the imperial person:—how in the gradual relinquishment of these last-mentioned official titles, and at length the public adoption of the appellative *Dominus*, or *Lord*,<sup>3</sup>—a title expressive of a master's authority over his household slaves, rather than that of a commander over his soldiers, or Prince over his subjects,—advance was made in the course of the third century to the titles and character of an *absolute monarch*:—how by Diocletian, on his restoration of the empire, this change was consummated; the appellative *Dominus* fully adopted; (in the *Greek* provinces its equivalent Βασιλευς, or Δεσποτης, being recognised as the most proper one;) and that of *Imperator*, though still retained in

<sup>1</sup> Gib. ii. p. 165.

<sup>2</sup> I say *formally*, because there was the formal presentation of the proper badge of office in each case by the Senate. So Lampridius, ch. 2, of Alexander Severus:—"Certatim omnia decreta sunt et nominum genera, et potestatum. Primus denique omnium cuncta insignia, et honorificentie genera, simul recepit." The peculiarity in this case was the investiture with one and all *at the same time*. In which, however, Pertinax preceded him.

<sup>3</sup> Says Tertullian, Apolog. 34; "Augustus, Imperii formator, ne Dominum quidem dici se volebat." Previous to Trajan's time, says Spanheim, (from Victor,) p. 729, Caius had affected the appellation, "qui se Dominum dici tentaverat;" and also Domitian: though Papinius says of the latter;

Et dulci Dominum favore clamant;  
Hoc solum vetuit licere Cæsar.

Gibbon (ib. 164) remarks on Pliny's strange inconsistency in expressing abhorrence of the title, and yet addressing it repeatedly to Trajan in his letters. Alexander Severus determinately opposed its application to himself: (Lamprid. 4:) and it was never stamped on the *Roman* money till the reign of *Aurelian*; and then but seldom. On subsequent coins the letters D N occur frequently for *Dominus Noster*. See Spanheim De Usu Num. pp. 729, 730, &c.; Eckhel viii. 365.

the *Latin* provinces, yet used with a new sense attached to it, viz. that not of "the *general* of the Roman armies, but the *sovereign of the Roman world*:"—further how, according to the long-established custom of expressing official rank and power by signs,<sup>1</sup> a new and appropriate *badge* was chosen: how the *diadem*, that ensign of Oriental despotism, and which, as such, had been by the republican Romans so abominated, and shunned even by the earlier emperors,—how, I say, in place of the old imperial badges of the *laurel crown* and the *military robe of purple*,<sup>2</sup> the Persian *diadem* and *robe of silk and gold* were assumed by Diocletian and his associated colleague:<sup>3</sup> and at the same time, instead of the former familiar mixing with fellow-citizens, the seclusion, mystery, prostration, and adoration, which formed part of the distinctive ceremonial of the Persian court, was introduced into the Roman.

As to the *empire governed*, the new principle introduced into the administration, Gibbon continues, was that of *division*. The abilities of one man being deemed inadequate to the public defence, Diocletian associated three colleagues with himself; and laid down the *joint administration of four Princes*, not as a temporary expedient, but as the new fundamental law of the constitution.<sup>4</sup> This division was in a certain sense a *two-fold* one:—there being but two *chief emperors* or *Augusti*, distinguished by the use of the *diadem*, one for the East, the other for the West of

<sup>1</sup> Thus the badge of *kings* in Rome was the *trabea*, i. e. a white robe with stripes of purple, or the *toga prætexta*, white and fringed with purple, a *golden crown*, an *ivory sceptre*, the *sella curulis*, and 12 *Lictors with fasces and securæ*;—that of *Consuls*, the *toga prætexta*, *sceptre*, and 12 *Lictors*;—of *Dictators*, 24 *Lictors*;—of *Decemvirs*, 12 *fasces*;—of *Military Tribunes* nearly the same as *Consuls*. So as to the *superior magistracies*. See Adams, Smith's *Dict. of Antiq.*, and also Eckhel Vol. vi. p. 114. Examples occur under the second and third Apocalyptic Seals of the badges of *inferior magistracies*. See my Vol. i. pp. 155, 185.

<sup>2</sup> See my Vol. i. pp. 135—137.

<sup>3</sup> See the citation from Jornandes to this effect p. 15 *suprà*: an authority followed by Tillemont as well as Gibbon.

Gibbon should have a little qualified his statement on the matter: since, though the new badge seems to have been then, or very soon after, introduced, the old badge was also still retained for a while. The earliest *medallic* illustration that I have found is in the coins of Licinius. See my *Essay on the Diadem* in the Appendix to this Volume.

<sup>4</sup> So *Denina* on Diocletian:—saying that it was no new thing for an emperor to have a colleague, as in the cases of Nerva and M. Aurelius; but that it was quite new to *divide the empire*: and that Diocletian had the art so to influence his colleagues, as to hold firm and united "un vastissimo stato governato da quattro Capi." Soo too Niebuhr ii. 349. (Schmitz.)



the Roman world, their boundary line bisecting Illyricum; and the two other Princes, called *Cæsars*, though independent in their respective governments, being yet considered in the light of juniors, and subordinates, to their respective seniors, or heads.—It was understood all the while that the empire was still one, though divided: Rome being still its grand capital;<sup>1</sup> and the civil edicts of the four Emperors, inscribed with their joint names, received in all the provinces, as promulgated by their mutual councils and authority.<sup>2</sup> Notwithstanding which precautions, however, the result was that the political union of the Roman world was gradually dissolved; and, as Gibbon expresses it, “a principle of division introduced, which, in the course of a few years, occasioned the perpetual separation of the Eastern and Western Empires.”<sup>3</sup> In effect,—and almost as if in preparation for its eighth or last headship,—that which was Rome’s empire proper now began to separate from those Greek Provinces east-ward, which it had *temporarily* annexed to itself:—just like the fourth Wild Beast of Daniel, its representative; of which, though it was said to have subdued the third Wild Beast its predecessor, yet a view was presented to the Prophet, with especial reference to its last or ten-horned state, pointedly separate from that third beast, and distinct.<sup>4</sup>

It is this *quadripartite* or *bipartite* diademed headship then, which, on the strong grounds above-stated, I regard as the Dragon’s *seventh* head.<sup>5</sup> Nor can I help observing, ere I pass from the subject, on the admirable, though only indeed habitual, precision of the Apocalyptic prophecy: which in a point that *Commentators* (many of much learning) have overlooked, deceived by the continuance of the old imperial *name* to the new headship or government, did

<sup>1</sup> “Soon after this [viz. Diocletian’s triumph, A.D. 303] the Emperors ceased to vanquish, and Rome ceased to be the capital of the empire.” Gib. ii. 157.

<sup>2</sup> See my Note<sup>5</sup>, p. 55 *suprà*.

<sup>3</sup> See on this subject Gibbon v. 138, 161, 372, &c.

<sup>4</sup> Dan. vii. 12.

<sup>5</sup> The singularity of the *succession* may be noted as among the peculiar features of this *seventh* Headship: the *Cæsars*,—themselves chosen by the *Augusti*,—succeeding on the demise of the latter.

Like Gibbon the Abbé de la Bletterie notes the greatness of the change; as cited in Duncombe’s Julian, i. 171:—“Diocletian should be considered as the founder of a new empire; which had not, it may be said, anything in common with that which was founded by Augustus, but the name.”

yet not overlook the change: and showed that it did not, by affixing to the Dragon's seven Heads, (the type alike of heathen Rome's seven hills and seven ruling heads,) precisely that one distinctive badge which best, if not alone, might have marked it;—the badge, not of the *crown*, but the *diadem*.<sup>1</sup>

Having satisfied ourselves on this *seventh* governing head of Pagan Rome, all will be found easy of solution,—and indeed, as before said, almost explained to us by the Apocalypse itself,—in respect of the *wounding to death* of this *seventh* Head, and subsequent rise of an *eighth*. For what were we led to trace, as fulfilled in history, by the symbolic vision of the xiith chapter? It opened with the closing paroxysm of the Roman Dragon's persecution of the Church, under direction of his *seventh* and *diademed* headship: a crisis in which he was figured as already expelled, even as if by force of some secular power friendly to the Woman, from the government of two-thirds of the empire; then, at length, (though not without the intervention of “war in heaven,”) as cast down from the elevation of governing power in it finally, and altogether.<sup>2</sup> So, after four great battles, in which Maximin and Licinius vainly fought the battle of Heathenism,<sup>3</sup> and then yet another struggle under Julian, the last heathen head of the Roman Empire was wounded and struck down.—But *life* yet awhile lingered in the old Paganism, though cast down; and hope, that prompted strenuous efforts, as we have seen, again to regain ascendancy.<sup>4</sup> Specially its spirit lingered

<sup>1</sup> The *diadem* having at the time depicted in the vision become the badge of the *imperium*, or sovereignty, it might properly, according to received usage, be used to signify the seven preceding constitutional forms of sovereignty in the Roman State. I may illustrate from what Eekhel, i. 253, observes on the diadems in the Syracusan medals of Gelo and Hiero, struck by the Syracusans in honour of them, long after their deaths. They (Gelo and Hiero) did not indeed wear diadems. But the Syracusans depicted them as kings by the *then* common badges of *kings*. So again in the coins of the Calpurnian and Marcian gentes, and for the same reason, Numa and Ancus are depicted each with a diadem, “quo ceruè uterque rex usus nunquam fuit.”

<sup>2</sup> See pp. 20—23 and 29—31 *suprà*.

<sup>3</sup> That of the Milvian Bridge in the suburbs of Rome, in which Constantine vanquished Maxentius; that which ended in Licinius' victory over Maximin; and Constantine's two victorious battles, in his second and last war with Licinius.

<sup>4</sup> So Gibbon v. 105. As long as their sacrifices continued, he says, “the Pagans fondly cherished the secret hope, that an auspicious revolution, a second Julian, might again restore the altars of the gods.”

round *the seven hills of Rome*, the locality so long consecrated to it; and which the Christian government, in a manner very remarkable, had instantly on its formation forsaken, as if one that it could not associate with, for another seat and throne.<sup>1</sup> There, I say, it still lingered even to the time of Theodosius; though weaker and fainter continually from the *repeated strokes* given it (to use Gibbon's most illustrative language<sup>2</sup>) by the Christian Emperors. And in spite of a petition addressed to Theodosius in the name of *ROME personified*, pleading its long glory, grandeur, and victories, as connected with the ancient *Pagan* worship, and praying for at least toleration to it in Rome,<sup>3</sup>—the pious Emperor rejected the suit: and by a decisive edict, suppressive of its *sacrifices* as well as *temples*, inflicted "*a deadly wound*" on surviving Paganism, in the empire generally, and above all in the capital. As if the better to mark the formal deposition of the idolatrous animating spirit of the old *seventh draconic Head* from all authority in Rome, we read that "in a full meeting of the senate the Emperor proposed, according to the forms of the republic, whether the worship of *Jupiter*, or that of *Christ*, should be the religion of the Romans;" and

<sup>1</sup> First for *Constantinople*, the seat of Constantine and his successors in the East. After the division of the empire, the Western Emperors made their capital first at *Milan*, then under Honorius at *Ravenna*. The fact well deserves observation.—On Diocletian's triumph, A.D. 303, ten years only before the establishment of Christianity in the Roman empire, Gibbon observes in a passage quoted partially by me at p. 126; "It was the last triumph Rome ever beheld. Soon after this the emperors ceased to vanquish, and Rome ceased to be the capital of the empire." Gib. ii. 157.

<sup>2</sup> Ib. v. 119: "The *violent and repeated strokes* of the orthodox princes were broken by the soft and yielding substance against which they were directed: and the ready obedience of the Pagans protected them from the pains and penalties of the Theodosian Code."—These were strokes by *the sword of civil justice*: as in a law of the Theodosian Code ascribed to Constantius, "*Gladio sternatur*." Gib. iii. 408. See my Vol. i. pp. 155, 246.—Compare Apoc. xiii. 14.

<sup>3</sup> Perhaps in this Gibbon followed Baronius, iv. 742: "Quo religionis affectu idololatriam sepius, *ut percussum multis ictibus anguem*, caput rursus extollemem, penitus extingendam curavit Theodosius."—Compare Julius Maternus, a Christian writer about the middle of the fourth century; "*Amputanda sunt hæc, sacratissimi Imperatores, penitus, atque delenda, severissimis edictorum vestrorum legibus*." And again; "*Licet adhuc in quibusdam regionibus idololatriæ morientia palpitent membra*, tamen in eo res est, ut à Christianis omnibus terris pestiferum hoc malum funditus *amputetur*." ap. Lardner iv. 170.

"*ROME* herself, the celestial genius that presided over the fates of the city, is introduced by the orator to plead her own cause before the tribunal of the emperors. . . Since I do not repent, permit me to continue in the practice of my ancient rites. . . This religion has reduced the world under my laws." Gib. v. 98.

that "on a regular division Jupiter was *condemned and degraded* by a large majority."<sup>1</sup>—I spoke of the "*deadly wound*" inflicted by Theodosius: and my readers, while marking the inverted commas that enclose the phrase, will have thought perhaps that it was not without reason that I so applied the *Apocalyptic* language of metaphor. But in fact the quotation, though *Apocalyptic*, was not made by me *primarily* from the *Apocalypse*: but from him whose unconscious destiny it has been to furnish, times almost without number, its best illustrations,—the infidel *Gibbon*.<sup>2</sup>

Thus did Paganism, the animating spirit of the seven heads of old Rome and its empire, wounded unto death, expire.—Nor must I omit to add that, as if to mark the excision of Rome itself in its character of the old Imperial capital, it too was struck down by the sword of the Gothic and Herulian conquerors: so as not merely to have its Pagano-religious, but even its political and civic life annihilated; its head as it were decollated, and wounded to death.<sup>3</sup>—And was there then in the old seven-hilled locality, so fondly and so long cherished by the Dragon,<sup>4</sup> that whereby, as a new principle of life and power, he might yet again, *though still all subserviently to himself*, attach supremacy to it over the now newly rising Romano-Gothic kingdoms all around? that wherewith, to use the *Apocalyptic* metaphor, he might heal the deadly wound given by the Christian sword, and make the Roman Beast live again? Even so. It is to the Historian of the Decline and Fall that I again refer for an answer. "Like Thebes, Babylon, or Carthage," he says,<sup>5</sup> "the name of Rome might have been erased from the earth, if the city had not been animated by a *vital principle*, which again restored her to *honour and dominion*." And then he mentions, as this *vital principle*, the tradition that two Jewish teachers, a tent-

<sup>1</sup> Gibb. ib. 100.

<sup>2</sup> Ib. p. 116; "The last Edict of Theodosius inflicted a *deadly wound* on the superstition of the Pagans."

<sup>3</sup> So Jerome, on Alaric's first threatening Rome, wrote "*Roma vitam auro redimit*:" and again, on Rome's capture, spoke of the "*Romani Imperii caput truncatum*:" (see my p. 393, Vol. i. Note <sup>1</sup>): i. e. the empire left a headless trunk.

The *civic* extinction, however, of the old capital was only completed by Totilas. See my Note <sup>1</sup> p. 131.

<sup>4</sup> Tertullian De Spectac. 7, speaks of Rome as the "*urbis in qua demoniorum conventus consedit*."

<sup>5</sup> Gibbon, viii. 161—171.

maker and a fisherman, had formerly been executed at Rome in the circus of Nero:—that, after 500 years, their genuine or fictitious relics were adored as the palladium of *Christian Rome*; and their holy shrines, guarded by miracles and invisible terrors, resorted to by pilgrims from the East and West:—that about this time the *Bishoprick of Rome* was filled by one of living energy, the first and greatest of the Gregorys, one well fitted to turn to account the miraculous sanctity and superstitions of the spot:—that, besides a temporary exercise of the local sovereignty of Rome, the inroads of his episcopal authority into Greece, Gaul, and Spain, (as well as Italy,) might well countenance the more lofty pretensions of succeeding Popes:—in short, that thus the *Bishops of Rome* began to be a new *Head* of empire to it; and that in the rise of *Papal* superstition to supremacy, the deadly wound of its last *Pagan* ruling Head was healed.<sup>1</sup>

Such is Gibbon's account of the revival of the Imperial City of the seven hills; and of the new principle of life and empire, and the new Head, under which this revival was accomplished. Corroborating testimonies to the same fact will occur in what remains of this Chapter, and in the next. From which testimonies it will also appear that the Papal Headship *began* to show itself *earlier* than Pope Gregory, indeed contemporarily with the establishment of the Romano-Gothic kingdoms:<sup>2</sup> also that, after their kings' universal adhesion to it, it *continued* thenceforth their *only* Head; and this in the distinct character of ANTICHRIST.—For the present I shall content myself with citing the agreeing testimony of two learned Pontifical writers of the middle age, *Augustin Steuchus* and *Flavio Blondus*. *Augus-*

<sup>1</sup> Hence, let me again observe, as before at p. 115, a proof of the Beast's heads' double significancy. Had the Beast's heads symbolized Rome's seven hills, *simply and alone*, so as some critics would have it, how could we explain the wounding to death, and revival, of one of those heads? On the other hand, in the *second* sense of the symbol, all is appropriate in the figure; and the accordance of historic fact with it palpable and perfect.

<sup>2</sup> Similarly writes Niebuhr, Vol. i. p. 189. (Ed. Hare and Thirwall.) After noticing Rome's desolation by Totilas, he speaks of its then "becoming the capital of a *spiritual* empire; which, after the lapse of twelve centuries, we have seen interrupted in our days." This is after a notice of the celebrated augury as to the 12 sceles period of old Rome's destined duration, founded on Romulus' reported vision of the 12 vultures: which, at 100 years the scele, would have ended A.D. 416; at 110 years, (the E. rusean mode of reckoning, and which Niebuhr prefers,) A.D. 566.

*tin Steuchus* thus writes; "The empire having been overthrown, unless God had raised up the *Pontificate*, Rome, resuscitated and restored by none, would have become uninhabitable, and been a most foul habitation thenceforward of cattle.<sup>1</sup> But in the *Pontificate* it revived as with a *second birth*: its empire being in magnitude indeed not equal to the old one, but in kind not very dissimilar; because all nations, from East and from West, venerate the Pope not otherwise than they before obeyed the Emperors."<sup>2</sup> The other, *Blondus*; "The Princes of the world now adore and worship, as *Perpetual Dictator*, the successor not of Cæsar but of the Fisherman Peter: that is, the *Supreme Pontiff*, the *substitute* of the afore-mentioned *Emperor*."<sup>3</sup>

But was not this new head a *Christian* head? And, if such, how came it to be depicted as a head of what appeared in vision as a *θηριον* or Wild Beast;—and this a Wild Beast which, according to the sacred prophecy, was the represent-

<sup>1</sup> Procopius says that Totilas the Goth had determined to make Rome a place for flocks and herds: Marcellinus, in his Chronicon, that for 40 days after Totilas' desertion of it, no men, but only beasts, stopt within its precincts.—In illustration I cannot but refer the reader to a most graphic description of Rome as left in ruins by the Goth Totilas, and supposed to have been visited by Belisarius, given in Dr. Miley's *Rome Pagan and Papal*, i. 263, &c., and ii. 193—196.

<sup>2</sup> "Everso Imperio, nisi Deus Pontificatum restituisset, futurum erat ut Roma, à nullo excitata et restituta, inhabitabilis post hæc, fœdissima boum et pecorum futura esset habitatio. At in Pontificatu, etsi non illa veteris Imperii magnitudo, specie certè non longè dissimilis reuata est; quia gentes omnes, ab ortu et occasu, haud secus Pontificem Romanum venerantur quàm olim Imperatoribus parebant."

<sup>3</sup> "Dictatorem perpetuum, non Cæsaris sed *piscatoris Petri successorem*, et Imperatoris prædicti vicarium, Pontificem summum Principes orbis adorant et colunt." *Roma Instaurata*, Lib. iii.—Both this and the former extract are quoted by *Vitringa*, p. 785; borrowing, he says, from Larenus. They are also given by *Daubuz*, p. 568.—*Steuchus* was Librarian to the Pope: *Flavio Blondus* an Antiquary of the xvth century; from whose *Roma Instaurata* Bellarmin, says *Vitringa*, has often quoted.

It may be interesting to compare what *Blondus* and *Steuchus* say, not merely with the prophecy itself, but also with what the ancient Father *Hippolytus* (referred to already at p. 74) gathered from sacred Prophecy respecting the expected Antichrist, as restorer of Rome.

Τουτο σημαίνει ότι κατά τον Αυγουστου νομον, αφ' ου και η βασιλεια Ῥωμαιων συνεστη, οὕτω και αυτος κλεισει και διαταξει απαντα επικυρων, δια τουτου δοξαν εαυτω πλειονα περιποιουμενος. Τουτο γαρ εστι το θηριον το τεταρτον ου επληγη η κεφαλη και εθεραπευθη, δια το καταλυθηναι αυτην, και ατιμασθηναι, και εις δεκα διαδηματα αναλυθηναι. Ος τότε πανουργος ων ὡσπερ θεραπεισει αυτην, και ανανοσει. . . . Ενεργησει γαρ, και ισχυσει, δια τον ἵπ' αυτου ὀριζομενον νομον. De Antichristo § 49. Thus it was *Hippolytus*' inference from the Apocalyptic prophecy that *Antichrist* would *revive Rome and its empire in some new form*, even as *Augustus* remodelled and fresh founded it; and this by means of some new law or constitution, which, while revivifying Rome, was to bring glory to himself:—an inference singularly accordant with the historical statements respecting the Pope's restoration of the Roman empire given above.

ative and chosen delegate of the Dragon? The prophetic answer to this question is thus given; "He," the 5th head, is "*one of the seven*;" i. e. (as in similar expressions elsewhere,) <sup>1</sup> one similar in spirit and character with the seven previous heads:—professedly indeed Christian, but essentially heathen; professedly gentle as a lamb, but really cruel against Christ's saints as the Dragon. This has already appeared too clearly in the history of the Witnesses; and will appear yet more fully as we enter on its own history in my next Chapter.

But first I have to explain the *ten Horns*, conformably with the above-given explanation of the Beast's last Head; the Head which doubtless bore them.<sup>2</sup>

### § 2.—THE TEN HORNS OF THE BEAST.

It is of course a necessary preliminary to our enumeration of *ten kingdoms answering to the ten horns of the Beast* that we satisfy ourselves *geographically* as to the *extent of Roman territory* on which,—and *chronologically* as to the *time* at which,—such kingdoms ought to be sought. It is chiefly from adapting their several lists to more or less of the fullest territorial extent of the old Roman world,<sup>3</sup> and to epochs earlier or later in the prolonged period of the flux and reflux of the Gothic waters over it,<sup>4</sup> that interpreters, agreed on the main principles of their exposition, have yet in their lists more or less differed from each other. That there should have been the large measure of agreement which there has been between them, can scarce have arisen from anything else but the notoriety, and more or less prolonged fixedness, of most of the kingdoms.

With regard then to the *first* point, it seems reasonable to me that we should seek the ten kingdoms on the *territory*

<sup>1</sup> So 1 John ii. 19: "They went out from us, because they *were not of us*;" *οκ εξ ημων*; also 2 Tim. iii. 6; "*Of this sort* are they which creep into houses," &c.; *εκ τωτων εισιν*. This, I doubt not, is the true explanation of the Apocalyptic phrase. I had once thought it might mean simply one of the seven depicted in the vision. But in such a view there would have been no point. In what I now give there is much. (5th Ed.)

<sup>2</sup> So too, I see, Hengstenberg, ii. 10.

<sup>3</sup> E. g. *Eberhard*, Bishop of Salzburg, at the Diet of Ratisbon, in his list of ten Barbarian invaders included those of the Eastern as well as Western Empire.

<sup>4</sup> Thus *Sir I. Newton's* is made, incipiently, with reference to the year 406, *Mede's* to 456 that of *Dr. Allix* to 486, *Bishop Newton's* to the 8th century, &c.

not of the whole Roman empire, but of *the Western only*. For the separation of the Roman world into Eastern and Western,—a separation first sketched out, and prepared, by Diocletian's formation of the Beast's seventh Head, and one by which the latter division came alone to be attached *ultimately* to the Capital of the seven hills,<sup>1</sup>—I say this separation and division was effectually carried out in the interval between the first wounding of the seventh head, and the rise of the eighth or Papal. Further, it was over this part only of the Roman world that the Gothic flood swept away the old Imperial Government, and made room for new kingdoms to arise: and, yet again, over this part only that the authority of the eighth or Papal Head was properly or permanently established.—I would therefore beg the Reader to trace on the Map the frontier line of the Western empire as drawn by Gibbon:<sup>2</sup> beginning north from the wall of Antoninus that separated England from Scotland; then following the Rhine up to its point of nearest proximity to the Danube-source, i. e. half-way between Strasburg and Basle; thence down the Danube to Belgrade;<sup>3</sup> and thence in a Southern course to Dyrrachium, and across the Adriatic and Mediterranean to the Syrtis Major and the great Desert of Africa. It is to be understood that all to the *Eastward* of this line belonged to the *Constantinopolitan* or *Greek* division of the Empire; all *Westward*,—including England, France, Spain, the African Province, Italy, and the countries between the Alps and the Rhine, Danube and Save, anciently known under the names of Rhætia, Noricum, and Pannonia, in modern times as Switzerland, half Swabia, Bavaria, Austria, and the Western part of Hungary,—to the *Western* or *Roman* division.—This it is with which alone we have to do at present.

As to *time*, it seems to me that the list of kingdoms should be made with reference to some period subsequent (only not long subsequent) to the completion of the number

<sup>1</sup> See Note <sup>1</sup> p. 126, and Note <sup>1</sup> p. 128.—I say *ultimately*: because Rome was still considered *theoretically* and *constitutionally* the capital of the whole empire under the Diocletianic regime. I beg my reader to mark this. So p. 126.

<sup>2</sup> See my Map, Vol. i. p. 366, or rather that prefixed to Gibbon's 1st volume.

<sup>3</sup> Respecting these two rivers Ambrose thus remarks in his *Hexameron*, ii. 12; "*Danubius barbarorum atque Romanorum intersecans populos, donec ponto ipse cundatur; Ithenus memorandus adversus feras gentes murus Imperii.*"



ten on the platform of the Western Empire: and, in regard at least of *Daniel's* vision, prior of course to that eradication of three of them predicted by him.<sup>1</sup> Such seems marked as the intended epoch by the circumstance of the prefigurative vision *at its commencing point* exhibiting the Beast emerging from the flood,—not with three or four horns only at the first, and then with the rest rising on it afterwards,—but already with the ten.—It may perhaps be well to observe further, that the conditions of the vision seem to require that the constituency or character of each of the ten kingdoms should be *Romano-Gothic*:—I use the term *Gothic generically*, and as inclusive of all the kindred barbarian invaders. For the ten horns all rose with the Beast *from out of the inundating flood, or sea*, spoken of, and as its product.<sup>2</sup>

If these points be granted me,—and I think they will commend themselves to the Reader as reasonable and proper,—the period within which to seek the kingdoms, and form the enumeration in question, will be reduced within narrow limits. Even prior to any minute investigation it will be obviously inconsistent with the requirements of the vision to antedate the list before the extinction of the Western empire, A. D. 476, by Odoacer; for it was then first that a Barbaric Horn established its rule in the central Province of Italy. Again it seems also hardly consistent to post-date the list near a century after Odoacer; and to include the *Greek* Exarchate of Ravenna, then at length formed,<sup>3</sup> as one of the ten *primary* horns of the *Romano-Gothic* Beast. In fact the irruption of the Greek imperial army among the Gothic horns, A. D. 533, whence the Exarchate arose, and striking down two of them, the Vandal and the Ostrogothic, in Africa and Italy, appears to me to form almost as marked a chronological limit on the one side, as

<sup>1</sup> On the eradication of the three horns see my notice in the next chapter.

<sup>2</sup> "The waters on which the woman sitteth." Apoc. xvii. The reader will remember what has been said at p. 64 of the earth swallowing up the flood.

In Nebuchadnezzar's vision of the great Image, a similar origin and constitution seems ascribed to each and all of the ten toes; as being all alike a mixture of clay and iron.

<sup>3</sup> Sir I. Newton indeed dates the establishment of the Ravennese Greek horn, or kingdom, from the time of the Emperor Honorius first making it his capital. But his usual sagacity here, I think, forsook him. Could the Roman kingdom of Honorius be considered one arising from the Gothic flood?

the establishment of Odoacer's Italic kingdom on the other. Between the two there lies but the interval of 57 years. And I think there presents itself in the history of the *Franks* that which yet further narrows the interval for investigation. For they,—the most noted afterwards, and perhaps most important of all the nations of the West,—could scarce be said to have formed a horn on the territory of the Western empire, until in 486, emerging from their Batavian island,<sup>1</sup> they had under Clovis conquered Syagrius, the so-called “King of the Romans;”<sup>2</sup> who was then the ruling chief of the natives and barbarians of Soissons and its neighbourhood.—On the whole, after consideration of all the circumstances of the case, I conclude to prefer the terminating point of this 57 years' interval, i. e. A.D. 532<sup>v</sup> or 533, as the chronological epoch at which to make my enumeration; my preference having regard to certain notable characteristics of that epoch that will be mentioned afterwards. At the same time a list of ten kingdoms may be made with reference to the commencing point of the interval, i. e. A.D. 486—490. And, as being that which may best prepare the Reader for understanding the state of things to which *what I conceive to be the true list* refers, I shall present this first; and with a brief explanatory comment.

From about the year 486 then, to 490, the following were the then existing Barbaric kingdoms, formed by the invaders within the limits of the Western empire: *Anglo-Saxons, Franks, Allemans, Burgundians, Visigoths, Suevi, Vandals, Heruli, Bavarians, Ostrogoths*; ten in all.—First the *Anglo-Saxons*, having in 449 invaded Britain, were at the time spoken of “fiercely struggling,” to use Gibbon's language, “with the natives for its possession.”<sup>3</sup> The various Principalities formed by them, as their conquests proceeded, were at length completed in the year 582 into the Saxon Heptarchy; Principalities so connected with, and subordinated to, the strongest for the time being, that they might be considered, as Camden says,<sup>4</sup> and often

<sup>1</sup> “The narrow limits of his kingdom were confined to the island of the Batavians, with the ancient dioceses, (*civil dioceses*, see the Note p. 22.) of Tournay and Arras.” Gibbon vi. 310.

<sup>2</sup> Gib. vi. 313.

<sup>3</sup> vi. 403.

<sup>4</sup> “After they had fixed in Britain they divided it into seven kingdoms, and made

in fact have been,<sup>1</sup> in the light in which I doubt not the Apocalyptic prophecy views them of a *monarchy*;—the germ of what, with reference to its later history the same prophecy afterwards calls *the tenth of the great Papal Civitas, or state*.<sup>2</sup>—Secondly, the *Franks* had now, as just a little while since observed, advanced their kingdom under Clovis from the Belgic province to the country between Soissons and Paris, the germ of the future kingdom of *France*.<sup>3</sup>—Thirdly, the *Allemanni*, with Metz as their capital, occupied both sides the Rhine; from German Switzerland in the South, to the confines of the French Netherlands.<sup>4</sup>—Fourth, and to the south of Allemanni, came the *Burgundians*, under their king Gundobald; holding the Duchy of Burgundy, French Switzerland, Savoy, and Southern France within the Rhone.<sup>5</sup>—Fifthly, the *Visigoths* (whose victorious king *Euric* was now recently dead) had at this time an empire that included the South-Western half of France, between the Loire, Rhone, and Pyrenees,<sup>6</sup> (thus touching the Franks of Clovis on the one side, and the Burgundians on the other,) and also all Spain except Galicia:—which latter

it a *Heptarchy*. But, even in that, he who was most powerful was (as Bede has observed) styled *King of the English nation*; so that in the very *Heptarchy* there seems to have been a sort of *monarchy*." Camden's Brit. i. 88. (Lond. 1772.)—The reference is to Bede, Eccl. Hist. ii. C. 5; who specifies seven kings thus predominant, as *Bretwaldas*: the first *Ella* of Sussex, a contemporary of Odoacer; the third *Edelbert*, King of Kent at the time of Augustine's mission from Pope Gregory I, and the conversion of Saxon Britain.—The principality of *Wessez*, under which in King Egbert's reign (A.D. 800) all the seven kingdoms finally coalesced, had not just yet been founded, I should observe, in 490.

<sup>1</sup> Says Sismondi, Hist. of the Fall of the Roman Empire, ii. 181; "The seven kingdoms of the Saxon Heptarchy formed to some intents but one single political body:" and "whenever one of the seven kings was acknowledged as chief of the Heptarchy, a *Witenagemote*, or assembly of the wise men of the seven kingdoms, was convened to deliberate on the interests of the whole confederate body." And so again Hallam, Mid. Ages, ii. 376; who suggests that the supremacy of the supreme chief was probably marked by payment of tribute to him. Of *Edelbert* Fuller thus speaks, to the same effect, in his Church Hist. i. 84: "At this time [A.D. 596] Ethelbert was in effect monarch of England; . . . all the rest of the Saxon kings being homagers to him."

Gibbon, vi. 385, observes that the reign of those seven kings whom Bede has enumerated as having successively acquired in the Heptarchy an indefinite supremacy of power and renown, "was the effect not of law but of conquest." But this does not affect the fact of that supremacy, and consequent oneness for the time of the seven kingdoms under it.

<sup>2</sup> See my Vol. ii. p. 472.—I have noted the *Saxons* first of the ten kingdoms as being most northerly; but their Heptarchy was in fact completed latest of all, and so formed the *tenth* kingdom in order of time. <sup>3</sup> Gibb. vi. 314. <sup>4</sup> Ib. 315.

<sup>5</sup> Ib. v. 359, vi. 324: or Müller, Hist. Univ. xi. 3.

<sup>6</sup> Ib. vi. 205—208; 308—310. *Euric* died in 485 A.D; leaving the kingdom to his young son Alaric.

province, sixthly, was held, together with most of that which is now Portugal, by the *Suevi*.<sup>1</sup>—Seventh came the *Vandals*, holding the African province, from the Gibraltar Straits to the Syrtes, together with the Italian islands of Sicily, Sardinia, Corsica.<sup>2</sup>—Eighth, the kingdom of *Odoacer* and the *Heruli* embraced Italy, and extended Northward beyond the Alps into Noricum and the Tyrol.<sup>3</sup>—Ninth, the kingdom of *Bavaria* was formed just about this time:—a kingdom unnoticed by former Commentators; but of which continuous notices occur subsequently in European history, from Theodoric to Charlemagne and the middle ages.<sup>4</sup>—And tenth and last came the *Ostrogoths* of Pannonia;<sup>5</sup>—the same that immediately afterwards were destined to migrate into, and to conquer, the fairer Italian kingdom then held by the Heruli.—Thus was the vast circle of the Western empire then occupied and filled.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Gib. vi. 206.

<sup>2</sup> Ib. v. 205.—With reference to the islands let me add the contemporary testimony of *Victor Vitensis*, in the B. P. M. viii. 676; stating that *Genserik* had the islands Sicily, Sardinia, Corsica, Majorca, and Minorca under his rule; but that he allowed *Odoacer* to occupy the first (Sicily) *tributario jure*, as a tributary. <sup>3</sup> Gib. vi. 234.

<sup>4</sup> The learned Jesuit *Gordon* in his *Opus Chronologicum* has the following notice on the year 511; “Moritur Theodon, primus Bavarie rex.” And so too *Moreri*, Art. *Baviere*; who dates Theodon's accession A.D. 504. Later research has discovered an earlier king, *Aldeger*, who reigned till 508, when Theodon succeeded, him. (See my Plate.) Now, allowing a mean length of duration to his reign, we may date it before 493, the epoch of *Odoacer's* overthrow by Theodoric. Some make it a son-in-law of *Clovis* who thus first held the sovereignty of *Bavaria*, about the end of the 5th century.

The kingdom is noticed by *Gibbon* under Theodoric's reign, vii. 23, as forming one of the boundaries of the *Ostrogothic* kingdom; “He reduced . . . the unprofitable countries of *Rhætia*, *Noricum*, *Dalmatia*, and *Pannonia*, from the source of the *Danube* and the territory of the *Bavarians* :” and he refers as authority to the *Count de Buat's Hist. des Peuples Anciens*.

Subsequent notices of it need hardly be quoted, its existence being afterwards a matter of historical notoriety. I will only therefore adduce two from *Gibbon* and from *Müller*, referring to the end of the 6th century:—viz. *Gib.* viii. 147; “The *Lombard* kingdom extended East, North, and West, as far as the confines of the *Avars*, the *Bavarians*, and the *Franks* of *Austrasia* and *Burgundy* :” and *Müller*, B. xi. c. 2; “The *Bavarians* (*Bajoaires*) had now (i. e. about the end of the 6th century) given name to *Noricum*.” <sup>5</sup> *Gib.* vii. 2, &c.

<sup>6</sup> The ten that I have enumerated are all at different times noticed by *Gibbon*; and in the following passage they are nearly all united (vi. 272): “During the same period” (i. e. before the end of the 5th century) “Christianity was embraced by almost all the barbarians that established their kingdoms on the ruins of the Western empire; the *Burgundians* in *Gaul*, the *Suevi* in *Spain*, the *Vandals* in *Africa*, the *Ostrogoths* in *Pannonia*, and the (*Herulian*) *Mercenaries* that raised *Odoacer* to the throne of *Italy*.” Besides them *Gibbon* had mentioned the *Visigoths* of *Gaul* and *Spain* just previously. He excepts the *Franks* and *Saxons*, as having up to the time of his allusion, about A.D. 490, still persevered in *Paganism*. So that eight out of our ten are embraced by him in this enumeration; that is, all except the *Alamanni* and *Bavarians*: who moreover are noticed by him contemporarily, as we have seen, elsewhere. See too his notice on the subject *ib.* 403.

I beg further to refer the reader to *Sir I. Newton's Treatise on Daniel*, for an

I next take the æra which I regard as the one *primarily* meant in our prophecy, of A.D. 532, or 533, just before Belisarius' invasion of Africa. Now in the half-century elapsed from the date to which my former list referred, the following changes had occurred.<sup>1</sup>—1. In *Britain* the Anglo-Saxons had advanced their conquests, and multiplied their Principalities: among them having now founded that of *Wessex*, under which all afterwards united.<sup>2</sup> 2. In *Gaul* Clovis and his Franks had first conquered and incorporated with his kingdom the Allemanni, (thereupon, A.D. 496, embracing orthodox Christianity, and becoming thus the *eldest* son of the Roman-Catholic Church,) <sup>3</sup> then had defeated and made partially dependent on him the Burgundians, then reduced the Visigothic kingdom in France to the narrow strip of Septimania; thus extending his territory to limits not very unlike those of modern France. After which he dying, and at his death, A.D. 514,<sup>4</sup> his kingdom thus enlarged having been divided into four, with the respective capitals Metz, Orleans, Paris, Soissons,<sup>5</sup> and, on occasion of a joint conquest of Burgundy, one of their four Princes having fallen,<sup>6</sup> and *his* territories been divided among the three survivors,—the number of Ganlick kingdoms became the same as at the epoch of our former examination; and there were now again *three* kingdoms, only of Frank domination, occupying much the same territory respectively as the *Burgundian*,<sup>7</sup> *Allemanic*, and earlier *Frank* Principalities of A.D. 490.—3. In *Spain*, *Portugal*, and *Africa*, no change had occurred. The former two were still ruled by the Visigoths and Suevi, the latter by the Vandals.<sup>8</sup>—4.

elaborate digest of historical and chronological information respecting these kingdoms, or at least most of them: indeed one that is somewhat confusing by the multitude of its details. Gibbon is much clearer.

<sup>1</sup> See generally for authority Gibbon and Sir I. Newton ubi suprâ; also Keightley's convenient Outlines of History, in Lardner's Cabinet Encyclopædia.

<sup>2</sup> Founded A.D. 495. Egbert, A.D. 800, was king of Wessex.

<sup>3</sup> Gibbon vi. 317, Mosheim v. 1. 1. 5.—Clovis too fixed the royal seat at *Paris*, where it has continued ever since.

<sup>4</sup> So Gordon from Baronius: others date it 511.

<sup>5</sup> *Ib.*

<sup>6</sup> *Clodomir* of Orleans was killed A.D. 528; his kingdom divided A.D. 533, or probably before. The other three were *Childebert* at *Paris*, *Clothaire* at Soissons, *Theodoric* at Metz. Gordon.

<sup>7</sup> "Its own laws and usages however remained to it (Burgundy); and its existence as a distinct nation." Müller xi. 3.—About 560 it revolted from the Franks: and, after a temporary reunion under *Clothaire*, and afterwards under *Charlemagne*, again became independent 879 A.D. *Ib.* 113.

<sup>8</sup> The Vandals still also held *Sardinia* and *Corsica*. Gib. vii. 28. *Sicily* they had

But in *Italy* there had been a revolution. The Ostrogoths from Pannonia under Theodoric had in 490 invaded Italy; and after three years of war conquered Odoacer, and established over it an Ostrogothic, in place of the Herulian kingdom: an empire extending from Sicily to Pannonia inclusive; and which continued thus great till Theodoric's death in 526.<sup>1</sup>—5. *Bavaria* was still an adjoining independent kingdom.<sup>2</sup>—6. On occasion of Theodoric's death the Ostrogothic kingdom (though still continued in Italy) having receded from its former extension into the Province of Pannonia, and thus made way for its formal cession that same year, 526, by the Greek emperor to the *Lombards*, these latter had begun a bloody and long-protracted war to reduce the Gepidæ that contested the province with them:<sup>3</sup>

given up in 495 to Theodoric: (Gordon:) and as an independency; not, as to Odoacer, *tributario jure*. See Eunodius' Letter to Theodoric, B. P. M. ix. 374: "Quibus (*Fandalis*) pro annua pensione satis est amicitia tua."

Huneric, the successor to Genseric in the Vandal African kingdom, banished the faithful Trinitarian Bishops of that country to *Sardinia*, as a province of his kingdom, early in the viith century. See my Vol. ii. p. 223.

<sup>1</sup> "His domestic alliances (a wife, two daughters, a sister, and a niece) united the family of Theodoric with the kings of the Franks, the Burgundians, the Visigoths, the Vandals, and the Thuringians; and contributed to maintain the harmony, or at least the balance, of the great *Republic of the West*." So Gibbon, vii. 21. Again: "He reduced under a strong and regular government the unprofitable countries of Rætia, Noricum, Dalmatia, and Pannonia; from the source of the Danube and territory of the Bavarians, to the petty kingdom erected by the Gepidæ on the ruins of Sirmium." vii. 23. A passage partially cited before.

<sup>2</sup> See Note <sup>4</sup> to p. 137.—A very few years after the epoch I am describing, the *Bavarians*, as well as *Burgundians* and *Allemanni*, were temporarily subjected to the Franks. Gib. vi. 341.—Advancing some two and a half centuries onward, we read (Müller xiii. 4) that on Duke Thassilo of *Bavaria* refusing to acknowledge Charlemagne's supremacy, he was overthrown by Charlemagne, and his territories annexed to the great Carolingian empire. Not very long before Charlemagne's death (which occurred in 814) he assigned Italy, *Bavaria*, and Pannonia, as one-third of his empire, to Pepin his second son; who, however, died before his father. And in the middle of the 9th century *Bavaria* was the chief seat of the empire of Charlemagne's grandson Louis of Germany. Sismondi ii. 95, 122, 123; Müller xiv. 13.

<sup>3</sup> For a brief sketch of the Lombards' establishment on Roman territory, their previous history, and first exploits there, see Gibbon vii. 274.—Sir I. Newton (on Daniel) makes the Lombards to have been in *Pannonia* as early as the reign of Odoacer; for he speaks of their migrating under their king Gudehoc (a contemporary of Odoacer) from *Pannonia* into Rugiland on the north of the Danube; and then returning into *Pannonia*, A.D. 526, under king Audoin. Dr. Allix too, in his list of Gothic kingdoms, corresponding with the year 486, inserts the *Lombards*. But I know not on what authority. *Paul Warnefrid* is evidently the ancient authority from whom Sir I. Newton chiefly draws his facts; and he says nothing about *Pannonia*: save only that, after Odoacer's return to Italy from an expedition made by him into Pannonia, in which he overthrew and slew the Rugian king, and so left that kingdom open to invasion, the Lombards, "de suis regionibus egressi," entered and occupied Rugiland for some years; then, under their 7th king Tato, "egressi de Rugiland habitaverunt in campis patentibus, qui sermone barbarico *feld* appellantur." After which, under their 9th king Audoin, father to Alboin, they cross the Danube into Pannonia, and there after overthrow of the Gepidæ, established themselves, with the emperor Justinian's

—therein preparing themselves (as it may be well to observe in passing) for the yet more distinguished part that they were to act, ere the close of the 6th century, in the conquest of the greater part of Italy.—Thus, in fine, there existed at the epoch of A.D. 532 the following ten kingdoms on the platform of the Western Roman Empire; viz. the *Anglo-Saxons*, the *Franks of Central, Alleman-Franks of Eastern*, and<sup>1</sup> *Burgundic-Franks of South-Eastern France*, the *Visigoths*, the *Suevi*, the *Vandals*, the *Ostrogoths in Italy*, the *Bavarians*, and the *Lombards*:—still ten in all. The most important difference between this and the former list is that there the *Heruli* had place among the ten, here the *Lombards*: the latter being numerically, though not as yet geographically, in the stead of the former.

Such then is the list, to which I conceive the sacred prophecy primarily to have had respect: a general *Papal* connexion of the kingdoms, as will soon be shown, having then begun, which at a little later epoch (my *secondary* epoch) had its completion. I may observe that I have drawn up both this list and the former entirely for myself from historic records, not consulting prophetic Commentators on the subject. And the great coincidence that they exhibit with such of the lists of others as have reference to the same period, or nearly the same,<sup>1</sup> may add to

sanction; (A.D. 527, Gordon;) shortly before Belisarius' famous expedition against, and overthrow of, the Vandals in Africa. Hist. Longobard. B. P. M. xiii. 164.

<sup>1</sup> That of Dr. Allix, drawn up to suit the same year 486 as my first list, precisely agrees with mine, with but one exception; viz. that he, instead of the *Bavarians*, specifies the *Lombards*: for whose existence however as a nation at that early date, *within the limits of the ancient empire*, I can find, as observed in the preceding Note, no authority.

With regard to other authors of eminent name, *Machiavel*, with reference to the time of the Eastern Emperor Zeno's reign, from 475 to 490, enumerates the Ostrogoths, Visigoths, Sueses, Alans, Vandals, Franks, Burgundians, Heruli, Anglo-Saxons, Gepidæ: \*—*Bossuet*, on Apoc. xvii. 12, the Goths, Vandals, Huns, Franks, Burgundians, Sueses, Alans, Heruli, Lombards, Allemans, Saxons; of whom the Huns were gone ere

\* In my English Ed. (London, 1675) p. 3, we read thus: "Zeno, governing in Constantinople, commanded the whole empire of the East. The Ostrogoths commanded Mæsia; the Visigoths Pannonia; the Suevi and Alani Gascoigne and Spain; the Vandals Africa; the Franci and Burgundi France; the Heruli and Turingi Italy:" the first clause of which, as is evident, alike from notorious history and from the context, is a mistranslation, or misprint, for "The Ostrogoths commanded in Mæsia and Pannonia; the Visigoths, Sueses, &c." This appears from the previous context as well as history, (though the mistaken version has been given by Bps. Chandler and Newton:) where also the Angli or Anglo-Saxons are mentioned; and the Gepidæ as in Pannonia just afterwards. Mr. C. Maitland (Apost. School, p. 445) strangely says that Machiavel only specifies *five* kingdoms as in the Western Empire!

the Reader's confidence that they are fairly taken.—No doubt at intermediate times between 486 and 533 lists might be made of contemporarily existing kingdoms on the territory of the Western empire, exhibiting one or two more than the number ten, or one or two short. But I think it may be said that *ten*, rather than any other, was about that time the characteristic number.<sup>1</sup> And, as Sir I. Newton says at the close of his Chapter on the subject, (I must beg my readers to mark this,) “whatever was their number afterwards, as some of those kingdoms at length fell, and new ones arose, they are still [in the prophecy] called the ten kings from their first number.”<sup>2</sup> Indeed it is to be observed that not only did a thus divided form continue for

the Lombards came:—*Mede*, p. 661, with reference to the year 456, the Britons, Saxons, Franks, Burgundians, Visigoths, Sueves, Vandals, Allemans, Ostrogoths, and Greeks;—*Sir I. Newton*, the Vandals, Suevi, Visigoths, Alans in Gaul, Burgundians, Franks, Britons, Huns, Lombards, Greeks of Ravenna:—*Bishop Newton*, on Dan. vii., the Britons, Saxons, Franks, Visigoths in Spain, Burgundians, Allemans, Huns, Lombards, Greeks of Ravenna, and Dukes of Rome.—*Machiavel* dates the *Lombards'* entrance into Pannonia as under Alboin, or about 526 or 527 A.D., as I do.

The reader will find it interesting to compare *Jerome's* list, given at the time of the first irruption of the Goths into Italy, A.D. 409: “*Quadus, Vandalus, Sarmata, Italiani, Gepides, Heruli, Sazones, Burgundiones, Alemanni, et hostes Pannonii.*” (See my Vol. i. p. 393 Note 1.)—Also that of *Berengaud*, the Apocalyptic commentator of the 9th century. “*Quarta Bestia*,” (i. e. of Daniel,) “per quam Romani designati sunt, decem cornua habuisse describitur, per que ea regna quæ Romanum imperium destruxerunt designata sunt; sicut S. Hieronymus, quorundam assertionem sequens, exponit. Eandem itaque significationem habent decem cornua in Apocalypsi hoc loco: significant quippe ea regna per que Romanum imperium destructum est. Partem namque Asiæ per se primum abstulerunt *Persæ*,\* postea vero *Saraceni* totam subegerunt: *Vandali* Africam sibi vindicaverunt. *Gothi* Hispaniam, *Lombardi* Italiam, *Burgundiones* Galliam, *Franci* Germaniam, *Hunni* Pannoniam, *Alani* autem et *Suevi* multa loca depopulati sunt, quæ eorum subjacebant ditioni.” Ad Apoc. xvii. 12.

<sup>1</sup> The expositors of the Futurist school call attention to the partial difference of the lists: a difference arising in part from the greater or less geographical extent assigned to the Empire; (for some add an invader or two of the *Eastern* Empire;) in part from the difference of æra to which the lists refer.—But they seem to me to require an exactitude of fulfilment, and universal consent of interpreters about it, which on such subjects the parallel prophecies of Scripture show to be unreasonable. Might they not as well deny that the great horn of the he-goat of Daniel viii. meant Alexander the Great, though the Angel asserts as much: because of this horn appearing broken into four; and that expositors might enumerate more or fewer kingdoms than four, as those into which Alexander's kingdom broke up, by referring to different æras? Indeed Dr. Todd has elaborately argued that point. The reply is that it is the four most notable horns that Daniel intends.

It will have been observed that *Romish* writers of eminence, as well as *Protestant*, note *ten* as the number of the early Romano-Gothic kingdoms; e. g. Machiavelli and Bossuet. So also in modern times, Bishop Walmesley, writing under the name of Pastorini; p. 134.

<sup>2</sup> As the apostles are still called the twelve, John xx. 24, 1 Cor. xv. 5, though at the time referred to reduced by Judas' defection to eleven. “It is used here popularly,” says Alford on 1 Cor. xv. 5, “as *decemviri*, and other like expressions, though the number was not full.” So too Whitby, &c.

\* So Bossuet (on Apoc. xvii. 12) supplies the word, wanting here in some copies.



ages afterward to characterize the great commonwealth (if we may so call it) of Western Christendom, but the *decuple* number of kingdoms seemed to continue in a manner their standard numeral type. At certain long subsequent epochs of note, notwithstanding many intervening revolutions and changes in Western Europe, the number *ten* will be found to have been observed on from time to time, as that of the Western Roman or Papal kingdoms. So Gibbon, with reference to the 12th century; <sup>1</sup> Daubuz to the time of the Reformation; <sup>2</sup> Whiston to the commencement of the 18th century; <sup>3</sup> and finally Cuninghame to the regal governments at the last great political settlement of Europe, A.D. 1815.<sup>4</sup>

And now I have to advert to that very remarkable symbol of the *diadems* seen by St. John on the Beast's *ten horns* in the Apocalyptic vision; and its wonderful fulfilment in the history of those Romano-Gothic kingdoms of the 6th century which we suppose the horns to have prefigured. Its general appropriateness, though hitherto altogether unnoticed by Apocalyptic expositors, might yet well have suggested itself to the prophetic student, if at all an attentive reader of Gibbon, or other elaborate and accurate historians of the æra under review; inasmuch as *the diadem*, which from the opening of the 4th century had constituted the most characteristic badge of the Roman Emperors, and as such, we have seen, been exhibited prophetically in the Draconic vision,<sup>5</sup> is spoken of incidentally by those historians as the badge assumed and worn in the sixth century by one and another of the Romano-Gothic sovereigns of our list.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Speaking of Roger, first king of Italy, A.D. 1130, Gibbon, x. 310, thus writes: "The *nine kings* of the Latin world might disclaim their *new* associate, unless he were consecrated by the authority of the Supreme Pontiff:"—the nine kings enumerated by him being those of France, England, Scotland, Castile, Arragon, Navarre, Sweden, Denmark, Hungary.—Vitringa, p. 788, gives France, Spain, Germany, England, Scotland, Denmark, Sweden, Hungary, Bohemia, Poland, for A.D. 1100.

<sup>2</sup> p. 557.\*

<sup>3</sup> pp. 265, 266. (2nd Edit.)

<sup>4</sup> p. 144, viz. "Austria, Bavaria, England, France, Naples, Netherlands, Portugal, Sardinia, Spain, Wurtemberg."

<sup>5</sup> See p. 15; also the illustrative article and medals in my Appendix to this Volume.

<sup>6</sup> Of *Odoacer* Gibbon writes (vi. 226); "*Odoacer abstained*, during his whole reign, from the use of the purple and *diadem*:" and of *Theodoric* too, (vii. 27,) that, "from

\* Daubuz, *ibid.* compares the ten Apocalyptic kings to the *ten Canaanitish kings* that occupied the land till dispossessed by the arrival of the Lord's people Israel.

But a much fuller, as well as more interesting, illustration of it may be given (and this to the eye) from the Romano-Gothic coinage of the period. Indeed these illustrations furnish evidence of the exact truth of the Apocalyptic pre-figurations, and divine prescience of Him who revealed them to his servant in Patmos, such as fills my mind with wonder.

It is to be understood then, as I must here observe preliminarily, that the barbarian Gothic kings,<sup>1</sup> after their first conquests, were generally anxious to receive appointment from the Roman emperor, (the *Western* emperor first, while there was one, the *Eastern* afterwards,) as *Master-Generals*, *Patricians*, or *Consuls* of the empire:—the appointment to either of the two former being equivalent to that of Vice-roy: and most useful to them not otherwise only,<sup>2</sup> but above all in order to legitimatize their government in the eyes of their Roman subjects; who, in respect of number, immensely exceeded the barbarian population that had conquered them.<sup>3</sup> So e. g. after the extinction of the Western empire, (not to advert to earlier exemplifications,) the Herulian, Frank, and Ostrogothic chiefs, Odoacer, Clovis, and Theodoric, from the Byzantine emperors. In the negotiations and treaties on which matter it was usually stipulated by the Roman emperors, and agreed to by the barbaric kings, that the bust and names of the former, with the distinctive imperial badge of the *diadem*, should be stamped on the barbarian coinage, (at least on their gold coins,) not the Gothic princes' own.<sup>4</sup> Hence, and yet more because in every case it was notorious that such a stamp

a tender regard to the expiring prejudices of Rome, he declined the name, purple, and *diadem* of the emperors;” though “he had his own image on his coins, and assumed the whole substance and plenitude of imperial prerogative.”—But of *Clovis*, king of the *Franks*, he says (vi. 338); “On that solemn day” (the day of his inauguration into the Roman consulship, A.D. 510), “placing a *diadem* on his head, Clovis was invested . . . with a purple tunic and mantle.” And so too (ix. 152), of the Frank *Pepin's* coronation, two or three centuries after, by Pope Boniface.—Again of the son of *Leovigild*, Visigothic king of *Spain*, A.D. 577, Gibbon writes (vi. 296); “His eldest son *Hermenegild* was invested by his father with the royal *diadem* :” also (ix. 473), with reference to *Roderic*, the last of the Visigothic line, A.D. 711, just before the battle of *Xeres*; “*Alaric* would have blushed at the sight of his unworthy successor, sustaining on his head a *diadem of pearls*.”—In the middle age the word *diadem* was used in a less proper sense of the imperial crown, when different in form from the old Roman Augustan diadem.

<sup>1</sup> I here use the word *Gothic* generically.

<sup>2</sup> Ere the fall of the Western Empire the prowess of *Ætius*, representative of the emperor in Gaul, showed that the Roman power had still force there to injure foes, and assist friends. See Gibbon vi. 94. Justinian's expeditions against the African Vandals, the Ostrogoths in Italy, and Visigoths in Spain, proved the same in regard of the Byzantine emperor. <sup>3</sup> See Procopius, as cited p. 144. <sup>4</sup> Gibbon vi. 339, 340.

had by long custom become all but essential, in order to the coin being regarded and received by the inhabitants as of legal currency, there resulted a *semi-Roman* transitional state of the Gothic coinage, as Numismatists call it, for a century more or less, from about 450 A.D. to 550 :<sup>1</sup> the Vandal kings of Africa forming however an exception ; and acting in this respect more independently.<sup>2</sup> At length Clovis the Frank, at the opening of the 6th century, had the plenary sovereignty of Gaul awarded him by the Byzantine Emperor, with title of Consul and Augustus, and the Roman *imperial diadem* as its badge and token :<sup>3</sup> a grant renewed in 532 to Clovis' children, by Justinian, with full power over the coinage ; and engagement that his purely Frank money should have the privilege of currency assured to it, throughout the Roman empire.<sup>4</sup> In the course of the 6th century the Frank king's example in stamping his diademed effigy on the coinage was followed by others of the barbaric Princes ; the Lombards coming last probably, soon after A.D. 600 ; or perhaps the Bavarians. My appended Plate of coins, selected mostly from the British Museum Cabinet, or else copied from the Plates of thoroughly dependable Numismatists, will furnish to the eye a very interesting illustration of the whole subject. I subjoin certain details of explanation in a Note.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> So the accurate Lelewel ; " Numismatique du moyen age ; " Paris, 1835 ; p. 11.

<sup>2</sup> See my Plate, and the explanatory Note, p. 145.

<sup>3</sup> So Gibbon, *ibid.* as cited by me in the Note, p. 143. Also Maimbourg, *Hist. d'Arrianisme* : " L'Empereur Anastase . . . luy envoya les marques de Consul et de Patrice, avec le *diademe imperial*, tissu d'or et couvert de perles, que Clovis reçut en ceremonie. . . Depuis ce tems-là on donna toujours au roi le titre d'*Auguste*." This was A.D. 510, subsequently to Clovis' return to Tours, after defeating the Visigoths.

<sup>4</sup> So Procopius, B. G. iii. 33 : a passage referred to by Gibbon, *ibid.* ; but which is so interesting to our purpose, that I must, like Mr. Biley, cite it. *Ον γαρ ποτε φωντο Γαλλιας ξυν τῷ ασφαλὲι κεκτησθαι Φραγγοι, μη του αυτοκρατορος το εργον επισφραγισαντος τουτο γε. Και απ' αυτου οι Γερμανων αρχοντες . . . νομισμα χρυσοουν εκ των εν Γαλλοις μεταλλων πεποιηται, ου του Ρωμαιων αυτοκρατορος, ηπερ ειθισται, χαρακτηρα ενθεμενιοι τῷ στατηρι τουτῳ, αλλα την σφετεραν αυτων εικονα. Καιτοι νομισμα μεν αργυρουν ο Περσων βασιλευς η βουλοιοτο ποιειν εωθει χαρακτηρα δε ιδιον εμβαλεισθαι στατηρι τουτῳ ουτε τον αυτων αρχοντα θεμις, ουτε δε αλλον οντινασον βασιλια των παντων βαρβαρων, και ταυτα μαλλον οντα χρυσον κυριον' επει ουδε τοις ξυμβαλλουσι προεισθαι το νομισμα τουτο οιοι τε εισιν, ει και βαρβαρους τους ξυμβαλλοντας ειναι ξυμβαυι. (i. e. I suppose, that not even the Persian king's gold coin, stamped with his effigy, was receivable by Roman tax-gatherers from Roman tax-contributors.) Ταυτα μεν ουν τῷδε Φραγγοις εχωρησεν.*

Procopius was a contemporary ; and, for a while, secretary to Belisarius. He brings down his history of Justinian, and his Persian, Vandal, and Gothic wars, to A.D. 553.

<sup>5</sup> In reference to this point, and to the appended Plate of Romano-Gothic medals illustrative of it, let me begin my explanatory remarks with the *Vandal* coinage, as furnishing the earliest illustrations ; thence ascend northward by the *Suevic* and

1

2  
3  
4

5  
6

7

# COINS OF THE TEN ROMANO-GOTHIC KINGS OF THE 6TH AND 7TH CENTURIES DIASEMED.

AD	ROMAN	VANDALS	SURV	VISTI-GOTH	FRANKS	ALLEMANS	BURUNDIANS	AMGLO-SAXONS	OSTRO-GOTH	ROMANS	LOMBARDS	POPES	AD
460	460-476 Theodoric I 472-476 Theodoric II 476-481 Theodoric III 481-486 Theodoric IV 486-493 Theodoric V 493-496 Theodoric VI 496-500 Theodoric VII 500-502 Theodoric VIII 502-506 Theodoric IX 506-511 Theodoric X 511-526 Theodoric XI 526-534 Theodoric XII 534-547 Theodoric XIII 547-567 Theodoric XIV 567-584 Theodoric XV 584-602 Theodoric XVI 602-610 Theodoric XVII 610-615 Theodoric XVIII 615-621 Theodoric XIX 621-628 Theodoric XX 628-635 Theodoric XXI 635-642 Theodoric XXII 642-648 Theodoric XXIII 648-655 Theodoric XXIV 655-661 Theodoric XXV 661-668 Theodoric XXVI 668-675 Theodoric XXVII 675-682 Theodoric XXVIII 682-689 Theodoric XXIX 689-696 Theodoric XXX 696-703 Theodoric XXXI 703-710 Theodoric XXXII 710-717 Theodoric XXXIII 717-724 Theodoric XXXIV 724-731 Theodoric XXXV 731-738 Theodoric XXXVI 738-745 Theodoric XXXVII 745-752 Theodoric XXXVIII 752-759 Theodoric XXXIX 759-766 Theodoric XL 766-773 Theodoric XLI 773-780 Theodoric XLII 780-787 Theodoric XLIII 787-794 Theodoric XLIV 794-801 Theodoric XLV 801-808 Theodoric XLVI 808-815 Theodoric XLVII 815-822 Theodoric XLVIII 822-829 Theodoric XLIX 829-836 Theodoric L 836-843 Theodoric LI 843-850 Theodoric LII 850-857 Theodoric LIII 857-864 Theodoric LIV 864-871 Theodoric LV 871-878 Theodoric LVI 878-885 Theodoric LVII 885-892 Theodoric LVIII 892-899 Theodoric LIX 899-906 Theodoric LX 906-913 Theodoric LXI 913-920 Theodoric LXII 920-927 Theodoric LXIII 927-934 Theodoric LXIV 934-941 Theodoric LXV 941-948 Theodoric LXVI 948-955 Theodoric LXVII 955-962 Theodoric LXVIII 962-969 Theodoric LXIX 969-976 Theodoric LXX 976-983 Theodoric LXXI 983-990 Theodoric LXXII 990-997 Theodoric LXXIII 997-1004 Theodoric LXXIV 1004-1011 Theodoric LXXV 1011-1018 Theodoric LXXVI 1018-1025 Theodoric LXXVII 1025-1032 Theodoric LXXVIII 1032-1039 Theodoric LXXIX 1039-1046 Theodoric LXXX 1046-1053 Theodoric LXXXI 1053-1060 Theodoric LXXXII 1060-1067 Theodoric LXXXIII 1067-1074 Theodoric LXXXIV 1074-1081 Theodoric LXXXV 1081-1088 Theodoric LXXXVI 1088-1095 Theodoric LXXXVII 1095-1102 Theodoric LXXXVIII 1102-1109 Theodoric LXXXIX 1109-1116 Theodoric LXXXX 1116-1123 Theodoric LXXXXI 1123-1130 Theodoric LXXXXII 1130-1137 Theodoric LXXXXIII 1137-1144 Theodoric LXXXXIV 1144-1151 Theodoric LXXXXV 1151-1158 Theodoric LXXXXVI 1158-1165 Theodoric LXXXXVII 1165-1172 Theodoric LXXXXVIII 1172-1179 Theodoric LXXXXIX 1179-1186 Theodoric LXXXXX 1186-1193 Theodoric LXXXXXI 1193-1200 Theodoric LXXXXXII 1200-1207 Theodoric LXXXXXIII 1207-1214 Theodoric LXXXXXIV 1214-1221 Theodoric LXXXXXV 1221-1228 Theodoric LXXXXXVI 1228-1235 Theodoric LXXXXXVII 1235-1242 Theodoric LXXXXXVIII 1242-1249 Theodoric LXXXXXIX 1249-1256 Theodoric LXXXXXX 1256-1263 Theodoric LXXXXXXI 1263-1270 Theodoric LXXXXXXII 1270-1277 Theodoric LXXXXXXIII 1277-1284 Theodoric LXXXXXXIV 1284-1291 Theodoric LXXXXXXV 1291-1298 Theodoric LXXXXXXVI 1298-1305 Theodoric LXXXXXXVII 1305-1312 Theodoric LXXXXXXVIII 1312-1319 Theodoric LXXXXXXIX 1319-1326 Theodoric LXXXXXXX 1326-1333 Theodoric LXXXXXXXI 1333-1340 Theodoric LXXXXXXXII 1340-1347 Theodoric LXXXXXXXIII 1347-1354 Theodoric LXXXXXXXIV 1354-1361 Theodoric LXXXXXXXV 1361-1368 Theodoric LXXXXXXXVI 1368-1375 Theodoric LXXXXXXXVII 1375-1382 Theodoric LXXXXXXXVIII 1382-1389 Theodoric LXXXXXXXIX 1389-1396 Theodoric LXXXXXXXX 1396-1403 Theodoric LXXXXXXXXI 1403-1410 Theodoric LXXXXXXXII 1410-1417 Theodoric LXXXXXXXIII 1417-1424 Theodoric LXXXXXXXIV 1424-1431 Theodoric LXXXXXXXV 1431-1438 Theodoric LXXXXXXXVI 1438-1445 Theodoric LXXXXXXXVII 1445-1452 Theodoric LXXXXXXXVIII 1452-1459 Theodoric LXXXXXXXIX 1459-1466 Theodoric LXXXXXXXX 1466-1473 Theodoric LXXXXXXXXI 1473-1480 Theodoric LXXXXXXXII 1480-1487 Theodoric LXXXXXXXIII 1487-1494 Theodoric LXXXXXXXIV 1494-1501 Theodoric LXXXXXXXV 1501-1508 Theodoric LXXXXXXXVI 1508-1515 Theodoric LXXXXXXXVII 1515-1522 Theodoric LXXXXXXXVIII 1522-1529 Theodoric LXXXXXXXIX 1529-1536 Theodoric LXXXXXXXX 1536-1543 Theodoric LXXXXXXXXI 1543-1550 Theodoric LXXXXXXXII 1550-1557 Theodoric LXXXXXXXIII 1557-1564 Theodoric LXXXXXXXIV 1564-1571 Theodoric LXXXXXXXV 1571-1578 Theodoric LXXXXXXXVI 1578-1585 Theodoric LXXXXXXXVII 1585-1592 Theodoric LXXXXXXXVIII 1592-1599 Theodoric LXXXXXXXIX 1599-1606 Theodoric LXXXXXXXX 1606-1613 Theodoric LXXXXXXXXI 1613-1620 Theodoric LXXXXXXXII 1620-1627 Theodoric LXXXXXXXIII 1627-1634 Theodoric LXXXXXXXIV 1634-1641 Theodoric LXXXXXXXV 1641-1648 Theodoric LXXXXXXXVI 1648-1655 Theodoric LXXXXXXXVII 1655-1662 Theodoric LXXXXXXXVIII 1662-1669 Theodoric LXXXXXXXIX 1669-1676 Theodoric LXXXXXXXX 1676-1683 Theodoric LXXXXXXXXI 1683-1690 Theodoric LXXXXXXXII 1690-1697 Theodoric LXXXXXXXIII 1697-1704 Theodoric LXXXXXXXIV 1704-1711 Theodoric LXXXXXXXV 1711-1718 Theodoric LXXXXXXXVI 1718-1725 Theodoric LXXXXXXXVII 1725-1732 Theodoric LXXXXXXXVIII 1732-1739 Theodoric LXXXXXXXIX 1739-1746 Theodoric LXXXXXXXX 1746-1753 Theodoric LXXXXXXXXI 1753-1760 Theodoric LXXXXXXXII 1760-1767 Theodoric LXXXXXXXIII 1767-1774 Theodoric LXXXXXXXIV 1774-1781 Theodoric LXXXXXXXV 1781-1788 Theodoric LXXXXXXXVI 1788-1795 Theodoric LXXXXXXXVII 1795-1802 Theodoric LXXXXXXXVIII 1802-1809 Theodoric LXXXXXXXIX 1809-1816 Theodoric LXXXXXXXX 1816-1823 Theodoric LXXXXXXXXI 1823-1830 Theodoric LXXXXXXXII 1830-1837 Theodoric LXXXXXXXIII 1837-1844 Theodoric LXXXXXXXIV 1844-1851 Theodoric LXXXXXXXV 1851-1858 Theodoric LXXXXXXXVI 1858-1865 Theodoric LXXXXXXXVII 1865-1872 Theodoric LXXXXXXXVIII 1872-1879 Theodoric LXXXXXXXIX 1879-1886 Theodoric LXXXXXXXX 1886-1893 Theodoric LXXXXXXXXI 1893-1900 Theodoric LXXXXXXXII 1900-1907 Theodoric LXXXXXXXIII 1907-1914 Theodoric LXXXXXXXIV 1914-1921 Theodoric LXXXXXXXV 1921-1928 Theodoric LXXXXXXXVI 1928-1935 Theodoric LXXXXXXXVII 1935-1942 Theodoric LXXXXXXXVIII 1942-1949 Theodoric LXXXXXXXIX 1949-1956 Theodoric LXXXXXXXX 1956-1963 Theodoric LXXXXXXXXI 1963-1970 Theodoric LXXXXXXXII 1970-1977 Theodoric LXXXXXXXIII 1977-1984 Theodoric LXXXXXXXIV 1984-1991 Theodoric LXXXXXXXV 1991-1998 Theodoric LXXXXXXXVI 1998-2005 Theodoric LXXXXXXXVII 2005-2012 Theodoric LXXXXXXXVIII 2012-2019 Theodoric LXXXXXXXIX 2019-2026 Theodoric LXXXXXXXX 2026-2033 Theodoric LXXXXXXXXI 2033-2040 Theodoric LXXXXXXXII 2040-2047 Theodoric LXXXXXXXIII 2047-2054 Theodoric LXXXXXXXIV 2054-2061 Theodoric LXXXXXXXV 2061-2068 Theodoric LXXXXXXXVI 2068-2075 Theodoric LXXXXXXXVII 2075-2082 Theodoric LXXXXXXXVIII 2082-2089 Theodoric LXXXXXXXIX 2089-2096 Theodoric LXXXXXXXX 2096-2103 Theodoric LXXXXXXXXI 2103-2110 Theodoric LXXXXXXXII 2110-2117 Theodoric LXXXXXXXIII 2117-2124 Theodoric LXXXXXXXIV 2124-2131 Theodoric LXXXXXXXV 2131-2138 Theodoric LXXXXXXXVI 2138-2145 Theodoric LXXXXXXXVII 2145-2152 Theodoric LXXXXXXXVIII 2152-2159 Theodoric LXXXXXXXIX 2159-2166 Theodoric LXXXXXXXX 2166-2173 Theodoric LXXXXXXXXI 2173-2180 Theodoric LXXXXXXXII 2180-2187 Theodoric LXXXXXXXIII 2187-2194 Theodoric LXXXXXXXIV 2194-2201 Theodoric LXXXXXXXV 2201-2208 Theodoric LXXXXXXXVI 2208-2215 Theodoric LXXXXXXXVII 2215-2222 Theodoric LXXXXXXXVIII 2222-2229 Theodoric LXXXXXXXIX 2229-2236 Theodoric LXXXXXXXX 2236-2243 Theodoric LXXXXXXXXI 2243-2250 Theodoric LXXXXXXXII 2250-2257 Theodoric LXXXXXXXIII 2257-2264 Theodoric LXXXXXXXIV 2264-2271 Theodoric LXXXXXXXV 2271-2278 Theodoric LXXXXXXXVI 2278-2285 Theodoric LXXXXXXXVII 2285-2292 Theodoric LXXXXXXXVIII 2292-2299 Theodoric LXXXXXXXIX 2299-2306 Theodoric LXXXXXXXX 2306-2313 Theodoric LXXXXXXXXI 2313-2320 Theodoric LXXXXXXXII 2320-2327 Theodoric LXXXXXXXIII 2327-2334 Theodoric LXXXXXXXIV 2334-2341 Theodoric LXXXXXXXV 2341-2348 Theodoric LXXXXXXXVI 2348-2355 Theodoric LXXXXXXXVII 2355-2362 Theodoric LXXXXXXXVIII 2362-2369 Theodoric LXXXXXXXIX 2369-2376 Theodoric LXXXXXXXX 2376-2383 Theodoric LXXXXXXXXI 2383-2390 Theodoric LXXXXXXXII 2390-2397 Theodoric LXXXXXXXIII 2397-2404 Theodoric LXXXXXXXIV 2404-2411 Theodoric LXXXXXXXV 2411-2418 Theodoric LXXXXXXXVI 2418-2425 Theodoric LXXXXXXXVII 2425-2432 Theodoric LXXXXXXXVIII 2432-2439 Theodoric LXXXXXXXIX 2439-2446 Theodoric LXXXXXXXX 2446-2453 Theodoric LXXXXXXXXI 2453-2460 Theodoric LXXXXXXXII 2460-2467 Theodoric LXXXXXXXIII 2467-2474 Theodoric LXXXXXXXIV 2474-2481 Theodoric LXXXXXXXV 2481-2488 Theodoric LXXXXXXXVI 2488-2495 Theodoric LXXXXXXXVII 2495-2502 Theodoric LXXXXXXXVIII 2502-2509 Theodoric LXXXXXXXIX 2509-2516 Theodoric LXXXXXXXX 2516-2523 Theodoric LXXXXXXXXI 2523-2530 Theodoric LXXXXXXXII 2530-2537 Theodoric LXXXXXXXIII 2537-2544 Theodoric LXXXXXXXIV 2544-2551 Theodoric LXXXXXXXV 2551-2558 Theodoric LXXXXXXXVI 2558-2565 Theodoric LXXXXXXXVII 2565-2572 Theodoric LXXXXXXXVIII 2572-2579 Theodoric LXXXXXXXIX 2579-2586 Theodoric LXXXXXXXX 2586-2593 Theodoric LXXXXXXXXI 2593-2600 Theodoric LXXXXXXXII 2600-2607 Theodoric LXXXXXXXIII 2607-2614 Theodoric LXXXXXXXIV 2614-2621 Theodoric LXXXXXXXV 2621-2628 Theodoric LXXXXXXXVI 2628-2635 Theodoric LXXXXXXXVII 2635-2642 Theodoric LXXXXXXXVIII 2642-2649 Theodoric LXXXXXXXIX 2649-2656 Theodoric LXXXXXXXX 2656-2663 Theodoric LXXXXXXXXI 2663-2670 Theodoric LXXXXXXXII 2670-2677 Theodoric LXXXXXXXIII 2677-2684 Theodoric LXXXXXXXIV 2684-2691 Theodoric LXXXXXXXV 2691-2698 Theodoric LXXXXXXXVI 2698-2705 Theodoric LXXXXXXXVII 2705-2712 Theodoric LXXXXXXXVIII 2712-2719 Theodoric LXXXXXXXIX 2719-2726 Theodoric LXXXXXXXX 2726-2733 Theodoric LXXXXXXXXI 2733-2740 Theodoric LXXXXXXXII 2740-2747 Theodoric LXXXXXXXIII 2747-2754 Theodoric LXXXXXXXIV 2754-2761 Theodoric LXXXXXXXV 2761-2768 Theodoric LXXXXXXXVI 2768-2775 Theodoric LXXXXXXXVII 2775-2782 Theodoric LXXXXXXXVIII 2782-2789 Theodoric LXXXXXXXIX 2789-2796 Theodoric LXXXXXXXX 2796-2803 Theodoric LXXXXXXXXI 2803-2810 Theodoric LXXXXXXXII 2810-2817 Theodoric LXXXXXXXIII 2817-2824 Theodoric LXXXXXXXIV 2824-2831 Theodoric LXXXXXXXV 2831-2838 Theodoric LXXXXXXXVI 2838-2845 Theodoric LXXXXXXXVII 2845-2852 Theodoric LXXXXXXXVIII 2852-2859 Theodoric LXXXXXXXIX 2859-2866 Theodoric LXXXXXXXX 2866-2873 Theodoric LXXXXXXXXI 2873-2880 Theodoric LXXXXXXXII 2880-2887 Theodoric LXXXXXXXIII 2887-2894 Theodoric LXXXXXXXIV 2894-2901 Theodoric LXXXXXXXV 2901-2908 Theodoric LXXXXXXXVI 2908-2915 Theodoric LXXXXXXXVII 2915-2922 Theodoric LXXXXXXXVIII 2922-2929 Theodoric LXXXXXXXIX 2929-2936 Theodoric LXXXXXXXX 2936-2943 Theodoric LXXXXXXXXI 2943-2950 Theodoric LXXXXXXXII 2950-2957 Theodoric LXXXXXXXIII 2957-2964 Theodoric LXXXXXXXIV 2964-2971 Theodoric LXXXXXXXV 2971-2978 Theodoric LXXXXXXXVI 2978-2985 Theodoric LXXXXXXXVII 2985-2992 Theodoric LXXXXXXXVIII 2992-2999 Theodoric LXXXXXXXIX 2999-3006 Theodoric LXXXXXXXX 3006-3013 Theodoric LXXXXXXXXI 3013-3020 Theodoric LXXXXXXXII 3020-3027 Theodoric LXXXXXXXIII 3027-3034 Theodoric LXXXXXXXIV 3034-3041 Theodoric LXXXXXXXV 3041-3048 Theodoric LXXXXXXXVI 3048-3055 Theodoric LXXXXXXXVII 3055-3062 Theodoric LXXXXXXXVIII 3062-3069 Theodoric LXXXXXXXIX 3069-3076 Theodoric LXXXXXXXX 3076-3083 Theodoric LXXXXXXXXI 3083-3090 Theodoric LXXXXXXXII 3090-3097 Theodoric LXXXXXXXIII 3097-3104 Theodoric LXXXXXXXIV 3104-3111 Theodoric LXXXXXXXV 3111-3118 Theodoric LXXXXXXXVI 3118-3125 Theodoric LXXXXXXXVII 3125-3132 Theodoric LXXXXXXXVIII 3132-3139 Theodoric LXXXXXXXIX 3139-3146 Theodoric LXXXXXXXX 3146-3153 Theodoric LXXXXXXXXI 3153-3160 Theodoric LXXXXXXXII 3160-3167 Theodoric LXXXXXXXIII 3167-3174 Theodoric LXXXXXXXIV 3174-3181 Theodoric LXXXXXXXV 3181-3188 Theodoric LXXXXXXXVI 3188-3195 Theodoric LXXXXXXXVII 3195-3202 Theodoric LXXXXXXXVIII 3202-3209 Theodoric LXXXXXXXIX 3209-3216 Theodoric LXXXXXXXX 3216-3223 Theodoric LXXXXXXXXI 3223-3230 Theodoric LXXXXXXXII 3230-3237 Theodoric LXXXXXXXIII 3237-3244 Theodoric LXXXXXXXIV 3244-3251 Theodoric LXXXXXXXV 3251-3258 Theodoric LXXXXXXXVI 3258-3265 Theodoric LXXXXXXXVII 3265-3272 Theodoric LXXXXXXXVIII 3272-3279 Theodoric LXXXXXXXIX 3279-3286 Theodoric LXXXXXXXX 3286-3293 Theodoric LXXXXXXXXI 3293-3300 Theodoric LXXXXXXXII 3300-3307 Theodoric LXXXXXXXIII 3307-3314 Theodoric LXXXXXXXIV 3314-3321 Theodoric LXXXXXXXV 3321-3328 Theodoric LXXXXXXXVI 3328-3335 Theodoric LXXXXXXXVII 3335-3342 Theodoric LXXXXXXXVIII 3342-3349 Theodoric LXXXXXXXIX 3349-3356 Theodoric LXXXXXXXX 3356-3363 Theodoric LXXXXXXXXI 3363-3370 Theodoric LXXXXXXXII 3370-3377 Theodoric LXXXXXXXIII 3377-3384 Theodoric LXXXXXXXIV 3384-3391 Theodoric LXXXXXXXV 3391-3398 Theodoric LXXXXXXXVI 3398-3405 Theodoric LXXXXXXXVII 3405-3412 Theodoric LXXXXXXXVIII 3412-3419 Theodoric LXXXXXXXIX 3419-3426 Theodoric LXXXXXXXX 3426-3433 Theodoric LXXXXXXXXI 3433-3440 Theodoric LXXXXXXXII 3440-3447 Theodoric LXXXXXXXIII 3447-3454 Theodoric LXXXXXXXIV 3454-3461 Theodoric LXXXXXXXV 3461-3468 Theodoric LXXXXXXXVI 3468-3475 Theodoric LXXXXXXXVII 3475-3482 Theodoric LXXXXXXXVIII 3482-3489 Theodoric LXXXXXXXIX 3489-3496 Theodoric LXXXXXXXX 3496-3503 Theodoric LXXXXXXXXI 3503-3510 Theodoric LXXXXXXXII 3510-3517 Theodoric LXXXXXXXIII 3517-3524 Theodoric LXXXXXXXIV 3524-3531 Theodoric LXXXXXXXV 3531-3538 Theodoric LXXXXXXXVI 3538-3545 Theodoric LXXXXXXXVII 3545-3552 Theodoric LXXXXXXXVIII 3552-3559 Theodoric LXXXXXXXIX 3559-3566 Theodoric LXXXXXXXX 3566-3573 Theodoric LXXXXXXXXI 3573-3580 Theodoric LXXXXXXXII 3580-3587 Theodoric LXXXXXXXIII 3587-3594 Theodoric LXXXXXXXIV 3594-3601 Theodoric LXXXXXXXV 3601-3608 Theodoric LXXXXXXXVI 3608-3615 Theodoric LXXXXXXXVII 3615-3622 Theodoric LXXXXXXXVIII 3622-3629 Theodoric LXXXXXXXIX 3629-3636 Theodoric LXXXXXXXX 3636-3643 Theodoric LXXXXXXXXI 3643-3650 Theodoric LXXXXXXXII 3650-3657 Theodoric LXXXXXXXIII 3657-3664 Theodoric LXXXXXXXIV 3664-3671 Theodoric LXXXXXXXV 3671-3678 Theodoric LXXXXXXXVI 3678-3685 Theodoric LXXXXXXXVII 3685-3692 Theodoric LXXXXXXXVIII 3692-3699 Theodoric LXXXXXXXIX 3699-3706 Theodoric LXXXXXXXX 3706-3713 Theodoric LXXXXXXXXI 3713-3720 Theodoric LXXXXXXXII 3720-3727 Theodoric LXXXXXXXIII 3727-3734 Theodoric LXXXXXXXIV 3734-3741 Theodoric LXXXXXXXV 3741-3748 Theodoric LXXXXXXXVI 3748-3755 Theodoric LXXXXXXXVII 3755-3762 Theodoric LXXXXXXXVIII 3762-3769 Theodoric LXXXXXXXIX 3769-3776 Theodoric LXXXXXXXX 3776-3783 Theodoric LXXXXXXXXI 3783-3790 Theodoric LXXXXXXXII 3790-3797 Theodoric LXXXXXXXIII 3797-3804 Theodoric LXXXXXXXIV 3804-3811 Theodoric LXXXXXXXV 3811-3818 Theodoric LXXXXXXXVI 3818-3825 Theodoric LXXXXXXXVII 3825-3832 Theodoric LXXXXXXXVIII 3832-3839 Theodoric LXXXXXXXIX 3839-3846 Theodoric LXXXXXXXX 3846-3853 Theodoric LXXXXXXXXI 3853-3860 Theodoric LXXXXXXXII 3860-3867 Theodoric LXXXXXXXIII 3867-3874 Theodoric LXXXXXXXIV 3874-3881 Theodoric LXXXXXXXV 3881-3888 Theodoric LXXXXXXXVI 3888-3895 Theodoric LXXXXXXXVII 3895-3902 Theodoric LXXXXXXXVIII 3902-3909 Theodoric LXXXXXXXIX 3909-3916 Theodoric LXXXXXXXX 3916-3923 Theodoric LXXXXXXXXI 3923-3930 Theodoric LXXXXXXXII 3930-3937 Theodoric LXXXXXXXIII 3937-3944 Theodoric LXXXXXXXIV 3944-3951 Theodoric LXXXXXXXV 3951-3958 Theodoric LXXXXXXXVI 3958-3965 Theodoric LXXXXXXXVII 3965-3972 Theodoric LXXXXXXXVIII 3972-3979 Theodoric LXXXXXXXIX 3979-3986 Theodoric LXXXXXXXX 3986-3993 Theodoric LXXXXXXXXI 3993-4000 Theodoric LXXXXXXXII												

N.B. In certain of the numbers some have given the date of the coin, generally the contemporary Emperor; in such cases the Emperor's name is marked with an asterisk.

On the whole it appears that at the opening of the 6th century not only did the several Gothic princes exercise in

*Visigothic* kingdoms in Spain and Portugal to the great central *Frankish* kingdom, and its *Allemanic* and *Burgundic* connexions, or divisions; thence to the *Anglo-Saxons* in Britain; and then, returning southward, to the *Ostrogoths*, *Bavarians*, *Lombards*.

1. The **VANDALS**.—After *Geneseric's* death, A.D. 476, the Vandal kings successively were *Hunneric*, 476; *Gunthamund*, 484; *Thrasamund*, 496; *Hilderic*, 523; *Gelimer*, 530: under which last king, A.D. 534, the Vandalic kingdom was recovered to the Roman empire (i. e. the R. empire of the East) by Belisarius. Now of *Geneseric* there are extant coins with a *nameless diademed head* on the obverse; the word *Karthago* on the reverse sufficiently proving the coin to be Vandalic, and the *namelessness of the head* indicating the ruse adopted, in order at once to save his own dignity as a perfectly independent monarch, and to allow of the people regarding it as the Roman emperor's diademed head, if requiring such an effigy as the mark and stamp of legitimate and current coin.\* Of all the subsequent Vandalic kings there are coins, such as in my Plate, *with their own heads diademed*, and their names appended on them; the country having in their times become accustomed to the Vandalic supremacy.

2. The **SUEVI**.—The *Suevi* founded their kingdom in the Western parts of the Spanish peninsula early in the 5th century under *Hermanric*, whose reign was from 409—440. Then followed *Rechila*; and, after him, *Richiarius*, 447—456; then, after two more kings, *Reinmond*, A.D. 463, who is particularized, as having about that time been converted to the Christian, or at least to the Arian, faith. After him a chasm occurs in the Suevic history of some 80 years, till the accession of *Theudemir*, 558—569; whose kingdom is said to have included Portugal, Galicia, and a considerable part of Asturias, and who is celebrated as the first Suevic king converted to the Christian Catholic faith. In 585, sixteen years after *Theudemir's* death, the Suevic kingdom was subdued by *Leovigild*, king of the Visigoths †—The only coin of Suevic kings known to be extant is that of *Richiarius*, given in my Plate; on which, as in the *Transition* period, there appears the *Roman emperor's* effigy diademed. There is this peculiarity in it, that the effigy is that of *Honorius*, who had been dead some twenty or thirty years at the time of *Richiarius's* accession. Having first established themselves in Portugal in the reign of that emperor, it seems that the Suevic kings had continued still to stamp his name and bust on their coins. The BR on the coin seems to me plainly to indicate Braga as the place of coinage. ‡ The legend on the reverse is *Jussu Rehareddi Regis*. (So, on some of *Augustus's* coins, *Jussu Populi Rasche*.)

3. The **VISIGOTHS**.—Of the *Visigothic* kings of Spain, from the famous *Eurie* (462—484), who in the course of the years from 462—472 conquered Spain, to *Roderic*, “the last of the Goths,” who in 713 perished in the battle which gave his kingdom to the Saracens, a list is recorded of 23 kings. Of these *Alaric II.* (484—506), eminent for his translation of the Theodosian Code into the Gothic for the use of his Roman subjects, having been killed in battle by Clovis, and *Amalric* his son also killed in battle, A.D. 531, by Childebert son of Clovis, the Visigothic monarchy became elective. In which elective succession *Leovigild* (572—586), under whom (with his son *Hermenegild* as his associate) the Suevic kingdom was subjugated and incorporated by the Visigoths, and *Reccared* (586—601), under whom Spain adopted the Catholic faith, are celebrated: also, subsequently, *Suintilla* (621—632), under whom the Roman imperialists were expelled from their last possessions in Spain; *Chindeswind*, and his son *Recceswind* (642—672); under whom, and their more eminent successor *Wamba*, (672—680), were held the Councils of Braga and Toledo; councils famous, as having exercised authority in matters of State as well as Church. Of *Leovigild*, *Hermenegild*, *Reccared*, *Chindeswind*, *Wamba*, coins are extant; all (as well as those of *Ervigius* (680—687), *Egica* (687—699), *Roderic* (710—712), *diademed*. Upon these coins very

\* The coin inserted in the Plate to my 4th Ed. as *Geneseric's*, from Cleweil, is now repudiated, as of much later date, on more exact investigation.

† See on the *Suevic* history, and regal succession, the *Mem. Un. Hist.* xix. 377.

‡ Not *Bordeaux*, which I understand has been suggested by some Numismatists; a place far away from the Suevic territory. In sundry Visigothic coins, after *Leovigild's* conquest of the Suevi, *Bracara*, in full, is stamped upon them, as the place of coinage.

their respective dominions the prerogatives of supreme sovereignty, but also that they had generally begun to appropriate to themselves the *Roman diadematic* badge of such

generally, as will be seen, the city where they were struck is noted; whether Seville, Toledo, Cordova, Braga, or Merida.\*

4, 5, 6. THE FRANKS, ALLEMANS, BURGUNDIANS.—On this head two points seem to me to deserve here the special notice of the Apocalyptic student. The 1st is the historical fact that, notwithstanding the subjugation of the *Allemani* by the Franks under Clovis in 496, and that of the *Burgundians* by the later Frank king Clotaire I., in 536, yet, with but a few years' exception, now and then, as under Clotaire I., Clotaire II., and his son Dagobert, the Allemanic and Burgundian dominions almost always after continued to constitute separate kingdoms, through the division of the empire among his sons by any one that might for a while have reigned as sole king of all Frankdom.—The 2nd is that, whereas, previous to 532, the bust of the *Roman emperor, diademed*, was generally on the Frankish coins, (*Clovis* himself however in the later years of his reign forming an exception,)<sup>†</sup> the coinage subsequently to that epoch, whether of the *central* Frank monarchs at Paris, the *Alleman* at the usual Alleman or Austrasian capital Metz, and the *Burgundic*, whether at Chalons sur Saone, at Dijon, at Lyons, or at Geneva, as the then Burgundic regal capital, all alike exhibit the ruling *Frankish* king's own head *diademed*.‡ In my Plate each line is illustrated. In Roret's Encyclop. Numism. p. 1, it is observed that the Merovingian kings' coins were the *son d'or (solidus)*, of 85 grains weight, and in value = 40 deniers (*denarii*) of silver; § its half, and its third part, or *semis* and *triens*: also the *silver denier*, or *saiga*, weighing 21 grains.

7. THE ANGLO-SAXON.—Of the *Anglo-Saxon* kings, the earliest coin extant, I believe, with the specific name of the monarch, is that of *Egbert*, king of Kent, A.D. 664; whose head is on the coin *diademed*: next coins of *Offa*, king of Mercia (A.D. 755—794), also *diademed*. And the same as regards those of *Cocwulf*, a little later. But earlier than Egbert are the coins of which specimens are given in my Plate, the first one of the silver *seattie*, or *chipped* coins, from Ruding's British Coinage, the second from Hawkins, with regal busts *unnamed* but *diademed*; and which are thought to have been a general type of the regal coinage from after the conversion of the Kentish king by Augustin, about A.D. 600, because with the cross, which was *subsequently* introduced. So Hawkins on the British silver coinage: who, when arrived at the coins of Athelstan, A.D. 925—941, makes this remark:—"The heads of former [Anglo-Saxon] kings have generally appeared with a *fillet-formed diadem*. Athelstan appears with a small coronet: even the rudest of his coins having *rays*, or *points*, indicative of *such* a crown."

8. THE OSTROGOTHIS.—Of the Ostrogothic kings of the 6th century, as will be seen, the coins extant are comparatively numerous. The example of *Theodoric*, their first and greatest king (489—526), in respect of his abstaining from the use of the imperial diadem, was *generally* followed by his successors. Thus we have coins of *Theodoric*, as his monogram T II on the reverse shows, (unless indeed it be that of *Theodatus*,) with the diademed heads on the obverse of the contemporary emperors Anastasius or Justin; and the same is the general character of the coins of his successors, *Athalaric*, 526—534; *Theodatus*, 534—536; *Vitiges*, 536—540; *Baduella* (or *Totila*), 541—551; and *Teia*, 552, A.D., the last of the kings of the Ostrogoths. But there are also coins of *Baduella*, *Theodatus*, and others, with *their own heads diademed*. A specimen of each is given in my Plate.

\* See on the Visigothic *history*, the Mod. Un. Hist. *ibid.*; also Gibbon vi. 205; and, on the *medals*, Florez.

† See my statements bearing on this p. 144 *suprà*, with the Notes 3 and 4. Of Clovis the second coin given in my Plate exhibits his own head on the obverse, *diademed*; and on the reverse the very interesting device of a dove dropping the holy oil on him, on his baptism after conversion to Christianity. So M. Rigollot, ap. Encyclopedie Numismatique de Roret (Paris, 1851), p. 411; from the second Plate in the Atlas of which work I have copied the coin. ‡ See on Frankish medals *Conbrouse*.

§ So Gibbon, vi. 340, says that the Frank kings about A.D. 500, imitating the Roman imperial coinage, made 72 *solidi* out of one pound of gold: also that, as the proportionate value of gold and silver was as 1 to 10, the value of the *solidus* was probably 10 shillings; and that it contained 40 *denarii*, or *silver threppences*.

sovereignty; and that about the close of that century (an epoch also had respect to, as I conceive, in the prophecy)<sup>1</sup> their assumption of the diadem, in sign of it, had become general, if not universal.

There remains for consideration the connexion of those ten early barbaric kingdoms and kings with the *Bishops of Rome*, as their *ecclesiastical* and *spiritual Head*; agreeably with the Apocalyptic symbol of the ten horns, sprouting from the Beast's last or Papal Head:—a conjunction of secular power, evidently essential in order to the Popes effectively carrying out their antichristian pretensions. This I propose to illustrate in my next Chapter; after first depicting, as is requisite, three correspondingly successive stages of the Papal Head's own development. For the present Müller's testimony may suffice: who, when summing up his sketch of their early rise, thus observes; "With the exception of a common reverence for *the Roman See*, they had *no point of union*."<sup>2</sup>

## CHAPTER V.

### THE BEAST'S DEVELOPMENT, GROWTH, PRETENSIONS, AND ACTINGS, IN THE CHARACTER OF ANTICHRIST.

*A self-exaltation and pride super-human, super-regal authority, the effective usurpation of Christ's place in the pro-*

9. THE BAVARIANS.—Of these no coin of the two or three centuries under review is known to be extant. But there can be little doubt, I imagine, as to the fact of the Bavarian Kings, or reigning Dukes, having stamped the same *diadematic* sign of sovereignty on their effigies in the coinage as the kings their neighbours. So, in a private letter, M. de Salis: "It is not improbable that some of the more barbarous imitations of Italian or Lombard coins [*diademed*, it will be seen,] belong to countries North of the Alps; e. g. *Bavaria*." In place of coins my Bavarian column gives a list of the kings.

10. THE LOMBARDS.—The early Lombard coins are rare. Barbarous *trientes*, says M. de Salis, may be ascribed to them, that have the name and diademed bust of the Eastern Emperor Mauritius Tiberius, (see Gibb. vi. 140—145,) under whom, late in the 6th century, the Lombards conquered Italy. A little later the Lombard kings stamped their own heads, *diademed*, on the coinage. So one of *Cunipert*, A. D. 686, from the B. M., and others of *Aripert 2* and *Luitbrand* of the dates 701 and 712 respectively, from Zanetti's *Monete d'Italia* Bologna, 1786. These have all the Constantinopolitan device of the Archangel Michael; and legend round it, S. C. S. MICHAEL.

<sup>1</sup> See my Ch. ix. § 2 infra.    <sup>2</sup> B. x. ch. 11. Compare Niebuhr cited p. 130 supra.

\* The current idea of the Lombard kings having from earliest times been crowned with an *iron crown* is erroneous. So Muratori ad ann. 591:—"La dignità regale non fu conferito ad esso Agilolfo se non in Maggio di quest' anno (591) dalla dieta generale de' Lombardi che si raunò in Milano. Chi scrive che egli fu coronato colla *corona ferrea* non è assistito da documento o testimonianza alcuna di antichità."



*fessing Church*,<sup>1</sup> *unparalleled blasphemy as regards God*, and *oppression of his saints*,—such are the chief general characteristics assigned to the *ten-horned Apocalyptic Beast*, or rather to its *eighth Head*; (for we must never forget the Angel's comment,<sup>2</sup> showing that it is *this* that is the grand subject of the description: <sup>3</sup> the *body* being subordinated to, and obeying, and supporting its Head;) and such characteristics I shall now, I doubt not, be enabled to show to have attached, one and all, most fully and strikingly, to the new *sacerdotal Head* of the decem-regal revived Roman Empire; i. e. to the POPES, or BISHOPS OF ROME.

I am led alike by the Apocalyptic description, and by that given in those other prophecies which we saw to have reference to the same power, to exhibit this in a *two-fold* chronological point of view, each of which will furnish matter for a separate Section:—viz. *first*, in its *incipient* development, synchronically with the rise of the ten kingdoms; *secondly*, as *more fully unfolded* afterwards, throughout the remainder of the 1260 years, its destined period of prospering. Very wonderfully the whole Papal system and power arose out of a combined and most palpable perversion of Scripture and historic fact, which gradually but successfully was palmed on the mind of Western Christendom during the period of the Gothic irruptions, and rise and establishment of the Romano-Gothic kingdoms.—The passage of Scripture perverted was that memorable declaration of Jesus Christ to Peter, “Thou art Peter, (*Πετρος*,) and upon this rock (*πετρα*) will I build my Church,<sup>4</sup> and the

<sup>1</sup> Viz. as having the *lamb-like Beast* for his attendant and minister.

<sup>2</sup> So Apoc. xvii. 11; “The *beast* that was and is not, is the *eighth*” *king and head*: also verses 12, 13; “The ten horns are ten kings . . . that shall give their authority and strength to the *beast* :” i. e. evidently to its contemporarily ruling head.

<sup>3</sup> In contrast with the second and smaller *Beast* that had the *lamb-like* horns and covering; of which, as will be afterwards noted, (viz. in Ch. vi.) it is expressly said that it would exercise all its authority *before*, or *in subordination to*, the first and greater *Beast*.

<sup>4</sup> *Σὺ εἶ Πέτρος, καὶ ἐπὶ ταύτῃ τῇ πέτρᾳ ὠκοδομήσω τὴν ἐκκλησίαν μου.* Matt. xvi. 18: a passage in which our English authorized version quite fails to give the alliteration between the *πέτρος* and *πέτρα* in the Greek original. Perhaps we might give its effect by thus paraphrasing; “Thou art by name a *stone from the rock*; and on *this rock* will I build my Church.”

At the same time it should be remembered that in one MS. of good authority, instead of *Σὺ εἶ Πέτρος*, the reading is in contracted form *Σὺ εἶπες*; which would be more naturally a contract for *σὺ εἶπας*, *Thou hast said*, than for *σὺ εἶ Πέτρος*, *Thou art Peter*. And both by Augustine and Jerome this reading of the Greek, and the sense “*Thou hast said*,” is recognized.

gates of hell shall not prevail against it, and I give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven :”—a passage which was now dogmatically expounded,—*not* so as of old, either of Christ himself as the rock,<sup>1</sup> or of the grand truth of Jesus of Nazareth being the promised Christ, and Son of God, as exprest in Peter's noble confession of faith just preceding,<sup>2</sup> or of that apostle's individually assigned honour of being the primary constitutor of the Judæo-Christian Church by the conversion of 3000 Jews through his first sermon on the day of Pentecost, and primary opener of the Church to the Gentiles, on the conversion and admission of the Roman centurion Cornelius,<sup>3</sup>—*but* of St. Peter as the fancied episcopal head of some local line of bishops of the Christian Church,<sup>4</sup> and consequently as including in the dignity of the prerogatives, then assigned to him, each and every one

<sup>1</sup> So Origen on John i. 42, Πέτρον αὐτον κληθῆσθαι εἶπεν, παρωνομασθέντα ἀπο τῆς πέτρας, ἣτις ἐστὶν ὁ Χριστός, cited by Huet in his edition of Origen, Vol. ii. p. 130, Notes. And the same on Matt. xvi. 18; (ib. Vol. i. 275, 276;) where he adds that all true Christians are *Petri*, as all alike drinking from the *πέτρα*, or *rock*, following them.—So too *Augustine* in Matt. xiv. 24. “Hoc ei nomen [*Petrus*] à Domino impositum est; et hoc in cā figurā, ut significaret *Ecclesiam*. Quia enim *Christus* *petra*, *Petrus* populus *Christianus*. *Petra* enim principale nomen est. Ideo *Petrus* à *petrā*, non *petra* à *Petro*: quomodo non à *Christiano* *Christus*, sed à *Christo* *Christianus* vocatur. ‘Tu es ergo,’ inquit, ‘*Petrus*; et super *hanc petram* quam *confessus es*, super *hanc petram* quam *cognovisti*, dicens, *Tu es Christus, Filius Dei vivi*, ædificabo *ecclesiam* meam; id est, *super me ipsum*, *Filium Dei vivi*. Super me ædificabo te; non me super te.’ Serm. lxxvi. 1. And so again Serm. cclxx. 2; and elsewhere. Somewhat curiously one Pope, and that no other than Gregory VII, follows him here: viz. in his versified grant to Rodolph, cited by me p. 143 *suprà*; “*Petra* dedit *Petro*, &c.”

<sup>2</sup> τῆς πέτρας: . . τοῦτεστι τῆς πίστεως τῆς ὁμολογίας. So Chrysostom in loc., and elsewhere, Hom. clxiii.; ἢ ἐπὶ τῷ Πέτρῳ. . . ἀλλ’ ἐπὶ τὴν πίστιν τὴν ἑαυτοῦ. So too Cyril Alex, in Is. xlv., and elsewhere; also Theodoret Ep. 77; Hilary de Trin. vi. 36; “Super *hanc confessionis petram ecclesiæ ædificatio est.*”

<sup>3</sup> So Ambrose Serm. xlvii. (Ed. Basil 1555), De Fide *Petri*: “*Petra* dicitur *Petrus* eo quòd primus in nationibus fidei fundamenta posuerit.” Also *Augustine* in his *Retractations* i. 21. 1; where noticing the explanation cited in my former Note as one which he had very often (sæpissimè) given of it, he adds that he had in *one place*, in earlier days, explained it of Peter himself, after Ambrose. He concludes; “*Harum duarum sententiarum quæ sit probabilior eligat lector.*”—So too many modern expositors, as *Whitby*.

It seems to me very remarkable that immediately after this eulogy of St. Peter, (so explaining the verse,) as a rock on which the Church would be built,—a eulogy following on his true confession of Jesus as *divine* and *the Christ*,—Jesus called him *Satan*, on his deviating from that true confession into a deprecation of his being, what was also essential to his office, a *suffering* Christ. (Matt. xvi. 23, Mark viii. 33.) Was not this like a warning voice to those who, as the supposed inheritors of Peter's episcopacy, and of the promise made to him, wished to attach to themselves all the *Messiah's* predicted divine exaltation and glory; but to shun following him in his self-renunciation, humility, and suffering?

For further information and illustrations on this point see Suicer on *Πετρα*.—The subject came up for disputation early in the Reformation times; as between Eck and Luther at Leipsic. Merle, B. v. c. 5.

<sup>4</sup> As if the very title of *apostle*, or *missionary*, did not of itself seem to preclude the idea of apostles having a fixed local episcopate.

of his episcopal successors in that locality, even to the end of time.—The *historic fact* falsified was that of St. Peter (not Paul) having been the founder, or first apostolic constitutor, of the Church at *Rome*; <sup>1</sup> and consequently of the bishops of that particular locality of *Rome's seven hills* being specifically, exclusively, and for ever the inheritors, in all their full plenitude of meaning, of the prerogatives here supposed to be conferred on Peter. Strange and most unnatural indeed was such an interpretation. But, with all the deceivableness of unrighteousness to help it on, might it not be palmed on men?—So, on his other schemes against Christ's Church failing, we infer from a comparison of prophecy and history that this was the great Deceiver's reserved plan of proceeding. And, "let me but succeed in the plan," it was evidently his secret thought, "and upon this rock I will build to myself a kingdom and church of ANTICHRIST."

§ 1.—INCIPIENT DEVELOPMENT OF THE BEAST'S EIGHTH HEAD, OR THE PAPAL ANTICHRIST, SYNCHRONICALLY WITH THE RISE OF THE TEN KINGDOMS.

The synchronism that I speak of in the heading of this Section was implied in the pictured symbol itself: for it represented the ten horns as attached to the eighth head of the Beast on its very emergence from the flood. Accordingly with which picturing the same synchronism seems too to have been implied by the Angel in the 12th verse of the xvii<sup>th</sup> chapter. For the most obvious and natural translation of the verse, as already shown, is this; "The ten horns are ten kings, that receive their power or authority as kings *at one and the same time* with the Beast."<sup>2</sup> And, if so, then the converse follows that the Beast itself, or that which the Angel identifies with it, its *eighth* or *Papal Head*, would receive its characteristic authority and power synchronically with the ten kings.—Now the Gothic kingdoms began to emerge ere the middle

<sup>1</sup> On this see my Paper in the Appendix.

<sup>2</sup> Εξουσιαν ὡς βασιλεῖς μίαν ὥραν λαμβανουσι μετὰ τοῦ θηρίου See my Notes on pp. 81, 82.

of the fifth century ; and were completed to the number of ten, we have seen, near about the end of that century, or first quarter of the sixth : the last or Lombard kingdom having appeared on the platform of the Western empire in the year 526. So that it is *within this century, from about 430 A.D. to 530*, that I am to show the Roman Papacy to have *incipiently* assumed that principle of *domination over the ten kingdoms of Western Christendom*, as well as of *usurpation of Christ's place in the Church, blasphemy against God, and hostility to God's saints*, by the which it was afterwards more fully characterized.

And to show this it will not, I conceive, suffice to point out how it became in the course of that period an *ecclesiastical Patriarchal power*, supreme in rank and authority (beyond all lawful measure) over the *clergy* of the West. This might have been,—just as with the Constantinopolitan Patriarch in reference to the Eastern clergy,<sup>1</sup>—and yet no domination have resulted to it therefrom over the *kings* and *kingdoms*.<sup>2</sup> It was the *spiritual* authority officially attached to him,<sup>3</sup> which constituted the principle of the Romish Bishop's headship over the kings, as also of his anti-christian usurpation, and blasphemy against the Most High, in after ages :—an authority distinct from, though very mainly upheld by, his *ecclesiastical* power over the *clergy*, as will appear in my next Chapter. And what and whence this *spiritual power*, but from his being supposed to be officially the *representative of the Apostle Peter*, with the *power of the keys* centered by Christ in him : and so, by

<sup>1</sup> In the second General Council, that of *Constantinople*, Canon 5, the Constantinopolitan Patriarch had the *πρεσβεια τιμης*, or honorary precedence, over all the oriental clergy given to him ; in the Council of *Chalcedon* not the *πρεσβεια* only, but also ecclesiastical jurisdiction over the eastern churches. See its Canons 9, 17.

<sup>2</sup> "In ecclesiastical rank and jurisdiction," says Gibbon (ix. 131), with reference to the times of Gregory II, or opening of the 8th century, "the Patriarch of Constantinople and the Pope of Rome were nearly equal. But the Greek Prelate was a domestic slave *under the eye of his master* : " while "a *distant* and dangerous station, amidst the Barbarians of the West, excited the spirit and freedom of the Latin (i. e. Roman) bishops."—Again, with reference to a much later period, we read, in the same historian, that on occasion of the projected union of the Greek and Latin churches, at the Council of Ferrara, A.D. 1438, the Greek Patriarch's scruples about attending are said to have partially yielded to his hope of learning the secret from the Pope, how to deliver himself from his *slavery* (*δουλεια*) to the Greek emperor. See Gib. xii. 98.

<sup>3</sup> It would be well if a distinction were always made between power *spiritual* and power *ecclesiastical*. Even in our own day strange errors have arisen from confusing the two things, which are so different.

speedy consequence, CHRIST'S VICAR upon earth; or, to use St. John's most singularly characteristic appellation, ANTI-CHRIST?<sup>1</sup>

I purpose therefore showing this precise authority to have been even thus early, and within the century named, *claimed by the Roman Bishops,—legitimized by the Roman Emperors,—and, shortly after, recognized and submitted to by the barbarian Western Kings*:—entering thus fully into the subject of its first and early development, both because I deem it very curious and important; and also because Apocalyptic commentators have too often, as it seems to me; neglected this *main* point of inquiry, in their search after points of much lesser moment.<sup>2</sup>

1st, then, the *antichristian vicarial authority* spoken of was the subject, *even thus early, of Papal claims and Papal assumption*.<sup>3</sup>

It is to be understood that the high, supremely high, ecclesiastical rank which attached to the Bishops of the Roman See in the third and fourth centuries, was attached to them chiefly in consequence of *Rome being the imperial city, and capital of the empire*. So a Canon of the Council of Chalcedon, (held A.D. 451,) in retrospective view of the past, expressly declares.<sup>4</sup> But what when that ground-work of their supremacy in rank was destroyed, first by the removal of the imperial seat to Constantinople, on Constan-

<sup>1</sup> See my Vol. i. pp. 64—66, on the word *Antichrist*.

<sup>2</sup> I mean as confining their researches to some particular *Imperial Decree* in the Papal favour, so as Mr. Cuninghame; or, as Bishop Newton, (on Dan. vii.) to the circumstance of the Pope's becoming a *temporal power*.—On the other hand the Waldenses well directed attention to Antichrist's earlier growth, as well as full-grown manhood. See my allusion to their Treatise on Antichrist, Vol. ii. pp. 394—397; and the Treatise itself in M. Monastier.—So the Roman historians were wont to speak of the infancy, youth, manhood, and old age of the Roman empire: (see e. g. Annaeus Florus' Epitome in init.) and the Jewish prophets of the infancy and growth to womanhood of the Jewish nation.

<sup>3</sup> For general corroboration see Gieseler i. § 92.

<sup>4</sup> Canon 28 (Hard. ii. 613); *Και γαρ τῷ θρονῷ τῆς πρεσβυτερας Ῥωμης, δια το βασιλευειν την πολιν εκεινην, οι πατερεις εκοτως αποδειωκασι τα πρεσβεια.*

It was similarly doubtless in view of Rome as the imperial metropolis that the heathen Emperor Aurelian referred the dispute about Paul of Samosata to the Roman and Italian bishops. Euseb. vii. 30.

In *Irenæus'* earlier statement (iii. 3), that it became every church "*convenire ad Romanam ecclesiam, propter potentiorem (or potiozem) principalityatem,*" the *principalitas* meant seems from the context to have been the Roman Church's *prior* and *Apostolic formation*; whence its claim to the respect of the other *Western Churches*.

tine's conversion, and sole supremacy over the whole empire;—an event already alluded to as most remarkable, and by which the old capital of Roman heathenism was left vacant for its destined new occupant:—then next, on the division of the empire into East and West after the death of Theodosius by Honorius' establishment of the Western seat of government at *Ravenna*, instead of *Rome*; and yet more by the Barbarian kings' conquests of Rome, and all the various Provinces of its empire in the West, and establishment thereupon of their several capitals elsewhere? On the old principle, ought not the ecclesiastical precedence thenceforth to attach rather to the Bishops of those new capitals? <sup>1</sup> It was then that the crafty design of Rome's infernal patron and inspirer began to be unfolded: and that its claim to supremacy was fully and boldly put forth by the Popes on the purely *spiritual* grounds to which I have alluded, (grounds doubtless bruited before, but only fitfully, partially, and unsuccessfully,<sup>2</sup>) of its being *the see of the Prince of the Apostles, PETER, on whom the whole Church was built*; not to add, the scene also of his martyr-

<sup>1</sup> In the Canon of the Council of Chalcedon, just quoted from, this principle was in fact applied; and equal privileges voted to the Bishop of *Constantinople* with those of the Bishop of *Rome*, because of Constantinople (or *New Rome*, as it was called) being also *the royal City*. The sentence above quoted is followed by this: *Και τῶ αὐτῶ σκοπῶ κινουμένοι οἱ ῥ' θεοφιλεστάτοι ἐπισκοποὶ τὰ ἴσα πρεσβεία ἀπειμῶν τῶ τῆς νεῆς Ῥώμης ἀγίωτατῶ θρονῶ.* &c.

<sup>2</sup> *Tertullian*, in his *De Pudicitia*, written after he had become a Montanist, speaks of the Roman bishop having styled himself, even thus early, *Pontifex Maximus* and *Episcopus Episcoporum*. For, as Gibbon observes somewhere, "The same ambition animated the spirit of Victor I (A.D. 200) and Paul V (A.D. 1605); the system of ecclesiastical dominion being pursued in every age by the aspiring Bishops of the imperial city." But, so far, very much in vain. *Tertullian* only notices Pope Victor's act and pride, to reprobate it.\*—And *Cyprian*, even though speaking of the Roman See (Ep. 55) as the "*Petri cathedram, atque ecclesiam principalem, unde unitas sacerdotalis exorta est,*" did yet in practice strongly resist Pope Stephen's pretensions to universal authority; and marked his sense of the general independence of other churches, as well as of his own.—A century later similar inconsistency was observable in *Jerome*. In his Epistle 57 to Pope Damasus, about A.D. 375, he states his conviction, that as Christ's Church was founded on the rock of Peter, he who was not in communion with *the Roman See*, which was *Peter's*, would fail of salvation. But later in life, in the Epistles from Bethlehem, he concurred with Paula and Eustochium in urging Marcella to flee from *Rome*, as the city that was doomed to destruction, *the great harlot of the Apocalypse*.

\* "*Pontifex scilicet Maximus, Episcopus episcoporum, dicit, Ego et mæchis et fornicationis delicta pœnitentiâ functis dimitto. O edictum cui adseribi non poterit bonum factum!*" De Pudic. ch. i. On which Rigaltius suggests that the word *Pontifex Maximus* was an appellation sarcastically applied to the Bishop of Rome.

dom, and his burial-place.<sup>1</sup> I append a few documentary extracts in evidence.

First, after Innocent I, and then Boniface I, had in the years 416, 419, 422, A.D. spoken out more privately the mighty pretension,<sup>2</sup> the Legate of Pope Celestine shortly after, viz. in the Council of Ephesus, A.D. 431, proclaimed it publicly before all Christendom:—"It is a thing undoubted that the Apostle PETER received the keys and power of binding and loosing; *which Peter still lives and exercises judgment in his successors, even to this day and always.*"<sup>3</sup>—The same was the style of Pope Leo's Legates in the Council of Chalcedon, some twenty years later; proclaiming him "Head of all churches:" and this evidently because, as the Council itself said, "Peter spoke in Leo."<sup>4</sup> On similar grounds this headship of Christendom and the world was claimed by Leo himself, in his letters and his orations. In a sermon on St. Peter and St. Paul's day he thus express himself before his Roman congregation: "As being *the see of the blessed Peter, thou, Rome, art made the*

<sup>1</sup> This latter point had become too prominent by the end of the 4th century, in Rome's pretensions to sanctity and authority, to be here omitted by me. So *Chrysostom* contra Judæos, 9; *Εν τη βασιλικωτάτη πόλει Ῥώμῃ, πάντα αφιεντες, επι τους ταφους του ἀλιεως και του σκηνοποιου τρεχουσι και βασιλεις, και ὑπατοι, και στρατηγοι.*

<sup>2</sup> "Quis nesciat . . . quod a principe apostolorum Petro Romanæ ecclesiæ traditum est, ac nunc usque custoditur, ab omnibus debere servari (serviri?)." So Innocent to Decentius: after previously writing to the Patriarch of Antioch, where *Peter* was reported to have been first bishop: "Non tam pro civitatis (Antiochenæ) magnificentiâ hoc ei attributum, quàm quòd prima primi Apostoli sedes esse monstretur; . . . quæque urbis Romæ sedi non cederet, nisi quòd illa in transitu meruit, ista susceptum apud se consummatumque gauderet."

"Beatus Petrus cui arx sacerdotii Dominicâ voce concessa est:" "in quo (Petro) universalis ecclesiæ positum legitur fundamentum:" "in quo regimen ejus (sc. universalis ecclesiæ) et summa consistit:" \* "Hanc ergo [viz. Peter's Church] ecclesiis toto orbe diffusis velut caput suorum certum est esse membrorum; à quâ se quisquis abscedit fit Christianæ religionis extorris." So Boniface I to the Thessalian and Illyrian Bishops. Hard. ii. 1121, 1122, 1124.

<sup>3</sup> Ουδενι ἀμφιβολου ἐστι . . . ὅτι ὁ ἅγιος και μακαριωτατος Πητρος, ὁ ἐξαρχος και κεφαλη των αποστολων, ὁ κειν της πιστεως, ὁ θεμελιος της καθολικης εκκλησιας, απο του Κυριου ἡμων Ἰησου Χριστου . . . τας κλεις της βασιλειας εδεξατο' και αυτω δεδοται εξουσια του δεσμειν και λυειν αμαρτιας' ὅστις, ἕως του νυν, και αι, εν τοις αυτου διαδοχοις και ζη και δικασει. Hard. i. 1477. †

<sup>4</sup> Hard. ii. 67, 306. "Beatissimus. . . Papa urbis Romæ, qui est caput omnium ecclesiarum."—"Petrus per Leonem locutus est."

\* He adds about the Nicene Council; "Nicenæ Synodi non aliud præcepta testantur; adeo ut non aliquid super eum [sc. Petrum] ausa sit constituere, cum videret nihil supra meritum suum posse conferri; omnia denique huic noverat sermone concessa." This was A.D. 422.

† A passage referred to by me in my Paulikian argument, Vol. ii. p. 321.

*head of the world*; so as to have even wider rule through divine religion, than by the power of earthly domination.<sup>1</sup> And, in exercise of his so-derived supremacy, when the Council of Chalcedon, spite of the Papal Legates, had in its 28th Canon asserted somewhat inconsistently the equal dignity and privilege of the Constantinopolitan with the Roman Patriarch,<sup>2</sup> Leo indignantly rejected the Canon; declaring (though falsely) that it was a deviation from the earlier Canons of the Nicene Council.<sup>3</sup> He added, moreover,

<sup>1</sup> "Isti sunt qui te ad hanc gloriam provexerunt, ut gens sancta, populus electus, civitas sacerdotalis et regia, per sacram beati Petri sedem caput orbis effecta, latius præsideres religione divinâ quàm dominatione terrenâ:" (Serm. i.):—a passage quoted by Daubuz, 567: and in which mark what is said of the *holy nation*, the *elect people*, and the *city of kings and priests*; as if the Roman See, and people in communion with it, were the fulfilment of what is spoken of in 1 Peter ii. 5, and Apoc. xx. 6.—Contrast too with it what the Apocalypse intimates of *God's elect people*, &c.; alike in the Sealing Vision of Apoc. vii., (see my Vol. i. pp. 282—285, &c.), and in Apoc. xiv. 1, xvii. 14, &c.: also the spiritual Apocalyptic appellation of Rome, as illustrated in my Vol. ii. pp. 442—445.

It deserves observation how, at the very time of the substitution of a new *Papal Head* for the old *Imperial*, the fact of the substitution was thus publicly announced by the Pope himself.—Compare the statements of the two Romish writers quoted by me pp. 130, 131 *suprà*: also that of *Prosper*, Leo's notary: (B. P. M. viii. 106:)

Sedes Roma Petri; quæ, pastoralis honoris  
Facta caput mundo, quidquid non possidet armis  
Religione tenet.

<sup>2</sup> See Notes<sup>4</sup> p. 152 and<sup>1</sup> p. 153 *suprà*.—This Canon, says Harduin, ii. 611. does not appear in the Latin manuscripts! At p. 626 there is the protest of the Papal Legates against it.

<sup>3</sup> "Consensiones vero Episcoporum, sanctorum canonum apud Nicænam conditorum regulis repugnantes, unitâ nobis vestræ fidei pietate, in irritum mittimus, et *per auctoritatem Beati Petri Apostoli*, generali prorsus definitione cassamus." Leonis Epist. 55; quoted by Daubuz, p. 579. So too in Leo's Letter, Har. ii. 688, cited on my next page.

There is much of uncertainty and contradiction on the subject of the Acts of the Nicene Council. See Mosheim, iv. 2. 5. 12. Dean Waddington says, i. 198; "The three written monuments of it were the *Rule of Faith*, a number of *Canons*, and the *Synodical Epistle* addressed to the Churches on its dissolution." Of the Canons (probably twenty in number) the only one bearing on the primacy of Rome, was one in which that of the *Alexandrian Bishop* was paralleled with it. I mean Canon 6. See Har. i. 325.

A specimen of the forgeries palmed on the world under the title of *Acts of the Nicene Council*, may be seen in the Arabic Report of them given in Harduin i. 463 et seq. In which, for example, there occurs the following: "Qui tenet sedem Romæ caput est et princeps omnium Patriarcharum: quandoquidem ipse est primus, sicut Petrus, cui data est potestas in omnes Principes Christianos, et omnes populos eorum; ut qui sit Vicarius Christi Domini Nostri, super cunctos populos et universam ecclesiam Christianam." Ib. Can. 39; p. 469. It is duly given by Malvenda i. 45, (the first in his list of ancient testimonies for the Romish primacy,) as if genuine.

The Papal forgeries, in the Reports of ancient Councils, are treated of by Comber: sometimes a little rashly; e. g. in the case of Justinian's Decree, as will presently appear. Pope Zosimus, A.D. 418, was an early and eminent commencer of the forger's work; palming the Canons of the Sardican Council on the African Churches as Canons of the Council of Nice: for which (the imposture being discovered) his successor Boniface had to submit to cutting reproaches. Gieseler, Vol. i. p. 267.



that he, the Bishop of Rome, was officially "*guardian of the Catholic faith, and of the traditions of the fathers:*"<sup>1</sup> so asserting another principle essential to the development of the Popes as Antichrist; namely that of having in their guardianship certain *unwritten* rules of faith and action independent of, and differing from, God's own *written* rule, of which it had been said that it might neither be added to nor detracted from:<sup>2</sup> and, in fine, that whoever disputed the primacy and authority of the Roman See, as being that rock on which by Christ's own ordinance Christ's universal Church was built, was none other than the Devil or Antichrist.<sup>3</sup>—I pass to Leo's immediate successor in the Roman episcopate, *Hilary*: and find him accepting, as no more than his rightful prerogative, the Tarragonese Bishop's reference to him as officially "*Vicar of Peter*; by whom, forthwith from after the resurrection of Jesus Christ, *the keys of the kingdom* were taken up, and his teaching ordained with a view to *the illumination of all* throughout the world."<sup>4</sup>—Still, with similar assumption, Pope *Gelasius*, Bishop of Rome from 492 to 496, asserted strenuously this Papal prerogative. In a letter to Faustus he wrote; "Things divine are to be learned by the secular Potentates from Bishops, above all from the *Vicar of the blessed Peter*:"<sup>5</sup> in a letter to the Emperor Anastasius; "There are two authorities by which the world is governed, the *Pontifical and the Royal*; the sacerdotal order being that which has charge of the sacraments of life, and from which thou must seek the imparting to thee of salvation.<sup>6</sup> Hence in divine things it becomes Kings to bow the neck to Priests; specially to the Heads of Priests, whom *Christ's own voice*

<sup>1</sup> Harduin ii. 687. Leo's Letter to the Council closes with the words; "Et me, auxiliante Domino nostro, et catholicæ fidei et paternarum traditionum esse custodem."  
<sup>2</sup> Deut. iv. 2, Apoc. xxii. 18, 19.

<sup>3</sup> "Cum ergo universalis ecclesia per illius principalis petreæ adificationem facta sit petra, et primus apostolorum beatissimus Petrus voce Domini audierit, Tu es Petrus, et super hanc petram ædificabo ecclesiam meam, quis est nisi Antichristus, aut Diabolus, qui pulsare audeat inexpugnabilem veritatem?" Ap. Baronium, vi. 235.

<sup>4</sup> Hard. ii. 787; "Susceptis regni clavibus post resurrectionem Salvatoris, per totum orbem beatissimi Petri singularis prædicatio universorum illuminationi prospexit. Cujus Vicarii principatus, sicut enitet, ita metuendus est ab omnibus et amandus."

<sup>5</sup> "Seculi potestas à Pontificibus, et præcipuè à beati Petri Vicario, debet cognoscere quæ divina sunt, non ipsa eadem judicare." Ib. 886.

<sup>6</sup> "Ab eis causas tuæ salutis expetis." Ib. 893.

*has set over the universal Church.*"<sup>1</sup> And yet again, in two immediately consecutive Councils at Rome, held A.D. 494 and 495, which recognised and accepted his words as those of CHRIST'S VICAR: "Not by virtue of Conciliar canons, but *through Christ's own delegation*, saying '*Thou art Peter,*' &c., the Roman See holds the Primacy;<sup>2</sup> and, itself without spot or wrinkle, has authority over the whole Church, for its general superintendence and government:<sup>3</sup> there being excepted from its authority of the keys none living; but only, [in this point almost alone Gelasius fell short of the Papal pretensions of after times,] only the dead."<sup>4</sup> At the former Council he had authoritatively drawn up a list of Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, to be received as Canonical and Divine, (including most of the Apocryphal Scriptures in the list,) as also of sundry patristic writings not to be received; the last with damnation pronounced against their authors:<sup>5</sup> all like Leo, as the supreme arbiter

<sup>1</sup> Ib. In the above I have a little condensed.—One might almost deem Innocent III the speaker. Gelasius excommunicated the Greek Emperor A.D. 494.

<sup>2</sup> Ib. 938. "Sancta . . . Romana ecclesia nullis synodiis constitutis cæteris ecclesiis prælata est; sed evangelicâ voce Domini et Salvatoris nostri primatum obtinuit, *Tu es Petrus* inquitis: . . . Est ergo prima Petri Apostoli sedes Romana ecclesia, non habens maculam, neque rugam, nec aliquid hujusmodi."—See again my notice of similar declarations about the Roman Church in the 5th Lateran Council, in my Vol. ii. p. 442.

<sup>3</sup> "Sedes Apostolica quæ, Christo Domino delegante, totius ecclesie retinet principatum, pro dispensatione curaque generali." Ib. 944.

<sup>4</sup> "Nostro Salvatore B. Petro præ cæteris delegante, *Quæcumque ligaveris*, &c.—sicut his verbis nihil constat exceptum, sic per Apostolicæ dispensationis officium et totum possit generaliter alligari, et totum consequenter absolvi. . . Non nobis poterunt imputare cur prævaricationis offensam  *viventibus* remittamus, quod ecclesie, Deo largiente, possibile est; qui nos etiam  *mortuis* veniam præstare deprecant, quod nobis possibile non esse manifestum est." Ib. 946, 947. This was in the second Council A.D. 495; at the close of which the Bishops assembled shouted, "*Vicarium Christi* te videmus. Dictum sexies."—I unite my notice of it with the former, because its 50 Bishops were probably all, or nearly all, members of the Council of 494.

<sup>5</sup> Ib. 937. The *first* list is headed, "Ordo librorum Veteris Testamenti, quem sancta et Catholica Romana suscipit et veneratur ecclesia; digestus à beato Papâ Gelasio, cum septuaginta Episcopis." This includes the *Apocryphal Books* of Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, Tobit, Esdras, Judith, and the 1st Book of Maccabees. The *second* list gives the Books of the New Testament as still received. In a *third* list are the first four Councils: in a *fourth* the writings of the Fathers; as Cyprian, Gregory Nazianzen, Basil, &c. &c.: and ending; "Cætera, quæ ab hæreticis seu schismaticis conscripta sunt, nullatenus recipit Catholica et Romana ecclesia." A list of about 100 of the *Apocryphal* writings, not to be received, is then subjoined; among which I observe the *Opuscula of Tertullian and Lactantius*, and of the Apocalyptic commentators *Victorinus* and *Tychonius*. All these, with their authors, the concluding clause consigns to eternal damnation: "Cum suis auctoribus, auctorumque sequacibus, indissolubili vinculo in æternum confitemur esse damnata." So early began the Pontifical *Liber expurgatorius*.—Hence Bishop Atto's recognition, some centuries afterwards, of Tychonius and Victorinus as Apocryphal. Dacher. Spicil. i. 414.

and judge in matters of Christian faith.—Let me only add, with reference to Pope *Symmachus*, who held the Pontificate at the opening of the 6th century, that, a Council having been convened at Rome A.D. 501, by King Theodoric's command, to judge of certain charges against him, the Council demurred to entering on the matter, on the ground of incompetency; considering that the person accused was supreme above all ecclesiastical jurisdiction.<sup>1</sup> And a little after, to crown all, another Roman Synod, with *Symmachus* himself presiding and consenting, in the most solemn manner adopted a Book written by *Ennodius*, in defence of the resolutions of the former Synod: in which Book it was asserted, “that *the POPE was JUDGE as GOD'S VICAR, and could himself be judged by no one.*”<sup>2</sup> It was just in accordance with that previous Roman Council, which had shouted in acclamation to *Gelasius*, “We behold in thee *CHRIST'S VICAR.*”<sup>3</sup> A term this sometimes incautiously applied before to Bishops generally, in their own particular restricted spheres of action, and in the character of *Christ's ambassadors*:<sup>4</sup> but now attached to, and assumed by, this one Bishop *distinctively and alone*; with the world itself as his sphere, and in the character of *God's own appointed representative*, as *plenipotentiary Administrator and Judge*. It was a step *per saltum* (I beg my readers well to mark this) mightier than imagination can well follow;

<sup>1</sup> “Scientes” (i. e. the assembled Bishops) “quia ejus sedi primùm Petri apostoli meritum, vel principatus, . . . singularem ei in ecclesiis tradidit potestatem; nec antedictæ sedis antistitem minorum subjacuisse judicîo, &c.” The two first subscriptions to the report of the Synod are thus worded; “*Laurentius episcopus Mediolanensis huic statuto nostro, in quo totam causam Dei judicio commisimus, subscripsi.*” *Hard.* ii. 967, 970. In a 2nd Synod, held the same year, the Prelates wrote back to *Theodoric*; “*Ipsi per canones appellationes omnium episcoporum commissæ sunt: et eum ipse appellat equid faciendum?*” *Ib.* 974.

<sup>2</sup> “*Vice Dei judicare Pontificem,*”—“à nullo mortalium in jus vocari posse docuit” (scil. *Ennodius.*) *Mosh.* vi. 2. 2. 2, 9. The Treatise is given in the *B. P. M.* ix. 375. “*Aliorum forte hominum causas Deus voluerit per homines terminare; sedis istius præselem suo sine questione reservavit arbitrio. Voluit Beati Petri successores cælo tantùm debere innocentiam. . . Tu es Petrus, &c. . . Illi sedi quidquid fidelium est ubique submittitur, dum totius corporis caput esse designatur.*” So p. 380. On its adoption by the Roman Synod in 503, see *Hard.* ii. 983. “*Libellus qui synodali auctoritate ab Ennodio conscriptus est in præsentia omnium legatur. Quo recitata, et ab omnibus consonâ voce comprobato, sancta Synodus dixit, Hæc ab omnibus teneantur, &c.*”

<sup>3</sup> See the end of Note <sup>4</sup> p. 157.

<sup>4</sup> So *Ignatius* (if the passage be genuine) spoke of Bishops as *εις τοπον Θεου*. And *Cyprian*, that every Bishop is within *his own diocese* a priest of God, and a judge appointed in the place of Christ.

by which he vaulted at once from the mere ecclesiastical rank of Patriarch, to that of supremacy over all the kings and potentates of the world.—The haughty assumption was followed up by his next successors.<sup>1</sup> So evidently, says Mosheim, was the foundation laid, even thus early, of the subsequent Papal supremacy. So evidently, I must add, was it laid, alike before kings and people,<sup>2</sup> in Papal pretensions that realized the precise predicted character, and even appellation, of ANTICHRIST.<sup>3</sup>

2. Nor, in the *next* place, was there wanting even thus early a measure of *legal sanction* to these Papal claims: I say *legal*, because the *Imperial* edicts were then the law of the Roman Empire.—A law of the truly Christian emperor Theodosius has been referred to by Ranke,<sup>4</sup> as a primary imperial recognition of the Roman Bishop's Patriarchal pre-eminence: and, we may add, an incautious expression in it about *St. Peter* may have probably had the unintended effect of seeming to support his claims, as the standard and consequently the judge of Christian faith. "It is our pleasure," he wrote in the year 380, "that all the nations governed by us should stedfastly adhere to the religion taught by *St. Peter* to the Romans: that which faithful tradition has preserved, and which is now profest by the Pontiff Damasus." It was added, however, by the Emperor; "And profest also by Peter Bishop of Alexandria, a man of apostolic holiness." In his reference to the Roman Pontiff it was evidently the intention of Theodosius simply

<sup>1</sup> E. g. on an appeal to Pope Boniface the 2nd in 531 from the Bishop of Larissa in Thessaly, address to him as *Universal Patriarch*, \* Boniface accepts that title as but his due: and in a Roman Council, gathered on the occasion, has recited, and adopts, sundry previous Papal letters of jurisdiction in Illyricum; as, first, those of the 1st Boniface, given p. 154 *supra*;) founding the Papal right of intervention, both there and elsewhere, on Peter's universal charge over the Church. Hard. ii. 1111, 1118, &c.

<sup>2</sup> "Theodoric was not ignorant of the dignity and importance of the Roman Pontiff: . . . a Bishop who claimed such ample dominion in heaven and earth; who had been declared in a numerous Synod to be pure from all sin, and exempt from all judgment." Gib. vii. 37.

<sup>3</sup> Ennodius elsewhere calls the Pope *our Christ*: "Sufferre non possumus vana in CHRISTUM nostrum et blasphema ructantes:" i. e. *Antichrist* in the *second* sense of the word; as an *opposing, usurping Christ*. Elsewhere, writing to Pope Symmachus, he says; "*Cælestis imperii apicem regitis.*" B. P. M. ix. 404, 343.

<sup>4</sup> Hist. of Popes, i. 12.

\* "Domino meo sancto, ac per omnia beatissimo, et revera venerando Patri Patrum, universali Patriarchæ Bonifacio."

to make use of the authority of the Roman See, then very great with the people, as an auxiliary to his grand object of extirpating Arianism, and establishing the Trinitarian faith; seeing that the Roman Church had never swerved on *this* point from the orthodox doctrine.<sup>1</sup> And that he did not recognize the Roman Bishop as supreme or sole judge of the faith, appears even in the edict itself, from what I have just cited from it, in which the Alexandrian Bishop's authority is placed side by side with that of the Roman Bishop. Still the effect was doubtless to support the Roman See in the antichristian pretensions which it might even then have been inclined to put forth, as the impeccable standard and rule of Christian truth.—Next in the year A.D. 445, induced it appears by Pope Leo, the Emperors Valentinian III and Theodosius II issued conjointly a memorable Decree,<sup>2</sup> which, as chiefly *ecclesiastical*, and bearing on the subordination of the Western *Clergy* to Rome, will be more fully referred to in my next Chapter: but in which, at the same time, by its designation of the Roman Pope as *director of universal Christendom*,<sup>3</sup> and by its recognition of his right and primacy as grounded primarily on *Peter's merit*,<sup>4</sup> not on the mere circumstance of Rome being originally the Imperial City,—I say in these two different points Valentinian's Decree yet more strongly supported the high and antichristian claims of the Popedom. "From this time," says Ranke, after reference to Valentinian's Decree, "the power of the Roman Bishops grew up under the protection of the Roman Emperor himself."<sup>5</sup>—Yet again, there was the famous Decretal Letter of Justinian to the Pope, dated March 533, and which became thenceforth part and parcel of the *Civil Law*;—a Decretal Letter to which (among

<sup>1</sup> See Gibbon, v. 14, where the Edict is fully cited; and in which the context clearly bears out Gibbon's representation that the emperor's intention in it was to the effect that I have stated.

<sup>2</sup> For the Edict in full see Sir I. Newton on Daniel, p. 120: also Gieseler, 2nd Per. § 92.

It should be observed that the name of the *Eastern* Emperor Theodosius II, as well as of the *Western* Emperor Valentinian, is appended to the Edict.

<sup>3</sup> "Tunc demum ecclesiarum pax ubique servabitur si rectorum suum agnoscat universitas."—*Universitas* seems to be here used indefinitely. Elsewhere it is often used more restrictedly, of any particular body *in its entirety*. Gieseler seems to restrict its meaning here to Western Christendom.

<sup>4</sup> "Sedis Apostolicæ primatum sancti Petri meritum, qui princeps est episcopalis coronæ, et Romanæ dignitas civitatis, sacræ etiam Synodi firmavit auctoritas."

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* i. 12.

other reasons) I have had reference, in fixing on the epoch of 533 as probably a *primary* epoch of the commencement of the 1260 predicted years of Papal supremacy:—I say there was then promulgated this Imperial decretal Letter; in part of which, supposing the received text correct, there was both a solemn recognition of the Pope as *Head of all the Churches*, and a kind of subjugation even of the *Eastern Churches* to his rule.<sup>1</sup> I speak hypothetically, because the genuineness of this part has by some been questioned;<sup>2</sup> though not, as it certainly seems to me, with reason. And even in the remainder, on which I believe no doubt exists, there is, both implicitly and expressly, a recognition of the Pope in the antichristian character before spoken of, as *Head and Judge of the faith*: alike by the Emperor's himself appealing to him for his approbation, ere he published to the Roman world a formal statement of Christian faith; by his declaring that even the Patriarch of Constantinople (he who alone among ecclesiastics had professed rivalry with the Roman Bishop) wished in all things to follow Rome; and by his representing the unity of all churches as converging to Rome as its centre.<sup>3</sup> This was just when the

<sup>1</sup> See below in Note <sup>3</sup> the parts in Italics within the brackets.

<sup>2</sup> See Comber on the *Forgeries of Councils*. According to him the part inclosed in brackets in the extract following was forged; from *Itaque* to *Petimus*.

<sup>3</sup> See the *Italics* of the part *unbracketed* of the Decree now subjoined.

“Victor Justinianus, pius, &c., semper Augustus, Joanni (the *second* Pope John) sanctissimo Archiepiscopo almæ urbis Romæ, et Patriarche.

Reddentes honorem apostolicæ sedi, et vestræ Sanctitati, . . omnia quæ ad ecclesiarum statum pertinent festinavimus ad notitiam deferre vestræ Sanctitatis: quoniam semper nobis fuit magnum studium *unitatem vestræ Apostolicæ sedis*, et statum sanctarum Dei ecclesiarum custodire, qui hactenus obtinet, et incommotè permanet, nullà intercedente contrarietate. [Itaque omnes sacerdotes universi orientalis tractus et subicere et unire sedi vestræ Sanctitatis properavimus. . . Nec enim patimur quidquam quod ad ecclesiarum statum pertinet, quamvis manifestum et indubitatum sit quod movetur, ut non etiam vestræ innotescat Sanctitati, *quæ caput est omnium sanctarum ecclesiarum*. Per omnia enim, ut dictum est, properamus honorem et auctoritatem crescere vestræ sedis.”—On this follows a statement of certain then existing heresies on the subject of Christ's person; also of the Emperor's own orthodox faith, and its agreement with the doctrines of the four preceding General Councils of Nice, Constantinople, Ephesus, and Chalcedon, *conformably with the creed of the Roman Sec.* “Omnes ergo sacerdotes, sequentes doctrinam *Apostolicæ sedis vestræ*, ita credunt, et confitentur, et prædicant.” Then the letter proceeds; “Unde properavimus hoc ad notitiam deferre vestræ Sanctitatis per Hyppatium et Demetrium, beatissimos episcopos, ut nec vestram Sanctitatem lateant quæ à quibusdam paucis monachis malè et Judaicè, secundùm Nestorii perfidiam, denegata sunt.] Petimus ergo vestrum paternum affectum, ut vestris ad nos destinatis literis, et ad sanctissimum Episcopum hujus almæ urbis et Patriarcham fratrem vestrum, (quoniam et ipse *per eosdem* scripsit ad vestram Sanctitatem, *festinans in omnibus sequi sedem apostolicam Beatitudinis vestræ*;) manifestum nobis faciatis quòd omnes qui *prædicta* rectè confitentur suscipit vestra

Western Romano-Gothic powers had begun to give in their adhesion to the Roman See, as the seat of Christ's Vicar on earth.

Besides which, I must add that, some 70 years or a little more after Justinian's edict, there was issued another notable one by the Emperor *Phocas*, which (so far

Sanctitas, et eorum qui Judaicè ausi sint rectam denegare fidem condemnat perfidiam. Plus enim ita et circa vos omnium amor, et vestræ sedis crescet auctoritas; et quæ ad vos est unitas sanctorum ecclesiarum inturbatâ servabitur; quando per vos didicerint omnes beatissimi Episcopi eorum quæ ad vos relata sunt sinceram vestræ Sanctitatis doctrinam."—Hard. ii. 1146, 1147.

Mr. Cuninghame, in the Preface to his Fulness of the Times, pp. xi—xxii, has carefully, and I think satisfactorily, replied to Comber's charge. 1. The words *per eosdem*, and *prædicta*, (which I have Italicized,) in the concluding part of the letter, suffice of themselves to show Comber's mistake in eliminating all within the brackets. For they are words of reference, respectively, to the *messengers Hypatius and Demetrius*, and the *confession of faith*, which occur only in the bracketed part.—2. Comber's argument from a later letter of Justinian to the next Pope Agapetus, reciting his letter to Pope John, with a view to Agapetus' renewed confirmation, but reciting only the part unbracketed, is disposed of by the fact of a fuller and more complete MS. of that to Agapetus, (a document referred to as quite satisfactory by Pagi,) citing in it the whole here given of the letter to Pope John.—3. Taking the *date* of the Agapetan letter there given, there exists no anachronism to contravene the genuineness of that in question. Justinian's letter to Pope John, being noted as recently written in another letter of Justinian to the Constantinopolitan Patriarch, Epiphanius, dated March 25, 533, must necessarily have a little preceded that date. Pope John's reply is dated March 25, 534; \* Justinian's to Agapetus March 14, 536.—4. Pope John's reply to Justinian (Hard. *ibid.*) prominently and primarily refers to the important sentence within the brackets, in which Justinian subjects the Eastern Churches to the Roman Pope. "Tanquam aliquod sidus irradiat, quod amore fidei. . . Romanæ sedis reverentiam conservatis, et ei cuncta subjicitis, et ad ejus deducitis unitatem, ad ejus auctorem, hoc est apostolorum primum, [*Petrum*,] Domino loquente preceptum est, Pasce oves meas. *Quam esse omnium verè ecclesiarum caput et Petrum regulâ, et Principum statuta, et Pietatis vestræ reverendissimi testantur affatus.*"—5. In the unbracketed part, the "*quæ ad vos est unitas sanctorum ecclesiarum*" implies the main point disputed.—6. In the *original Greek* of a letter written the same year, 533, by Justinian to the *C. P. Patriarch*, and preserved in the Codex Justin. i. 1. 7, (ap. Gieseler i. 341,) is a clause the most important to our purpose in the bracketed part of the letter to Pope John; viz. that which recognizes the Roman Pope as the head of the whole priesthood of God, and duty consequently of communicating with him on everything concerning the Church: στε γαρ ανεχομεθα τι των εις εκκλησιαστικην ὀρωντων κατασασιν μη και τη τε Παπα της πρισβυτερας Ῥωμης αναφειρεσθαι μακαριστη, ὡς κεφαλυ ηση παντων των ὄσιωτατων τε Θει ιερωην.

And indeed Justinian expressed himself similarly in other acts and laws. Mr. C. in his *Seals and Trumpets*, p. 191, cites from the 131st of the *Novellæ Constitutiones* of Justinian, entitled "De Ecclesiasticis Titulis et Privilegiis," the following extract; "Ideoque sancimus sanctissimum senioris Romæ Papam primum esse omnium sacerdotum; beatissimum autem archiepiscopum Constantinopoleos, novæ Romæ, *secundum* habere locum post sanctam apostolicam senioris Romæ sedem:" also Novel 9, calling Rome "*patriam legum, fontem sacerdotii.*"—It was Justinian's policy, we must remember, just then, when Belisarius' expedition was about sailing for the conquest of Africa, and perhaps of Italy afterwards, to propitiate the Pope. "During the first years of his

\* The interval of a year between Justinian's letter to Pope John and Pope John's reply is to be accounted for, I conceive, 1st, from the circumstance of the Imperial messengers having been delayed on their voyage from C. P. to Rome in those troublous times; 2ndly, from his wish for communication on the subject with Roman senators and Italian bishops, before sending his reply. See Hard. ii. 1150.

as imperial decree might go) *confirmed* the right of the Roman See and Bishops to the *headship of all churches*; and this expressly in contradistinction to their then only rival in Christendom, the See and Bishop of Constantinople.<sup>1</sup> I conceive that another later and notable epoch of commencement to the 1260 years was marked by it:<sup>2</sup> more especially as it marked also the epoch just about which (after certain changes of which more in my next Section) both the Anglo-Saxon and Lombard kings, last of the Western Romano-Gothic princes, gave in their adhesion to the Roman See; and so completed the formal submission of the West—its kings as well as people—to the religion and religious supremacy of Papal Rome. A point this which I must next treat of.

reign," says Gibbon, viii. 324, "Justinian courted the Popes, till he got them into his power." And, even afterwards, though as subordinate to his own imperial power, it was his policy to regard *ecclesiastical* Christendom as one body under one head, viz. of the Roman bishop. From which subjection the separation of the West from the East freed it.

Gibbon, viii. 2, notes the manner in which the spirit of the Justinian Code was transfused into the jurisprudence and institutions of the Western States of Christendom, so as to have effect for centuries afterwards. (See Note<sup>2</sup> p. 166 *infra*.) So, in regard of its elevation of the Roman see above others, its effect was to legalize the Roman Bishop's supremacy; when the counter-influence of the Eastern Emperor's secular authority had past away.

In a Review of Milman's Latin Christianity in the Edinb. Rev. for Jan. 1858, p. 66, the following statement, as on a much controverted point, seems to me to deserve citation. "The Code of Justinian invaded without scruple the spiritual province of the Roman pontiffs. . . . The emanation of all authority, both ecclesiastical and civil, from the temporal sovereign was the first principle of Justinian's legislation. Recognising the primacy of the See of St. Peter, and insisting in accordance with the centralizing ideas of old Roman law on the union of all Churches in submission to Rome, it determines the limits of that pre-eminence. The head of Roman Christendom is the subject of the Roman Emperor. He must bow before the imperial decrees . . . The Papacy owed its subsequent aggrandisement chiefly to those circumstances which concurred to keep the Roman civil law [so far] in the background, and for a time almost to conceal its existence." The last clause is however expressed too strongly, and less accurately than the statement just cited from Gibbon. Moreover the writer has overlooked the inconsistency of this Code with itself in any supposed subordination of the Papal power to the Imperial; while recognizing the Popes' primacy as *as successors of St. Peter*, and so VICARS OF CHRIST.

<sup>1</sup> The authorities for this are *Paulus Diaconus*; who says of the Emperor *Phocas*; "Hic, rogante Papâ Bonifacio, statuit sedem Romanæ et apostolicæ ecclesiæ caput esse omnium ecclesiarum; quia ecclesia Constantinopolitana primam se omnium ecclesiarum scribebat."—and *Anastasius*; who in his Ecclesiastical History on the year A.D. 606 observes; "Hic (Bonifacius) obtinuit apud Phocam Principem ut sedes apostolica Beati Petri Apostoli caput esset omnium ecclesiarum; . . . quia ecclesia Constantinopolitana primam se omnium ecclesiarum scribebat."

<sup>2</sup> Both Papal and Protestant writers have attached weight to these Decrees of *Justinian* and *Phocas*. In Chap. ix. § 2 *infra* I shall speak more fully on this point: and on their constituting commencing epochs to the 1260 years, the first less, the second more perfect; like the two of Judah's predicted 70 years of captivity.



3. For, as to this *subjection of themselves and their kingdoms* in religious matters to the POPE on the part of the *Kings of Western Christendom*, though bound to it in a manner *de jure* even from Valentinian's time, by the Roman law,<sup>1</sup> yet some years past ere they *de facto* acknowledged it. We read that, at the formation successively of their several kingdoms, the Paganism or Arianism of most of the Gothic Princes was a bar to their personal and perfect adhesion to the Roman See: notwithstanding the authority with which that See had been invested by the Roman Imperial Law, and the deep-rooted reverence felt towards it both by the clergy and the people.<sup>2</sup> But first in A.D. 496 the *Frank King Clovis*, on occasion of his victory over the *Allemanni*, embraced the *Catholic* faith, as that of *Rome*,<sup>3</sup> and so received the title, transmitted downward through nearly 1300 years to the French Kings his successors, of *eldest son of the Church*: then, in the course of the 6th century, the Kings of *Burgundy*,<sup>4</sup> *Bavaria*, *Portugal*,<sup>5</sup> *Spain*,<sup>6</sup> *Lombardy*,<sup>7</sup> *England*.<sup>8</sup> And then already, (the recreant *Vandal* and *Ostrogothic* kings having, as we shall

<sup>1</sup> Especially as considering these Western kings' recognition of the Roman Emperor's supremacy, as stated p. 143 *suprà*, it seems to me that the *legal* authority with which the Imperial Law invested the Popes must not be overlooked. This, as we have already in part seen, the Popes were always ready to inculcate on the Western kings; connectedly with, and as founded on, the fact of their being successors of St. Peter.

<sup>2</sup> This popular veneration of the Bishops, and the Bishops' dependence on the Roman See, induced even the Arian Gothic kings of the 5th century to cultivate the Pope's friendship. So Mosheim v. 2. 2. 6. <sup>3</sup> Gordon dates it 499, after Siebert.

<sup>4</sup> A.D. 509, says Gordon, as from Greg. Tur. on the Gest. Frane. B. iii. c. 5, and Siebert's Chronicon: which authorities however do not fix the precise date. Gieseler (2nd Per. § 121) dates the Burgundian king Sigismund's conversion A.D. 517, in which year a Catholic Council was held under his auspices; viz. the Concilium Epaonense, mentioned in Note <sup>1</sup> on the next Page. And so Moreri.

<sup>5</sup> A.D. 558. So Gieseler, *ibid*: Fleury A.D. 561. <sup>6</sup> A.D. 589.

<sup>7</sup> About A.D. 600. See Moreri, Art. *Agilulf*. In 603, it seems, this Lombard king had his son baptized in the Catholic faith.

<sup>8</sup> A.D. 597—604.—Britain did not however then owe to *Rome* its first conversion and its Church. About 200 A.D. Tertullian (Contrà Judæos, c. 7) speaks of "Parthians and Medes, &c., and divers peoples of Spain and Gaul, and parts of Britain, which had been inaccessible by the Romans, having been subdued by Christ." About 230 Origen, on Luke i. Hom. 6, observes; "The power of God our Saviour is even with the Britons, who are divided from our world." In Diocletian's persecution Britain had its martyrs; St. Alban, &c. In 314 it sent bishops to the Council of Arles: in 325 assented to the Canons of the Nicene Council; (Euseb. V. C. iii. 19;) in 347 sent delegates to the Council at Sardica; (Athanas. 2nd Apology, ad. init. ;) in 359 to that at Ariminum. (See generally on the above, Fuller's Ch. Hist. B. i. § 3, 4.) Again Jerome (by Paula and Eustochium, Ep. 17 or 101) speaks of Christians there, as "adoring one Christ, and observing one religion." And so Chrysostom, about 398.\*

\* M. Guizot, in his notice of Gregory's mission to England (Civil. in France, Lect.

see, been supplanted,) there appeared on the part of the Western Princes, by the time of Pope Gregory I. and Phocas, indications of submission and subserviency to the Roman Pontiff, in all that concerned religion and the Church, as of inferiors to a superior,<sup>1</sup> of children to a father,<sup>2</sup> of common mortals to one that, like the Great Druid of their ancestral Paganism, was the chief mediator and administrator of the divine wrath and favour.<sup>3</sup> The principle of the *Unity of the*

<sup>1</sup> E. g. under King Sigismund of *Burgundy*, and says Gordon by his authority, about the year 517, there was convoked a Council at Epaona in Savoy, (whether *Jena*, a small village on the Rhone, as says Harduin, or rather, as Moreri, Pouas, now a village four leagues from Vienna,) in obedience to orders received from the Pope: who, said the Viennese Bishop, had sharply rebuked him for the intermission of such half-yearly assemblings. "Venerabilis Papæ Urbis, nobis ob hanc negligentiam succensentis, mordacia mihi nonnunquam scripta perlata sunt."—A Lyonnese Council too of the same date, and mostly the same Bishops, seems to speak of the Burgundic king as if then in Church communion. Hard. ii. 1053, 1054.

In the various *Frank* kingdoms of the 6th century the Bishops were ranked as Counts; and so attended at the national assemblies, and issued thence their capitularies. So Müller, xi. 4, 5.

Again, King Recared of *Spain*, in the Council of Toledo, A.D. 589, at which Arianism was renounced for Roman Catholicism, (see my p. 64 supra,) assisted in passing a Canon of obedience to all the synodic Papal Epistles:—viz. Canon I.; "Manent in suo vigore Conciliorum omnium constituta, simul et synodiæ sanctorum Præsulum Romanorum epistolæ." Hard. iii. 479.

The devotion of the *English* Princes, after conversion to the Romish faith, was early illustrated by their engagement for the payment to Rome of the *Peter's penny*.\*

<sup>2</sup> "The venerable name of *Pope*," [or *Father*,] says Gibbon (vii. 37), speaking of A.D. 500, "was now appropriated to the *Roman Pontiff*:"† it having been once the title of all bishops alike. (Bingham, ii. 2. 7.)—Address by *nations*, it was an *imperial*, and originally a *divine* title. So Ovid to Augustus; (Fasti ii. 131;)

Hoc tu per terras quod in æthere Jupiter alto  
Nomen habes; hominum tu pater, ille Deûm.

And Horace; Hic ames dici Pater atque Princeps.—See the subject illustrated in Spanheim de Usu Num. 717.—The title, as given to the Pope, was sometimes in the form *Patri Patrum*. So in the Letter of the Thessalian Bishop to the Roman Pope Boniface A.D. 531, cited p. 154 supra; and those of the Eastern Prelates, A.D. 536, (Hard. ii. 1218,) *Ἡαρη πατερων*.—The *imperial* or *royal* sense attached to it appeared (to borrow an illustration of date much later) in the legend of the medal of Pope Julius III, "Dominus Julius Reip. Christianæ Rex ac Pater."

<sup>3</sup> See Mosh. viii. 2. 2. 6.

xix., Vol. ii. 174, Hazlitt,) has singularly omitted all reference to this early Christianization of England. "Britain received her faith, and her first preachers, from Rome."

\* In Wise's Bodleian Medals, Table xvii. there are engravings of silver coins struck by the early Archbishops of York, with the legend *S. Petri M.* (*M.* for *moneta*) in the obverse, and round the reverse *Eboracæ. Civ.*: called hence *St. Peter's money*. It seems to have been intended for the English circulation: and not (so as some have thought) for the specific purpose of being sent as the tributary pence to Rome. "Nonnulli olim inscitè denarios Papæ Romano, juxta Inæ et Offiæ leges solvendo, quod vulgo vocarunt *Peter pence*, interpretati sunt." Wise, p. 230.

N.B. It was this Offa, king of Mercia (A.D. 755—794), not Ina, king of Wessex (A.D. 726), who founded the English Cloister at Rome, and paid the Peter's Pence for its support: pence afterwards claimed as tribute. Giesel. Per. iii. § 6.

† So Gregory VII afterwards, Hard. vi. 1304; "Quod unicum est nomen [Papæ] in mundo."

*Church*, in its Romish not Scriptural sense, had begun to establish itself in men's minds;—I mean that of the whole professing Church being intended to constitute one body, under one *earthly* Head, CHRIST'S VICAR the POPE.<sup>1</sup> And the Western kingdoms had coalesced as one under him: just like the ten horns of the Beast from the Sea on its eighth Head, in the Apocalyptic vision.

I must not omit to add that both by the Theodosian and Justinian codes,—now generally received, at least on matters ecclesiastical, in the Barbarian kingdoms,<sup>2</sup>—*anti-heretical decrees* came to be in force;<sup>3</sup> and Bishops, and ultimately the *Pope*, as we shall see more fully in the next Chapter, to be sole judges of heresy. And, as very false doctrines (not unsupported, according to the well-known prophecy of the mode of Antichrist's manifestation, by *false miracles*<sup>4</sup>) constituted no small part of the orthodoxy now sanctioned at Rome,<sup>5</sup> there resulted a *legal intolerance*

<sup>1</sup> Wadd. i. 309 notes this as not coming into full operation till after the Gothic irruption; though broached earlier. See my p. 153 *suprà*.

<sup>2</sup> Thus a constitution of the Frank King Clotaire, of about the date 559, orders the use of the *Roman* law in the case of the Roman population, in matters civil, and also in all matters ecclesiastical. Har. iii. 343.

<sup>3</sup> By Theodosius' law, referred to p. 159 *suprà*, heretics (*Arians*, as he meant) were made obnoxious to civil penalties. (Gib. v. 15.) Justinian, A.D. 528, decreed thus against those who differed from his own profession of faith;—a faith, which shortly after, as we saw, was declared to, and approved by, the Pope; "Jubemus tales, tanquam confessos hereticos, competenti animadvertione subjugari." (Given in Cuninghame, p. 188.) Pope Pelagius, A.D. 555, writing to the Frank King Childebert, called in against such the aid of the *secular arm*: an aid granted thereupon by the constitution of Childebert. Har. iii. 333, 334. And Müller (B. xi. c. 6) notices how the church laws, framed on the basis of the Theodosian Code, introduced intolerance in Spain. "The priests preached intolerance, and persecuted heretics mercilessly."

As a further illustration of the speedy advance to a direct application of persecuting Papal laws against faithful Christians, I may cite the Canon of the Roman Council held by Gregory II, about the year 730, against the Iconoclasts: "Si quis . . . imaginum sacrarum . . . destructor . . . extiterit, extorris sit à corpore D. N. Jesus Christi, vel totius ecclesie unitate." (Gib. ix. 141.) And, as Gibbon adds, it is laid down by the Papal Canon law, as expressed by Gratian, "homicidas non esse qui excommunicatos trucidant."

<sup>4</sup> "Whose coming is with *signs* and *lying wonders*, &c." 2 Thess. ii. 9. See on this my Note <sup>2</sup> p. 97 *suprà*; and also my remarks in the next chapter on the lamb-like Beast doing signs before the first Beast, its principal. Says Mosheim of the opening of the 7th century; "Every objection was silenced by appeal to two things,—the authority of the church and *miracles*; which the ignorance of the age made it easy for any man of cunning to impose on the people." vii. 2. 3. 1.—Let me illustrate from the curious legend of a miracle wrought by Gregory I, recorded in Sigebert's Chronicon, ad ann. 592; i. e. the precise epoch referred to in my text. "Illic, inter cætera pictatis opera, animam Trajani Romanorum quondam Imperatoris, quamvis Pagani, à pœnis inferni liberari miscrando et plorando à Deo obtinuit."

<sup>5</sup> Gregory authorized images, purgatory, pilgrimages, relics; and enforced clerical

of the faith of the saints : which, whether enforced at the time or not, furnished a ready means and occasion for their future persecution and oppression.

§ 2.—UPROOTING OF THREE HORNS, OUT OF THE TEN,  
BEFORE THE BEAST.

But now as to the uprooting of the *Vandal* and *Ostrogothic* horns, to which I alluded as having occurred in the interval between Justinian and Phocas,—a change followed by yet another of the same character a century and a half later,—it is well that we pause a while on these events, and the period embracing them. For they constituted it, as it were, a TRANSITION PERIOD in the history of the Beast, or Papal Antichrist, from that of the *earlier partial* to that of the *later full* development of his power and wickedness. And, as such, we find it to have been prominently set forth by Daniel : viz. in his prefiguration of the plucking up of three horns out of the original ten into which the 4th empire had been divided ; before another of peculiar character, which had risen up contemporarily with, or behind them ;<sup>1</sup> and which, in respect of its *secular* power evidently, seemed but in comparison as a *little horn*.

The coincidence in purport between this prediction of *Daniel* about the *three horns*' removal, and that of *St. Paul* respecting the removal of the earlier *Imperial let or hindrance* in his time existing,<sup>2</sup> will at once be evident to the Reader. For, if it needed that the Imperial power ruling at Rome should be removed, in order to the primary actual development of the Papal Antichrist, (agreeably with *St. Paul's* wonderful prophecy,) the same necessity would obviously require the removal, in order to its *fuller* development, of such of the ten horns as might have established themselves in the immediate neighbourhood of Rome, and be in a condition, with the plenitude of their royal power, to oppress or overawe it.—Now then, in looking at the list given in my fourth Chapter, we may mark *three* of the ten

celibacy, &c. Wadd. Ch. x., xiii., &c. But indeed these things had become orthodox much earlier. Gibbon, v. 126, speaks of the worship of saints and relics as in vogue from soon after Constantine's death down to the Reformation. The truth of this I have abundantly shown in my first volume.

<sup>1</sup> See p. 91 Note <sup>1</sup> *suprà*.

<sup>2</sup> See p. 96, 97, &c., *suprà*.

kings as thus characterized.<sup>1</sup> First, the *Vandals*, as rulers, within the Roman Bishop's own diocese, of *Corsica* and *Sardinia*; <sup>2</sup> secondly, the *Ostrogoths*, the successors of Odoacer in the kingdom of *Italy*; and thirdly, the *Lombards*: which last, although in the year A.D. 533 referred to in my list far distant in Pannonia, were some 30 or 40 years after destined to conquer Lombardy, and afterwards to extend their conquests to the very neighbourhood of Rome.—The manner in which these several powers overawed the Roman Bishops is matter of history.<sup>3</sup> It was such as to make it evident that their removal from before it was essential to the full glory and expansion of the Papal spiritual power. And, accordingly, their removal constitutes one of the most prominent topics in the next pages of the history of Western Christendom. First, in 533, just after Justinian's decretal Epistle before quoted, the horn of the *Vandals* in Africa, Corsica, and Sardinia, and, presently after, that of the *Ostrogoths* in Italy, was rooted up by Justinian's forces under Belisarius. After which, and the establishment of the Greek Exarchate at Ravenna, (a power that cannot properly, I conceive, be reckoned among the ten horns of the prophetic Beast, emerging as the latter would seem to have done, one and all, out of the Barbarian invading flood,)<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> I might cite *three* that were eradicated from before the Pope out of the list *first* given; viz. the *Heruli* under Odoacer, the *Vandals*, and the *Ostrogoths*. But it is needless; the *second* list being, as I believe, the true one. Moreover, though the neighbourhood of Odoacer could not but be unpleasant to the Pope, he does not appear to have overawed him, like Theodoric or the Lombards. A Letter from Pope Gelasius, of the date 494, speaks of having successfully resisted Odoacer's wishes on certain ecclesiastical matters: "Odoacri barbaro hæretico, cum aliqua non facienda præceperet, Deo præstante, nullatenus paruisse manifestum est." Hard. ii. 914.—Other expositors (as Peyrani the Vaudois minister, in his Work on the Vaudois, p. 54) have supposed the *Herulian*, *Ostrogothic*, and *Lombard* horns to be the three meant. But they were not contemporarily existent as horns of the Beast. The *Herulian* had been destroyed, ere the *Lombard* had risen within the limits of the Roman Empire.

<sup>2</sup> See p. 138, Note <sup>8</sup> *suprà*.

<sup>3</sup> *Theodoric* made his own approbation essential to the election of the Pope; summoned Councils (e. g. that of *Rome* to examine the charges against Symmachus) by his own authority; and, on one occasion at least, personally oppressed the Pope. See Gibbon vii. 42.—The *Vandal* kings were not only Arians, but persecutors of the Catholics: in *Sardinia* and *Corsica* under the Roman episcopate, we may presume, as well as in Africa. (See the Treatise of *Victor Vitensis* on the subject; which is further illustrated by the exile of the African Bishops, noted by me Vol. ii. p. 223, and in Hard. ii. 1055.) Their coast attacks too on Italy, and taking and sacking of Rome, are events notorious.—Of the *let* and *hindrance* of the *Lombards* Pope Stephen's Letter to Pepin, referred to Note <sup>4</sup> in my next page, sufficiently tells the tale.

<sup>4</sup> The reader will doubtless be aware that the three horns plucked up are by Sir I. Newton, Bishop Newton, and many others, interpreted as the *Lombard* power, the *Greek Exarchate*, and the *Dukedom of Rome* under the Exarchate. Indeed Mr. Brooks (p. 431) says; "The three horns plucked up are *with tolerable unanimity*

the *Lombards* came in ; just as if to neutralize the Greek Emperor's power in that country, and prevent its domineering over the Pope at Rome, so as over the Patriarch at Constantinople :<sup>1</sup> and for some years so divided the empire of Italy with them, as to allow of Gregory the Great and others acting independently the part of *King*, as well as of *Pope*, at Rome.<sup>2</sup> At length in the course of the 8th century, the Lombard power altogether preponderating,<sup>3</sup> and after the conquest of the Exarchate A.D. 752, acting like its predecessors in Italy to overawe the Roman See, the assistance of the Franks was invoked by the two Popes Stephen II and Adrian I,<sup>4</sup> from the Gaulic province

declared to be *Rome, Lombardy, and Ravenna* ; which \* have now formed the Papal territories for more than 1000 years." But, besides that the *Exarchate* and the *Dukedom of Rome*, instead of being two of the original ten horns of the Beast that rose out of the Gothic inundation, had their origin from quite a different source, and, in respect of *time*, were not even in existence at the rise of the Beast,—besides this, I say, the Dukedom of Rome, being the dependency of a dependency, could *never*, I conceive, be properly considered a horn.

<sup>1</sup> That the inclination thus to domineer was not wanting to the Greeks, and would have exerted itself had there been sufficient power to support it, appears from the indignities heaped on Pope Sylvester, and his banishment, and supersession by Belisarius, in the year A.D. 537. See Gibbon vii. 238. Again constraint, or indignities, were similarly suffered in 546 and 653 by the Popes *Vigilius* and *Martin* from the Greek Emperors, acting through their generals or Exarchs in Italy. Gieseler i. 325 ; Wadd. i. 315. All however, as before said, p. 163, inconsistently with their own laws ;—that of Phocas, in 606, inclusive.

In the main, however, the Pope's independence was preserved through this æra of his history. So M. Guizot, speaking of the time when Rome was nominally under the Byzantine Emperors : (Civiliz. of France, c. 19 :) " Instead, like the Frank, Spanish, and Anglo-Saxon Bishops, of being a servant of a *king present*, he was the representative of a *king absent*. He depended on the *emperor of the East* ; a sovereign who rarely cramped his administration, never eclipsed it."

<sup>2</sup> Gibbon, viii. 171, speaks of the first Gregory's "*temporal reign*," as well described by Sigonius : also, ix. 151, with reference to the middle of the 8th century, of " the *sacerdotal monarchy of St. Peter*." Mr. Biley, p. 160, well cites the following from Adrian de Valois' *Gesta Francorum*, in further illustration of the point : " Fredegair le Scholastique raconte que Gregoire, ayant imploré le secours de Charles contre l'empereur Leon, . . et contre Luitprand roi des Lombards, lui conféra le consulat Romain, en vertu des *prerogatives imperiales* dont il (sc. le Pape) s'étoit emparé."

<sup>3</sup> In this the weakness of the Exarchate the Greek Emperors courted, rather than attempted to oppress, the Popes. Thus A.D. 684 they formally abandoned the Imperial privilege of confirming the Papal election, exercised since Theodoric ; (so Gordon ad ann. 684, from Anastasius and Sigonius ; ) and, 26 years after, offered them homage ; as noted in my next Section. Mosheim, vii. 2. 2. 2, a little modifies the former statement.

<sup>4</sup> The Pope's Letter of application to Pepin was written *in the name of St. Peter* : saying that the Virgin Mary too, and all the martyrs, were interested in the deliverance of Rome from the Lombards. " Ego *Petrus apostolus*, qui vos adoptivos habeo filios, ad defendendum de manibus adversariorum hanc Romanam civitatem et populum mihi à Deo commissum, . . vestram omnium provocans dilectionem adhortor. . . Sed et domina nostra Dei genitrix, semper virgo Maria, nobiscum vos protestatur :

\* Mr. B. means evidently *parts* only of the Lombard kingdom.

so devoted to them. And then the *Lombard Horn* was eradicated through the instrumentality of Pepin and Charlemagne, (just like those of the *Vandals* and the *Ostrogoths* previously,) never again to be heard of in Christendom: and the Exarchate of Ravenna,<sup>1</sup> together with other of the Lombard conquests, attached for ever to the Roman See, under the very singular appellation of *Peter's Patrimony*.<sup>2</sup>

. . . simul etiam et throni et dominationes. . . necnon et martyres et confessores Christi, &c." From the Carolin. Cod. ap. Gieseler ii. 15, and Gibbon ix. 149. The latter might well say, "This most extraordinary letter."

<sup>1</sup> The Exarchate, in its strict and proper limits, included the territories of Ravenna, Bologna, and Ferrara. Dependent on it was the Pentapolis; which extended along the coast from Rimini to Ancona, and into the interior as far as the ridges of the Apennines. Gib. ix. 157.

<sup>2</sup> Pepin's *donation* was made A.D. 755; its confirmation and enlargement by Charlemagne, A.D. 774. In 817 Louis I confirmed the gift of the Dukedom of Rome; &c. Sir I. Newton, Ch. vii. on Daniel, speaks of this as *Peter's Patrimony*. Gibbon, x. 270, includes in the patrimony Apulia and Calabria, after the Norman conquest of them, and recognition of the Pope's suzerainty over them, in the 11th century. Others, as Moreri, use that phrase more restrictedly of the Pope's earlier territorial possessions, between the Tiber, Marta, and Tuscan sea.

On Pepin's and Charlemagne's donations the account by Sir I. Newton, *ibid.*, is full and interesting. He notices (p. 91) a piece of mosaic, still existing, he says, at Rome as late as the 16th century, which Pope Leo III, caused to be made in his palace near the Church of St. John Lateran, in memory of his sending the banner of Rome to Charlemagne: in which mosaic *Peter* appeared with *three keys* in his lap, reaching the pallium to the Pope with his right hand, and with his left the banner of Rome to Charlemagne. And he interprets the *three keys*, as the keys of the three parts of his patrimony; viz. *Rome with its Duchy, Ravenna with the Exarchate, and the territories taken from the Lombards*. He also adds, "These were the three dominions whose crowns are now worn by the Pope."

But there seems to be no certainty in what he says either about the *crowns* or the *keys*. Muratori's account of the mosaic (*Annali d'Ital. ad ann. 798*) speaks of the pallium and the banner depicted in it: but he says nothing of the three keys in Peter's lap; nor does it seem safe to trust the impression of certain antiquaries as to an obscure, perhaps half-effaced, part of an old mosaic. Such is Muratori's own judgment. "Non si può con sicurezza trovare la luce vera in mezzo a sì fatte tenebre."—As to the *three crowns* of the Papal tiara, though said by some with Sir I. N. to represent the three States of the Church, yet the circumstance of the first being assumed on the Episcopal mitre, not, I believe, till about the time of Alexander III., A.D. 1160, the second by Boniface VIII. as late as the year 1300, and the third soon after by Benedict XII, or Urban V (see Ducange and his Supplement on *Regnum*, also Ferrario, ii. 428,) it seems to me very questionable whether the third might not have been added, as other writers have said, in token of the Papal *prophetic* character, as well as that of *Priest* and *King*: or else, very possibly, the *three crowns*, like the *three keys*, (see next Note,) of the Papal authority in *heaven, earth, and hell, or purgatory*. The Pope's triple crown signifies, says the Ceremon. Roman., the "sacerdotalis et imperialis summa dignitas atque potestas."

<sup>2</sup> Cancellieri in his *Sollenni Possessi*, p. 6, mentions other similar representations "Fuori della Capella della Madonna della Bocciaata nelle grotte Vaticane si vede il Musaico che stava nel atrio della Basilica sopra il sepolcro di Ottone 2 Imperatore, rappresentante il Salvatore con S. Paolo alla destra, e S. Pietro alla sinistra, con *tre chiavi* che pendono dalla sua mano." A mosaic illustrated, he says, by Torrigio on the Grotte Vaticane, p. 35, Ciampini on the Sacri Edifici, Tab. xxv., and Dionisi on the Vatic. Crypt. Monumenta, Tab. x. p. 24: and that they prove the whole to be a symbol of the Papal power over (sopra) the three Churches, *militant, in Purgatory, and triumphant!* So also S. Ivo Carvotensis; who adds that, in token of the Pope's

It was, perhaps, to be inferred from the circumstance of the *ten-horned Beast* constituting the characteristic standing symbol of the Popedom for the fated 1260 years,<sup>1</sup> that (except in what is elsewhere said of the *tenth* of the great city falling<sup>2</sup>) the number of the Western kingdoms subject to the Papal Head would, notwithstanding this triple eradication, be yet by additions or changes made up from time to time to its original complement. And this, as we have before seen, was very much the case :<sup>3</sup> only so as that none should, like the eradicated three, oppress by immediate neighbourhood and superior force the Papal power. Thus, first, the *Kingdom of Naples*, which grew up in the middle age under Norman rule, and included both *Southern Italy and Sicily*,<sup>4</sup>—the representative in a manner, on that part of their territory, of the earlier *Ostrogoths*,—was held as a direct fief from the Pope.<sup>5</sup> Next *Sardinia*, once *Vandalic*, after recovery from its temporary Saracenic domination by the Pisans, fell at length, but also as a Papal Fief, to the devoted Princes of Savoy.<sup>6</sup> Again, in *North Italy* the old *Lombard* provinces came under the government of a friendly *Frank* or *German Emperor*, residing far away beyond the Alps ; at least one friendly till the middle age, when the Popes were strong enough to brave his hostility.—Meanwhile *Central Italy*, from sea to sea, continued still immediately under Papal rule. Moreover, with regard to the extent of the Papal subject kingdoms, the diminution through Saracen invasion was very much made up by the conquests of Charlemaigne, Otho, and other *sous of the Church*, in

power in heaven, earth and hell, the Pope (on taking possession at the Lateran) strikes thrice with his virga on the Church's threshold—Nicolò Allemanni too, p. 55, Tab. vii. and p. 56, Tab. viii., describes two pictures of St. Peter with three keys in hand.

<sup>1</sup> So too in the ten toes of Nebuchadnezzar's image in Daniel.

<sup>2</sup> Apoc. xi. 13. See my Vol. ii. p. 472, &c.

<sup>3</sup> See p. 142, Note 1 *suprà*.

<sup>4</sup> This was after a century or two of disorganization ; in which the state of South Italy, says Müller, divided into baronies, resembled that of the Homeric age : adding that the Pope, though too weak himself to unite it, had yet strength enough to prevent its union under another Head.

<sup>5</sup> A. D. 1053. So Gibbon, x. 270 : "A tribute or quit-rent of twelve-pence was afterwards stipulated for every plough-land : and since this memorable transaction, the kingdom of Naples has remained above 700 years a fief of the Holy See."—In 1475 Ferdinand, king of Naples, obtained from the Pope a remission of the yearly tribute due to the Roman See, on condition of sending every year a white horse to Rome, in token of homage. Mod. Un. Hist. xxvi. 210.

<sup>6</sup> Ranke in his History of the Popes, iii. 190, speaks of *Sicily* and *Sardinia* as still in A. D. 1700 looked on as Papal Fiefs.



northern and central Germany.<sup>1</sup> For all these conquests became spiritually subject to the Roman See.<sup>2</sup>

§ 3.—THE BEAST'S PRIDE, SELF-EXALTATION, BLASPHEMIES, AND OPPRESSION OF THE SAINTS, AS FULFILLED IN THE FULL-GROWN PAPAL ANTICHRIST.

I have in a preceding Section sketched the Popedom in its first anti-christian development and early growth ; and both in the various circumstantial attending it, and in its pretensions as even thus early put forth, have traced its correspondence with the Apocalyptic Beast, and the Antichrist of other cognate prophecies :—its *occasion of development* being then when the old Imperial Roman Government had been removed out of the way ; its *local seat* the seven hills of Rome : its *constituency* the ten Romano-Gothic kingdoms of the revived Western Christendom ; its *ruling head* an *ἐπισκοπος*, or Bishop, with “eyes as the eyes of a man :”—which Bishop, like Judas, traitor and apostate, (indeed the *chief*, as well as *product*, of the long previously progressing apostasy,) held out as the actual basis of his authority, the very profession of being, with unlimited and only self-responsible authority, CHRIST'S *appointed VICAR on earth*. A character this answering, even as a translation in terms, to the prophetic word ANTICHRIST in its *first* sense : and, inasmuch as it was an utter falsehood and usurpation, answering also to it in its other and *second* sense, of a hostile COUNTER-CHRIST.—Pursuing the subject we shall, I doubt not, find all else that was predicted of “the Antichrist,” as to both what he was to *be*, and what to *do*, after his manifestation, fulfilled in the latter Papal history. The proof of this is to be now my subject. Let me only just remark, ere proceeding, that (except as regards what is directly inculpatory in them) the characteristic points thus far noted from prophecy have been not only admitted, but from time to time even insisted on, as

<sup>1</sup> See again p. 142 *suprà*.

<sup>2</sup> Let me recommend to my readers the perusal of Guizot's 19th chapter on the History of Civilization in France, with reference to the general subject of this Section, viz. the early growth of the Papacy.

applicable to the Popedom, by Papal writers themselves. I subjoin illustrations on what is most important below.<sup>1</sup>

1. In witness of the *removal of the old Roman Government* being what facilitated, and indeed was a necessary preliminary to, the establishment of the Popedom, let me cite two Romish writers : viz. 1st, *Damian*, a celebrated Monk contemporary with, and a friend of, Hildebrand; 2nd, the *orator of the tenth Session* of the 5th Lateran Council.—The former then puts these remarkable words into the mouth of Jesus Christ, as addressing the Pope : “Ego claves totius universalis ecclesie mee tuis manibus tradidi, et super eam te mihi Vicarium posui, quam proprii sanguinis effusione redemi : et, si pauca sunt ista, etiam monarchias tradidi. Immo, *sublato rege de medio*, totius Romani imperii *vacantis* tibi jura permisi.” (This passage is cited from Schmidt by Hallam, Mid. A. ii. 275.)—The latter (Harduin ix. 1789) thus speaks of Constantine’s removal of his imperial seat to Byzantium. “Constantinus, à divina gratiâ afflatus desuper, . . . *sceptrum imperii orbis et urbis, ac monarchiam universi*, vero et proprio Domino Deo, et homini in sede sua *Romanâ Silvestro*, Pontifici Maximo, in jure *primævo et naturali Christi*, æterni sacerdotis, . . . *plenè cessit*; . . . *alianque sedem jussu Christi*, et concessione Apostolicâ, *quesivit*, et sub obedientiâ sedis Apostolicæ in *Byzantio* erexit.” \*—In which statement there is a reference, I presume, to the famous forged Decretals of Constantine.

2. As to the Pope’s *headship*.—“Romanus Pontifex caput totius Christianæ communitalis princeps existit.” So Turcremata, in the xvth century, ap. Gieseler, vol. iii. 262. And in the xvith: “Sicut humanum corpus ex capite multisque membris conficitur, ad diversa naturæ munera obeunda, ita et ecclesia militans ex te sanctissimo Pontifice, *tanquam capite*, cæterisque Christicolis, *tanquam membris*, integratur.” Hard. ix. 1603. So too in the Notes pp. 158, 190, 192.

3. As to the Pope’s answering to the symbol of “*having eyes as the eyes of a man*.”—The symbol (which was explained by me abstractedly Note 1 p. 89 supra) is applied generally to the *Episcopacy* in the reported Decree of Pope Pius I., Hard. i. 96; “*Plebs episcopum non accuset*: . . . *Episcopi à Deo sunt judicandi, qui eos sibi oculos elegit*.” Concordant with which is the expression of Boniface I. (A.D. 419), “*Episcopatus speculam*” (Hard. ii. 1122); and that too of the Greek Emperor Constantine to the Roman Synod A.D. 681, after the 6th General Council; *τους της εκκλησιας οφθαλμους τους ιερας φαμεν*. Hard. iii. 1465. Also Gillebert; “*Oculi ejus [ecclesie] prophetae, oculi ejus apostoli, . . . oculi utrorumque interpretes et doctores populorum*. . . Sed nescio † si omnes qui oculi habeant officium teneant et usum.” In Cantic. Serm. xxiii. 1.—More particularly it is applied to the *Roman See and Pope*. So Boniface I of the Pope, under the name of Peter (Hard. ii. 1122): “*Intuetur enim te . . . beatissimus Petrus apostolus oculis suis, qualiter summi rectoris utaris officio: nec potest tibi esse non proximus qui pastor dominicarum ovium est perpetuus constitutus*.” So in 869 Anastasius the Librarian to Pope Adrian. After comparing the five Patriarchal Sees to the five senses, he makes the *Roman See* to answer to the *eye-sight*, as having oversight, so as no other, over the whole Church. “*Inter quas sedes quia Romana præcellit, non immerito visui comparatur*;

\* Protestant writers, as might be expected, also note this. So e.g. *Dean Waddington*. In his sketch of the *rise of the Papal supremacy*, chs. ix, x, he notices, as one of its three principal instrumental causes, the *removal of the civil Government from Rome to Ravenna* by the Emperor Honorius:—the other two being the Pope’s dignity as Patriarch of the West; and the Popes grounding their primacy, not on the circumstance of Rome being the Imperial City, but on their being *successors to Peter*, and with the *power of the keys*; that same which I have at large dwelt upon in an earlier Section of this Chapter.—*Daubuz*, p. 578, like Gibbon, cited in my Note<sup>2</sup> p. 151, contrasts the very different case of the Constantinopolitan Patriarchs, oppressed by the residence of the Emperor in the same city.

We may compare De Pradt’s account of Napoleon’s intention of transferring the Pope to Paris; so to have him under his eye, and thus in subjection. *Quatre Concordats*, Vol. ii. p. 257.—At the time of my passing this 5th edition through the press, (A.D. 1860, 1861,) the necessity of the Pope’s independency as a *temporal sovereign at Rome*, in order to the acting out of his *spiritual* sovereignty, has been prominently set forth by all the advocates of the Papacy. † Ap. Bernardi Op.

The period involved in the comprehensive glance which we have now to take, in pursuing the history, is a large one: seeing that it ranges over near 1000 years, from Charlemagne and Pope Adrian I to Gregory VII, from Gregory VII to Boniface VIII, from Boniface VIII to Leo X and the Reformation, and from Leo to the French Revolution. Of the which its four remaining constituent parts,<sup>1</sup> the *first* (to use again the Waldensian simile<sup>2</sup>) may be regarded as that of the Papal Antichrist's *growth into a perfect man*; the *two next* those of his *continued maturity*; the *fourth* that of his *decline*:—just as the *earlier period*, from Justinian to Gregory, and Gregory to Charlemagne, was that of his *vigorous childhood and youth*. But through one and all, from youth to maturity, and maturity to decline, he appears on the page of history ever answering to the Apocalyptic description before us.—The evidence abounds in profusion. It needs not however, (especially as considering the historic illustrations elsewhere given by me of the same subject,<sup>3</sup>) that I should here offer in proof of it any more than a very slight and brief sketch.

1. And, first, of the Beast's *pride and blasphemies*.  
 "There was given unto him a mouth speaking great things,"<sup>4</sup>

qui profecto cunctis sensibus præeminet, acutior illis existens, et communionem, sicut nullus eorum, cum omnibus habens." Hard. v. 754.—So again Pope Innocent IV., A.D. 1245, in his sentence against the Emperor Frederic; "Ad apostolicæ dignitatis apicem . . . assumpti, *omnium Christianorum . . . merita* intimæ considerationis *oculo* . . . discernere debemus." Hard. vii. 381. Other examples occur ib. 1321, 1338, 1353. And in similar figure St. Bernard (De Consid. ii. 6) says to Pope Eugenius, "Qui *speculator* super omnia constitucris."—So was the Pope's the *oculus pastoralis* *κατ' ἐξοχήν*.

<sup>1</sup> The first from about A.D. 800 to 1080; the 2nd from 1080 to 1300; the 3rd from 1300 to 1517; the 4th from 1517 to 1793.

<sup>2</sup> See my Vol. ii. p. 396, and p. 152 Note<sup>2</sup> *suprà*.

<sup>3</sup> Especially in my Part iii. Chapter iii. on Leo X, with regard to the Papal pride and blasphemies; and in those on Apoc. ix. 20, and on the Witnesses, Vol. ii. pp. 20, 28, 424, &c., with regard to the Papal oppression of the saints, and Papal cruelties.

<sup>4</sup> Apoc. xiii. 2 describes this as a *lion's mouth*. And it is observable that the very symbol of a *lion's mouth, speaking great things*, is ascribed eulogistically by Pope Nicolas I. in the 9th century to Pope Leo the Great, the earliest founder of the Popedom:—"Nisi imitator scilicet illius *leonis* de quo scriptum est, Vicit Leo de tribu Juda, divinitus excitatus, *os aperiens*, totum orbem et ipsos quoque Augustos concuteret, et ad pietatem commoveret, religio catholica penitus corruisset." The extract is given by Dauhuz, p. 580.—And so *Hincmar* of the same Leo, Harduin v. 402; "Magnus Leo maximo rugitu de urbe Romæ, orbis scilicet capite, per totum mundum intonat."—See too my Vol. ii. pp. 59, 75, 85.

I conceive that Daniel's 4th Beast's "mouth, speaking great things," (Dan. vii. 8,) was symbolized in the vision as a *great mouth*, like the *great lion-like mouth* of the

and blasphemies."—The fulfilment of this, in all the plentitude of the symbol, was involved, we may truly say, in the Papal assumed character as *Christ's Vicar*, i. e. as Antichrist.<sup>1</sup> For assuming, as the Pope falsely did, to be *Christ's Vicar*, Christ's *plenipotentiary* Vicar, on earth, let me ask, how could he but utter great things and blasphemies?—For example, could he who represented the Judge of all be amenable to man's judgment? We have already seen the Pope's early and solemn deprecation of the idea:<sup>2</sup> and, as time went on, still the same was asserted by his great mouth. He might judge all, but could be judged by none; might make laws, but was above laws.<sup>3</sup> (Did the remembrance never cross his mind, we may think, of the *ανομος* or *lawless one*, of St. Paul's prophecy?<sup>4</sup>)—Again, could earthly kings be esteemed equal by him?

Apocalyptic Beast. In similar figure wrote Sophocles, Antig. 127, (a passage cited before by me on Dan. vii.,) *Ζεὺς γὰρ μέγαλης γλωσσῆς κομπῶνς ὑπερεχθαίρει.* Also Shakspeare, in his King John;

"Here's a *large mouth* indeed,  
That spits forth death and mountains, rocks, and seas."

Of course, however, the symbol of the *lion's mouth*, while signifying this, must also be considered to have had reference to the strength of the Papal antitype to tear and destroy the saints; just as the *bear's feet* represented his power to oppress them. *Λεουσι χασμ' ὀδοντων*, says Anacreon; and Ovid, *Armatos unguibus ursos*.

<sup>1</sup> I beg to refer the reader generally, on the subject of this Section, to Gieseler's Eccles. Hist. Period iii. § 61, 62.

<sup>2</sup> In the Roman Council of A.D. 503, under Pope Symmachus. See p. 158 *suprà*.

<sup>3</sup> In the time of Charlemagne, A.D. 799, a Roman Council enacted precisely the same part as that convened by Theodoric. The Pope having been accused, the Council declined to hear his accusers; declaring that he who was judge of all men was above being judged by any other than himself: and, on his coming in, and asserting his innocence, he was considered as acquitted. Sir Isaac Newton on Daniel, p. 86, notes this from Anastasius.—So again about 1090 A.D. Urban II: (Hard. vi. ii. 1650:) "Pape soli fas esse de omni ecclesiâ judicandi; ipsum vero nullorum subjacere judicio."—Afterwards in the *Canon Law*, collected and published by Gratian in the xiith century, it was said; "Pontificem constat à pio Principe Constantino *Deum* appellatum; nec posse Deum ab hominibus judicari manifestum est." Gratian Decret. Dist. 96, Can. *Satis*. ap. Daubuz 581.\* A precedent urged earlier by Pope Nicholas I, A.D. 860, on the Emperor Michael. Hard. v. 146.

The claim continued unchanged in the 15th century. So A.D. 1464, on Paul II dismissing Platina after his election, and Platina's threatening to bring the case before the judges of the Rota, Paul fiercely replied; "*Nos ad judices revocæ? Ac si nescires omnia jura in scrinio pectoris nostri collocata esse? . . . Pontifex sum: mihi que licet arbitrio animi aliorum acta et rescindere et approbare.*" Wadd. iii. 273.—See too, as illustrating the Pope's fit claim to the appellative *ανομος*, even in the xvth century, the extracts from contemporary Papal jurists, ap. Gieseler, vol. iii. § 135, pp. 264, 265.

<sup>4</sup> See my p. 102 *suprà*.

\* Daubuz calls the Canon Law and Decretals the Pope's Oracle, pp. 581, 587. Nor without reason. "Inter *cononicas Scripturas* Decretales Epistolæ connumerantur." So, as he cites it, the Canon Law itself.—See too Mosheim xii. 2. 1. 6, and Gieseler, vol. ii. § 60, on the fact of their being a true expression of the Papal mind.

Was it not Christ's own appointment that he should be king of kings, and head over all, in his place, on earth; <sup>1</sup> and from the power of the keys given him, could there exist a being that might plead exemption? <sup>2</sup> His exaltation and superiority in this character above all mere royal or imperial Majesty he declared to be that of the sun above the moon; which latter indeed had no light but what it derived from the sun: <sup>3</sup> and that it was but a fit mark of their subordination that all Princes should kiss his feet. <sup>4</sup> Their kingdoms in fact were but held from him. <sup>5</sup> It was his to make kings and unmake; to assign kingdoms, and to take them away. <sup>6</sup> He kicked the imperial crown, on one occasion

<sup>1</sup> So in the Roman Council held A.D. 877 (Hard. vi. 184); "Papam ipse Christus omnium nostrum, ad vicem suam in terris, voluit esse caput." "Rex regum" is a Papal title that occurs not infrequently. So Hard. vii. 374 of Innocent IV, and ib. ix. 1705 of Leo X.

<sup>2</sup> So Pope Gregory VII. "I cannot find," he said, on excommunicating the Emperor Henry IV., "that when the Lord confided to Peter the power of the keys, he made any exception in favour of kings." Müller xv. 2.

<sup>3</sup> So Innocent III., about 1200 A.D.; and in a spirit as proud, by Boniface VIII, about A.D. 1300. Wadd. ii. 167, Gieseler ii. 247.—The imperial title *Augustus* (*αὐβασταρος*) given by the Pope to Charlemagne and his successors, and the nearly equivalent title of *His Majesty*, given to others of the Western Kings, made the fulfilment of St. Paul's prophecy in this Papal super-regal self-exaltation more literally striking. See pp. 97, 98 supra.

<sup>4</sup> Capitolinus in his Life of the younger Maximin, c. 2, speaks of his pride in sometimes admitting such a mode of salutation. "In salutationibus superbissimus erat, et . . . genua sibi osculari patiebatur, nonnunquam etiam pedes." On which Casaubon remarks, that "pedum oscula Caligulae propria, et similia monstrorum." But even in these cases it was kings that were so saluted by their subjects. In the Pope's case it was by kings. "Quod solius Papae pedes omnes principes deosculentur," was one of Gregory the 7th's dictates. Hard. vi. 1304.

Raynald. xii. 107, relates an exemplification that I shall have to notice under my next head, which occurred as late as A.D. 1515, just before the Reformation. The arrangement made by Paris, Bishop of Pisaurum, Master of ceremonies to the Pope, who was present on the occasion, was that the French king should kneel thrice in approaching the enthroned Pope; and first kiss his feet, ere he kissed his hand and face.

<sup>5</sup> Ducange on the word *Imperator* quotes from Glaber Rodolphus, A.D. 900, the Pope's "optimum decretum" following; "Ne quisquam auctor Romani Imperii sceptrum gestare Princeps appetat, seu Imperator dici aut esse valeat, nisi quem *Papa sedis Romanae* morum probitate aptum elegerit Reipublicae, eique commiserit insigne Imperiale."

It has been said that Pope Constantine, A.D. 708, was the first Pope that claimed the right of confirming temporal princes in their kingdoms. And perhaps correctly.

<sup>6</sup> Baronius relates (Foulis, Roman Treasons, p. 115) that on St. Medard's building a church at Soissons, Gregory I, in giving it certain privileges, declared in the Deed that *the King should be degraded or deposed* who violated them; and so furnished an early precedent to succeeding Popes. But the deed is suspected.

We have, however, an authentic account of the deposition of the race of Clovis by Pope Zachary in the 8th century. And afterwards came Gregory VII's disposal of the German empire as a fief of St. Peter: deposing Henry, and conferring the crown on Rodolphus, in the versified grant already cited by me;

Petra dedit Petro, Petrus diadema Rodulpho.

Again (Gieseler ii. 247), in the year 1303 Boniface, on confirming Albrecht in the

of the coronation of an emperor, in token of it.<sup>1</sup> On another, "Is not the king of England my bondslave?" was his voice from the great mouth:<sup>2</sup> and yet again; "He hath set me as prince over all nations, to root out and to pull down, to destroy and to build."<sup>3</sup>—The promises of the latter day, made to Christ, he cited as to be fulfilled in *him*; (so changing *times*, as well as *laws*, according to the prophecy:<sup>4</sup>) and proclaimed that the glory of the predicted

*Emperorship*, declared that it was by the Pope's authority (as Christ's Vicar) that the imperial crown had been transferred from the Greek empire to Charlemagne and his successors. "Et attendant hic Germani," added Boniface; "quia, sicut translatum est imperium ab aliis in ipsos, sic Christi Vicarius, successor Petri, habet potestatem transferendi imperium à Germanis in alios quoscumque, si vellet; et hoc sine juris injuriâ." All which was humbly submitted to and confessed by Albrecht.

Gregory VII. further declared *France* tributary to Rome, *England* a fief of Rome and tributary; as also *Spain, Saxony, &c.*, and *Naples*, an admitted fief. See Waddington, Vol. ii. p. 77.—The later subjection of *King John of England* by Innocent III. and, after his deposition, the redonation to him of the kingdom as a Papal fief,—moreover, in the case of Philip and Otho, his disposal of the German Empire (Wadd. ii. 164) are well known.—Daubuz, p. 585, states, from Pius II's letters, that he proposed even to the *Turkish Sultan* to give him a legal title to the Greek empire, if he would assist him. (Æneus Sylv. Epist. 396:—cited too, I see, by Guers, Ch. Hist. ii. 33.) Again, there were the later Papal grants of the Indies to Spain and Portugal, mentioned in my Vol. ii. pp. 72—75.

The orator of the 1st Session of the 5th Lateran Council proudly refers to the many previous actings out of the Papal prerogative in the deposition of refractory Kings. Hard. ix. 1605.

Even in our own days, and in the time of his deep temporary humiliation under Napoleon, the Pope asserted the same authority. "Qu'ils apprennent," said Pius VII. in his excommunication of Napoleon, June 10, 1809, "qu'ils sont soumis par la loi de Jésus Christ à notre trône, et à notre commandement." Abbé de Pradt, Quatre Concordats.

<sup>1</sup> This was Pope Celestin III, A.D. 1191, on occasion of the coronation of Henry VI. The fact is thus described by Roger of Hoveden. "But the Lord Pope sat in the Pontifical chair, holding the golden imperial crown between his feet; and the Emperor bending his head received the crown, and the Empress in the same manner, from the feet of the Lord Pope. But the Lord Pope instantly struck with his foot the Emperor's crown, and cast it upon the ground; signifying that he had the power of deposing him from the Empire, if he were undeserving of it. The Cardinals however lifted up the crown, and placed it on the Emperor's head."—The proceeding was too remarkable not to be often noticed afterwards, both by Papists and anti-Papists. So e. g. by Baronius ad ann. 1191, and Martene De Rit. ii. 204, on the one hand; and, on the other, by Jortin, Ecc. Hist. iii. 245, and Puffendorf, apud Clarke on the Dragon, p. 316.

With reference to this usurpation of supremacy over kings, Eberhard, Archbishop of Saltzburg in 1210, thus remarkably applies Daniel's prophecy of the fourth Beast and his little horn to the Papacy:—"The Emperor is now no more than a name. The ten kings who have parted the world among them (Mark, *the ten*) do destroy, rather than govern it. . . Under them is grown up that little horn which has eyes, and a mouth speaking proud things." Ap. Cressener, p. 189.

<sup>2</sup> So Innocent IV. Le Bas' Wicliff, p. 67.

<sup>3</sup> The words, I think, of Boniface VIII. against Philip King of France; as well as of Pius V. in his excommunication of our Queen Elizabeth. Soutley, p. 396.

<sup>4</sup> Dan. vii. 25. Compare verse 22; "Until the time came that the saints (God's true saints) possess the kingdom." I prefer the sense above given to Mede's: who (p. 737) explains the clause of *changing and deposing kings*; an explanation grounded on Dan. ii. 21.

consummation consisted but in this, that all kings throughout the whole world were then at length to bow down to *him*, all nations to do *him* service.<sup>1</sup>

Further, as Christ's appointed representative and impersonator, did not each *ecclesiastical* and *spiritual* prerogative office and title of Christ attach also to him?<sup>2</sup> If Christ *the universal shepherd of souls*, was not he, the Pope, the same?<sup>3</sup> If Christ *the door* of the sheep, was not *he* the door?<sup>4</sup> If Christ *the truth*, was not *he* the depository, source, and oracular expounder of truth; even as one equally *independent, authoritative, and infallible*?<sup>5</sup> If Christ the *Holy One*, was not he the same; and did not the title distinctively and alone belong to him of *His Holiness*?<sup>6</sup> If

<sup>1</sup> See my Vol. ii. pp. 71, 81.

<sup>2</sup> Cardinal Bellarmine (writing under Papal sanction) expressly affirms that every title which is in Scripture given to Christ appertains also to the Pope; and, to guard against misapprehension, he gives a copious enumeration of them.

<sup>3</sup> So in Julius's Bull of Indiction of the 5th Lateran Council; "Pastorem et patrem animarum." Hard. ix. 1587.

<sup>4</sup> So Paschal ii. Hard. vi. ii. 1842.

<sup>5</sup> *Independent* even of sacred Scripture, and against it. So in the Canon Law; "Papa contra Apostolum dispensat, et contra Canones Apostolorum: item contra Vetus Testamentum." "Papa potest contra Apostolum dispensare." "Dispensat in evangelio interpretando ipsum."—The Holy Scriptures even, it was said, derived their authority from him. "Vetus Novumque Testamentum sunt recipienda, non quòd Codici Canonum ex toto habeantur annexa, sed quòd de his recipiendis Sancti Papæ Innocentii prolata videatur esse sententia." The extracts are given by Daubuz, p. 582: also by Gieseler, Per. iii. § 61, Note 7. See too my Vol. ii. pp. 64, 65.—In a debate in the House of Commons, March 13, 1855, Mr. Drummond having cited as a Roman Church law, "*Papa potest legem Dei mutare*," as also another, to the effect that the Pope could make *vitia* to be *virtutes*, and vice versâ, (on which see Book of the Church, p. 190,) he was contradicted by Mr. Ball, saying that the former citation was from Bellarmine, and had been repudiated at Rome. Yes, rejoined Mr. D., but how? It was substantially retained, with just this alteration; "Papa non potest Dei legem mutare *sine causa*."

I need hardly mention again his retention of the Apocryphal Books in it, agreeably with the original arrangement of Pope Gelasius.—The Papal claims to *infallibility*, begun by Pope Gelasius, says Jortin, are too notorious to need the adduction of evidence. The *Gallican* Romanists, indeed, at least those of Bossuet's school, say that the *infallibility* of the Romish Church resides in the Pope and Council conjointly; but the *Cis-Alpine* and *Italian* divines, including of course the Popes themselves, that it resides in the Pope personally. Hear Gregory X: "Perpetue sanctionis oraculo definimus." Such was the Papal style in announcing his dogmas. Hard. vii. 709.

It is observable that *Gregory Nyssen*, on account of Eunomius adulterating Scripture, and perverting it to his purpose, calls him *Antichrist*; thus closing his xith Oration contra Eunomium; "Ὁ γὰρ τῶν τοῦ Χριστοῦ λόγων κριωπιτερας τὰς ἰδίας φωνὰς ἀποδείξει φιλονεικῶν, . . . τι ἄλλο κυρίως, καὶ οὐχι Ἀντιχριστὸς λεγοῖτο; (ap. Saucer on Antichrist.) Jerome too says of Antichrist; "Mutabit, et auget tentabit sacramenta ecclesie." (In 2 Thess. ii.) And, accordantly therewith, addition to the sacraments was also made, and through the same authority, by the Popes.

<sup>6</sup> In the degeneracy of the Roman empire during the third and fourth centuries the *language* suffered: and, instead of the former simplicity and directness of *personal* address, abstract qualities, suitable as was supposed to the office or station filled by an individual, were addressed; e. g.—*Your Majesty, Your Grace, &c.*: a strange custom which has come down to the present times.—In the *ecclesiastical* phraseology the

Christ the *husband of the Church*, was not *he* her husband? With the *marriage ring* in the ceremonial of his inauguration he signified it;<sup>1</sup> with his great voice in the Canon law and Papal bulls he proclaimed it to the world.<sup>2</sup>—Indeed the power of the keys of Christ's Church and kingdom, given him, extended into the invisible world. He opened with them, and who might shut; shut, and who might open? With his indulgences, as the Lamb of God, he took away the sins of the world,<sup>3</sup> thereby assuring the faithful in this life of forgiveness and of Heaven:<sup>4</sup> yea, and by their power evoked suffering souls out of purgatory;<sup>5</sup> therein surpassing

same change naturally occurred as in that of the *state*. *Christians* having been called generally by the apostle a *holy people*, and *Christian ministers* and *bishops* being supposed to be such more especially, the titles of *Your Grace*, *Your Holiness* (Ἡ ὁσιότης σου), and other such appellations were given to the Bishop. (See Eusebius, V. C. iii. 18, iv. 42; Hard. ii. 579; Augustin, Epist. passim.) But when the Popes established their power, just as they abstracted from the general body of the bishops and clergy the *power of the keys*, (except as subordinates,) and concentrated it in themselves, so too they appropriated to themselves distinctively the title of *Your Holiness* as the proper *Papal title*. Compare Note <sup>2</sup> p. 165 *suprà*, on another Papal title.

<sup>1</sup> It was an early custom that on the consecration of a Bishop, the Metropolitan, who by right performed the ceremony, should place in the hands of the prelate a *ring*, as well as a *crozier*; the former in symbol of his spiritual connexion with the Church he was to govern, as the latter of his pastoral duties. "*Anulus*," said the 2d Lateran Council, "in quibus ad ipsos pertinens (Qu. *pertinentis*?) *ecclesie desponsatio* exprimitur." Hard. vi. ii. 1215. It was the attempt, in fact, of the *German Emperors* to present these emblems of spiritual authority, that caused the celebrated quarrel between Gregory VII and the Emperor Henry, and the wars of the *investiture*. See Waddington, ch. xvi. vol. ii. p. 71. In the case of the Pope's consecration the *ring* is given in token of his marriage to the *Church Universal*. So *Martene de Rit.* ii. 89; quoted by me Vol. ii. p. 52, Note <sup>3</sup>.

<sup>2</sup> The Canon Law frequently calls the Pope the *Husband of the Church*; which, says Daubuz, p. 582, Bellarmine explains by saying, *etiam Christo secluso*; "even to the exclusion of Christ."—The appellation is frequent. I may refer to my sketch of the orations in the 5th Lateran Council, given Vol. ii. pp. 80, 81, &c., for a specimen: where the Pope, being present, received it as *but his due*.

Bonanni, i. 441, 447, illustrates by a medal of Gregory XIV, in which a woman representing Religion, or the Roman Church Catholic, is depicted with a cross in one hand, the triple crown in the other; and the legend "*Sponsus meus decoravi coronâ*." Other Bishops, says Bonanni, are "*sponsi ecclesiarum suarum*;" the Pope the "*sponsus ecclesie universalis*."

<sup>3</sup> See the address of the Sicilian ambassadors noted by me p. 189 *infra*: language accepted by the Pope, like all the rest, as *but his due*.

<sup>4</sup> See in my Vol. ii. pp. 67, 68, the glaring exemplification of this asserted power of the Papal Indulgences given by the Papal agent Tetzl, before the Reformation; and the facsimile of an Indulgence, here engraved, that was issued two centuries after the Reformation.—And compare Tertullian's indignant exclamation at the assumption of any such power by the Roman or any other Pontiff:—"Audio enim edictum esse propositum, et quidem peremptorium. Pontifex Maximus, quod est Episcopus Episcoporum, edicit, Ego et mœchiæ et fornicationis delicta penitentiaë functis dimitto. O edictum! Absit à sponsa Christi tale præconium!" De Pudicit. c. 1. A passage already cited by me p. 153 *suprà*. But *this*, says Shepherd, *may* have been simply a relaxation by the Roman Bishop of ecclesiastical censures. (Com. Prayer, ii. 485.)

<sup>5</sup> For an early reported exemplification of this Papal prerogative, viz. as exercised



Christ himself (as he boasted) in his range of mercy.<sup>1</sup> And what of his anathemas? Dreadfuller far than the thunderbolts of the Capitoline Jove, his prototype,<sup>2</sup> they doomed rebels to hell.<sup>3</sup>—Even the Spirits of heaven that fell not were subject to him: so that he might bid the Angels to charge themselves with the souls of the Jubilean pilgrims, that died in obeying his invitation to Rome.<sup>4</sup> Nay, it was his prerogative to add to the celestial choir. By his canonizing edicts he distinctively elevated whom he pleased of the dead into Saints of angelic rank and privilege; thenceforward to form part of heaven's own hierarchy, and to be made objects to living men of adoration and worship.<sup>5</sup>

by the 1st Gregory in favour of Trajan, see my Note p. 166 *suprà*. For an exemplification before all Europe just before the Reformation see the historic sketch of Tetzels in my Vol. ii. p. 68.—A later exemplification of it met my eye in the Gregorian Chapel, connected by a few steps of descent with the Basilica of the S. Croce in Gerusalemme at Rome. By the altar there stands the advertisement; “*Celebrandosi la S. Messa in questo altare si libera un’ anima dal Purgatorio, come risulta dalla Bolla della S. M. di Gregorio XIII.*” And hard by is also inscribed the authorization in the Bull as follows. “*De divinâ misericordiâ confisi tenore presentium concedimus ut, quoties quicumque sacerdos, sive secularis sive regularis, missam in altari S. Gregorii nuncupando, sito subtus ecclesiam Sanctæ Crucis in Hierosolymâ de Urbe, et contrâ altare S. Elenæ ibi prope, [celebret,] pro liberatione unius animæ in purgatorio existentis celebraverit.*” Gregory XIII was Pope from 1572 to 1585; the same whose effigy is on the Papal Bartholomæan medal given below.

<sup>1</sup> So it was stated in Theses that were publicly discussed in the Schools. Southey, Book of Ch. p. 191.

<sup>2</sup> As regards the famous bronze statue of the apostle Peter in St. Peter's, “a Roman antiquary,” says Dr. Burton, (*viz.* Turrigius De Crypt. Vat. p. 126.) “informus us that this was made by order of St. Leo out of the bronze of a statue of Jupiter Capitolinus; and that it was intended as an offering for St. Peter having liberated Rome from the fury of Attila... The workmanship is extremely rude; and, though it is called a bronze statue, it has much more the appearance of iron.” *Antiq. of Rome* ii. 144. (2nd Ed.)—Mr. Benjamin Gibson, the well-known sculptor at Rome, informed me that he had tested a small piece of the metal, and found it to be that which was used in the ancient statues; being quite different from the bronze of the moderns.—Daubuz, p. 569, says that it was changed into a statue of St. Peter, simply by substituting the two keys now in his hand for the original thunderbolt.

See the Pope's assimilation to Jupiter by Castalio, as cited in my Vol. ii. p. 60.

<sup>3</sup> “*Vinclis anathematis obligatus in gehennâ cum diabolo deputabitur.*” So Pope Adrian II. (867—872, A.D.) Ducange on *Excommunicatio*.



<sup>4</sup> Giannone's Naples, B. xxii. ch. 8. I have already alluded to this, Vol. ii. p. 19.

<sup>5</sup> The first canonization by Popes was that of Udalric by Pope John XV. A.D. 993. Now and then other Bishops of eminence also decreed the apotheosis. But in the 12th century Alexander III ordained that the canonization of saints was to be viewed as exclusively a *Papal* prerogative. Mosh. ix. 2. 3. 4; x. 2. 3. 4.—“*Romanus Pontifex,*” said Pope Alexander VI. A.D. 1494, on his canonization of Archbishop Anselm, “*viros claros et electos. . . inter sanctos debet collocare; et, ut sanctos, ab omnibus Christi fidelibus coli, venerari, et adorari mandare.*” Hard. ix. 1552. And by a Decree of Pope Urban VIII, dated March 13, 1625, it was provided that the images of departed saints may not be exhibited with a glory round their heads, nor lighted candles set before them, nor anything else implying veneration or worship be shown or address to them, before they have been canonized or beatified by the

THE USURPING VICE-CHRIST'S  
asserted power over the world of the living

Man-created object of worship.  
(Martin V. A.D.1417.)

Supremacy over Kings  
(Calixtus III.A.D.1456.)




Papal Indulgence.

SANCTISSIMO  
DNO NRO PAPA  
CLEMENTI XII

*Indulgentie  
hujus donavit, ut per hanc  
forma concessa  
Pro Eo et Rmo Angli  
P. A. dee Revocabit*

*Indulgentie  
plenarie Pro  
Nathano Hickman  
Anglo*



*Nathan Hickman Anglus Roma presens humillime supplicat  
Sanctitati vestre ut benigne concedere dignetur indulgentiam plenariam  
in articulo mortis sibi suisq; consanguineis et affinibus usq; ad Sradum etiam  
inclusive nec non viginti quinq; alio personis arbitrio dispensandis Dumo de  
tunc vere poenitentes et confessi de sacra communione reflecti fuerint vel  
quatenus id facere requiverint Satem Contrite Nomen Jesu ore, sin ming  
Certe Deo te invocaverint, quam gratiam Deus eo.*



From Original in the Library of  
Trin Col. Cambridge

Life-giver in pestilence.  
(Gregory XIII. A.D.1572.)

Opener of heaven at the Jubilee.  
(Clement VII. A.D.1525)



The Coins from Benanni.



Was it not then with reason that he claimed to be revered even as CHRIST; <sup>1</sup> and in every way inculcated the fact of Christ's impersonation in him on the minds and eyes of men? <sup>2</sup> Was it not with reason that he averred that to pretend to rivalry with him was to act as Antichrist; <sup>3</sup> to violate his Canons, blasphemy against Him who had been

Apostolic Sec. See on this Bonanni i. 39, and the Bullar. Rom. referred to by him: also my Vol. ii. pp. 16, 26.

How similar the law of *Pagan* apotheoses, as reported by Tertullian, adv. Gent. 34; "Maledictum est ante ἀποθεωσιν deum Cæsarem nuncupare." On which see Eckhel vi. 474.—Of the *Pagan* Ceremonial of canonization an interesting illustrative picture may be seen in Montfaucon, Vol. v. pp. 102—104; of the *Papal* one in Picart's Book on the Ceremonies Religieuses.

<sup>1</sup> The Pope was thus addressed frequently, and received it, like his other titles, as distinctively and only his due. In my Note <sup>3</sup> p. 159 *suprà*, we have seen how Ennodius, the oracle of the then convened Roman Council, as early as the opening of the 6th century, so address him. In the xiith we have the notable exemplification of it by St. Bernard; "Considera te esse . . . Vicarium Christi, *Christum Domini*." Ep. to Pope Eugenius III. De Consid. iv. 7. Another and later illustration occurs in the Sienna General Council A.D. 1423, afterwards translated to Basle: an official report about Pope Martin's Embassy to the Greek Emperor containing the following description of the Pope by his own accredited orator: "Sanctissimus et beatissimus, qui habet cœleste arbitrium, qui est Dominus in terris, successor Petri, *Christus Domini*, dominus universi, regum pater, orbis lumen, summus Pontifex, Papa Martinus." Hard. viii. 1019. And yet a later is given in my sketch of the addresses to Pope Leo X, by the appointed preachers in the Lateran Council, Vol. ii. p. 80.

It was the command of Gregory VII, (Hard. vi. 1304,) "Pape solius nomen in ecclesiis recitetur:" and Southey observes that men were required to bow at the Pope's name (so recited), as at *Christ's*. Book of the Church, p. 190.

<sup>2</sup> So, 1st, *personally*, in his acting out, with studied dramatic effect, during the Holy Week, alike of what might seem acts of humiliation, (barring certain salvos to the Papal dignity,) such as that of washing the disciples' feet, and ministering to them at the last supper: also of acts of self-exaltation, as when claiming admittal at St. Peter's, by the opening of the everlasting doors to him, in his character of the King of glory, into the heavenly temple:—the former two, as all visitors to Rome know, on the Maunday Thursday; the latter on the Palm Sunday at St. Peter's. (In which ceremonies the kneeling of the attendant who brings the ewer, or dishes, to the Pope will not have been unnoticed by an attentive eye.)—So again, 2ndly, in the multitudinous medals and paintings authorized by him, in which he is intended under the figure of Jesus Christ. See my Vol. ii. p. 55, &c., for some paintings illustrative. For *medallic* illustrations see Bonanni *passim*. So e. g. from the coins of Gregory XIII, one with Christ thus addressing the kneeling multitudes; "Come to me all that are weary, and I will refresh you:" and one of Sixtus V. representing Christ, with a scourge, driving the profane out of the temple, and the legend, "My house is a house of prayer, &c." So too another of the same Gregory in my Plate, with that Pope's dragon-crest as the brazen serpent lifted up.

<sup>1</sup> I may add to this the Pope's association with himself of a council of 70 cardinals, as if in representation of Jesus Christ's 70 disciples. So Gibb. xii. 301.—Among Huss's errors was noted his saying, "Quod Cardinales non sunt veri successores collegii Apostolorum Christi, nisi vixerint more Apostolorum." Hard. viii. 411.

<sup>3</sup> When there were two or more rival Popes, they branded their rivals as *Antichrists*. In this they only adopted the phrasology of St. Bernard against the Anti-Pope Anacletus: "Eccè *Christus Domini*, iste Innocentius, positus est in ruinam et in resurrectionem multorum. Nam qui Dei sunt libenter junguntur ei: qui autem ex adverso stat aut *Antichristi* est, aut *Antichristus*." Ep. 124.

Pope Leo, in the extract given by me Note <sup>3</sup> p. 156 *suprà*, had furnished them with an early authority and precedent.

outpoured upon *Christ* without measure, the Holy Ghost?<sup>1</sup> Was it not again with reason that he claimed the homage and submission, not of the knee and lip only, but (through the confessionals of his universal priesthood) of the inmost soul and conscience of men everywhere; even as Him whose eye was upon the seven golden candlesticks, and whose province that of the searcher of the reins and hearts.<sup>2</sup>—Yea, as Christ was GOD, (mark the manner in which this great truth of Christianity was held by him,—even as a usurper might exalt the dignity of a crown plucked from the rightful and royal head, and set upon his own,)<sup>3</sup>—I say, as Christ was GOD, was it not reasonable that he should every way inculcate on men the impression that he was to be looked on as the Divinely appointed VICE-GOD,<sup>4</sup> and so as GOD?<sup>5</sup> Fitly therefore might he signify this also before

<sup>1</sup> So the Canon Law, *Violator*, referred to by Daubuz, p. 582: also Pope Sixtus' affirmation, cited by Brightman, p. 441 (Ed. 1644); that "whosoever accuseth the Pope it shall never be forgiven him: because whoso sinneth against the *Holy Ghost* shall never be forgiven; neither in this life, nor in that to come." (Concil. Tom. i. in the Purgat. of Sixtus.)—Hence *the dove*, in symbol of the Holy Ghost, hovering over the Pope, in some of the Papal medals engraved in my Plates.

<sup>2</sup> Compare Apoc. ii. 1, 23. Also (ap. Bonanni i. 422) the medal of Urban VII. with the type of the seven-branched candlestick. "To pretend to a dominion over the conscience is to usurp the prerogative of God." So the Henoticon of Zeno (Emperor of the East from 474 to 491). Milman i. 321.

<sup>3</sup> See p. 70 *suprà*.—I would beg those who make distinction in modern days between the *Socinian* and the *Papal* heresies, all in favour of the latter, to consider this. For my own part I would rather a man should deery and deny me any honour I might be entitled to,—than that, after having robbed me of it, and appropriated it to himself, he should exalt it in value, thereby to add to his own dignity.

<sup>4</sup> "Summus Pontifex non hominis puri, sed *veri Dei*, verè Vicarius appellatur." So Innocent III in his Lib. i. Epist. 326 ad Faventin. Episc. And again Epist. 335; "Romanus Pontifex non puri hominis, sed *veri Dei*, vicem gerit in terris," cited by Gieseler, on A.D. 1073—1395, § 61, Note <sup>6</sup>.

So again in the Jesuit Caraffa's theses, of which Bishop Bedell wrote from Venice, A.D. 1608; theses dedicated to the reigning Pope Paul V., and not disavowed by him: on the top of which, printed as they were in the form of a tower, an altar was depicted, and the Pope's picture upon it; with the inscription, (one to which I shall have to recur in my Chapter viii. on the *Beast's Number*;) "Paulo V. *Vice-Deo*, Christiano Reipublice Monarchæ Invictissimo, et *Pontificiæ Omnipotentie Conservatori Acerrimo."* Bedell's Life by Monck Mason, p. 68.—Sir Culling Eardly, in a late Pamphlet, notices the following title of a book, published with the sanction of the Neapolitan censorship in 1724, and which illustrates the common application of this title *Vice-God* to the Popes, even in the xviiiith century; "Istoria dell' antica Republica di Amalfi; Consecrata al *Vice-Deo* Benedetto decimo-terzo, Pontefice Ottimo Massimo. Con licenza dei Superiori."

<sup>5</sup> So the Papal Casuists; "Honorem qui debetur *Christo*, secundum quòd *Deus* est, deberi *Papæ*; quia honor debetur potestati. Sed una est potestas *Christi*, secundum quòd *Deus* est, et *Papæ*." Noted by Vitringa, p. 797, from Heidegg. Myst. Bab. The same had been set forth by Innocent in his Decretals; (apud Gieseler ubi *suprà*;) "DEUS quia *Dei Vicarius*;" also in the Canon Law's statement, before referred to, that Constantine called the Pope a *God*; with the gloss, "Our Lord God the Pope." See p. 175 Note <sup>3</sup>

men: fitly in God's Church or temple, and during the chanting of Psalms professedly in God's worship, on a throne placed apart in the midst, hold then and there his levée, and have all the ceremonial of reception gone through:<sup>1</sup>

Let me add the following striking statement, to the same effect, from the "Speculum Vitæ Humanæ" of Rodericus Sancius, Romish Bishop and Referendary of Pope Paul II; a book published at Rome, by Papal authority, in 1468, and many times afterwards. "Obtundit omnem humanum intellectum illius sacratissimi . . . statûs majestas. . . Si nihil in hoc seculo excellentius statu et dignitate simplicium sacerdotum, quid cogitandum est de summo Pontifice qui vices veri Dei gerit in terris? . . . qui non ad humanum tantum principatum, sed ad divinum, non ad principatum solum mortalibus, sed angelis, non ad judicandum vivos, sed mortuos, non in terrâ solum, sed in celo, . . . à summo Deo, et in ejus loco, . . . evectus est." The passage is cited by Gieseler, § 135, Vol. iii. p. 263.

Well truly might the famous Gerson's saying about one particular Pope have been generalized: "Les Bulles de Jean XXIII. commencent par un mensonge, . . . *Serviteur des Serviteurs de Dieu*. . . Il devrait plutôt s'intituler *Seigneur des Seigneurs*. Aussi bien se vante-t'il d'avoir autant de puissance que *Jesus Christ* en possède, comme Dieu et homme." Guers. Hist. de l'Egl. ii. 38.

The language of the Canon Law, and frequency not only of the application of the title of God to the Pope, but of *the Pope's receiving it as his due*, makes it surprising to me that Dr. S. R. Maitland (Second Enquiry, p. 105, Answer to Cuninghame, p. 43) should have written as he has on the subject: as if it was really little more than the exaggeration of compliment or flattery; and the guilt of which, if any, was chargeable on the flatterer, not the Pope. As regards the *former*, my citations from the Canon Law are decisive. As regards the *latter*, besides the exemplification just given, there may be seen various other examples in my account of Leo X's inauguration, Vol. ii. pp. 64, 65, 80, &c. Other examples of Leo the Tenth's time, and which must have come under his cognizance, are given in the Appendix to Roscoe's Leo X, Numbers lxxi, lxxii, c. Of which take as a specimen the two following lines from the last; lines address to the elephant presented to Leo:

Si servire Deo verè est regnare, Leoni  
Dum servis regnas: nam *Leo* in orbe *Deus*.

So, some 70 or 80 years earlier, in the Council of Florence, held A.D. 1439; where the Alexandrian Jacobite Patriarch thus address Pope Eugenius:—"Cogitanti majestatem tuam tantus suboritur pavor: . . . pulvis enim et cinis sum *coram te Deo in terris: Es namque Deus in terris, et Christus:*" (Hard. ix. 1020:) language which was accepted by the Pope as nothing but what was proper. So again the inscription of which Daubuz speaks as on the gate of Tolentino, and of which the Pope could scarce be ignorant, "Paulo iii. Opt. Max. in Terris Deo:"\* also the *Sacrum Ceremoniale* (Daub. 581); "*Sedes Dei, id est Sedes Apostolica.*"

Baronius, speaking of John, the Constantinopolitan Patriarch, contesting the title of *Universal Bishop* with the Pope, likens it to the act of the apostate Angel rising against the *Most High God*. Wadd. i. 299. And who a more true expounder of the Papal mind than Baronius?—Now is not the conscious receiver of stolen goods a partaker in the crime? Such was Herod's guilt; Acts xii. 23. But it was surely small, in comparison with that of the Popes.†

Said Pope Sixtus in 1588, on hearing of Henry III's murdering the Cardinal de Guise; "And by the *secular* arm! As if there were *no Pope* in the world; as if *no God* existed." Ranke ii. 176.

Just one word on another objection on this head, made by Maitland, I think, as well as others; from the fact of the Popes' habitual public prayers to God, as to a superior. But was the fact of Jesus Christ's prayers as man to God a proof of his non-pretension to be God himself? As in the case of the *God-man* so in the case of the pretended *Man-God*.

<sup>1</sup> "Cantatis litaniis, et aliis devotis orationibus, et hymno *Veni Creator Spiritus*,

\* At p. 189 Note <sup>2</sup> *infra*, there may be seen another not dissimilar example.

† Our Anglican Reformers were not unmindful of this view of the Papal subject. See *Cranmer's* extracts from the Canon Law. Parker Ed. pp. 68—75.

seeing that, if it be *God* that is the subject of the chanting, it is *God's Vicegerent* on earth, the *Pope*, that receives the attendant prelates' reverence and adoration.<sup>1</sup> And so again, on the greater festivals, when, borne along on his sedia gestatoria among kneeling multitudes into the temple,<sup>2</sup> he exhibits himself as a Divinity to the people; with incense fuming before him,<sup>3</sup> and those singular flabelli of peacocks feathers, *full of eyes*, on either side of his moving throne: of which if the meaning be asked, the learned Papal antiquary gives answer that they signify perhaps the *innumerable eyes, running into all the earth*, that become the Vicegerent of Deity; perhaps the *Cherubim*, full of eyes within and without,<sup>4</sup> the same that were seen in the visions of Ezekiel and St. John on either side of the throne of the Divinity, whether moving or at rest.<sup>5</sup>—Nay since, by his transub-

&c., de more, . . . capellâ cantorum incipiente, *Salvum me fac Deus, &c.*, et invocât Spiritûs Sancti gratiâ, ac exhibîtâ per omnes cardinales et prelatos sanctissimo Domino nostro obedientiâ et reverentia consuetâ, cantatoque evangelio, &c." So Hard. ix. 1574, of the sacred service in the Lateran Church, and obeisance by all the dignitaries to the Pope in the midst of it, at the opening of the 5th Lateran Council. The description may serve to illustrate to those of my readers who have not been eyewitnesses of the thing at Rome, the manner in which the worship of God and of the Pope are intermixed, when the latter is present. The scene is pictured in Pope Alexander's medal, copied in my Plate.

<sup>1</sup> So an Italian gentleman explained to me the reason of the thing.

<sup>2</sup> See the illustrative Plate.

<sup>3</sup> I borrow this particular from Cancellieri, pp. 64, 77.

<sup>4</sup> I refer again to the learned Roman antiquary Cancellieri's work on the Solenni Possessi, which I have more than once borrowed from already. In an account of Gregory XIIth's ceremonial of entrance on his Pontificate A.D. 1405, by a contemporary reporter D'Aguolo di Searperia, the following passage occurs. "Duo etiam præmittuntur equites, qui in longissimis hastis *geminos Cherubinos* ingerunt; in quibus celestium commercia regnorum representantur." On which Cancellieri (p. 36) has the Note; "Il Magri, nel Hiero-Lexico, qui erede indicati i flabelli."—Again (ib. p. 125) the following occurs in Paolo Alaleona's narrative of Sixtus the Vth's coronation A.D. 1585. "Duo ventalia alba ex plumis pavonum in Basilicâ S. Johannis ferebant hinc inde ad Pontificem delatum duo camerarii secreti Papæ." On which Cancellieri has a fuller Note. "Questi due pennacchi," says he, "formati di penne occhiute di pavone ricordano, secondo la spiegazione del Magri del Suaresio e del P. Bonnani, al Pontefice, quanti occhi gli sieno necessari." Then, after mentioning that flabelli somewhat similar were used as early as the 4th century for a different purpose, viz. to drive away flies from the sacramental cup, he adds: "In mezzo ad essi sogliono dipingervi i *Serafini*, o i *Cherubini*, come sappiamo da S. Germano." Also that "i Maroniti e gli Armeni usano i flabelli di forma rotonda, coperti di lamine d'argento, o di metallo, con varii campanelli all' intorno, che sono agitati da due cherichi, vicino al celebrante, che nel pronunziare l'Inno Cherubico rappresenta col tremor delle mani quello de' beati Spiriti assistenti al trono della Divina Maesta. . . Quindi potè derivare l'opinione di alcuni, accennata alla p. 36, che i flabelli siano stati chiamati Cherubim o Cherubini."

Elsewhere we find the Cardinals, as living supporters of the Papal throne, compared to the Cherubim that supported the throne of God. "Utinam Cardinales, qui sunt animalia pennata plena oculis ante et retro, talia prospiciant." So a Document sent in to Pope Clement V and the Council of Vienne, A.D. 1312. Waddington II. E. Vol. iii. p. 7, from Raynaldus. <sup>5</sup> Ezek. x, 12, Apoc. iv. 6.






THE VICE-CHRIST IN GODLIKE STATE, EXHIBITING HIS OWN NEW-MADE BREADEN GOD FOR ADORATION;

"a god whom his fathers knew not, glorified by him with gold & silver & precious stones" Dan XI 38.

PL 27

Vol III. P. 184






THE USURPING VICE-CHRIST'S.  
asserted power over the world of Spirits.

His judicial inquiry on the dead.  
(Alexander VII. A. D. 1655)

To five of the dead he awards heaven, & their apoth  
(Gregory XV. A. D. 1622.)




The  
Vice-Christ receives adoration  
sitting on the high altar at St Peter's.



From Engraving published at Rome with license of the Authorities.

Their admission among the gods his act & glory.  
(Clement X. A. D. 1670.)

He creates God from bread.  
(Alexander VII. A. D. 1655.)



From Bonanni

stantiating power, he is the *God-maker*, and thereby in a manner exalted *above God*, it is surely fitting that he should exhibit such his superiority; seating himself once at least, viz. on the day of his consecration, upon *God's high altar* under the dome of St. Peter's, there to receive the adoration of his cardinals:<sup>1</sup> so, in the most solemn manner, to use St. Paul's language, "sitting in the temple of God, and showing himself as God;"<sup>2</sup> so, to use Daniel's, "exalting himself above every God."<sup>3</sup>

Thus did the Pope act out the part of Antichrist;—not alone by usurpingly appropriating to himself Christ's functions, honours, and prerogatives as *Prophet* to his Church, so as did the early partial Antichrists of the Gnostic Sect,<sup>4</sup> but his functions, honours, and prerogatives as *Prophet, Priest, and King*; yea, and, in regard of Christ's character as the *God-Man*, parodying him as the *Man-God*. Thus did he fulfil, I might almost say more than fulfil, what was here said of the *great words and blasphemies against God and his name*,<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> There is a primary and private adoration before this, the same that is represented in the well-known medal struck on Pope Martin's election in 1415, at the time of the Council of Constance. Of the public one in St. Peter's I add a pictorial sketch from a little Book called *Le Sagre Funzioni alla Morte del Sommo Pontifice*, lately published at Rome "con approvazione;" p. 66.—Mr. Tregelles, in his Comment on Daniel, has asserted that it is not on the high altar at St. Peter's that the Pope is seated and adored. But what can he mean by so saying? Would he have any other altar in St. Peter's than the great one under the dome to be the *high altar*? That the custom of being *there* adored has been continued for centuries, appears from the accounts of the Soleuni Possessi of successive Popes in Cancellieri (c. g. of Leo X, p. 68); and my Plate shows that it is still unabandoned.

The Romish Priest Eustace cannot help exclaiming against this. In the Appendix to his Travels in Italy (iv. 382), after observing that the "Pope receives the homage of the Cardinals seated in a chair on the *high altar* of St. Peter," he adds; "Why should *the altar* be made *his footstool*? Why the throne of the victim Lamb converted into the footstool of a mortal?" It seems however in the Picture appended to be his seat, rather than footstool.

<sup>2</sup> Compare on this point the exclamation of Arnulph of Orleans in the Synod at Rheims A.D. 991, in reference to Pope John XV. "Quid hunc, Reverendi Patres, in sublimi solio residentem, veste purpureâ et aureâ radiantem, quid hunc, inquam, esse censetis? Nimirum, si caritate destituitur, solâque scientiâ inflatur et extollitur, *Antichristus est in templo Dei sedens, et se ostendens tanquam sit Deus*." Given in Gieseler ii. 81. It is another example of that view of the Antichrist, as one that might be a Patriarch of highest dignity in the professing Church, which was set forth so strikingly in the 4th century by Chrysostom and Theodoret; and kept up, and exprest, from time to time, as we saw, p. 107 *suprà*, through the middle age.

Malvenda, p. 45, alludes with much disgust to Arnulph, as an authority eagerly followed by Protestants.

<sup>3</sup> Dan. xi. 37, 38.—I must beg to refer my readers, on the very interesting and important point illustrated in the appended picture, to my Comment. on Dan. xi. 38, Part vi. ch. 2, § 2, in my 4th Volume.—And generally let them mark the illustrations of the Papal pretensions given in the Popes' own medals here selected.

<sup>4</sup> See my Vol. i. p. 66; also p. 107 *suprà*.

<sup>5</sup> Compare John x. 33; "We stone thee for *blasphemy*: because thou, being a

spoken by the great mouth of the symbolic Beast of the Apocalypse.

Ουρανῶ εσθηριξε καρη, και επι χθονι βαινει.

Little surely did the blind bard of Chios think that there would ever exist on this world's theatre a succession of living men who would so fully realize his most daring ideal personification.—Great was the *mystery of godliness*;—GOD, THE ETERNAL GOD, AS CHRIST, HUMBLING HIMSELF TO BE MAN. Great, in measure only second to this, was the *counter-mystery of iniquity*, so as it was seen when unfolded in its perfection;—MAN, MORTAL MAN, IN THE USURPED CHARACTER OF CHRIST'S VICAR, EXALTING HIMSELF TO BE AS GOD.

2. But could he *gain submission* to these his fully outspoken pretensions? Was it possible that such self-exaltation above man, as well as blasphemy and impiety against God, should be deferred to?—In regard of the *Beast* in the prefiguration, the Angel declared that such *would* be the case, both with kings and people. “These kings have one mind, and shall give their power and strength unto the Beast:”<sup>1</sup> and again; “All the world wondered after the Beast;”<sup>2</sup> and they worshipped the Beast, saying, Who is like unto the Beast? Who is able to make war with him? And power was given him over all kindreds and nations: and all that dwell on the earth shall worship him, whose names are not written in the Lamb's book of life.”—And,

man, maketh thyself equal with God:”—indeed it was on this charge that the High Priest finally condemned Christ. Matt. xxvi. 64, 65. Compare also another kind of blasphemy against God, noted Mark ii. 7; “He blasphemeth: for who can forgive sins, but God only?” To either charge of blasphemy the Pope must alike plead, Guilty! And so too in regard of yet another kind of blasphemy, that of *idolatry*, noted in Ezekiel xx. 27, 28; the Pope being not only a participator with others in it, but the great *saint* and *idol maker*.

As to his own worship of these, whether the saints and their images, or the transubstantiated bread, as held up (see my Plate) in its glory of the *mostranza*, let it never be forgotten that he was an exalter of *himself* in worshipping *them*. For was not he their maker? “Gloria sanctorum decor ejus.” See again the illustrative medals appended.

<sup>1</sup> Apoc. xvii. 13.

<sup>2</sup> The force of the phrase “wondered after the Beast,” a phrase used both in xiii. 3, *θαυμασθη εν ὄλη τῇ γῆ ὀπισω του θηριου*, and in xvii. 8, *θαυμασονται οἱ κατοικουντες επι της γῆς βλέποντες το θηριον*, is illustrated by Mr. Daubuz from the following line of Euripides, *Medea*, 1141;

Δεσποινά εἴ ἦν νυν ἀντι σου θαυμάζομεν

and so shown to imply the deference, awe, and subjection yielded by an inferior to a superior. On the *ὀπισω* compare John xii. 19; *ιδε ὁ κοσμος ὀπισω αὐτης ἀπηλθεν*.

in regard of the *Popes* prefigured, the fact of universal submission to them is almost the most notorious, as well as most wonderful fact, in the history of Western Christendom.

Thus as respects the submission of *kings*. Already in the eighth century this was Gregory the Second's boast to the Greek Emperor; "All the kings of the West reverence the Pope as a *God on earth*."<sup>1</sup> Its truth was manifested when his successor Stephen entered France as a suppliant. For Pepin and his Franks received him, we read, as a *Divinity*.<sup>2</sup> In similar view of his power Pepin, when aspiring to the French crown, prayed the Pope to authorize his usurpation: and, on his doing so, both Franks and the whole Western world implicitly acquiesced in the title.<sup>3</sup> Even in *Charlemagne's* case, though he grasped in his hands, on investiture with the imperial title, a paramount sovereignty, yet was it an act of deference, as towards a superior, to receive the title and empire as the Pope's donation.<sup>4</sup> And this was soon the coronation oath,—an oath not enjoined only by Popes, but agreed to by the Western Emperors,—that they would "be *faithful and submissive to the Pope and Roman Church*."<sup>5</sup>—Even the Pope's making and unmaking of kings and emperors, was from time to time submitted to by them. The Emperor Otho, like Rodolphus before him, both received the Imperial crown as a Papal grant, on the Pope's deposition of the former Emperor; and, when the Pope reclaimed the grant, resigned it.<sup>6</sup> The same did other princes also.<sup>7</sup> A Spanish king voluntarily resigned his kingdom to the Pope, that he might receive it back as a fief from Christ's Vicar:<sup>8</sup> and

<sup>1</sup> Ὅν αἱ πασαι βασιλειαὶ τῆς δυνάμεως ὡς Θεὸν ἐπιγίνοιον ἐχουσι. Gib. ix. 137. This was A.D. 727.

<sup>2</sup> A.D. 753. So Sismondi, Fall of Roman Empire, ii. 60.

<sup>3</sup> "Under the sacerdotal monarchy of St. Peter," says Gibbon generally, "the nations began to resume the practice of seeking on the banks of the Tiber their *kings*, their laws, and the oracles of their fate." ix. 151.

<sup>4</sup> "The Lord John, Apostolic and universal Pope, hath at Rome *elected*, and anointed with the holy oil, Charles Augustus Emperor." So in 876 said the Synod at Pavia; with expression of their own assent. Hard. vi. i. 170.—See further my Notes, p. 176 *suprà*.

<sup>5</sup> "Vis sanctissimo in Christo Patri, Domino Romano Pontifici, et sanæ Romanæ Ecclesiæ, subjectionem debitam et fidem reverenter exhibere?" Then the king says, with two fingers of his right hand on the altar, "Volo, &c." So Martene de Rit. ii. 208. So too Mod. Un. Hist. xlii. 77, and Hallam ii. 275.

<sup>6</sup> Wadd. ii. 164.

<sup>7</sup> "The *nine* kings of the Latin world might disclaim their *new* associate, unless he were consecrated by the authority of the Supreme Pontiff." So Gib. x. 310, of the first Norman king of Sicily A.D. 1130:—a passage already cited by me, p. 142, as illustrative of the continued *decuple* number of the Western kings.

<sup>8</sup> viz. Peter II of Arragon, about A.D. 1200. Hallam ii. 283.—Ranke dwells on

John, king of England, in like manner resigned his crown to the Papal Legate, that he might receive it again as a vassal, feudatory to the Roman See.—Even the kingdoms of the new world they asked, and received as fiefs, from him.<sup>1</sup> “Power was given him over all kindreds and nations.”—And mark the other signs of their subjection to him. They hold the stirrup, and lead the palfrey that he rides on.<sup>2</sup> They prostrate themselves, and kiss the foot he offers.<sup>3</sup> In the Emperor Henry’s notable case of disobedience to the Papal will, the terrors of a Papal excommunication and anathema<sup>4</sup> drive him in abject humiliation to entreat for pardon: and barefoot, and in sackcloth, he waits three wintry days and nights outside the gates of the city, till the Pope relents and grants it.<sup>5</sup> Again, princes quit their kingdoms; and go on dangerous, perhaps wicked, crusades at his call. It was on the belief of his being *Lord of their salvation*; and alone able to give them forgiveness of sins, and the crown of life.

If such the submission of *kings*, what need be said of the *people*? Not in respect of his power in *secular* things, but in things much higher, who knows not of the universal

these extraordinary marks of Papal authority and greatness: and observes, with reference to them, that at the beginning of the xiith century Prior Gerohus’ prophecy seemed near fulfilment, that the secular monarchies would be broken into tetrarchies, and the Church free under the *Great Crowned Priest*. i. 30, 31.

<sup>1</sup> See my Vol. ii. pp. 72—75.

<sup>2</sup> *Louis II* is thought to have been the first king that held the Pope’s bridle; *Nicholas I* (A.D. 860) the first Pope that exacted it. So Pagi from Anastasius: ap. Wadd. iii. 325. In A.D. 1155 the haughty Emperor *Frederic Barbarossa* submitted to hold the Pope’s stirrup, as he mounted. Wadd. ii. 116. Up to the middle of the xvth century the same was done. So Ranke i. 37.

<sup>3</sup> Even a Greek Emperor, *Justinian II*, A.D. 710, is said to have offered to the Pope the homage of *prostration at his feet*. Gordon, ad ann. 710, from Anastasius and Sigonius. Among the Western princes it was common: Pepin leading the way, and kissing the feet of Pope Stephen.

Raynald. xii. 107, relates an exemplification by the famous and victorious French King Francis I, at Bologna, A.D. 1515, just before the Reformation. Leo X. sat on his throne to receive him: Francis knelt three times in approaching him; then kissed his *foot*, hand, and face. The account is given by Paris Bishop of Pisaurum, Master of ceremonies to the Pope, who was present on the occasion. I have alluded to this p. 176 *suprà*, under my former head.

So (ap. Daubuz, p. 581) the poet Mantuan:

Ense potens gemino, cuius *vestigia* adorant  
*Cæsar*, et aurato vestiti murice *reges*.

What a contrast to this in the only recorded case of the kissing of *Christ’s* feet, viz. by Mary Magdalene! Luke vii. 38.

<sup>4</sup> The terrors of a Papal *Interdict* were similarly felt, and yielded to, by *Philip of France* and *John of England*.

<sup>5</sup> Waddington, ii. 75.

reverence, and faith in his blasphemous pretensions, exhibited through the long middle ages by the multitudes of Christendom? Look at the thronging numbers on pilgrimage to Rome, in assurance of the salvation he promises them!<sup>1</sup> Look at their reception of his dogmas in matters of faith, as very *oracles* from Heaven!<sup>2</sup> Look at their ready opening of the inmost secrets of their hearts and lives to his delegates, in the confessionals, as to one whose judgment and absolution from sin is alone the judgment and absolution of God. Look at their purchasing of his *indulgences*, with often hard-earned money; in belief of thereby delivering the captive souls of departed relatives, as well as their own souls, from the pains of purgatory and of hell!<sup>3</sup> Look at their crowding and devout worship at the shrine of every fresh saint canonized by him, as assuredly thereby and thenceforth an accepted inmate and mediator for them in Heaven. Look at the Sicilian ambassadors prostrated before him with the cry, thrice repeated, "Lamb of God! that takest away the sins of the world!"<sup>4</sup> It was the famous Gerson's declaration; "The people think of the Pope as the *one God* that has power over all things in earth and heaven."<sup>5</sup> And this in a measure even after the Reformation, as well as before it.<sup>6</sup>—Truly it was fulfilled that was written, "All the earth wondered after the Beast:" and again: "All shall worship him, but they whose names are written in the Lamb's book of life."<sup>7</sup>—It was the last

<sup>1</sup> See my Vol. ii. p. 18.

<sup>2</sup> I have already observed on the Pope's Bulls being called *Oracles*. Let me add, as a specimen of such being the popular estimation of his Bulls, the inscription on a triumphal arch raised on occasion of the entry of Sixtus IV.: (Daub. *ibid.*.)

*Oraculo vocis mundi moderaris habenas;  
Et merito in terris crederis esse Deus.*

<sup>3</sup> See the illustration of this in my Vol. ii. p. 67, et seq.

<sup>4</sup> This was to Martin the 4th, Pope from 1281 to 1285. The fact, as P. Paolo reports to us, p. 151 (Engl. Ed. 1676), was noticed in the Council of Trent; and moreover that Pope Martin's answer was, "They said, Hail, King of the Jews, and smote him with their hands."—It is also noticed in Southey's *Book of the Church*, p. 190, and by Brightman, p. 436, as from Paulus Æmylius, *Book vii.*

<sup>5</sup> "Æstimant Papam esse unum Deum, qui habet potestatem omnem in cœlo et in terrâ." Quoted by Daubuz, p. 581.

<sup>6</sup> E. g. Ravallae's language, that "God was the Pope, and the Pope God," (Foullis, p. 39,) as late as A.D. 1600:—a view so held by him, as even justifying a king's murder in the Pope's cause. See *Mod. Un. Hist.* xxiv. 439.

<sup>7</sup> It may be useful to add a few remarks here on the word *all* in these passages; words which some have stumbled at in the application of this Prophecy to the Popedom: others, as Dr. S. R. Maitland (*Sec. Inquiry*, p. 100), argued from as negating it.



solemn united act, before the Reformation, of the deputies of Christendom assembled in Council, to subscribe to the Bull *Unam Sanctam*, first issued by Boniface VIII: a Bull which declared, "That, as there was but one *body* of the Church and Christendom, so there was but one *Head*, viz. CHRIST'S VICAR; and that it was essential to the *salvation* of every human being *to be subject to the Roman Pontiff*."<sup>1</sup> Nor did the subsequent Council of Trent ever revoke it.

3. Finally, what of *the little class of Christ's saints here excepted?* Says the Apocalypse, "It was given to the Beast *to make war with the saints, and to overcome them:*"—a war alike in *word*<sup>2</sup> and in *deed*. And did not the bitter hatred of the Popes against Christ's faithful saints show itself either way alike in word and act? *Heretics, accursed, wild beasts, the children of the devil, the spawn of Hell*,—not a blasphemous or opprobrious epithet was there that the Pope of Rome and his agents did not heap


To satisfy an inquirer on this point, all that is needed is to compare the limited use of the word *all* in such passages as Matt. iii. 5, Acts ix. 35, Deut. v. 23, Dan. iii. 7; in which last passage "*all the people, nations,*" &c., that bowed down to Nebuchadnezzar's image, are explained in verse 2 as doing it through their assembled representatives. Just so in the Councils: e. g. that of Ephesus (Hard. i. 1395); in which the excommunication of Nestorius by its representative members was thus designated; "*All the earth anathematizes Nestorius.*"—Of course, as all were not Israel that were of Israel, so all were not Papists that were subject to the Papacy. From Apoc. xviii. 4, "Come out of her, my people," we may distinctly infer the fact of some of God's people being in Babylon, or the kingdom of the Beast, even to the very eve of its destruction; just as Lot was an inhabitant of Sodom, on the eve of *its* overthrow.

<sup>1</sup> So in the 5th Lateran Council. See my Vol. ii. p. 85. So again, as stated pp. 130, 158, 173 *supra*, was the Pope at the times there referred to recognized as the head to the whole body of Roman Christendom. To all which add Bernard's strong general testimony, as to both kings and people of about the date of A.D. 1150: "*Alemannie, Francie, Angliæ, Scotiæ, Hispaniarum, et Hierosolymarum reges, cum universo Clero et populis, adherent Domino Innocentio, tanquam filii Patri, tanquam capiti membra.*" Ep. 125.

<sup>2</sup> I do not here apply, as once I did, that clause in the 6th verse, "He opened his mouth to *blaspheme God's tabernacle, and them that dwell in it,*" as if meant of *God's saints on earth*, whose hearts however and *πολιτευμα* (Phil. iii. 20) are in heaven. Considering what is said of God's *σκηνη*, or tabernacle, in Apoc. xxi. 3, ("The tabernacle of God is with men,") and of "them that tabernacle in heaven" in Apoc. xii. 12, the heaven here meant seems almost determined to be that of *God's presence*. And, so taking it, the fulfilment of the prophetic statement by the Roman Popes is most striking. For, the Pope himself assuming to be the key-bearer of heaven, its later inhabitants were calumniously represented by him as only Papally canonized saints, oftentimes the very worst of men; (see my Vol. ii. pp. 12, 13;) the angels and earlier saints being also but his ministers: and heaven consequently as a seat of sin, and of traitorous and foul conspiracy against God and Christ.




BOHEMIAN HERETICS HUNTED AS WILD BOARS,  
OUT OF THE CHRISTIAN VINEYARD BY PAUL II, A. D. 1469.



From B

MEDAL OF TRIUMPH STRUCK BY GREGORY XIII,  
ON THE ST BARTHOLOMEW'S MASSACRE OF FRENCH HUGONOTS, A. D. 1572.



From a Medal in the British M

upon them. Witness, e. g., the names of infamy and devils painted on Huss's cap, as his fit associates, at his martyrdom.<sup>1</sup> The holy prophecies of Scripture, however, for the purposes of truth and edification set aside, were for *this* purpose resorted to; and the evil symbols and appellations, therein used to prefigure themselves, applied to Christ's saints.<sup>2</sup>—Then were there also the bloody *persecutions* and *crusades* (mark the mockery of that term) raised against them, as if wild beasts that must be hunted down, and destroyed, by successive Popes:<sup>3</sup>—the promise of forgiveness of sins and salvation being his incentive to the Crusaders;<sup>4</sup> and their answer practically too often, "We have spared neither age, nor sex, nor rank; we have smitten every one with the edge of the sword."<sup>5</sup> Besides which they were at all times by the Canon Law deprived of civil privileges; and it was declared that to murder such excommunicated heretics was no homicide.<sup>6</sup>—And so it was that they were at last overcome, as here foretold; and the Beast's pæan of triumph raised over their dead bodies, just before the Reformation. Of this, as I have told it before,<sup>7</sup> it needs not that I now repeat the story. Let me only add that even afterwards the same spirit of blasphemy and cruelty against them, wherever opportunity offered, still continued. Witness the tone of the subsequent Papal Decrees, and of those too of the Pope's vassal kings, against them. Witness the doings of the Inquisition, the murders of Protestant martyrs in Italy, Belgium, Spain, England, and the massacre on St. Bartholomew's day of the French Hugonots. Of the latter I append the Romish commemorative medal.<sup>8</sup> And, together with the celebrative fresco-

<sup>1</sup> Wadd. iii. 191.

<sup>2</sup> e. g. Babylon, the Beast, the Apocalyptic locusts, the crucifiers of Christ, the emanation from the pit of the abyss, wolves in sheep's clothing, abomination in the holy place, &c. &c. The orations in the Councils offer ample exemplification.

<sup>3</sup> A medal of Paul the 2nd is given in my Plate, illustrative of the *hunting down of heretics, as wild boars*. It was struck on occasion of the Papal crusade against Bohemian heretics in 1469.

<sup>4</sup> As by Innocent III; Hard. vii. 3, 19. The Popes were wont to send a standard on such occasions to the Crusaders; with a *cross* painted on it, and the Papal Keys. Ducange on *Vexillum S. Petri*.

<sup>5</sup> Ranke i. 32.

<sup>6</sup> "Homicidas non esse qui excommunicatos trucidant." So the Canon law, cited before from Gibb. ix. 141.

<sup>7</sup> See my Part iii. Ch. viii., on the Papal conquest and slaughter of the Witnesses.

<sup>8</sup> Given by Bonanni i. 336: and made notorious in England by Sir W. Cockburn's engraving of it as the Frontispiece to his work on the subject. It has been often re-cast from the Papal mint for foreigners.

painting on the same subject on the walls of the Hall of entrance to the Sistine Chapel in the Vatican, at Rome, it still furnishes evidence to the eye of Protestants there sojourning, that the Papal resemblance to the Apocalyptic Beast has remained on that, as on other points, unchanged, unchangeable.

Thus have I shown from history the applicability of all that was figured and explained to St. John respecting the Apocalyptic TEN-HORNED BEAST, and its LAST-RULING HEAD, to the POPEDOM and POPES of Western Europe. And I confidently appeal to the reader whether, in regard alike of the Beast's *heads* and *horns*, and its characteristics of *superhuman pride* and *blasphemies*, *usurpation of Christ's place in the Church*, *supremacy of power over man unparalleled*, and *oppression of the saints*, (as well as in regard also of St. Paul's, St. John's, and Daniel's other predictions about ANTICHRIST,) there has not been proved a perfect coincidence; a coincidence such as may indeed be deemed not only convincing,<sup>1</sup> but most wonderful.—And then what, when we turn to consider *the thing prefigured?* Surely

<sup>1</sup> A conviction this, which, as Bishop Warburton observes, was that of all our English Reformers; and on which in fact they mainly grounded the duty of separation from Rome. See my Paper of citations illustrative of this in the Appendix to the present Volume.

I cannot but think that one main cause of the diminution of conviction among Protestants now-a-days on this most important point, has been the fact of so many English modern expositors interpreting the Apocalyptic Beast to mean *the Western secular Empire and Emperors*. Could it be said that the world worshipped those *secular Emperors*, so as the Beast, or his ruling Head, was to be worshipped? Historic fact says plainly the contrary. To this I alluded at p. 109, on my opening of the subject; and again at p. 113 showed the inconsistency of such an interpretation with the prophecy of the *local seat* of the Beast being *Rome's seven hills*. To which let me here add, further, that the line of the Western Emperors was not *continuous* even from Charlemagne. E. g. Gibbon (ix. 190) notes a term of *seventy-four years*, between the abdication of Charles the Fat and establishment of Otho, as a period of vacancy of the Empire. And he also adds (ib. 191) that the Italians, as *Muratori*, for example, (and so too *Martene de Rit.* ii. 213,) only reckon those to have been Emperors who have been crowned at Rome; i. e. only a few comparatively of the whole series.\*

In the last Lateran Council the Emperor himself plainly showed who, *he* judged, was the *head* of Western Christendom; by praying *the Pope* in that character, as did the old Roman Senate to its supreme Dictator, to take care "ne quid detrimenti Respublica Christiana capiat." Hard. ix. 1845. See p. 190, and its Note <sup>1</sup> on this.

\* I am glad to say that on this point, as well as on others mentioned in my Vol. i. p. 549, Mr. Birks has abandoned his original view; and adopted that which regards the Popes, not the German emperors, as the Beast's last ruling head.

at this we must marvel; even as St. John, when he beheld *the woman*, or *apostate Roman Church*, upheld by the ten-horned monster, marvelled with great astonishment.<sup>1</sup> To think that the simple *Bishop of Rome* should have ever thought to found upon his episcopacy the extraordinary character of CHRIST'S VICAR on earth, and thereby to add to his episcopal *mitre* the *regno*, or rather *triregno* crown, of *super-imperial* (might I not say of *divine*) majesty,<sup>2</sup>—moreover that, when he exhibited himself in this character of ANTI-CHRIST, arrayed in the pontificals of his Sec, (pontificals, just such as were also Apocalyptically prefigured of Rome's apostate Church, of purple and scarlet and precious stones,<sup>3</sup>) the common sense, as well as moral sense, of Christendom should have so prostrated itself, as for full 1200 years and more to admire, yea and to adore the monster,—the phænomenon to my own mind seems so wonderful, as to be accountable for in no other way than from the influence of the Dragon, the old Serpent, in blinding the minds of men. The great *earthly means* and *help* to his successful assumption and acting out of such prerogatives, will furnish the subject of my two next Chapters. But the real *author* of his success is expressly declared to have been the *Dragon* or *Devil*: who, after long animating and reigning in the Paganism of the old Roman Empire, “gave to the Beast his seat, and power, and great authority.”

<sup>1</sup> Apoc. xvii. 6.—Of this vision of the *Roman Church*, “*Mother and Mistress of all Churches*,” more in a subsequent Part of my Book, which takes it more directly into consideration. Let me however just suggest, in illustration of my passing statement about it in the text, two parallels to the symbol of the Apocalyptic monster carrying the Woman impersonator of the apostate Church, as if his concubine or bride:—the *first* in the Pagan legend of Jupiter under the shape of a Bull carrying Europa; the second from the Hindoo fable of the elephant-god carrying his wife.—In the *way of contrast* the reader will remember what is said in Scripture of God carrying and supporting the true Church, *his Bride*; Deut. xxxii. 11; Isa. lxiii. 9, &c.

<sup>2</sup> The *triregno*, or *triple crown*, was worn in sign of the highest *super-imperial* power attaching to the Sec of Rome. See Ducange on *Regnum*: also my Vol. ii. p. 53, Note<sup>1</sup> and Note<sup>2</sup>, p. 170 of this Volume.

<sup>3</sup> Apoc. xvii. 4: a passage commented on, and illustrated, as above intimated, in my Part vi. Ch. i. § 2. See also my Vol. ii. p. 78, and p. 185 Note<sup>2</sup> *suprà*.

## CHAPTER VI.

## THE TWO-HORNED LAMBSKIN-COVERED BEAST.

“AND I beheld another wild Beast coming up out of the earth :<sup>1</sup> and he had two horns like a lamb ; and he spake as a dragon. And he exerciseth all the authority<sup>2</sup> of the first wild Beast, before him.<sup>3</sup> And he causeth the earth, and them which dwell therein, to worship the first wild Beast, whose deadly wound was healed. And he doeth great miracles ;<sup>4</sup> so that he even maketh fire to come down from heaven on the earth, in the sight of men. And he deceiveth them<sup>5</sup> that dwell on the earth by means of those miracles which it was given him to do in sight of the Beast.”<sup>6</sup>—Apoc. xiii. 11—14.

This *second Wild Beast* seems to have been on a smaller scale than the former ; having a covering skin and horns<sup>7</sup> like a lamb ; while in reality, as we may probably infer from Christ’s own words, a wolf.<sup>8</sup> It represented some class, power, or body, which was not the *principal* one on the theatre of action, but, in a manner, subordinate to that which the former Beast represented : seeing that though he indeed exercised all the authority of the first Beast, yet it was exercised only as *derived from*,<sup>9</sup> and also *overseen by*, and *responsible to*, the former :<sup>10</sup> moreover exercised to the

<sup>1</sup> Or *land* ; *εκ της γης*.

<sup>2</sup> *εξουσιαν*.

<sup>3</sup> *ενωπιον*. See Note 10.

<sup>4</sup> or signs, *σημια*.

<sup>5</sup> Several MSS. insert *τους εμους* before *τους καρ*.

<sup>6</sup> It will be seen that there are here no differences in the critical from the received text of any consequence.

<sup>7</sup> It is hardly needful to remind my readers that the *horns* are usually taken off with the skins of horned animals ; so that he who assumed the *covering skin* would appear with the *horns*.

<sup>8</sup> Matt. vii. 15.

<sup>9</sup> For its *εξουσια* is spoken of as being properly and primarily the *εξουσια* of the 1st Beast.

<sup>10</sup> *ενωπιον αυτου*. As my inference from this expression is of importance, let me cite a few parallel examples in support of it :—examples in all which the Septuagint and Greek Testament have the word *ενωπιον*, just as here ; and with reference, so as in our verse 11, not to mere particular acts, but to general conduct, as passing *before* him referred to. Gen. xvii. 1 ; “ Walk *before me*, and be thou perfect :” Prov. v. 21 ; “ The ways of men are *before the eyes of the Lord*, and he pondereth all his goings :” 1 Kings xi. 6 ; “ Solomon did evil *in the sight of the Lord* :” 1 Kings xv. 11 ; “ Asa did what was right *in the eyes of the Lord* :” Luke i. 6 ; “ They were both righteous *before God* :” Luke xv. 18 ; “ I have sinned *before thee* :” Luke xvi. 15 ; “ It is an

intent and result (we must ever connect this declared characteristic with the others) of causing all that were on the earth to *worship the first Wild Beast*.<sup>1</sup>—As to the particular *class* or *body* symbolized, our Lord's well-known figurative description of *false teachers*, "Beware of them which come to you *in sheep's clothing*, but inwardly they are ravening wolves,"<sup>2</sup> almost precludes the possibility of error in interpreting it to signify a body of *antichristian Clergy*, acting in support of the *Antichrist* just before symbolized and described:<sup>3</sup> (indeed the appellation *False Prophet* is elsewhere expressly given to this second Beast:<sup>4</sup>)—in other words, as the PAPAL CLERGY, united under the POPE in his *ecclesiastical* character (let my readers mark the distinction) as the *Western Patriarch*; and acting so as to support him in his usurped and far loftier character of CHRIST'S VICAR on earth, or ANTICHRIST.

In comparing together the type and antitype, it seems to me that the existence of the CLERGY spoken of as *a distinct class*,—its being an *apostatized Clergy*,—and, (inclusive of some twofold Hierarchy, like the Beast's two horns, ruling it,) a class subordinated *as one body*, from soon after the

abomination *in the sight of God*:" 2 Tim. iv. 1; "I charge thee *before God*, who shall judge the quick and the dead," &c. &c. In all these cases the presence indicated is that of a supervising superior.—And so, very specially, in the case of ministers of religion, as priests or prophets, ministering *before God*.

The point of this important expression, to the effect stated, has been unnoticed by many modern Commentators, though remarked on by Pareus, Mede, and Vitringa. The last observes: "Sensus est, Bestiam hanc prioris Bestiæ esse *administram*; et in potestate ejus administrandâ eum in modum se gerere, ut se priori Bestiæ, *tanquam diligentis sue inspectori*, hoc ipso maximè commendaret." p. 827. No doubt sometimes the preposition signifies simply the presence and observation of those whom it refers to: e. g. in verse 13 of the passage itself under consideration. But in this sense it is *specific acts* only that are spoken of; not the *general walk and conduct*, so as in verse 12 of the passage before us. It is however, of course, the stated fact of the *original source* of all the 2nd Beast's power being the 1st Beast, as its conferrer, and that of his using it all *for the 1st Beast's glorification*, that most decisively fixes the subordination of the 2nd Beast to the 1st.—So, I see, Hengstenberg ii. 39; "The expression *before him* implies that he acts as his servant, works in his interest."

<sup>1</sup> So Irenæus calls it the *ὄπρασπιστής*, or *armiger*, of the first Beast.

<sup>2</sup> Matt. vii. 15.

<sup>3</sup> To the same effect Gregory I (ap. Malvenda i. 425) specifically interprets the symbol as signifying *Antichrist's preachers and ministers*. "Joannes priorem Bestiam, id est Antichristum, superiore descriptione narraverat: post quem hæc etiam alia Bestia (de terrâ) ascendisse dicitur: quia post eum *multitudo prædicatorum illius* ex terrenâ potestate gloriatur." And so Arethas, Haymo, Rupertus, and substantially Ribera; all referred to by Vitringa, p. 822.

<sup>4</sup> See pp. 76, 77, *suprà*.



subsidence of the Gothic flood, to the PAPAL ANTICHRIST, —I say these seem to me to be the *three* points in which I ought 1ST to show its correspondence with the symbol exhibited to St. John of the TWO-HORNED LAMBSKIN-COVERED BEAST FROM THE EARTH. After which we shall be better prepared for intelligently considering, under a IIND main head, the several *particular acts* ascribed to this last-figured Beast.

I. Under my PRIMARY main head, then, I have, 1st, to show the existence of the *Clergy* in Roman Christendom as a *distinct class* or *body*. And, as to the *distinction of class* between the *Clergy* and *Laity* thus implied, it has notoriously existed from the first in the Christian Church. It followed necessarily from the authoritative injunctions of our Lord and of St. Paul, assigning the duty of teaching to the apostles and their successors, and to those whom they taught that of maintaining them:<sup>1</sup> and, from its peculiarity and importance, it has called forth the observation of philosophers and historians.<sup>2</sup> And who but must have thought at times of the suitability and almost necessity of such an arrangement, in a religion which was no mere thing of profession, form, and ceremony, nor any mere political engine to control the multitude:<sup>3</sup> but that to which a reality of object habitually attached as urgent and difficult as glorious; viz. of moulding afresh

<sup>1</sup> Luke x. 7; "In the same house remain, eating and drinking such things as they give; for the labourer is worthy of his hire:" a declaration repeated by St. Paul, in reference to the support of Christian Presbyters, 1 Tim. v. 18. So too 1 Cor. ix. 13, "They which minister about holy things live of the things of the temple; and they which wait at the altar are partakers with the altar, &c."

On the *early date* of the separation see Bingham, i. 5. 1—4, and Waddington, i. 38, with the authorities there cited.

<sup>2</sup> So *Gibbon* ii. 340, &c.; who speaks of it as "the memorable distinction of the *laity* and the *clergy*, which had been unknown to the Greeks and Romans." Again *Ranke*, at the commencement of his masterly *History of the Popes*, i. 10, thus expresses himself. "It was the distinguishing feature of Christianity that a peculiar class or profession, consecrated by the laying on of hands, . . . devoted themselves to spiritual and godly things. . . . Gradually the clergy separated themselves altogether from the laity. . . . In which separation of the Church from the State consists perhaps the greatest, most pervading, and influential peculiarity of all Christian times." \*

<sup>3</sup> Such was the Pagan religion of Rome, &c. *Gib.* i. 46.

---

\* Let not my readers pass on without noticing a misnomer here made by *Ranke*, and which has been so common for ages, and so influential to mislead; viz. in speaking of the *Clergy* as equivalent to the *Church*.—Proceeding, he adds; "The *spiritual* and secular powers may come into near contact, &c.:" where *spiritual* is by another misnomer, equally prevalent and misleading as the other, put for *ecclesiastical*.

the corrupt hearts of men in a corrupt world, and bringing every thought into obedience to the captivity of Christ. For what so calculated to promote the object as the influence of a Christian ministry, acting in the spirit of their instructions; and, both in season and out of season, both by word and example, inculcating the pure heart-renewing truths of the Gospel, and watching and warning the flock against corruption, in doctrine or in life? In truth the early history of the Church testifies to its effectiveness.

2. But what if the sacred class should itself become corrupt and apostate? the salt itself lose its savour? Then the same power that was instituted for good, would of course in the same proportion operate to evil.—Now the warning-voice both of Christ and his apostles gave intimation that such would at no distant period be the case.<sup>1</sup> And, in my former sketches of the history of the Christian Church in the 4th, 5th, and 6th centuries, I traced step by step the increasingly awful fulfilment of their prophecies:<sup>2</sup> until then at length, both with *clergy* and *laity*,—the clergy leading, the laity following,—the apostasy was shown to have advanced to such a height, as almost to invite an ANTI-CHRIST to crown and head it. Indeed Pope Gregory himself, only a little before the time here prefigured, represented the then existing Clergy as *an army prepared for the Antichrist*,<sup>3</sup> and like *wolves in sheep's clothing*:<sup>4</sup> thus almost ap-

<sup>1</sup> Compare Matt. vii. 15, xxiv. 24, Acts xx. 29, 2 Peter ii. 1, &c.

<sup>2</sup> See my Vol. i. pp. 264, 330, 404, &c.

<sup>3</sup> Lib. iv. Ep. 38; "Rex superbiæ propè est; et (quod dici nefas est) sacerdotum ei præparatur exercitus." I have before quoted this from Daubuz (Vol. i. p. 402, Note<sup>3</sup>) and mentioned that I read with Pareus and Daubuz *exercitus*, not *exitus*: also that the former, p. 306, in proof that *exercitus*, and not *exitus*, is the true reading, cites Gregory's own words following the former clauses; "Because the Clergy war and strive for *mastery and advancement*, who were appointed to go before others in *humility*:" which, adds Pareus, "cannot be referred to the *end* of priests, but to their *armies* and *proud war*."—Gregory's representation may have had special reference to arrogance like that of the Bishop of Constantinople in affecting the title of Universal Bishop. But the selfsame arrogance was soon after exhibited by the Western Pope; and by the Western Hierarchy and Clergy, according to their respective rank and measure, was too faithfully imitated.

<sup>4</sup> This was in a letter to the Greek Emperor, written, like the former, on occasion of the assumption of the title of *universal Bishop* by the Patriarch of Constantinople:—"Beneath the meanest garments we conceal a haughty heart: under the aspect of *sheep* we nourish the fangs of the *wolf*." \*—On the justice of this, as a general description of the Clergy, and more especially of the Episcopal Hierarchy of the times, see Gieseler, vol. i. p. 357, § 122. †

\* Gregory's whole letter is given by Sir N. Brent at the end of his Translation of

plying to them the actual Apocalyptic symbol under consideration. There was only this difference;—that, whereas he depicted them in the *plural*, as a multitude *uncombined*, though corrupt, and as only *prepared for* a yet future Antichrist, our prophecy, looking to a later epoch of Church history, sums them up in its symbol as *one combined body, all organized and subordinated under the now at length manifested Antichrist.*—To show how this was effected is our *next* and *last* point under this Head. And, in order to a clearer understanding of it, it needs that we carry back our retrospective view of the ecclesiastical relations of hierarchy and clergy nearly to its source:—a review that will detain us some little time.

3. It is to be understood, then, that until near the close of the second century, the Churches of which the Christian community consisted (Churches independent though federally united) were under the government each one of its proper Bishop;<sup>1</sup> and that of these Bishops none were possessed of superior rank, or authority, over the others. About this period, however, Provincial Councils began to be held half-yearly,<sup>2</sup> with a view to more united action on questions of doctrine, discipline, and practice:—Councils consisting chiefly of the Bishops of the Province, in the character of representatives of their respective Churches. And, forasmuch as a President was needed for the more orderly conduct of their proceedings, the Bishop of the *Metropolis*, or chief city of the province, was usually elected to the Presidency.<sup>3</sup>—So began the distinction of *Metropolitan* Bishops.—The distinction was thus at first one of merely occasional and temporary authority: but it was soon converted by the Metropolitan into one of permanent and general presidency and superintendence over all the Bishops and Churches of the Province.<sup>4</sup> “Let

<sup>1</sup> The bishop was then elected by the members of the Church; the people having a voice in the election, as well as the presbyters and deacons. So Bingham iv. 2. 2. 3, 4, &c. Also Waddington i. 40.

<sup>2</sup> So the Apostolic Canon 36. Hard. i. 18. On these Councils more in the next Chapter.

<sup>3</sup> Usually, not always. See Mosheim, ii. 2. 2. 2, 3, iii. 2. 2. 1; Gieseler Per. i. § 66.

<sup>4</sup> See Gieseler and Mosheim *ibid.*, also Waddington's Church History, i. 42, 310.

P. Paolo's History of the Council of Trent, p. 775; and the passage from it that I refer to by Waddington i. 300.

nothing be done by the Bishops without the cognizance of their *Primate*,<sup>1</sup> (or *Metropolitan*,) was one of the so-called *Apostolic Canons*, which represent to us the government and discipline of the Churches of Eastern Christendom in the 2nd and 3rd centuries.<sup>2</sup>—Moreover to the Bishops of *Rome*, *Antioch*, and *Alexandria*, as the capitals respectively of Italy, Syria, and Egypt,—to the first more especially,—there was accorded a certain pre-eminence over other Metropolitans, not indeed of authority,<sup>3</sup> but of rank and privilege.

On the establishment of Christianity, and union of Church and State in the Roman Empire, both the authority of the Metropolitans, and the precedence also over all others of the three Prelates, or *Patriarchs*, above mentioned, was solemnly recognized, confirmed, and indeed enlarged;<sup>4</sup>—besides that, on the erection of Constantinople into the Metropolis of the East, similar privileges were accorded to the Constantinopolitan Bishop as a fourth Patriarch;<sup>5</sup> to whose number, soon after, the Bishop of Jerusalem was

<sup>1</sup> Canon 33 or 35, according to the different versions. Hard. i. 18, 36.

<sup>2</sup> Mosheim i. 2. 2. 19.

<sup>3</sup> Cyprian of Carthage was at once an asserter of the pre-eminence of the Roman See in rank, and also of the independence of other Sees as to authority. "Neque enim quisquam nostrum," he wrote, "Episcopum se esse Episcoporum constituit; aut tyrannico terrore ad obsequendi necessitatem collegas suos adigit." Mosh. iii. 2. 2. 2; Giesel. ib. Notes 6, 7. See too Kaye's Tertullian, p. 239.—In the same spirit was the Canon 39 of a Council of the African Church as late as A.D. 419: "Ut primæ sedis Episcopus non appelletur princeps sacerdotum, aut summus Sacerdos, aut aliquid hujusmodi, sed tantum primæ sedis Episcopus." Hard. i. 883.

<sup>4</sup> The 6th Canon of the *Nicene Council*, under the Emperor Constantine's presidency, ordained as follows. I transcribe it as both the Index of what preceded, and germ in a considerable measure of what followed. Τα αρχαια εθη κρατειω, τα εν Αιγυπτω και Λιβυαις και Πενταπολει ωστε τον εν Αλεξανδρεια επισκοπον παντων εχειν την εξουσιαν, επιδη και τω εν Ρωμη επισκοπω τουτο συνηθες εστιν ομοιως δε και κατα την Αντιοχειαν, και εν ταις αλλαις επαρχυις, τα πρεσβια συζισθαται ταις εκκλησαις. Καθολου δε προδηλον εκεινο, οτι εν τις χωρις γυμνης του Μητροπολιτου γεινοιτο επισκοπος, τον τοιουτον η Συνοδος η μεγαλη ωρισε μη δειν ειναι επισκοπον. Hard. i. 432. In the Council of *Antioch* similarly, held A.D. 341, the 9th and 19th Canons ordained that the Bishops of each province should have such respect to their Metropolitan, as to do nothing out of the usual routine, and especially not to consecrate new Bishops, without his cognizance and sanction. Ib. 597, 601. And so too in the Council of *Laodicea*, held A.D. 372, Canon 12. Hard. i. 784. To the same effect is Pope Hilary's Decretal to the Bishop of *Tarragona*, A.D. 461; a Decretal grounded on the older Church Canons and Councils. Hard. ii. 789.—See too Mosheim iv. 2. 2. 3.

The word *εξουσια* will be observed in the *Nicene Canon*: the Council already giving something more than precedence of rank, though indefinitely.

<sup>5</sup> In the 3rd Canon of the Council of Constantinople, held A.D. 381, the second rank, next after the Roman See, was adjudged to that of Constantinople. Hard. i. 810.

added as a fifth.<sup>1</sup> Of the four Eastern Patriarchs, however, it is not my province to speak at present. Nor need I enlarge to show, with regard to them, how (notwithstanding the great privileges adjudged them, and more especially to the Constantinopolitan Patriarch<sup>2</sup>) both their own number,<sup>3</sup> the supremacy of their one common Emperor,<sup>4</sup> and then, after no long interval, the Saracen invasion, and establishment of a Mahometan Empire over Syria and Egypt, operated as effectual checks against their unlimited *ecclesiastical*, as well as *secular*, aggrandizement.—But, in regard of the great *Western Patriarch*, no such obstacles intervened to obstruct his advances to direct and paramount supremacy over the Clergy of Western Christendom; including in that division a considerable part of Illyricum.<sup>5</sup> And there were *ecclesiastical laws* enacted by the Roman Emperors, both before and during the dissolution of the Empire of the West, which tended greatly to promote and confirm it: and this (as it proved) not for the time only, but permanently.

Thus there was first issued, at the request of Pope Damasus and his Roman Council, on occasion of resistance to his jurisdiction by certain Italian and African Bishops, the Law of *Gratian* and *Valentinian* of the year 378, addressed

<sup>1</sup> Viz. by the Council of Chalcedon, A.D. 451; jurisdiction being adjudged him over Palestine. Har. ii. 491—495.—Gieseler, Per. ii. § 91, gives a clear synopsis of the whole subject with authorities.

<sup>2</sup> See Mosheim v. 2. 2. 3—5. In the Council of Chalcedon, A.D. 451, the 28th Canon directed that the ordination of the *Metropolitans of Thrace, Pontus, and the Asian diocese*, should be derived only from the Constantinopolitan Patriarch, as their supreme ecclesiastical Head; that of the *Provincial Bishops* flowing from these Metropolitans. Har. ii. 611.

<sup>3</sup> I mean as jealous of, and often interfering one with another; the stronger encroaching on the weaker. So, for example, when Theophilus of Alexandria in the year 403, under direction of the Empress Eudoxia, presided in a Council against Chrysostom of Constantinople, and deposed him. Mosh. v. 2. 3. 15. But it was generally the Patriarch of Constantinople that was the strongest, and the oppressor. Then the weaker appealed often to Rome. Mosh. v. 2. 2. 6.

<sup>4</sup> See this point illustrated in my preceding Chapter, p. 151, Note <sup>2</sup>: also the example of Chrysostom mentioned in my preceding Note.

<sup>5</sup> I may here fitly mention the Canon of the *Illyrian Council at Sardica* (the modern *Sophia*), held A.D. 347, which assigned to Bishops, if deposed by a synod, the right of appeal to the Bishop of Rome. It is given by Gieseler ii. 2, § 92, Note <sup>6</sup>.—Mosheim objects however (iv. 2. 2. 6), 1st, that the genuineness of the Canon is dubious; 2nd, that the authority of so obscure a Synod, even if it passed the Canon, was small; 3rd, that it awarded no general right of appeal to Rome, but only in the one particular case of episcopal deposition. At any rate, says Gieseler, *ibid.*, very few availed themselves of it: and hence the rather Pope Damasus' request for the imperial Decree next given.

to the Prætorian Prefects of Gaul and Italy, and so including the whole Western Empire: <sup>1</sup> a law which ordained that, in case of charge against an *ecclesiastic*, his *Metropolitan* was to be the Judge, with *liberty of appeal* however on the part of the accused to ROME; if against the *Metropolitan* himself, then the *Roman Bishop* to be judge, in person or by deputy, without appeal.<sup>2</sup> So was imperial authorization given to Rome's *Papal jurisdiction* over all the Western Clergy.—The Bishops having now to write to Rome for direction in doubtful cases, the Pope answered by *Decretal Epistles*;—Decretals, to which afterwards as much authority was attached by Papal Canonists as to the Holy Scriptures: <sup>3</sup> and he at the same time appointed from among the Metropolitans of each kingdom some one to represent him, and see to their publication and enforcement. Ere the middle of the 5th century we find this to have been done in *Gaul, Spain, and both Illyricums*; <sup>4</sup> and

<sup>1</sup> The Prætorian Prefect of *Italy* \* had the government not of *Italy* only, but of *Western Illyricum and Africa*; the Prefect of *Gaul, that of Gaul, Spain, and Britain*. See Sir I. Newton on Daniel vii.; from whom chiefly I here abstract.

<sup>2</sup> "Si in longinquiribus partibus alicujus ferocitas talis emerit, [i. e. any Bishop's hardihood such as contumaciously to resist the Metropolitan judicial decree deposing him] omnis ejus causæ dictio ad Metropolitanæ in eadem Provincia episcopi deducatur examen. Vel si ipse Metropolitanus est, Romam necessariò, vel ad eos quos Romanus episcopus judices dederit, sine delatione (Baronius *dilatione*) contendat." The whole Edict is given by Harduin, i. 842; with the petitioning letter for it of the Roman Synod to the Emperor immediately preceding: also by Sir I. Newton, p. 95.† Gieseler too gives its most essential part, *ibid.* Note <sup>3</sup>. The Synod thanked Gratian for some previous edict to the same effect; which only wanted, it seemed, more solemn imperial publication and enforcement. And it took occasion thus to state its general effect and purport: "Ut de reliquis ecclesiarum sacerdotibus Episcopus Romanus haberet examen; ut et de religione religionis Pontifex cum consortibus judicaret; nec ulla fieri videretur injuria sacerdotio, si sacerdos nulli usquam profani judicis arbitrio facile subjaceret." Hard. i. 839. The Letter, says Harduin, is supposed from its style to have been written by Ambròse.—A century and a half after, viz. A.D. 538, we find the Council of Orleans ordaining, in conformity with this Imperial law, that no Cleric (cujuscumque gradûs) should be taken by a Laic before the secular court, without the Bishop's permission. Hard. ii. 1428.

<sup>3</sup> "Inter canonicas Scripturas Decretales Epistolæ connumerantur." *Distinct.* 19 Can. in *Canonicis*, Rubric. ap. Daubuz, p. 587.—Pope Siricius' Decretals, address A.D. 385 to the Bishop of Tarragona, are the earliest. So Gieseler, *ibid.* Note <sup>11</sup>.

<sup>4</sup> In *Spain* Pope Siricius, in A.D. 384, appointed the *Bishop of Tarragona* his Vicar. In *Gaul* Innocent I, in 404, address the *Bishop of Rouen* as Papal Vicar; in 417, Zosimus the *Bishop of Arles*. In Innocent's decretal Letter he directs that lesser causes should be referred to Provincial Councils, the greater as usual to Rome. In *Eastern Illyricum*, as early as the year 382, Pope Damasus made the Bishop of Thessalonica his Vicar; and Pope Siricius, Damasus' successor, decreed that no

\* See my Note <sup>5</sup>, p. 158, Vol. i., on Constantine's change of the Prætorian Prefect's joint military and civil functions into functions wholly civil.

† Here, as before, I use Borthwick's Edition.

moreover that the Bishops of *Northern Italy*, if not of the *African Province*, partially recognized his right of superintendence: <sup>1</sup> the which, with the rest of Italy more immediately under him as Metropolitan, <sup>2</sup> made up nearly the Western Empire.—Further, when about the middle of that century the Bishop of Arles resisted his encroachments, another Imperial Decree was issued;—I refer to that notable and important one in 445 by the Emperors *Valentinian III and Theodosius II*, observed on already in my preceding Chapter: <sup>3</sup>—wherein the presumptuousness of resistance to the Holy See was sharply rebuked, the whole body of Bishops bidden to do nothing without his approbation, and the universal Clergy to obey him as their ruler. <sup>4</sup>—On which, in bolder tone, steps were taken towards the more complete subjugation of the Western Clergy to Rome, by the same Pope Leo, <sup>5</sup> on whose application the Imperial Decree was

Bishops should be ordained in that province without his Vicar's sanction: also that it should lie with him to call provincial councils. In *Western Illyricum* the Bishops of Laureacum and Salona were made Papal Vicars. (Sir I. N. 96—110.)—We have seen that the Roman supremacy over *Illyricum* was asserted by Boniface II, A.D. 531, on the strength of Papal precedents for a century preceding. See my p. 159 *suprà*. Hard. ii. 1124.—These *Papal Vicars* were *Legati Nati*; or Bishops who ex officio fulfilled the functions of *Legati à Latere*. See Ducange in verb. Appellants to Rome were to take credentials from them.

<sup>1</sup> See Sir I. N., pp. 111—115, on the ecclesiastical subordination of the Sees of *Aquileia, Milan, and Ferrara*, whose provinces embraced Northern Italy. In 844, however, Milan revolted for 200 years from Rome.—As regards *Africa*, the application of the Carthaginian Bishop to Pope Damasus, A.D. 375, for an authentic copy of the Canons and Decretals of the (Roman) Apostolic see (Hard. i. 759), and also the express complaint made against contumacious African Bishops in Damasus' and his Romish Synod's Letter to Gratian (Hard. i. 840), furnish illustration. Compare too the later reference to Rome in the matter of Antony; an unworthy Bishop ordained under misapprehension, and then deposed by Augustine, A.D. 422.\* Further illustration occurs in the appeal of the celebrated Pelagius to the Roman Bishop. Milner, p. 326; Gieseler, *ib.* § 85. But the *African* province was of all others the most independent of Rome. See Mosh. v. 2. 2. 6, and my Note <sup>3</sup>, p. 199.

<sup>2</sup> The Roman See, as observed in my preceding Chapter, p. 168, included in its Diocese the islands of Sardinia, Corsica, Sicily.

<sup>3</sup> Given by Sir I. Newton, p. 120. See p. 160 *suprà*.

<sup>4</sup> "Tunc enim demum ecclesiarum pax ubique servabitur si rectorem suum agnoscat universitas." Again; "Erat ipsa sententia [Papæ] per Gallias, etiam sine imperiali sanctione, valitura: quid enim Pontificis auctoritate non liceret?"

<sup>5</sup> See Pope Leo's Letter to the Bishop of Thessalonica, his Vicar, in Harduin, i. 1767. It deserves perusal, and especially its § 6 and 11.—As a specimen of the reverential feelings of many of the provincial Bishops towards the Romish Bishop, and preparation of the mind for the subjection that was fated for their successors, I may cite the following extract from a Letter of the Gallic Bishops to Leo: "Hæc apostolatûs vestri scripta, ita ut symbolum fidei, quisquis redemptionis sacramento non negligit tabulis cordis adscriptis . . . Apostolicæ sedi unde religionis nostræ fons et

\* See on this very illustrative example Augustine's Letter 209, address to Pope Celestine, A.D. 422.

issued:<sup>1</sup> and in his Decretals the Clergy were subjected to the Bishops; the Bishops to the Metropolitans, specially in regard of Episcopal ordinations; the Synod of Bishops, in their election of a Metropolitan, to the Papal Vicar; the Vicar of course, as Leo well reminds his Vicars, to the Pope (or Peter) himself:<sup>2</sup>—a system of ecclesiastical despotism, in short, complete and perfect in conception; but of which, however, the agitations of the Gothic kingdoms, and general Arianism of the Gothic kings, separating them from Rome, prevented for a while the full accomplishment.<sup>3</sup>—Once more, Justinian's Code (a Code first published in the year 529<sup>4</sup>) mainly confirmed, in regard of *ecclesiastics*, the Decree of Gratian;—made all matters of simony and clerical irregularity or insubordination, as well as of heresy, matters for Episcopal jurisdiction;—and, even in civil and criminal causes, assigned to the Bishop's court equal jurisdiction with the ordinary tribunal,<sup>5</sup> and required Episcopal sanction ere execution of sentence on the condemned.<sup>6</sup> While, in questions involving Bishops, the whole ultimate jurisdiction was left, at least in Western Christendom, to the Pope of Rome.<sup>7</sup>

origo manavit." Hard. ib. 1776. Again three of the Gallic Bishops wrote; "Merito illic principatum sedis Apostolicæ constitutum, unde adhuc *Apostolici Spiritus oracula* resercentur." Sir I. Newton, p. 126. Already the Pope's voice was referred to as the *Bath Kol*. See my Vol. ii. p. 110.—D'Achery (Spicil. iii. 307) gives a Letter of Pope Symmachus of the date 501, referring to some difference between two Bishops of Burgundic France which had been brought before him for adjudication. This shows the custom.

<sup>1</sup> So Gieseler *ibid*.

<sup>2</sup> See § 6 of Leo's letter to the Bishop of Thessalonica, just referred to.

<sup>3</sup> Mosh. vi. 2. 2. 2.—For example, the Council of Orleans in 533 ordained that Metropolitans should be elected, as anciently, by the Bishops of the province; without any reference, such as was enjoined in Pope Leo's Decretal, to the Papal Vicar. Harduin ii. 1175.—These Vicars, however, were still appointed by the Popes. So by Pope Hormisdas, about A.D. 517, the Bishop of Seville for Bætica and Lusitania, and the Bishop of Tarragona for the rest of Spain. Hard. ii. 1018, 1023; Sir I. Newton, p. 100.

<sup>4</sup> The *Code*, promulgated in 529, was a summary of former laws that still continued in force; the *Pandects*, published four years afterwards, of the *principles* of the Roman jurisprudence. The *Novels* were Justinian's additions. Gibbon viii. 36—46. (See above pp. 161, 162.) These all together made up the *Civil Law*.

<sup>5</sup> *Κεφαλή παντων των οσιοτατων τε Θεσ ιερων*. So the Code respecting the Roman Pope; cited p. 162 *suprà*.

<sup>6</sup> See Waddington i. 420.

<sup>7</sup> A Decretal Epistle of Pope Vigilius, address to Eutherius about A.D. 540, or soon after the edict of Justinian, thus largely speaks of the ecclesiastical law of appeal to Rome, even at a time when the power of Justinian was triumphant in Italy; and consequently not to be disregarded in the Papal edicts. "Petro concessum est ut cæteris [apostolis] præemineret; unde et Cephæ nominatur, quia caput est et principium omnium apostolorum. . . Quamobrem sancta Romana Ecclesia ejus merito. . . primatum tenet omnium ecclesiarum: ad quam tam summa episcoporum



But even the influence of these laws was not sufficient to overcome existing hindrances, and accomplish Leo's scheme of Papal domination over the Western Clergy. This was reserved to *Pope Gregory the Great* at the close of the 6th century, as the preparer, and a *Monk of the order of Benedict*, above 100 years after, as the completer:—the Benedictine Order, that I speak of, having very soon after its institution in 529, contemporarily with the first promulgation of Justinian's Code, embraced principles of obedience to the Pope; and, in less than a century after, overspread all the West.<sup>1</sup>—For the former, *Pope Gregory*, having drawn in the Barbarian Princes of the West to conformity with the orthodox and Roman faith, succeeded to a considerable extent in enforcing in their several kingdoms the rule that the Metropolitan must receive *Papal sanction*, in order to the exercise of his Metropolitan functions:<sup>2</sup> the reception of a *pallium* from Rome being the token of such sanction and investiture.<sup>3</sup> And the latter, the celebrated *Wilfrid*,<sup>4</sup> or *Boniface*,<sup>5</sup> (called also the Apo-

negotia et judicia atque querelæ, quàm et majores ecclesiarum quæstiones, quasi ad caput semper referenda sunt." Hard. ii. 1432.

<sup>1</sup> Benedict, himself of Nursia in the Sabine country, and so a Roman, had a true Roman, i. e. Papal feeling. His first monastery was on Mount Casino in Italy; where the more modern structure, its present magnificent representative, is still visited by travellers between Rome and Naples. See Mosheim vi. 2. 2. 6, 7.—Both Augustine and the forty monks that accompanied him, on the famous mission from Gregory to Britain, which resulted in the conversion of our island to Roman Christianity, and Roman religious supremacy, were all Benedictines.

<sup>2</sup> "Nunc permaneant in suo vigore Conciliorum omnium constituta, et synodice Præsulum Romanorum epistolæ," was King Recared's declaration, and that of the Council of Toledo over which he presided, A.D. 589, (as I have already at p. 165 observed,) on adhesion to the Catholic and Roman Creed.

<sup>3</sup> See Waddington i. 311, 312. The *pallium* was sent by Gregory himself to the Bishops of Antioch, Ravenna, Salona, Milan, Messina, Corinth, Autun, Arles, Seville. Dupin v. 112.—He also sent *keys* to many dignitaries, in token of the transmission of the virtue of the keys. But I think this was only to *lay* dignitaries; and so to symbolize the blessing, not the power. See Ducange on *Clavis*.

<sup>4</sup> It was from *England*, now united to Rome, that the Benedictine *Wilfrid* went forth to Christianize and Romanize Germany. Thus it is not without reason that Ranke, i. 16, dwells on the incalculable influence of the conversion of Britain by the Benedictines, towards the aggrandizement of the Papal See.

<sup>5</sup> A name given him by the Pope in memorial of his *good deeds*;—some of them more than equivocal, according to Foxe: saying (i. 369) that in one of this Wilfrid's Epistles it was written, "That even if the Pope were of most filthy living, and negligent of himself and the whole of Christianity, so as to lead innumerable souls with him to hell, yet ought there no man to rebuke him in so doing: for, saith he, he hath power to judge all men, and ought to be judged by none!"\*—He was an English

\* Always the *αγομος*. See p. 175 *suprà*.

stle of Germany,) early in the 8th century induced the Bishops of the German and Frank Clergy to make a *vow*, like his own, of *implicit obedience to the See of Rome*.—The custom of making this vow became soon established among the Western Clergy: and, in case of the Metropolitans, was conjoined with their investiture with the pallium.<sup>1</sup> The vow was in the very form of the oath of allegiance wont to be taken by a vassal to his suzerain.<sup>2</sup> “From that time,” says Ranke (i. 17), “the submissiveness to [Rome’s] ecclesiastical authority (i. e. on the part of the Clergy) which had characterised the Anglo-Saxons, extended itself over the whole Frankish Empire.”

In conclusion I need but make a passing allusion to the *decrees of Charlemagne*, as confirming the Papal supremacy over the ecclesiastics of his Empire;<sup>3</sup> and to the *war of the Investitures*, three centuries later, between the German Emperors and the Popes, as illustrating the superior stringency in the minds of the Clergy of their vow of fidelity to the Pope, in comparison with that to the secular sovereign, when the two came into conflict.<sup>4</sup> It is evident that from

Benedictine monk: began his missionary labours A.D. 715, was made Archbishop of Mentz \* 746, and killed 755. Mosh. viii. 1. 1. 2, 3.

<sup>1</sup> So Giannoue, in his Summary of the Papal steps to ecclesiastical domination, abstracted by Dean Waddington in his H. E. i. 312. “The Metropolitans had not the power of exercising all the episcopal functions (especially that of ordaining the Bishops of the provinces) until they had received the pallium from the Pope:” and the Pope naturally would not grant them it, until they had taken an “oath of fidelity, such as he required.”

<sup>2</sup> So Faber, S. C. iii. 180; who observes that it is given by Whitaker on the Apocalypse, p. 408. It is noticed also in Mendham’s Life of Pius V. p. 288.

Innocent II, in his address to the assembled Hierarchy in the 2nd Lateran Council, A.D. 1139, thus spoke of it: “Nostis quia Roma caput mundi, et quia à Romani Principis licentiâ ecclesiastici honoris celsitudo, quasi feodalis juris consuetudine, suscipitur; et sine ejus permissione legaliter non tenetur.” Hard. vi. ii. 1213.

<sup>3</sup> He ordained that the Episcopal (and so Papal) judicial authority should be supreme, and without appeal, in all cases in which clerks or even laymen might refer to it; and that the clergy should be altogether exempt from secular jurisdiction. Waddington, ch. xiii. Vol. i. p. 422.

<sup>4</sup> In Brydson’s Heraldry, p. 170, an interested reason is given for this. “The clerical Princes and Lords, with all the other clergy of Europe, held themselves bound by a more immediate and sacred allegiance to the Head of the Church than to any of their temporal sovereigns; whereby they secured at once *their own independence*, and his universal dominion.”

---

\* Monks had long been admitted to ordination, and all the sacerdotal offices. So the Imperial Precept of A.D. 398: (given by Sir I. N. p. 214:) and again the Decree of Pope Boniface IV, A.D. 610; “Credimus à sacerdotibus monachis ligandi solvendique officium . . . haud indignè ministrari.” Hard. iii. 543.

the time of *Wilfrid*, if not of *Gregory I*, above-mentioned, we may consider the Western Clergy to have been united, according to the Apocalyptic emblem, as *one body* under *one Head*, viz. the POPE of ROME, as *Western Patriarch* or *Universal Bishop*; <sup>1</sup> and the *Bishops* presiding over the *secular* Clergy, and the *Abbots* and *Generals of Orders* over the *regular* or *monastic*,—each alike powerful in Christendom, <sup>2</sup>—to have answered to the Beast's *two horns* in vision.—In truth the introduction of celibacy among the *secular* Clergy had transferred *them* too into a kind of *monastic order*; detached from other ties, and subject, as Ranke observes, to the Pope, the Universal Bishop, somewhat as the Monks of Clugny to the one Abbot of their Order. <sup>3</sup> Whatever power they possessed in their sacerdotal functions was regarded as *derived from him*; <sup>4</sup> inso-much that, up to the epoch of the Reformation, the Bishops subscribed themselves, at times, "*Bishop by the grace* (not of God but) *of the Apostolic See.*" <sup>5</sup> And it was all exercised *before*, i. e. *under cognizance of* and *responsibility to*, him, as their Head, in his above-noted character of the great Western or rather Universal Patriarch. By solemn oath, at the time of Consecration, each Metropolitan, each Bishop, was bound to this. <sup>6</sup>—I say, *before him* as *Patriarch*.

<sup>1</sup> On the distinction of *this* his character from that of *Christ's Vicar*, or *God's Vicergerent on earth*, see p. 151 *suprà*.

<sup>2</sup> Mosheim, v. 2. 2. 9, says that the monks that originally thought of seclusion, not sacerdotal rank, were ere the end of the 5th century become so opulent as to be "in a condition to claim an eminent station among the supports and pillars of the Christian community." Much more was this the case a century or two afterwards. See *ib.* vii. 2. 2. 3, 4.

<sup>3</sup> Ranke, i. 30.

<sup>4</sup> "Inter ipsos Gallos fuisse qui . . . faterentur *episcopos omnem potestatem suam à Deo quidem, sed per S. Petrum, habere.*" Mosh. x. 2. 2. 8.

<sup>5</sup> Ranke, i. 37.

The custom of Bishops so viewing, and so subscribing themselves, continued onward even after the Reformation. Bellarmine states it as still in his time the Catholic doctrine. Says De Pradt on the Concordats, Vol. ii. p. 160; "On a contracté à Rome une singulière habitude, celle de considerer les actes afferens à la religion comme des *grâces*. Les Bulles sont des *grâces*. *L'erection d'un évêché*, utile à l'église, est mise au nombre des *grâces*."—Both in Europe and in ultramarine countries the same custom is still observed. So e. g. in an edict of the Romish Bishop of Toronto, dated from Canada, March 1842, he styles himself "Bishop by the grace of God, and of the *Holy Romish See*." And so, a friend writes me, the Archbishops of Rouen.

<sup>6</sup> "I, N., elected to the Church at N., will from henceforth be faithful and obedient to the blessed Apostle Peter, and to the holy Roman Church, and to our Lord Pope N., and his canonical successors . . . And every — years I will in my own person visit the threshold of the Apostles; and I will give to our Lord and his successors afore-

For we must not, through the fixedness of our contemplation of the Pope in his immeasurably mightier but usurped character of CHRIST'S VICEGERENT UPON EARTH, and his consequent Headship over all the Kings and People of Christendom, as symbolized in the *first* Apocalyptic Beast's ruling Head, overlook his PATRIARCHAL Headship of the distinct Clerical Body, symbolized in the *second* and smaller Apocalyptic Beast, also:<sup>1</sup>—a twofold character this attaching to him,—the *sacerdotal* and the *royal* or rather *super-royal*,—the *ecclesiastical* and *extru-ecclesiastical*,—which in fact was not only recognized by Popes<sup>2</sup> and Papal Doctors,<sup>3</sup> but even signified to the eye in the Pope's separate use of the Papal insignia I have already alluded to<sup>4</sup> of the *mitre* and the *triple crown*.<sup>5</sup> And as to the meaning and application

said an account of my whole pastoral office, and of all things in any way concerning the state of my Church, the discipline of clergy and people, &c." Given in Percival's Roman Schism.

<sup>1</sup> "Vos caput sacerdotii . . . reputamus." So John of Constantinople to the Roman Pope Constantine. Cited by Malvenda, i. 45.

<sup>2</sup> So Pope Innocent the Third, in a Letter to our King John: "Rex regum et Dominus dominantium, Jesus Christus, Sacerdos in æternum secundum ordinem Melchisedech, ita regnum et sacerdotium in ecclesiâ stabilivit, ut sacerdotale sit regnum, et sacerdotium sit regale; unum præficiens universis quem suum in terris Vicarium ordinavit: ut, sicut ei flectitur omne genu cælestium, terrestrium, et etiam inferiorum, ita illi omnes obediunt et intendunt; ut sit unum ovile et unus pastor." Vitringa, 807.

<sup>3</sup> E. g. Bernard: "Allemanne, Francie, Anglie, Scotie, Hispaniarum, et Hierosolymorum Reges, cum universo Clero et Populis, favent et adhaerent Domino Innocentio, tanquam filii Patri, tanquam capiti membra." Ep. 125. So does Bernard distinguish the bodies of both beasts, and represent the Pope as head to both. (The passage was cited by me p. 190 supra in reference to the subjection of *kings* and *people*.)—Sometimes, as in the Basle Council, (Mosheim xv. 2. 2. 11.) the Roman Pontiff was spoken of as head of the *Church*, meaning (by the same misnomer that I have before alluded to) the *Clergy*; and the bishops, priests, and monks, as its members.

I may illustrate this double headship attaching to the Popes of Rome in the apostate Church, from our Lord Jesus Christ's bearing in his true Church the same double character; as being at once Bishop of bishops, and King of kings.

I may illustrate it too, *partially*, from the earthly Church visible. Before the year 1534 the English King was only *Head of the English State*, or *National Body*. After the memorable Parliamentary Act of that year, abolishing the *Pope's headship of the Church*, he became earthly legal head of the English *Church* also, with its *clergy* and *hierarchy*.\*

<sup>4</sup> See my Vol. ii. p. 52.

<sup>5</sup> "In signum spiritualium contulit mihi mitram; in signum temporalium coronam: miram pro sacerdotio, coronam pro regno." So Innocent III, before the *regno* had been changed into the *triregno*:—by which latter, says the Ceremoniale Rom., "significatur sacerdotalis et imperialis summa dignitas atque potestas:" adding that the Pope uses it "eundo ad ecclesiam et redeundo, sed nunquam in divinis:" or, as Du-

---

\* With how different a kind of headship however from the *Papal* will appear from comparing the account given of it in our Article xxxvii. with Gibbon's (xii. 261) of that of the Popes. "In an age of superstition it should seem that the union of the *royal* and *sacerdotal* characters would mutually fortify each other; and that the *keys of Paradise* would be the surest pledge of earthly obedience."

given by me of the Apocalyptic phrase "*before him*" the language of Rome itself furnishes its best justificatory comment. For, whatever was brought under the *cognizance* and *judgment* of the Papal See, (and what was there but must pass under its cognizance, with those everywhere peering eyes, like the eyes of a man?) was said to be done "*coram Petro*," *before Peter*.<sup>1</sup> Nor can I pass on without begging the reader to think of the state of the Western Clergy, pre-signified by this little word, as mediately or immediately referring, in their exercise of the ministry, to Papal judgment and a Papal tribunal; and to consider its contrast to the charge laid on them by St. Paul, to fulfil their ministry as "*before God* and the LORD JESUS CHRIST;"—"before JESUS CHRIST as about to judge the quick and dead, at his appearing and kingdom."<sup>2</sup>

Thus have I traced in ecclesiastical history the manner in which the whole Hierarchy and Clergy of Western Christendom, both *secular* and *regular*, *parochial* and *monastic*, were formed into a body completely subject to the Bishop of Rome, in the course of the two centuries following next after the first formation of the Romano-Gothic kingdoms in Western Europe:<sup>3</sup>—in other words, how the *two-horned lamb-skin-covered Beast*, or *Wolf in sheep's clothing*, rose up incorporate, soon after the manifestation of the first Beast, and all duly subordinated to its ruling Head; so as in fact to be prepared to act as prime minister in the kingdom constituted by him as ANTICHRIST. Not unobservable, I think,

randus writes of the regnum, "nunquam intrâ ecclesiam, sed extra." See Ducange and Suppl. on *Regnum*: also Bonanni i. 58; and my Note <sup>1</sup> Vol. ii. p. 53, Note <sup>2</sup> p. 170, and p. 193 *suprà*.

<sup>1</sup> Pope Leo I, in a Decretal Epistle, spoke of matters determined before the Pope in Roman Councils thus; "Cum *coram Apostolo Petro* semper in communionem tractatum fuerit, ut omnia Canonum decreta apud omnes Domini sacerdotes inviolata permanent." Sir I. N. p. 117. Compare p. 87.—In these cases the matter was settled before the personal presence, not indeed of *Peter* himself, but of his representative *the Pope*. In other provinces it was before the *Pope's representative Vicar* that ecclesiastical matters were settled, and that the clergy fulfilled their functions.

<sup>2</sup> 2 Tim. iv. 1, 2, "I charge thee *before God*, &c., Preach the word!"

<sup>3</sup> I may refer to Dean Waddington, iii. 315—318, for a general view of the subject of this head not dissimilar from my own. So did the Popes fulfil Theodoret's anticipation from prophecy of Antichrist's *ecclesiastical* dominancy: εν τη, εκκλησια αρπασει την προεδριαν (see p. 99 Note §:) just as, in Chap. v. preceding, we showed them to have fulfilled Chrysostom's *larger* anticipations of the dominancy to be asserted by him; την των ανθρωπων, και την τα θεα, επιχειρησει αρπασαι αρχην.



THE FIRST ROMISH ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY, ST. AUSTIN.

With his Arch-Episcopal Pall.



From Fair

---

ROMISH BISHOP.

With the early two-horned Episcopal Mitre.



From the Font in Winchester Cath

is the curious double parallelism between the prophetic symbol, here shown to St. John, and the body symbolized as long afterwards distinguishable before the eyes of men. It was a *lamb-skin* pallium, blest and presented by the Pope, that has, ever since the first Gregory's time, been essential to the Papal Archbishop's office, and consequently to the ordination and constitution of the Papal Clerical body under him.<sup>1</sup> Again, the Papal Bishops' and Abbots' mitre was cleft anciently from front to back, so as to give to the elevated points on either side the appearance of *horns*; whence they used in the middle age to have the appellative attached to them of *cornuti*, or *horned*.<sup>2</sup> Even by Roman Catholic expositors the parallelism has been noted; and it has led to such an explanation of the symbol as is here given.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Rock, in his lately published "Church of our Fathers," Vol. ii. p. 149, speaks of *the two lambs blest annually at St. Agnes'*; from whose fleeces (mixt if need be with other fine wool) the archbishops' palls are woven. And of their manufacture from the lambs' wool we thus read in "Rome in the sixth Century," vol. iii. pp. 204, 205; "There is a peculiar and solemn sort of blessing given to two lambs, on Jan. 21, at the Church of St. Agnese fuori le mura; from the sainted fleeces of which are manufactured, I believe by the hands of nuns, two holy mantles called *palli*, which the Pope presents to the Archbishops as his principal shepherds." (Cited by Keith ii. 318.) Then, it seems, the palls are laid for a day on St. Peter's high altar; and afterwards kept in a silver-gilt box close to St. Peter's shrine, till wanted. All "*coram Petro*," from the beginning to the end! \*—Compare Gieseler i. 344.

My sketch of St. Austin (first Archbishop of Canterbury), in his *pallium*, is from Fairholt's copy from an ancient Missal of the 9th century. A similar sketch of St. Dunstan with his *pallium* is given in Rock, ii. 97.

It is observable that both among *heathens* and *Jews* the priestly dress was not *woollen*, but *linen*. "Quippe lana," says Apuleius, Apol. i., "segnissimi pecoris excrementum, pecori detracta, jam inde Orphei et Pythagore scitis *profanus vestitus* est." And so Philo of the Jewish priests' dress. See Daubuz, p. 866.

<sup>2</sup> So Ducange, Suppl. in voc. *Cornutus*. "Episcopus à mitrà, que episcopis propria est, sic appellatus." And on *Cornua*; "Mitra:" citing from the Acta Sanctorum; "Exosa cornua Metropolitanam frontem insigniunt."

Dr. Rock, *ibid.* p. 319, in his Chapter on the *Mitre*, observes how at the end of the xith century (not very long after the Pope's complete subordination of the Western Clergy to himself) "the first sproutings, as it were, of the *two horns* of the episcopal mitre began to show themselves;" and how the mitre then, in England, "arose into two short points, not raised before and behind as now, but right and left over each ear." He illustrates from figures on the font in Winchester Cathedral, as given in the *Fetusta Monumenta*: from a Plate in which my appended engraving is copied. See too Bonann ii. 58, 59: who calls it "*mitram bicornem*;" and remarks that the *Greek* Bishops do not use the mitre. It is a *Latin distinctive*.

<sup>3</sup> The Jesuit Joseph Acosta, in his "De Temporibus Novissimis," p. 504 (Ed. Lugd. 1592), after approvingly stating the common patristic idea that this second Beast symbolized "predicatorum Antichristi multitudinem, in quibus *cornua agni* sunt quòd se per *hypocrisin sanctos simulent*," proceeds to express his opinion that probably *some eminent Church dignitary*, supporting Antichrist, might very possibly be specially intended; because of *two lamb's horns* being the symbol of the episcopal dignity: "quen-

\* In my Vol. ii. p. 20, Note 1, I have observed on the requirement by the Decretals that every Archbishop should be buried in his pall. Hence the number wanted annually must be very considerable; and the *money payments* of course large also.



I now proceed to show,

INDLY, how what was stated in the Apocalyptic prophecy of the *actings* of this *second lambskin-covered Wild Beast* was fulfilled in the *actings* of the *Papal Priesthood*, and specially of its *mitred double Hierarchy of Bishops and Abbots*, branching from the common *Patriarchal Head*:—viz. his *speaking like a dragon*, though bearing a *lamb's semblance*;—his *exercising all the power of the first Beast, before him*;—his *doing great wonders or miracles before men*, and therewith *deceiving them*; (more especially as *making fire to descend before men from heaven to earth*;)—and, finally, his *causing the earth and its inhabitants to worship the first Beast*.<sup>1</sup>

1. The second Beast, “*having horns like a lamb, spake as a dragon*.” That is, to use Hilary's words, “*under pretence of preaching the Gospel he would elaborate a denial of Christ* :”<sup>2</sup> and with poison, adds Ansbert, like as of a serpent. On the applicability of all which to the *Papal Clergy*, so much has been already said<sup>3</sup> as to render a lengthened additional illustration needless. Let me take only the two prominent characteristics of the Dragon, the Old Serpent, given by our Lord in St. John's Gospel.<sup>4</sup> First, the Old Serpent was a *liar*. And was not such the general character of the Papal Clergy? For, as it was not God's word that was taken by them for their supreme rule of doctrine, but rather the traditions and commandments of men enjoined by the Romish Church,<sup>5</sup> so their doctrine was not the pure truth, but leavened with falsehood:—not that of the right worship of God, but rather (as in the Dragon's old system of Paganism) of the worship of dead men:—not the mys-

dam acerrimum Antichristi defensorem; et cum merito non regem, aut militem, sed virum in ecclesiâ insignem, quòd *duo agni cornua episcopalis dignitatis insigne sint*.”

Says the Jesuit Lacunza in more modern times (i. 220); “*Our priesthood it is, and nothing else, which is here signified under the metaphor of a Beast with two horns like those of a lamb*.”—Compare what was said by Gregory, as cited p. 197, Note 4, to much the same effect, in times of the commencing Papacy.

<sup>1</sup> What is further said of the second Beast's proceedings in respect of the *Image*, and of the Number of the *Beast*, will be commented on in Chaps. vii, viii, infra.

<sup>2</sup> “*Sub specie prædicationis evangelicæ laboratur ut Christus, dum prædicari creditur, denegetur*.” Contr. Auxent. 2.

<sup>3</sup> See the references Note 2 p. 197; and Part III. Ch. i.

<sup>4</sup> John viii. 44.

<sup>5</sup> Dean Waddington (i. 401) observes from Fleury, that it was a rule of discipline, not to commit the canons of sacerdotal practice to writing, but to preserve them by a *secret tradition* among *bishops* and *priests*; chiefly those concerning the administration of the sacraments. Therefore the bishops confided their ecclesiastical letters to the *clergy* only.

tery of godliness, but the mystery of iniquity:—not Christ, but Antichrist. The lamb-like Beast, as realized on this earthly scene, was indeed notably “the False Prophet.”—Again, the Dragon was a *murderer*. And who knows not how the Papal Clergy preached up crusades against those they called *heretics*, though rather the saints of Christ: how they urged on the crusaders in the work; how, at inquisitions and trials for heresy, they mercilessly pronounced sentence of death; and assisted at the auto-da-fès and scenes of execution, to ensure the fulfilment of the sentence of blood.<sup>1</sup> Their garb and their profession was indeed that of *the lamb-like Saviour’s ministers*. But it was another Spirit that inspired them. “The Beast had horns like a *lamb*; but it spake as a *dragon*.”<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See my Vol. ii. pp. 20, 28, 423, &c., *suprà*.—I speak of the *generality* alone, here and elsewhere, and such as acted up to the spirit of their instructions. I am still not forgetful that there were many exceptions; and that all were not of Rome that were in Rome.

<sup>2</sup> Dr. Keith (ii. 149) has here added an illustration from the *Papal Flag* (of which he gives a copy), with a *lamb passant* before a cross. He copied it, he says, from D’Anville’s Atlas: and I have seen the same also among the flags given in a plate of the *Encyclopædia Britannica*. But I have been unable to authenticate it in this character. I am assured, on I believe the best authority, that, as the *armorial ensigns* of the Popedom are *gules, two keys in saltière argent* (thus given by Hector Le Breton and other authorities), so this latter is the device that would be represented on the Pope’s *flag*: other bearings, which the Popes appear to have used at different times, having been those appertaining to their respective families.\*—The *Vexillum S. Petri*, sent by the Pope to crusading princes, whether against infidels or *heretics*, had *the cross and keys* on it;—“*cruce et clavibus insignitum*.” So Ducange in verb.

It is possible, however, that some of the Popes may have made use in their banner of the device of a *lamb passant* at the time of the *Crusades*. For it was then assumed, I think, as the arms of the Templars; and was stamped on the coins of Louis IX (St. Louis) A.D. 1226, and some other of the French kings, (Philip IV, Louis X, Charles IV,) immediately following, as if a device at that time in favour. See Ducange’s Plate on *Moneta*.—I have been told too that the Papal Missionaries sent to Asia in 1289 used a similar flag.

It is a curious fact that among the six canons of the Trullan Council that the Roman Catholics reject, one is the 82nd, which forbid the representing Christ under the symbol of a *lamb*. So Mosh. vii. 2. 5. 12, Note<sup>o</sup>.

Mr. Brooks (p. 375) adds another illustration from the supposed armorial bearings of the Popedom. “Pope Gregory,” he says, (i. e. Greg. XIII,) “*removed the cross from the Papal triple crown made by Julius II, and replaced it by a brilliant emerald supported by two golden dragons*. . . . So the Popes have mounted the *dragon* for their *crest*; as they have also assumed for the device upon their *banner a lamb passant*.” But here too the statement is incorrect. The dragon was here introduced by Gregory XIII, not as a general Papal device, but simply as his own crest; just as in his blasphemous medal given in my Plate p. 178, with the dragon elevated as the serpent in the wilderness. Moreover at the top of the emerald, and so of the crown, is a *cross*; as appears in De La Motraye’s Plate, to which Mr. B. refers.†—At the same time, as

\* My inquiries at Rome on the subject, in the spring of 1848, resulted in answers to much the same effect.

† The same as to the *dragons* sculptured on the Fontana Paolina on the Janicu-

2. "The second Beast *exercised all the power and authority of the first Beast, (only) before him.*"—The grand characteristic power of the antitype of the first Beast, i. e. of the Papal Antichrist, was the *power of the keys*; a power directly and primarily *spiritual*, though indirectly also *temporal*. The *spiritual* power,—in its application to the *obedient* Roman Catholic,—was that of absolving from sin, communicating grace through the seven sacraments, the continual offering of Christ's propitiatory sacrifice, the deliverance or solacing of departed souls in purgatory, and opening to them of the gates of Paradise. And of *all* this the administration was delegated by the Pope to the *Romish Priesthood*, and to it alone:—first to the metropolitan bishops and the abbots, by the gift of the *pallium*, or otherwise; then through them to the inferior hierarchy, secular and monastic; then to the subordinate monks and clergy. So that even the itinerant preaching friar, or common village priest, was by virtue of his ordination empowered to exercise and administer all the same mighty spiritual power, in the sphere of his village flock, or gathered auditory:—yea even to the similar impersonation of Christ,<sup>1</sup>

Julius' triple crown, with the *dragon* supporters of the topmost emerald, is one of the rich *triregni* attached to the *Popedom*, and worn as well as other *triregni*, by the Popes, the illustration may hold so far.

<sup>1</sup> Says the Catechism of the Council of Trent, ii. 4. 75: "There is but one and the same Priest, Christ the Lord. For the ministers that offer the sacrifice represent not their own, but the person of Christ, when they make his body and blood. Which thing is intimated in the very words of consecration. For the priest says not, '*This is Christ's body*;' but, '*This is my body*:' i. e. *bearing the person of Christ our Lord*, he changes the substance of the bread and wine into the true substance of his body and blood." Also ib. 5, 10, 16, 37.

Again, *ibid.* ii. 7. 2:—"As bishops and priests sustain the person of God himself on earth, they are rightly called not only *angels*, but *gods*." Said Gregory VII to the bishops and priests in a Roman Council A.D. 1080, respecting the German Emperor and Prince Henry, opposed to them in the matter of the investitures; "They have taken counsel against the Lord, and against his anointed ones." Said the Pope and assembled prelates at the Council of Bari, A.D. 1097; "It was execrable that homage should be done to a layman (like King Rufus), for ecclesiastical honours, by *hands* which could *create the Creator*." *Hard.* vi. l. 1590; *Eadmar Acta SS. ap. Southey*, p. 81.

Said the eloquent Massillon; "There is nothing more sublime and venerable upon earth, than to exercise *in the room of Jesus Christ* the functions of his eternal priesthood. . . . We know that in all our offices we put on, so to speak, *the person of Jesus Christ*: we are the mediators between God and man."—But what then in the case of a vicious ungodly priest? "Il est d'avance," says Massillon, "cet homme de péché dont parle St. Paul, assis dans le temple de Dieu."\*

---

lum at Rome. "In the two small niches," says Murray's *Hand-Book to Rome*, p. 330, "are *two dragons*; part of the armorial bearings of Pope Paul V," (A.D. 1612,) the builder of the Fountain.

\* *Discours Synodaux*. So too Bourdaloue. See an interesting article on this

participation in the character of divine, and power of creating God. All however, as previously shown, “before,” i. e. as *responsible* to, the Pope.<sup>1</sup>

Thus much of Antichrist’s asserted power generally. Of certain particular exemplifications of it I must next speak under a separate head.

3. “The second Beast had power to *do great miracles, or signs*, (still “before the first Beast,”) so as to deceive thereby them that dwell on the earth.”—And need I remind the reader, how from the earliest date of the Papacy, miracles so called,<sup>2</sup> such as these, have been the accompaniment and alleged confirmation of the ministrations of the *Romish Clergy*? Not to repeat what has been before said with regard to the earlier times of the Apostasy,<sup>3</sup> and before it had yet headed itself in the Papal Antichrist,—the famous Gregory, the most eminent of the two great founders and fathers of the Papacy,<sup>4</sup> is noted for his propensity always to “confirm the truths of religion by the evidence of *ghosts and miracles*.”<sup>5</sup> And Dean Waddington observes justly, that by thus personally sanctioning religious impostures, he delivered over the Church to spiritual blindness and bondage.<sup>6</sup> For the Clergy followed their Head. As Mosheim says, in a passage already quoted by me, of the *Clergy* of the 7th century; “Every objection was silenced by them with appeal to two things, *the authority of the Church and miracles*.”<sup>7</sup> “He deceived them that dwell on the earth by the miracles which it was given him to do.”<sup>8</sup>—And, as at the first, so afterwards. Who knows

In the Lords’ Committee on the Roman Catholic question, an Irish Roman Catholic Bishop who was examined justified the priest’s retaining the secrets of the confessional, because in that his official function the priest heard and acted *as God*. Need we wonder at the superstitious awe of the priesthood in Ireland?—It is the same elsewhere; even in the far East. The native Roman Catholics fall down before their missionary priests as before a *Swamy*, or god. So Mr. Thomas, a Missionary of our Church in Tinnevely, told me.

<sup>1</sup> See the Romish Bishop’s oath, p. 206 Note <sup>6</sup> *suprà*.

<sup>2</sup> Of the early Fathers, the great majority supposed that the Antichrist’s miracles would be *false*. See my Note <sup>2</sup> p. 97 *suprà*: also Malvenda’s chapter on the subject, B. viii. ch. 26; with the heading, “Antichristi miracula non *vera* sed *falsa* erunt.”

<sup>3</sup> See my Vol. i. pp. 333, 411.

<sup>4</sup> The other and earlier being Leo I.

<sup>5</sup> Gibbon viii. 167.

<sup>6</sup> Ch. Hist. i. 304.

<sup>7</sup> vii. 2. 3. 1: cited p. 166 Note <sup>4</sup> *suprà*.

<sup>8</sup> Says Gibbon in *loc. cit.* with reference to Gregory the Ist’s narrated miracles;

subject in the Dublin University Magazine, with an engraving of Pope Martin’s medal; the same that is given in my Plate at p. 178, with the Legend, “*Quem creant adorant;*” and which was struck also by other Popes after him.

not this, that knows any thing of the history of the middle ages,<sup>1</sup> down even to the Reformation. And indeed yet later. In fact *miracles* have been declared by its Doctors to be one of the standing signs of the truth of the Romish religion: forgetting that this (as well as its boasted *catholicity of extension*, and *germ of origin from apostolic times*), was among the express prophetic marks of the kingdom of Antichrist.<sup>2</sup>—But mark! It was all under the Papal eye and supervision that the Priesthood was to exercise this, as well as the rest of the power given them.<sup>3</sup> “*Miracula ne prædicentur Ordinario inconsulto.*”<sup>4</sup> Such was the direction prescribed to the Papal Clergy on the matter of miracles; by way of safe-guard alike against rashness, self-exposure, and neglect of the due subordination. And through the *Ordinary* the reference was of course, in the more eminent cases of asserted miracles, ultimately to the POPE; to whom alone belonged the most solemn ratification of their truth, by the canonization of the performer, (generally himself an ecclesiastic,) after his death.<sup>5</sup>

Thus much of the *extra-ordinary* miracles asserted to be done by the Papal priesthood; just as by the lambskin-covered prefigurative Wild Beast. Of the *every-day* miracle of *transubstantiation*,—a miracle more wonderful, were it but true, than all the rest put together,—the name itself suggests the history.

“Dupin does not think that any one will vouch for the truth of *all* these miracles: I should like to know *how many* he believed himself.”—It will be no lost time to my readers if they will compare Dupin’s succinct summary of the miracles urged by Gregory in evidence of the truth of his faith, (Tom. v. pp. 138—140; Ed. 1691, Mons.) and also those of a later age of the Papacy noticed in my Vol. ii. ubi supra, with Malvenda’s anticipatory sketch, drawn from patristic lore, of the miracles *Antichrist* would do, in evidence of his. The agreement is curious. <sup>1</sup> See my Vol. ii. p. 15.

<sup>2</sup> The four most select marks of the true (or Romish) Church are said to be *unity, holiness, catholicity, apostolicity*. But Bellarmine (Tom. ii. L. iv. ch. 3 et seq.) has multiplied the number to *fifteen*, one of these being *miracles*.

As regards its *catholicity* we may compare what is said in Apoc. xiii. 3 of the *Antichristian Beast*, *θαυμασθη εν ὄλῳ τη γη οπισω του θηριου*: a phrase in which, if for the preposition *εν* we put its equivalent *κατα*, (*καθ’ ὄλην την γην*), there will result almost the very word *catholicity*, with prophetic application to the *Beast’s* dominion.—As regards its *primitive* and so called *apostolic origin*, we may compare what is said of the *great apostasy* predicted by St. Paul, “The mystery of iniquity doth *already* work.”—Its boasted *unity* is but the counterpart to the unity of the ten-horned Beast under the Beast’s last head:—its pretended *holiness* to that of the *lamb-like* covering of the Apocalyptic antichristian Beast’s attendant prophet and prime minister.

<sup>3</sup> *σημια ἃ ἐσθη αυτη ποιησαι ενωπιον του θηριου.*

<sup>4</sup> Concil. Noviom. A.D. 1344. Hard. vii. 1674. Also that of Trent. Ib. x. 169.

<sup>5</sup> See p. 16 Note 2, and pp. 26, 27, of Vol. ii. Miracles so called, as wrought by the man alive or dead, were essential in order to the recognition of his saintship.

And indeed I suspect that there is a partial allusion to this in what follows in the prefigurative prophecy; viz. about the second Beast doing great miracles "so as to make fire descend from heaven upon the earth before men." For we must remember that the Apocalyptic figures are in considerable measure *Judaic*; and that under the Jewish, as indeed under the previous Patriarchal dispensation, the descent of *fire from heaven upon earth* was in its application of a *two-fold* character;—a sign of *favour*, it might be, as well as of *wrath*. For though, when falling upon *men*, it marked their destruction as from God, yet, when falling on the *sacrificial holocaust*, it signified the acceptance of the sacrifice presented to the Divine justice,<sup>1</sup> *as a substitute for the offerer.*<sup>2</sup> And to see that in *this*, as well as in the *other* use of it, the Roman Church claims to exercise power over the fire of heaven,<sup>3</sup> it needs but to enter one of her temples. There behold on its altar before you the propitiatory offering prepared by the priest, according to the office assigned him of *sacrificing for the living and the dead.*<sup>4</sup> He pronounces the words of consecration over it: and instantly, according to the solemn dogma of his Church, his own asseveration, and the belief of the prostrate congregation, the sign of its acceptance is given, on behalf of the faithful Romanists, as verily as if the fire from heaven had fallen on and consumed it. For it is changed, through the descending influence of the Divinity, into the

<sup>1</sup> "Our God is a consuming fire." Deut. iv. 24; Heb. xii. 29.

<sup>2</sup> Of this the sacrifices of Abel and Abraham if I mistake not, and certainly that of Aaron at the dedication of the tabernacle, and Manoah's, David's, and Solomon's, are familiar illustrations. Indeed the prophet Elijah made it the distinctive proof of the truth of his mission;—"The God that answereth by fire, let him be God." See Gen. iv. 4, xv. 17, Lev. ix. 24, Judg. vi. 21, 1 Chron. xxi. 26, 2 Chron. vii. 1, 1 Kings xviii. 24, 38.

This view of the thing seems to have been taken by the heathen Greeks and Romans also. Plutarch, in his Life of P. Æmilius, speaks of a flash of lightning falling on the altar at Amphipolis while the consul was sacrificing, which both consumed and consecrated the victim: so showing the favour and acceptance of the gods towards the offerer and his people. Vol. ii. p. 313. Wrangham.

<sup>3</sup> So Hesyehius, Bishop of Jerusalem, a friend and contemporary of Gregory I. Commenting on Levit. x. 1, after distinguishing between the fire from the Lord which consumed the sacrifices, and the divine fire of punishment, he adds; "Utrumque ignem ecclesia habet: hunc quidem ad illuminationem justorum, et oblatorum perfectionem; illum autem ad pœnam impiorum, quam his qui blasphemant sacerdotes indicunt." B. P. M. xii. 89.

<sup>4</sup> See my Vol. ii. p. 163.—"Tanta in altari certo holocausta offerantur, quanta populo sufficere debeant." So Pope Clement, as cited Hard. viii. 1685:—I suppose Clement V (A.D. 1305) as speaking in the Clementines.

*very body and blood of Christ himself*, ready for the priest's breaking;—God's own chosen and ever most acceptable sacrifice.<sup>1</sup>

But the more obvious fulfilment of the figure, if we take the Romanists' own language as our guide, must be considered to consist in the asserted power of their Popes and Priesthood, to evoke and hurl the *judicial* fire of heaven, through their *anathemas* and *excommunications*, against enemies. For they themselves designate these as *lightnings* and *thunderbolts*.<sup>2</sup>—Take the case, for example, of the solemn excommunication of the Emperor Frederick by Pope Innocent, at the first Council of Lyons: and mark in the account the impression of awe and terror on the bystanders. "These words (of excommunication) uttered in the midst of the Council, struck the hearers with terror, as might the *flashing thunderbolts*. When, with candles lighted and flung down,<sup>3</sup> the Lord Pope and his assistant

<sup>1</sup> See Vol. ii. p. 161, Note 1.—Vitringa in loc., p. 830, alludes to this point, as very possibly intended in the symbol.

<sup>2</sup> "*Fulminare excommunicationem* vox fori hodierni;" says Ducange.—So e. g. Gregory VII spoke of the Emperor Henry IV, when excommunicated, as "*afflatum fulmine*." (Epist. ad Germ. ap. Daubuz 587.) My text above, with its illustrative Notes 1 and 2 p. 217, furnishes another exemplification.\* See my notice of the *Thunders of the Vatican*, as Apocalyptically alluded to, Vol. ii. pp. 110—113. Says Motley, Dutch Rep. i. 70; "In that dreary epoch these curses were deemed sufficient to draw down celestial lightning on the head, not of the blasphemers, but of his victim."

<sup>3</sup> This was a usual accompaniment of the solemn and great excommunication pronounced annually at the Feast *Cena Domini* by the Pope in person, his Cardinals, and his Priesthood, against all *heretics*, from the elevated Vestibule of the Lateran Church at Rome; and directed to be practised by the Roman Prelates elsewhere also on certain solemn occasions. See the Letter of Pope Paul II to the Archbishop of Lyons, A.D. 1469, Hard. ix. 1488: † also Mosh. xvi. § 3. 1. 1. 13, Note \*, and my Vol. ii. p. 451 Note 1. The candles were thrown down from an *elevated spot* by the excommunicators.—In 1770 one of the first acts of the Pope Ganganelli was to prohibit the reading of this Bull *Cena Domini*. (Ranke iii. 214.) But I believe the custom was soon revived: ourselves, the English nation, being of course, from after the time of the Reformation, always solemnly included in the curse. ‡

\* Martene de Rit. ii. 322, states, "Non solum in homines, sed in *Dæmonem ipsum*, aliquando vibrata fuisse excommunicationis fulgura." So once, e. g. by St. Bernard.

† "Conseuerunt prædecessores nostri Romani Pontifices annis singulis in die *Cenæ Domini* sedentes pro tribunali in pontificalibus parati, assistentibus sibi venerabilibus fratribus sancte Romanæ ecclesiæ Cardinalibus, necnon archiepiscopis, &c., ex eminenti aliquo loco, audiente multitudine tam curialium et incolarum, quam peregrinorum ad urbem Romanam eo tempore propter indulgentias et benedictionem Apostolicam confluentium, ad maiorem detestationem gravium quorundam criminum, quoscumque criminibus illis illaqueatos solenni publicatione cum candelis accensis, et deinde extinctis, et in terram projectis, excommunicatos denunciare." So Pope Paul II, A.D. 1467; with special mention of George Podiebrat (noticed in my Vol. ii. p. 567), as the fit object of the curse, for his support of the Hussite heresy and heretics. And this laudable custom he would have to be kept up.

‡ I am not sure whether the custom is wholly discontinued at the *present* time at

prelates flashed their *lightning-fire* terribly against the Emperor Frederick, now no longer to be called Emperor, his procurators and friends burst into a bitter wailing, and struck the thigh or breast. 'Oh! that day,' said one of them; 'that day of wrath, of calamity, and woe!'"<sup>1</sup> And woe indeed it full often was, in such case, to the excommunicated one. Was not his person shunned,<sup>2</sup> his life offered to the assassin?<sup>3</sup>—Nay, this lightning-fire from heaven was called down at times by them to scathe a whole kingdom. For, as under the old Pagan superstition,<sup>4</sup> so under the Papal, its true imitator, the very *locality*, as well as *person*, thus struck, was deemed accursed of heaven. Can all history furnish a parallel to the effect of a Papal interdict? Throughout a whole kingdom, it might be, (the entire body of the Clergy, or lamb-personating Wolf, assisting to its execution,<sup>5</sup>) the churches closed, the services stopped, the sacraments unadministered, the dead unburied, or at least deprived of *Christian* burial!<sup>6</sup> There is, I believe, *no* parallel to it in history.

<sup>1</sup> See the account, Hard. vii. 401. "Dom. Papa . . in Imperatorem Fredericum, sine aliquâ palpatione vel dissimulatione, . . talem sententiam excommunicationis, in pleno Concilio, non sine omnium audientium et circumstantium stupore et horrore, terribiliter *fulguravit*."—After the quotation of the sentence, it goes on; "Hac in medio Concilio prolata, . . *ad instar coruscantis fulguris*, non mediocriter timore omnibus inessurunt:" &c. And again: "Dom. Papa igitur, et Prælati adstantes Concilio, candelis accensis, in dictum Imperatorem Fredericum (qui jamjam Imperator non est nominandus) terribiliter . . *fulgurarunt*." This was A.D. 1245.

<sup>2</sup> The French King Robert's history offers an earlier exemplification; he having been in 997 excommunicated by Gregory V and a Roman Council. (See Hard. vi. i. 755.) The Beautés de l'Histoire de France, p. 104, thus describes the result. "L'excommunication étoit à cette époque une arme terrible entre les mains du souverain Pontife. Chacun fuyait avec horreur celui qui en avoit été frappé. Les seigneurs rompirent tout commerce avec le roi. A peine lui restait-il quelques domestiques pour le servir. Encore ceux-ci faisoient ils passer par le feu tous les restes de sa table, avant de les manger." So too Hallam ii. 242, 243.—On the Emperor Henry IVth's case see p. 188 *suprà*.

<sup>3</sup> "Homicidas non esse, &c." <sup>4</sup> "Places or persons struck with lightning were considered with pious horror, as singularly devoted to the wrath of heaven: . . the places were surrounded with a wall; the things buried with mysterious ceremony." So Gibbon ii. 97; referring to Festus.—He elsewhere (v. 292) speaks of the spells of Pagan diviners at Rome, being supposed to have the power of drawing down lightning from the clouds, and directing them against an enemy: and refers the superstition to the tradition of Numa having "by his spells drawn down Jupiter and his thunder on Mount Aventine." A subject thus illustrated with his usual antiquarian learning by Eckhel, v. 302.

<sup>5</sup> The necessity of the body of the Clergy co-operating, in order to the effectiveness of the Interdict, is evident.

<sup>6</sup> See Hallam *ibid.* and Waddington ii. 166 Note (\*); also Southey, Book of the

---

Rome. But on Maundy Thursday of 1848, when I was myself present, the Pope gave his blessing from the Balcony of *St. Peter's*, without the curse. 4th Ed.



4. "The second Beast *caused that the inhabitants of the earth should worship the first Beast.*" And does not the Papal Priesthood answer here too to the symbol? Who knows not of the subserviency of the Western Clergy to the Pope, as CHRIST'S VICAR: and the exercise of their influence, all but universally, to uphold him in his place; even like an *army of Priests* prepared, as Gregory I expressed it,<sup>1</sup> for the Antichrist? At the very beginning of his career who were the first solemn asserters, before their prince and people, of the Pope being God's Vicar? The *Romish Clergy* in Council.<sup>2</sup> And what was the language of the *Monks*, almost as early, respecting him? "The monks," says Mosheim on the 7th century, "who from their supposed sanctity had the greatest influence with the multitude, held up the Pope to their veneration *even as a God.*"<sup>3</sup> Again, in the middle age, who were the patrons and administrators of the Canon Law, which similarly deified the Pope,<sup>4</sup> but the Clergy, alike secular and regular? And similarly in the 16th century, and ever afterwards, the Jesuits?<sup>5</sup>—It is the testimony of almost all the ecclesiastical history of Western Christendom, that the Papal Hierarchy and Clergy did for the most part unite in this predicted object, to make the Roman earth and its inhabitants worship HIM whom the first Apocalyptic Beast or its

Church, pp. 113—117, and Le Bas' Wicliff, p. 330. "The suspension of sepulture," says Waddington, "the exposure of the corpses to dogs or birds, or even their promiscuous interment in unhallowed ground, were probably in practice the most appalling parts of the sentence." See my Vol. ii. p. 452.

<sup>1</sup> See p. 197, Note<sup>3</sup> *suprà*.

<sup>2</sup> See p. 158 *suprà*.

<sup>3</sup> Mosh. vii. 2. 2. 3; "Monachi Pontificem Romanum non secus ac Deum imperite multitudini . . . commendabant." As an *early* example, see the famous Wilfrid's language about the Pope, given Note<sup>3</sup>, p. 204 *suprà*. For a specimen of the *middle age*, hear St. Bernard. "Tu princeps episcoporum, tu hæres apostolorum, tu prinatu Abel, gubernatu Noe, patriarchatu Abraham, ordine Melchisedech, dignitate Aaron, auctoritate Moyses, iudicatu Samuel, potestate Petrus, unctione Christus." De Consid. ii. 8.—Or, again, hear the later episcopal orator of the 4th Session of the 5th Lateran Council; (one whom I have before cited, Vol. ii. p. 78;) "Tu denique alter Deus in terris." Hard. ix. 1651.—Did not the *second Beast* direct the Roman earth to the worship of the *first Beast*?

<sup>4</sup> See the Notes pp. 182, 183 *suprà*.

<sup>5</sup> See Mosh. xvii. § 2. 1. 1. 33. "The Jesuits," says he, "turned the Roman Pontiff into a terrestrial Deity, and put him almost on an equal footing with the divine Saviour:"—adding: "It may be easily proved that the Jesuits, instead of inventing these pernicious doctrines, did no more in reality than to propagate them as they found them, in that ancient form of the Romish religion that preceded the Reformation." See for a practical exemplification the case of Tetzl, described Vol. ii. p. 67.

governing Head symbolized; i. e. the PAPAL ANTICHRIST, ruling over PAPAL CHRISTENDOM.—So in the *general*. A particular and most notable illustration of the same use of their influence is to follow in the next Chapter.

## CHAPTER VII.

### THE IMAGE OF THE BEAST.

“AND he deceiveth them that dwell on the earth, through those miracles which it was given him to do in sight of the Beast: <sup>1</sup>—saying to them that dwell on the earth that they should make an image to (or for) the Beast, who had the wound by the sword,<sup>2</sup> and did live. And it was given him to give breath<sup>3</sup> unto the Image of the Beast: so that the Image of the Beast should both speak, and cause that as many as would not worship the Image of the Beast should be killed.”<sup>4</sup>—Apoc. xiii. 14, 15.

From the difficulties and ill success of commentators in the explanation of the IMAGE OF THE BEAST<sup>5</sup> here spoken of, it has been designated by Vitringa (and the statement been repeated by other expositors) as the cross of interpreters.<sup>6</sup> To the solution now to be offered the same ob-

<sup>1</sup> σημεία ἃ ἐδόθη αὐτῷ ποιῆσαι ἐνωπίον τοῦ θηρίου.

<sup>2</sup> ὃς ἐχει τὴν πληγὴν τῆς μάχαιρας. So A, C, and Wordsworth. Other critical editions, as Scholz, Heinrichs, Tregelles, have ὁ ἐχει or εἶχε. <sup>3</sup> πνεῦμα.

<sup>4</sup> There are here no variations of reading, it will be seen, of any consequence; except as regards the ὃς; which, if taken, marks the Beast, or rather his ruling head, as a *person*.

<sup>5</sup> It should be observed that the word εἰκὼν might be rendered *picture*, as well as *image*. The εἰκόνες worshipped in the Greek Church, and which gave occasion to the great *icomo-elastic* controversy, were in fact *pictures*.

<sup>6</sup> “Est in hac parte prophetiæ quod interpretes cruciat.” Vitr. 831: a statement repeated by Woodhouse. And certainly the unsatisfactoriness of all previous solutions that I have seen of the Beast's Image seems to me very obvious.

With that of *Bossuet*, or other Romanists,\* who make the *first* or *ten-horned Beast* to signify the *Pagan* persecuting Roman Empire, revived (verse 3) under Julian, I have of course little concern; being convinced (and this, I trust, on the clearest evi-

\* A few Protestant Commentators, as *Dr. Keith*, in his *Signs of the Times*, take the same view of the first Beast. Dr. K. himself seems to have been partly led to this view by the singular oversight of construing the word *before*, (“exerciseth all the power of the first Beast *before* him,”) of which the Greek is ἐνωπίον, to signify *before* in respect of *time*. So ii. 146, 418. (A mistake too, I see, of Mr. Rabett, p. 70, &c.)—In his *Evidence of Prophecy*, very inconsistently, Dr. K. propounds the more usual Protestant view of the 1st Beast as the *Popedom*. See my *Vindicia*, p. 67.

jections will, I believe, in no wise apply.—It seems clear to me, as it did to Vitranga, that, as the *two Beasts* are sym-

dence) that that Beast is symbolic of the empire of Rome *Papal*, not Rome *Pagan*. Nor indeed, even were we to waive all such preliminary objection, can they make out, on this their hypothesis, any satisfactory or even plausible explanation of the symbol before us.\*

As to the Protestant Commentators that concur (though with minor differences) in viewing the first Beast as the *Papal Antichristian Empire*, some, as *Pareus* and *Faber*, explain the *Beast's Image* of the *images of saints* set up in Papal churches for worship: it being so called, says Mr. Faber, not as *depicting the Beast*, but (like "Micaiah's graven image," Judg. xviii. 31) as *his chosen object of worship*.—Even supposing however that such an *εικων* were a fit representative symbol of the many and various images designated in Apoc. ix. 20 as "idols of gold and silver and brass and stone and wood," could it be said that the Pope and papal Clergy, which these Expositors in common with myself suppose to have been symbolized by the second Beast, induced the *people* to fabricate it, as if at some particular time, by some collective act? Would not this have been trenching on one of the most sacred prerogatives of Pope and priesthood; to whom alone it belonged to consecrate an image for worship? Or could it be said that they caused any *representative image*, or the *universality of images* so represented, to *speak*, to the effect that all rejecters of their worship should be put to death?

On the other hand, *Daubuz*, *Lowman*, *Bishop Newton*, the Bible Commentator *Scott*,† and others, explain it of the *Pope*, as being made the *idol* of the Romish Church, and an object of worship to Christendom. "Quem creant," they say, borrowing the legend of the famous medal struck by Martin V. on his election, "adorant." But how can the *Pope* be the *Image of the first Beast*, when he is explained by them to be (if not the Head of both Beasts) at least the Head of the *second Beast*?

*Mede* strangely identifies the *Image* with the *seven-headed Beast under his last head*; by supposing, 1st, that the Beast whose image it is, is the *Beast under its previous head*, or *Dragon* of Apoc. xii.; 2ndly, that the seven-headed Beast of Apoc. xiii. is distinctly the *secular Western Roman Empire of Charlemagne*, &c., the *two-horned Beast* being the one and only symbol of the *Pope and Papal Clergy under him*. Charlemagne's and his successors' empire, he argues, was saint-worshipping and idolatrous, and therefore an *image* of the old Roman *heathen* empire. It was the Pope that formed, named, consecrated it: and it was used by him (as the *secular arm*) for the punishment of heretics. So that this part of the sacred prefiguration is, as *Mede* would have it, only another account of the healing of the deadly wound and transfer of the *Dragon's* seat and power to the revived *Beast*, mentioned Apoc. xiii. 2, 3. See *Mede's* Comment. pp. 506—509, *Clavis* 421. "Violenta et incommoda interpretatio," says *Vitranga* with good reason. Was it not *after the seven-headed Beast had risen from the sea that the two-horned Beast appeared to rise from the earth*? How then could the latter be the reviver of the former?

To *Mr. Cuninghame's* solution, who, like *Dr. Cressener* before him, explains it of the *corrupt Roman Church*, it seems similarly a sufficient objection that it supposes the *Image of the Beast* to signify the same thing precisely as the symbolic *Harlot Mother, Babylon the Great*, described in the xviii. Chapter. Besides, how is this an *Image of Papal Christendom*? How made by the people at the bidding of the *Pope and Clergy*?—To *Vitranga's* solution, who explains it of the *Inquisition*, there is

\* E. g. having explained the *Image of the Beast* to mean the *image of the emperor Julian*, to which men were compelled to burn incense, *Bossuet*, when called to explain the statement of the *Image of the Beast being made to speak*, &c., shifts his ground, and makes the symbol signify the *images of the Gods*, e. g. *Apollo*, whose oracles *Julian* consulted, not that of *Julian* himself. As to ordaining the penalty of death, or interdiction of buying and selling, to his non-worshippers, *Julian's* principle of legislating and acting was quite the contrary.

† *Mr. Scott* with a certain variety of sense. "Is not the *Pope*, as a temporal prince, the very image of the ancient emperors? Is he not, as the pretended infallible head of the Church, the great idol of all zealous Papists? And is he not in both respects the representative of the whole Antichristian tyranny?"

*bolie*, and not to be *literally* interpreted, there must also attach a *figurative*, not *literal*, interpretation to the *Image of the Beast*. And I purpose to explain it, thus figuratively, of the PAPAL GENERAL COUNCILS of Western Europe: <sup>1</sup> not doubting to show fully and satisfactorily respecting them the two points following, points which involve all that is required by the prophecy: viz. 1st, that these Papal Councils *answered completely to the symbol of an IMAGE of the ten-horned Apocalyptic Wild Beast*, that is, of *Papal Anti-Christendom* and the *Papal Antichrist*: 2ndly, that the *Papal Hierarchy and Clergy* acted out, in and with regard to *them*, whatsoever the *two-horned lamb-personating Wild Beast* (or *false Prophet*) is here said to have done in, and with regard to, the *Image of the Beast*.

1st, THE PAPAL GENERAL COUNCILS OF WESTERN EUROPE ANSWER TO THE SYMBOL OF AN IMAGE OF THE TEN-HORNED BEAST; i. e. OF PAPAL ANTI-CHRISTENDOM AND THE PAPAL ANTICHRIST.

the similar answer,—that the Inquisition could not properly be represented as an *Image* of Papal Anti-Christendom, or of the Papal Antichrist, or as made by the people.

*Osiander* makes it the *Pope's Decretals*. “Sicut imago Dei est verbum Dei, ita imago Papatûs est verbum et doctrina Pape. Sedet enim in templo Dei, ostendens seipsum tanquam Deum. Quare et in hoc Deum imitatur quòd verbum et doctrinam è suo cerebro gignit ad imaginem suam. Cùm igitur doctrina Papatûs, quam ipsi pseudo-doctores docent, duplex sit, scilicet *fidei* et *morum*, necessario compilati sunt duo libri, scil. *Liber Sententiarum* et *Liber Decretorum* et *Decretalium*, qui sunt *ipsissima imago Papatûs*: omnem ejus formam, fidem, vitam, et mores ad vivum exprimentes.”—But how were the *people of Christendom* the makers of this image?

“What the image of the Beast is, distinct from the Beast itself, I confess I know not.”—So *Doddridge*, in loc.

With regard to *Patristic Commentators* I may just mention that both *Tichonius* and *Primasius* explain the Beast's Image of the hypocritical semblance of religion in the antichristian body, (“*illa impia civitas et populus infidelium*,”) signified by the ten-horned Beast. “*Imago ejus simulatio* est, in eis videlicet hominibus qui velut fidem catholicam profitentur, et infideliter vivunt.”

<sup>1</sup> This solution was first given by me in a Pamphlet on the *Image of the Beast*, printed in 1837; and of which the present Chapter is the substance, though remodelled and somewhat altered in detail.—At the time of giving it to the Printer I was not aware of the solution having occurred before to any other Author; but was surprised to find he had at the very time, nearly ready for publication, a Treatise on the *Image* by the *Rev. F. Fysh*, grounded on the same general view as my own; restrictedly however, as applied to the one Council of Trent. I also learned afterwards from *Vitringa* that *Cocceius* had long before suggested the *ecclesia representativa* as the thing signified. But, whether by this he may have meant the Church represented in Councils, I know not; not having had the opportunity of reference to his works.

It may be right to add that I made a point of not reading Mr. Fysh's Treatise till the publication of my own; so that the two testimonies might be considered altogether independent.

This follows immediately, as we shall presently see, from the *representative* nature of these Church-Councils.

For let us consider for a moment their original character and constitution. The account is thus given by Gibbon. "Towards the end of the 2nd century, the churches of Greece and Asia adopted the useful institution of *Provincial Synods*: and they may justly be supposed to have borrowed the model of a *representative Council* from the celebrated examples of their own country,—the Amphictyons, the Achæan league, or the assemblies of the Ionian cities. It was soon established as a custom, and as a law, that the Bishops of the independent churches should meet in the capital of the province, at the stated periods of spring and autumn. These deliberations were assisted by the advice of a few distinguished presbyters, and moderated by the presence of a listening multitude. Their Decrees, which were styled Canons, regulated every important controversy of faith and discipline."<sup>1</sup>—The conjunction of *presbyters* with bishops,<sup>2</sup> in the Provincial Councils of which Gibbon speaks, rendered them the more fully and fitly a representation of the *clerical* or *sacred* class: and the then popular election of the Bishops,<sup>3</sup>—yet more than the attendance of "the listening multitude,"<sup>4</sup>—of the *lay members* of the Church also. So that, on the scale of the province or diocese, the Council constituted, as Tertullian long before Gibbon called it, *the very representation of the whole constituent Christian body*; "*ipsa representatio totius nominis Christiani.*"<sup>5</sup>—After the establishment of Christianity by Constantine there were assembled, on a vastly larger scale, *General Councils*, formed of Bishops, similarly elected,<sup>6</sup> from all the Provinces of the Empire,

<sup>1</sup> Gibb. ii. 334.

<sup>2</sup> See on this Bingham, ii. 19. 12.

<sup>3</sup> See on this Mosheim, ii. 2. 2. 1; "Præsidebat unicuique cætui unus antistes seu episcopus; *communibus populi totius suffragiis creatus.*" So of the 2nd century; and of the 4th, iv. 2. 2. 1; "*Populus, eodem quo antea modo, liberè antistitem sibi creabat.*" See too Waddington, *Hist. of Church*, i. 40.

<sup>4</sup> Gibbon refers to a Council of Carthage under Cyprian, at which there attended "maxima pars plebis."

<sup>5</sup> De Jejun. Cap. xiii.

<sup>6</sup> It was not till the 5th or 6th century, I believe, that this popular character of the election of bishops was changed. The elections of *Ambrose* and *Martin of Tours* \*

\* "Sub idem fere tempus ad Episcopatum Turonicæ ecclesie Martinus petebatur. . . Incredibilis multitudo non solum ex illo oppido, sed etiam ex vicinis urbibus, ad *suffragia ferenda* convenerat." Sulpit. Vit. Martin. c. 7. B. P. M. vi. 351.

still with certain Presbyters conjoined;<sup>1</sup> and which thus similarly constituted a virtual representation of the Catholic or Universal Christian Church and body,<sup>2</sup> habitant in the Roman world.—Of these there were held *seven* or *eight* in the *Eastern* Empire, in the course of the 4th and four following centuries, before the final and total separation of the Greek and Latin Churches; all under the sanction and protection of the Greek or Eastern Emperors.<sup>3</sup> And there were held *twelve* afterwards in *Western* Christendom, in the course of the four centuries intervening from A.D. 1123 to 1545;<sup>4</sup> all under the sanction and presidency of the Popes of Rome. It is with these latter alone that we have to do in the present discussion. As the former proposed to themselves to represent the entire professing Church, or Christian body, so these, as was indeed solemnly asserted in the Councils themselves, to represent the whole Romish Church, or, as it was said, all *orthodox* Christendom.<sup>5</sup>—At

are well-known examples of the custom remaining to the end of the 4th century.—In the 7th and 8th the Kings of the West took the election of Bishops, or at the least their confirmation, very much, into their own hands. See Guizot, *Civil in France*, Lect. 12; (ii. 30, Bohu;) Waddington, i. 314.\*

<sup>1</sup> Bingham ii. 19. 13.—Dean Waddington says, i. 411, that in the French Councils of the 4th and 5th centuries bishops alone attended; and no presbyters, except as representatives of absent bishops. But, even so, this shows that presbyters were admissible. Elsewhere not merely in Provincial Councils, as at Rome A.D. 465, 487, 495, 499, Constantinople, A.D. 536, and Lugo, Braga, and Toledo, in the 6th and 7th centuries, did presbyters sit with the Bishops, and sometimes vote, but even in the General Councils such was now and then the case. E. g. in the subscriptions to the General Councils of Constantinople, Chalcedon, and the 2nd of Nice, there appear a few presbyters' names; and sometimes without notification of their being deputies of bishops. See Bingham *ibid.* 12, 13.—In a General Council the bishops thus sometimes in subscription marked their representative character; ὑπὲρ ἑαυτοῦ καὶ τῆς ὑπ' αὐτῷ Συνοδοῦ. So in the 6th General Council. Hard. iii. 1441.

<sup>2</sup> “The term *catholic* was applied to the *Church*, as comprising the *whole body of believers* throughout the world, as early as the middle of the 2nd century, and perhaps much earlier.” Burton's *Hist. of Church*, p. 424. So too Mosheim, speaking of the first Council of Nice. The word *Church*, let it be observed, was not then restricted to mean the *Clergy*, or *Church officers*, only.

<sup>3</sup> Viz. the Councils of Nice, A.D. 325, Constantinople 381, Ephesus 431, Chalcedon 451, 2nd and 3rd of Constantinople 553 and 681, 2nd of Nice 787, 4th of Constantinople, A.D. 869.

<sup>4</sup> Viz. the four Lateran General Councils, A.D. 1123, 1139, 1179, 1215 respectively; two of Lyons, A.D. 1245, 1274; that of Vienna 1311, of Pisa 1409, of Constance 1414, of Basle and Florence 1431, 1438, the 5th Lateran 1512, and that of Trent 1545.

<sup>5</sup> E. g. in the Councils of *Constance* and *Basle* very solemnly. On the former of which Gibbon makes the remark (ix. 216); “The *Republic of Europe* . . . was never represented with more dignity than in the Council of Constance.” † Its Decrees bore

\* Hence a fresh illustration of the late rise of the Western Clergy as a united body under the headship of the Pope.

† I must beg my reader's attention to this. Mr. Cuninghame in his 4th Edition,

the same time,—through certain changes in the mode of episcopal election, and other causes to which I shall further advert under my second Head,—they were *virtually* the representation rather of the *Head* of Anti-Christendom, i. e. of the *Papal Antichrist*, than of its *general constituent body*.

Now the word *representation*, according to its very etymology alike in Latin and in English,—whether as depicting the *external form*, or the *manners*, or (as here) the *mind and will* of the party represented,—and whether as effected by the *painter's colouring*, by *similarity of person*, by the *faithful expressive letter*,<sup>1</sup> or (as here) by a *deputy's vicarious personation*,—I say in every such case the word

a corresponding appellation.—In the Council of Trent (second Session), when it was proposed to call the Council simply *Concilium Generale*, the French prelates urged the addition of the words, “*universam ecclesiam representans*,” as in that of Constance. But, after some debate, the Pope's legate induced them to content themselves with the addition of the word *œcumenicum* only: alleging that the appellation *general and œcumenic* implied that it *represented the Universal Church*; the *Church* being here (not without an important object as we shall soon see) used in the largest sense of the whole professing Christian body. Dupin Bibl. Eccl. Vol. xv. p. 7.

<sup>1</sup> So Tertullian, Lib. Præscript. c. 36: “*Percurre ecclesias apostolicas, . . apud quas ipse authenticæ literæ apostolorum recitantur; sonantes vocem, et representantes faciem uniuscujusque.*” Also Cyprian, Ep. 58; “*Vicarius pro nobis . . has ad vos literas mittimus, representantes vobis per epistolam gaudium nostrum.*”

p. 168, has objected to my solution that the Beast whose image is spoken of was the *body politic* of Western Christendom; whereas the Councils General were only Councils *Ecclesiastical*, and consequently no representation of *it*. Mr. C. compares them with the English Convocation of Clergy. But, in fact, from the circumstance of the Pope being the common father and king of the whole ten kingdoms, “*Christianæ Republicæ rex et pater*,” (see the citations at pp. 165, 173 *suprà*.) the Councils were political in nature, as well as ecclesiastical. Witness the prominent place in their discussions of such subjects of common political interest as the *Crusades* to the Holy Land, or *Turkish wars*. On which last point I have cited at p. 192 *suprà* the Emperor Maximilian's application to the Pope, as supreme Head and Dictator of Christendom, to take care “*ne quid detrimenti Respublica Christiana capiat.*”—Justly therefore does Gibbon speak of this Commonwealth, or body Politic of Western Christendom, being represented in the General Councils. In fact not only were they such a representation of it, but the *only* one. In England, besides the *Convocation* (while in force) for *Church* matters, there was the *Parliament* for matters of *State*.—It will be shown presently (see p. 222 Note<sup>5</sup> *infra*) that *secular princes* were summoned to these Councils, as well as ecclesiastics.

It contrasts curiously with Mr. C.'s objection that the Romish priest Waterworth, in the Hereford Discussion, defended his Church from an attack against it founded on what past in the 4th Lateran Council, by this very fact. “*In those days Councils in the Western Church were not simply meetings of ecclesiastics, but they were meetings of the States-General.*” Report, p. 15. So too the well-known Irish R. C. Bishop, Dr. Doyle, in his evidence before the House of Lords on the state of Ireland, (Phelan and O'Sullivan, i. 194.) when prest on the 3rd Lateran Romish Council's absolution of the subjects of heretical princes from their oaths of fealty, answered that those Councils might be styled a *sort of congress of the European powers* as well as a Council of Bishops.<sup>17</sup>

*representation* signifies such a likeness as to exhibit the party *present*, as it were, on the scene.<sup>1</sup> And thus in every case,—the *three last* as well as the *first*,—the Apocalyptic word *εικων*, or *image*, has often and naturally been used as its equivalent.<sup>2</sup>—It is however with the case of *vicarious, representation by envoy, or deputy*, that I am alone concerned at present. And on this the following illustrations, of older and of more modern date, alike in the English and French, Latin and Greek languages, (all, I think, very exact to our point,) will suffice in evidence. 1. The figure has been applied to the chief exemplifications that history offers of *national representation by deputies*. So c. g. of the *British Parliament*. Says Burke; “The virtue, spirit, and essence of a *House of Commons* consists in its being the *express image* of the feelings of a nation.”<sup>3</sup> And so similarly, in our own times, Sir J. Graham; speaking of the object of the Reform Bill, as that which was “to constitute the House of Commons a *real and express image and representation* of the country.”<sup>4</sup> Just as also it was afterwards said, by *its* authors, of the yet more popularly elected *French National Assembly* of 1848, that it was to be a faithful and complete *image of that nation*.<sup>5</sup> 2. A patristic

<sup>1</sup> See my Note <sup>2</sup> p. 226.

<sup>2</sup> So Cicero, in a case of the *second* kind of representation referred to in the text above. Describing the slovenly appearance and morose bearing of the Consul Piso, he calls him “*exemplum imperii veteris, imaginem antiquitatis* :” the very representative and *image* of the unpolished garb and manner of the old Republic. And, carrying on the figure, he afterwards speaks of Piso’s laying an interdict on the perfumery shops at Capua, during his duumvirate in that city, as if “*imaginis ornandæ causâ* ;” for the sake of giving it still more of the rude garb of antiquity. (Pro P. Sextio, c. 8. Ed. Ernesti, Vol. iii. p. 974.)

In reference to the *third* kind of representation specified, that by *letter*, Ambrose thus writes, Ep. 66. 2; “*Ut verè, inter disjunctos corpore, quadam imago referatur presentia.*”

As to the *fourth*, the representation by *deputy*, our own Shakespear offers an illustration somewhat different in character from those that I have given, as most to my point, in the text. I will therefore insert it here. In his King Henry IV, 2nd Part, Act v., Scene 2, the Chief Justice thus expresses himself;

The *image* of the king whom I *presented*.

<sup>3</sup> On the Present Discontents. Works, Vol. ii. p. 288 (8vo Ed.)

<sup>4</sup> So Sir James Graham in his speech, as reported in the Evening Mail of May 31, 1841, on the Question of confidence in the Whig Ministry.—To the same effect in his address to his Constituents at Dorchester, given in the Mail of Jan. 3, 1842, he thus expressed himself: “Lord John Russell appealed to a Constituency, formed within the last eight or nine years, expressly to remove *nominal*, and establish *virtual* representation: so as to give not the *reflected image* of *other* interests, but the *actual impress of the public mind*.”

<sup>5</sup> So the Constitutionel Paris Paper of April 29, 1848, after the establishment of the Republic: “We congratulate ourselves on seeing that the rather numerous



expositor, speaking of Christian ministers as *envoys deputed from Christ*, calls them *his image*: "For the *envoy*," says he, "exhibits in himself *the image* of him that sent him."<sup>1</sup>

3. In the *ancient ecclesiastical Councils* themselves the very term was used to mark the character and office of each *deputed member of Council*. He was said, not merely to *represent*,<sup>2</sup> but ἐξεικονίζειν, to be *the image of*, them that sent him.<sup>3</sup>

Hence the obvious fitness of our Apocalyptic emblem, an *Image of the Beast*, to symbolize the *Councils General* of the *Papacy*: supposing the *Beast* itself to symbolize *Papal Anti-Christendom*; a point, I trust, long since fully proved by me.—Nor let me pass on without observing anticipatively that here, as so often elsewhere,<sup>4</sup> the figure made use of will be found to have been one *drawn from the life*.<sup>5</sup>

I now proceed to show,

minorities which exist in the country, will have representatives in the [National] Assembly. The more the Assembly is a faithful and complete *image* of the nation, the less will violent conflicts be to be feared." I copy from the translation in Galignani's Journal of the same date.

<sup>1</sup> "Sacerdotes vel legati ideo dicuntur, quia illum in se ostendunt cujus legati sunt: sunt etenim ejus *imago*." Quæstio 109 on Melchisedech, apud Augustin. Op. (Bened. Ed.) Vol. iii., Appendix. The author is uncertain.

In the middle age the same figure was applied by the Latins in Western Christendom. The word *imaginarius*, or *one's image-bearer*, was used of a deputy representative. So Ducange on the word IMAGINARIUS; "Vicarius, locum-tenens, qui vices alterius in rebus gerendis implet, et *imaginem* quodammodo refert;" exemplifying from Petrus de Vincis and others. And on VICARIUS he has a citation; "Vices agentium mos est ut suas non habeant dignitates. Splendent mutuato lumine: . . . et quedam *imago* in illis videtur esse veritatis."


<sup>2</sup> The following from Clement V's Letter of Convocation to the General Council of Vienne, A.D. 1310, well illustrates the point of *this* expression. "Alii vero *remanentes* Episcopi, electi, Abbates, Priores . . . presbyteri, et prælati, capitula, et conventus, *per eodem Archiepiscopum et episcopos ad prædictum Concilium accessuros*, (quibus ad omnia quæ in eodem Concilio statuentur. . . concedant plenariam potestatem, de quâ sufficienter constat per publica documenta,) *nostro se conspectui repræsentent*." Hard. vii. 1326: and so again 1328.—Also the following from the Bull of Indiction of the Tridentine Council: (Hard. x. 7:) "Sin accedere ipsi (reges) non poterunt, at graves saltem viros legatos cum auctoritate mittant; qui *personam Principis sui* quisque cum prudentiâ et cum dignitate *possint in Concilio referre*."

<sup>3</sup> After the 6th Council at Constantinople the Emperor Constantine wrote to request Pope Leo to send his *apocrisiarius* as his representative to Constantinople; ἐν τοῖς ἀνακνυπουσιν, εἴτε δογματικοῖς, εἴτε κανονικοῖς, καὶ ἀπλῶς ἐκκλησιαστικοῖς ἅπασι πραγμασι, τὸ τῆς ἡμετέρας ἀγίωσυνης ἐξεικονίζειν προσῶπον. This request of the Emperor's is quoted in a report of the proceedings of the Trullan Council, soon after the following. And it was argued from it that the Pope could not have had any deputy in the just previous Constantinopolitan Council, ἐξεικονίζειν αὐτον, to be *his image*; and consequently that the Canons of that Council lacked the Papal authorization. Harduin iii. 1464, 1648.

<sup>4</sup> See my Vol. i. pp. 420, &c.


<sup>5</sup> See p. 236 *infra*.

ROMAN IDEAL OF THE FIRST (SUPPOSED) GENERAL COUNCIL AT ROME UNDER POPE SILVESTER, IN THE  
PRESENCE OF THE EMPEROR CONSTANTINE AND HIS MOTHER HELENA, A D. 314.



From Arrighis Copy of the Picture in the Church of St Silvester, on the site of Trajan's Baths, where the supposed Council was held

ROMAN IDEAL OF THE FIRST SUPPOSED GENERAL COUNCIL AT ROME UNDER POPE SILVESTER IN THE PRESENCE OF THE EMPEROR CONSTANTINE AND HIS MOTHER HELENA. A D 314



From Anonima Copy of the Picture in the Church of St Silvester, in the site of Trajan's Bath, where the supposed Council was held

2ndly, *That* THE ECCLESIASTICAL HIERARCHY AND CLERGY OF PAPAL CHRISTENDOM acted out, in regard to and in these PAPAL COUNCILS, whatsoever the TWO-HORNED LAMB-PERSONATING APOCALYPTIC BEAST, OR FALSE PROPHET, is said to have done in regard to the IMAGE OF THE BEAST.

There are *three* things stated of the procedure of the Lamb-like Beast in the matter of the Image:—1st, that it was he that said to them that dwelt on the earth, that they should make an image to the Beast that had been wounded by the sword, and had revived; i. e. to the Romish Empire, revived in a new and spiritual form under the Headship of the Pope:—2nd, that he had power to give breath to the image of the Beast, so as to make it speak:—and 3rdly, that he would make it speak, and speak authoritatively,<sup>1</sup> to this effect, that whosoever would not worship it should be put to death.—All this seems spoken of as *given* to the lambskin-covered Beast to be done; <sup>2</sup> and as to be done *before*, i. e. as overseen by, and responsible to, the former Beast, or its ruling Head.<sup>3</sup>

1. *It was he that said to them that dwelt on the Roman earth that they should make an image to the Beast;—i. e. constitute a General Council of Anti-Christendom.*

The usual manner of effecting the convention of a General Council in Western Christendom, was as follows. The initiation was with the *Pope* in his character, not of CHRIST'S VICAR, but *Chief Patriarch*, or *Head of the Clergy*.<sup>4</sup> From him letters of invitation were sent to the Kings of the Western World, stating his intention of hold-

<sup>1</sup> *ἵνα ποιήσῃ*. The word may be interpreted of *legal enactments*, with penalties to enforce obedience.

<sup>2</sup> *ἃ ἐδόθη αὐτῷ ποιῆσαι ἐνωπίον τοῦ θηρίου*.

<sup>3</sup> See my observations on the force of *ἐνωπίον*, p. 194 *suprà*.

<sup>4</sup> This distinction is important to attend to, with a view to a clear understanding of the prophecy. See above, p. 195.—I have said that it was as *Patriarch*, or *chief Bishop*, that the Popes convoked and presided: because this was simply the extension of the ancient prerogative of the Metropolitan in regard to Provincial Councils. So of the 1st Lateran: "Hæc Sacrosancta Synodus solius *Pontificis* auctoritate indicta fuit." So Binns, in *Hard*, vi. ii. 1117.

The prerogative had been claimed much earlier for the Pope by the Clergy, viz. in 501, under Theodoric: "Ipsam Papam debuissc Synodum convocare." *Hard*, ii. 967. But then in vain. Theodoric was too near and too strong; and needed to be taken out of the way.—The Pope's early claim to this effect is observed on by Gieseler, 2nd Per. § 92 Note 19; also at p. 231 Note <sup>6</sup> *infra*. Which see.

ing a Council General, and the time and place of its meeting; and requesting their attendance, in person or by deputy.<sup>1</sup> Now it was through his *delegates* or *nuncios*,—themselves of the *clerical* order,—that these letters were transmitted: and they, whether of ordinary or extraordinary appointment, were empowered to communicate with the Kings on the subject; and explain to, and urge on them the fulfilment of, the Pope's wishes thereon.<sup>2</sup> At the same time other Papal letters of convocation were transmitted to all Provincial Archbishops and chief Abbots of monasteries: charging them to communicate on the same with their subordinate Bishops and monastic officials, and also with all Deans, Chapters, Presbyters, and Convents; in order that they might be duly represented in the coming Council, and provision made for attention to their several interests,<sup>3</sup> including the *lay* interests involved, as well as *clerical*. Thus it belonged prominently to the *ecclesiastical body*, through its *two horns*, or *episcopal and monastic Heads*, to give effect to the orders of the Pope, their Patriarch, respecting the convention of the Council; and to make it *to*, or *for* him.<sup>4</sup>—Finally, at the opening of the Council, in case of there being too small an attendance to make the Council respectable, and enable it to proceed to business, besides the repetition of the plans and

<sup>1</sup> The *invitation of the secular Princes*, as well as of *ecclesiastics*, to attend it was noticed by Innocent IV, at the first Council General of Lyons, as one chief mark of the generality of the Council. “Respondit quòd illud erat Concilium Generale, quia tam Principes seculares quàm Clerici ad illud fuerant invitati.” Hard. vii. 380.

<sup>2</sup> For example, William of Malmesbury (*ibid.*) thus speaks respecting the preparatory steps for convening the 1st Lateran Council, agreeably with the Pope's Bull of Convocation. “In Conventu Principum apud Triburiam congregato, . . . Legati Sedis Apostolicæ, (Catalaunensis Episcopus et Cluniacensis Abbas,) ad id à reliquis Episcopis et Principibus deputati, ab Imperatore . . . obtinuerunt ut promitteret se ob reconciliationem universalis ecclesiæ venturam ad indictam Synodum, mense Octobri Romæ celebrandam: cujus indictionem in prædicto Conventu Episcopi omnes colaudarunt.”—As another example I may refer to the Pope's Letter to the King of France, on occasion of convoking the 4th Lateran Council: in which Letter the Cardinal Legate through whom it was sent was commended to his favourable regard; as deputed to give him all the information that he might wish respecting the Council, *virâ vocæ*. Hard. vii. 11.

<sup>3</sup> So Innocent III, in preparation for the 4th Lateran: “Injungatis autem vos, fratres Archiepiscopi et Episcopi, ex parte nostrâ, universis ecclesiarum Capitulis, non solum cathedralium sed etiam aliarum ut Præpositum, vel Decanum, aut alios viros idoneos, ad Concilium pro se mittant.” Hard. vii. 7. And similar directions were sent to *Abbots*.—See too my Note <sup>2</sup>, p. 226.

<sup>4</sup> Such I conceive to be the force of the *dative* here:—viz. to do what they did agreeably to the will and pleasure of the Beast specified in the dative.

procedure before mentioned, it was entrusted to one of the Clergy to preach a sermon, forthwith to be published and circulated, inviting the nations to attend to the call, and join the Council.<sup>1</sup>—So that in the whole preparatory process it was assigned to the Papal Clergy, even as to the Apocalyptic lambskin-covered Beast, or False Prophet, to say to them that dwelt on the earth that they should form an Image, or representative Council, to the Papal Anti-Christendom and Antichrist.

2. “It was given him to *give breath to the Image of the Beast*, so as that *the Image of the Beast should speak*.

It was the peculiarity of these General Councils, as contrasted with either national Synods, or political Conventions on a larger scale,<sup>2</sup> that on *matters ecclesiastical*,—i. e. on almost all the subjects on which Councils were called to pronounce, for the word was one that was construed to have a large meaning,—the *Clergy should alone* vote, or have a voice. From early times the distinction of the orders of *Lay* and *Clergy* was observed in them. It was marked even in the *sittings* of the Councils. In that of Chalcedon, for example, held in the 5th century, while the *Bishops* sat on either side down the nave of the Church of assembly, the *lay-members* sat on the cross benches.<sup>3</sup> In the Western Councils they sometimes stood.<sup>4</sup> The number thus attendant was sometimes considerable. Their office was to suggest and counsel, in support of the several interests that they might have been deputed to maintain.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> So in the Sermon at the opening Session of the Tridentine Council. Dupin xv. 2.

<sup>2</sup> We may contrast the practice at the meetings of German Diets, Spanish Cortes or French or English Parliaments. In all of these, *ecclesiastical* dignitaries have attended, as well as *lay*; and all, not only alike joined in the discussions, but alike voted.

<sup>3</sup> “Residentibus magnificentissimis . . . Judicibus, (*Greek* ἀρχόντων) et amplissimis Senatu, in medio ante cancellos sanctissimi altaris, et ex levâ quidem parte sedentibus sanctissimis Episcopis et Vicariis . . . Leonis, Antistitis priscae urbis Romæ; et Anatolio Archiepiscopo Constantinopolitanæ regni civitatis, &c.; et dexterâ vero parte similiter consistentibus Dioscoro religiosissimo Archiepiscopo Alexandriae, &c.” Hard. ii. 66.

See generally the *Ordo de Concilio celebrando* of Isidore Mercator; Hard. i. 6. Also my illustrative Plate, intrâ, from an old Picture of the supposed *Roman* Council in the reign of Constantine.

<sup>4</sup> In the account of the 2nd General Council of Lyons, after a notice of the Prelates and Abbots sitting, we read; “*Stantibus inferiùs* . . . nunciis solennibus Franciæ, Alemanniæ, Angliæ, et Siciliæ regum, et aliorum multorum Principum, Barouum, Capitulorum, et Ecclesiarum procuratoribus.” Hard. vii. 687.

<sup>5</sup> In the Papal Letters of invitation to the 4th Lateran, addressed to the Latin

This they did chiefly, I conceive, in the several preparatory Committees.<sup>1</sup> But there were some that were privileged to attend not the preparatory Committees only, and the masses and solemn services that introduced the Sessional, but the deliberations of the Sessional itself. In regard of these, however, when a question was to be decided,—at least an ecclesiastical question, we read that they were *excluded*, as *not having a voice*. Such is expressly declared to have been the received custom in the General Councils of the West:<sup>2</sup> and it was forcibly dwelt on by the famous Cardinal Julian Cæsarini, at the time of the Council of Basle, in order to overcome the then Pope's scruples about sanctioning it.<sup>3</sup> It was *the Clergy* alone that *had a voice*.<sup>4</sup> What the majority of *their* voices affirmed became a Canon of the Council: and the Council was said to *speak* it.<sup>5</sup>—So exactly was the prediction fulfilled; “It was given to the lambskin-covered Beast, the Wolf in sheep's clothing, or False Prophet, to *give breath* to the Image of the Beast, so that the Image of the Beast should *speak*.”

And here seems to be the place for showing that this

Kings of Constantinople, Cyprus, and others, they were requested, if unable to attend in person, to send “nuntios speciales, viros idoneos, . . . per quos tua nobis aperia beneplacitum voluntatis.”—The Archbishops too were to see that their several Chapters sent to the Council of Lyons, “nuntios providos et fideles, qui vice ipsorum utile nobis consilium largiantur.” Hard. vii. 9, 377.—In Sir F. Palgrave's second Report of Public Records, there is noticed a Letter of Leo X. to Henry VIII., charging him to send some learned men to attend the then proximate Session of the 5th Lateran Council in 1516, to advise with on the projected Reformation of the Calendar.

<sup>1</sup> These preparatory Committees were chiefly famous at the Councils of Basle, Constance, and Trent.

<sup>2</sup> So in the account of the 8th Session of the last Lateran Council, Hard. ix. 1719: “Exclusis, *de more*, de loco Concilii omnibus non habentibus *voce*s definitivas; remanentibus in suis subselliis Prælati post Cardinales mitratis, et sacris vestibus indutis.”—After which withdrawal of the laity attendant, the Schedule of certain proposed Decrees on matters of faith was read and voted on.

<sup>3</sup> See Waddington, Vol. iii. 149. Cæsarini combats the Pope's fear of the temporalities of the Church being interfered with by the Council, from the circumstance of the comparative paucity of laymen that might be expected to attend its *sittings*, and their exclusion from *voting* in questions strictly ecclesiastical.

<sup>4</sup> *φωνην ουκ εχει*. “He has no *voice* ;” was said in the Council of Chalcedon in the sense of, He has no *vote*. Hard. ii. 73. And so at Trent. See P. Paolo, p. 127.

<sup>5</sup> Ferrario observes, ii. 431; “Erano chiamati *Atti* i colloqui, le discussioni, le dispute, è tutto che si faceva è diceva. Quando parlava un vescovo, usavan di scrivere, ‘La Santa Sinodo *dixit*.’” He means, of course, when the Bishop's proposal was affirmed by the majority. So in the Extract from the Roman Council of Symmachus, given in my Note<sup>2</sup>, p. 158; “Quo recitato, et ab omnibus consonâ voce comprobato, sancta Synodus *dixit*, Hæc ab omnibus teneantur.” So too in the Council of Trent. P. Paolo 128.

professedly representative Council of *Papal Anti-Christendom* was in fact the representative of the *Papal Anti-christ*;—this *Image of the Beast*, the image rather of that which, from its supremacy over the Beast, is put by the Angel expositor for it, viz. *its eighth Head*.<sup>1</sup> For, during the darkness of the middle ages, such was the Papal influence, especially over the hierarchy and clergy, both secular and monastic, deriving as they did from the Roman See their sacerdotal authority, and bound to it from the eighth century by an oath of fealty,<sup>2</sup> that whatever the Pope wished, *that* they voted, and *that* consequently they made *the Image speak*. For example, at the most famous General Council of the middle age, the fourth Lateran, at which above 1000 Bishops and Abbots attended, and Ambassadors also from most of the Christian Courts,—thus presenting the *appearanee* of a representation of all the ten Western Kingdoms,—the seventy Canons *dictated by the Pope* were at once obsequiously assented to by the assembled Prelates:<sup>3</sup> and the Council's voice, thus palpably the mere echo of his, was immediately afterwards received and subscribed to by the lay ambassadors.—After this, as light advanced, and when in consequence partial risings resulted in the spirit not of princes and people only, but even of some of the clergy, not indeed against Papal *anti-christian heresy*, but against Papal misrule and despotism,<sup>4</sup>—when Councils were thus no longer so manageable as before, and consequently no longer in favour as before with the Roman See,<sup>5</sup> yet by its strong remaining influence over the great majority of the assembled Prelates,<sup>6</sup> and its adroit use of its admitted prerogatives,—first of *convening*, with the determination of *time and place*,<sup>7</sup> then, in person or through its legates,

<sup>1</sup> Apoc. xvii. 11.

<sup>2</sup> See *suprà*, p. 205.

<sup>3</sup> Waddington ii. 172.

<sup>4</sup> This important distinction is well noticed in Waddington's account of the Council of Constance, iii. 137.

<sup>5</sup> It was the freedom of the discussions at Constance and Basle that first alarmed the Popes. Their reluctance to hold the Council of Trent is well known.

<sup>6</sup> See Waddington, *ib.* 129 et seq.

<sup>7</sup> Originally it was the *Christian Emperor's* admitted prerogative to convene General Councils. Constantine, having divided the administration of the Church into *external* and *internal*, and reserved to himself the *external*, relating to the outward state and discipline of the Church, did in this character call and preside in the first General Council, that of Nice: (Euseb. Vit. Const. i. 44 :) a prerogative that devolved on, and was exercised by, his successors on the throne of Constantinople. But in Western Christendom, after its separation from the Eastern Roman Empire,



of *presiding*,<sup>1</sup> (for, in case of the Pope being unrepresented in it, the Image, just like either Beast that constituted it, was considered *headless* and illegitimate,<sup>2</sup>) then of *proposing* the subject of debate, then of *adjourning*, *suspending*, *removing*,<sup>3</sup> or, if need were, of even *dissolving*<sup>4</sup> the Council,—I say through the adroit exercise of these various influential Papal prerogatives, from the first Lateran Council in 1123 down to that of Trent, the Western General Councils, while professing to be the representation and image of *Western Christendom*, were, to every the most important intent and purpose, (above all on questions of faith and heresy,) the representation and image rather of the *Papal mind*.<sup>5</sup> Indeed sometimes the Papal confirmation was formally called for, as at Trent, ere the Council's decree should be promulgated.—Thus, I repeat, that which was *professedly* the Image of the *whole* Beast, or *body of Western Chris-*

not only was the prerogative of convening *Roman* and *Italian* Councils, within the sphere of their own more proper episcopal or metropolitan authority, claimed and often exercised by the Popes, and *Provincial* Councils too, through their Vicars' agency, within the immensely wider sphere of their *Patriarchal* authority, (see my p. 201 Note <sup>4</sup> *suprà*, also the Letters of Pope Nicholas I. to King Lothaire A.D. 862, Hard. v. 233,) a prerogative contested however for some 3 or 4 centuries by the Western kings and emperors, from Theodoric (see p. 227 Note <sup>4</sup>) downwards; but, even as regards *General* Councils, the same prerogative was asserted. "Ex præcepto Christianorum principum, et ex consensu Apostolicæ sedis," was Pope Leo I's insinuation in 451 about the convention of the Chalcedon General Council. (Hard. ii. 688.) And in 587 Pope Pelagius II, in indignant remonstrance against the presumption of the Constantinopolitan Patriarch in the matter, thus spoke out his own exclusive prerogative; "Cum Generalium Synodorum convocandi auctoritas Apostolicæ sedi beati Petri singulari privilegio sit tradita, et nulla unquam Synodus rata legatur quæ Apostolicæ auctoritate non fuerit fulta." Hard. iii. 439.—On this head no occasion of exercising the power occurred in the West till the 1st Lateran Council in the xiith century, when the Papal power was paramount, and the right acknowledged by the Western Princes. See p. 227 Note <sup>4</sup>. In fact every recognised General Council of the West was convened by a *Papal* Præceptum: and the want of such an indictio urged against all others; e. g. against the Pisan Conciliabulum, in the General Council of Lateran. Hard. ix. 1562.

<sup>1</sup> See on this point P. Paolo, p. 129.

<sup>2</sup> "Agnoscamus truncatam Pontifice Synodum se ipsâ esse minorem." Thomassin, cited by Count de Maistre i. 6 ad fin.

<sup>3</sup> Prerogatives used most adroitly in the Councils of Basle and Trent.

<sup>4</sup> "Pope Martin continued to press the immediate *dissolution* of the Council. It was in vain objected that matters of great importance remained to be settled. . . *His Bull (of dissolution)* released the fathers from their unsuccessful labours. . . The Council of Constance *had ceased to exist*." Wadd. iii. 139, 140.

<sup>5</sup> So Luther, in his Table-Talk, ii. 62, as to the *fact*. That such the voice of a Council *ought to be* is argued out on *Romish principles* by Count De Maistre, in his "Pope," B. i. Ch. 3.

Fully alive to all that I have above stated, the Protestant powers in 1560, when invited to attend the Council of Trent on its third convocation, asserted in the spirit of our 21st English Article, that the Prerogative of convening a General Council attached to the Emperor, not the Pope. And they demanded, in order to its being a

*tendom*, was *virtually* the Image of the *Beast's ruling Head*, the *Papal Antichrist*.<sup>1</sup> And hence one notable *σημείον*, or act of jugglery, accomplished by the Pope and Papal Hierarchy that spoke through it: viz. to make the world believe that *its* voice was the voice of their own representatives; and so, *as in a self-assented act*, obligatory on themselves.<sup>2</sup> Much more notable than even this was their *σημείον*, or *juggling*, in successfully palming upon Christendom, as *the voice of the Divine Spirit*, what was but the voice of a thing of Rome's own inspiration. Indeed a Tridentine Bishop has himself so stated the matter: and this in terms so precisely agreeing with the Apocalyptic figure, that one might almost have deemed it a comment thereon.<sup>3</sup>

*free Council*, 1st, that the Pope should not *preside*; 2ndly, that the Bishops attending should be *exempted from their oath of allegiance to the Pope*; 3rdly, that the *Holy Scriptures* should be the sole ground of decision; 4thly, that the *Protestant deputies* should have a *voice*. But to none of these requisitions would the Papists consent: and so the Protestants declined attendance. P. Paolo, pp. 62, 256, 412. See too Bishop Jewel's Letter in defence of the Protestants' decision against attending the Council, at the end of Padre Paolo's Hist. p. 785. Engl. Ed.

<sup>1</sup> Compare my extracts from Burke, Sir J. Graham, and the Constitutional French Journal, p. 225, *suprà*.

<sup>2</sup> On the first Tridentine Session the Papal Legates declined discussing the question, whether it should be called a Council *representing the universal Church*; because of the removal that might result of that *happy ambiguity* which, as it was, attached to the term *Church*. In order to increase the authority of the Council's Decrees, they wished the word to be understood in its original and larger sense, as comprehending the *laity* as well as *clergy* of Christendom. But then where the *proper representation of the laity*? This, they knew, might have been urged, had the discussion continued, and consequently a claim raised for *the laity having a voice in the Council*. So they adroitly cushioned the question.

<sup>3</sup> "In summâ in eum statum res est adducta, istorum qui illic facti institutique venerant improbitate, non ut jam episcoporum sed *larrarum*, non hominum sed *simulacrorum*, quæ nervis moventur alienis, ut *Dadali statue* fuisse perhibentur, Concilium illud videretur. Erant Episcopi illi conductitii plerique ut utres, rusticorum musicum instrumentum, quos, *ut vocem mittent, inflare* necesse est.\* Nil habuit eum illo Conventu Sanctus Spiritus commercii. . . *Cursitabant Romam nocte dieque venedarii*. Omnia quæ dicta consultaque essent quam celerrimè ad Papam deferrebantur. Illinc responsa, tanquam Delphi aut Dodonâ, expectabantur: illic nimirum Spiritus ille Sanctus, quem suis Conciliis præesse jactant, tabellarii manticis inclusus mittebatur."—This singularly illustrative passage occurs in a sketch of the Council of Trent given A.D. 1567 to the German Emperor Maximilian by an Hungarian Bishop there present; and is cited in Padre Paolo's History of the Council, p. 785 (Engl. Ed.): also by Mr. Mendham, in his Edition of the Acta Concilii Tridentini a Gabriele Palcotto, Pref. p. xxi.

\* The Bishop's allusion seems to be to the *Ifferari*, or *bagpipe-players*, who come down annually to Rome from their mountains in the Abruzzi at the season of Advent, to celebrate the novena of the Immaculate Conception (Dec. 8), and of the Nativity, by performing Sonatas under the images of the Madonna in the streets or shops; and whose picturesque and wild figures, drest in the sugar-loaf hat, ample cloak, and high buskins, cannot but strike the attention of a foreign visitor.

3. And hence the *third* point here noted of the Image of the Beast, that it was an image *made to be worshipped*: for this is implied in the statement of a penalty attaching to such as should not worship it.

Of course it needed not, either in case of an image in its *literal* sense, or of an image in its *figurative* sense, that it should be *set up as an object of worship*. As, however, such was the purpose and use of Nebuchadnezzar's golden image, and such, again, of the images and pictures of the Roman Heathen Emperors in the early times of Christianity,<sup>1</sup> so in later ages was it the case, just as here predicted, with the *figurative Image*, or *representative Councils*, of Papal Christendom.

But how? Let it be remembered, in answer to this question, that it was not on political matters, for the most part, or mere ecclesiastical questions of discipline, that the Council General was called to pronounce; but chiefly, and above all, on questions of *religion and faith*. On these it professed itself qualified to pronounce with an authority *independent of the written Scriptures*, and *infallible*,<sup>2</sup> even as under the full guidance of *God's Spirit*;<sup>3</sup> and so accord-

<sup>1</sup> See Pliny's Letter to Trajan, &c.

<sup>2</sup> "The *infallible* decrees of General Councils." Gibb. iii. 305.—On the question where the *infallibility of the Church* resides, Romanists differ: whether in Popes alone, Councils alone, or Popes in Council. In the latter case all, I believe, agree in viewing the Council as infallible in matters of faith. See Hard. ix. 1273; Wadd. iii. 137.

<sup>3</sup> Gibbon, ii. 335, with his usual sneer, and his usual accuracy of statement, thus expresses himself about the early Christian Councils of the third century: "And it was natural to believe that a liberal effusion of the *Holy Spirit* would be poured on the united assembly of the delegates of the Christian people."—In the *Ephesian Council*, held A.D. 468, we find Pope Celestine thus directly asserting the fact of the Holy Spirit directing it; "*Spiritus Sancti* testatur *presentiam* congregatio sacerdotum." Hard. i. 1467.—Similarly respecting the 2nd Lateran the language of the reporter is, "Inter cetera quæ, *Spiritu Sancto mediante*, statuta sunt," &c. Hard. vi. ii. 1215.—In the Report of the Decrees of the 7th General Council about the worship of images in the Bib. Patr. (Paris 1624) i. 732, we read, *Ἐν τῶν καθολικῶν Συνοδῶν ὑφ' ὧν τοῦ τῆς πίστεως εὐαγγελιστῆς Πνεύματι Θεῷ τετρανωταὶ συμβουλευόμενοι*.—And in the 5th Lateran Council the orator Ægidius of Viterbo declared that by the omission of Councils the light of the Holy Spirit was extinguished: "Sancti Spiritus lucem Synodis omissis extingui." Hard. ix. 1577. See also *ibid.* 1649.

The usual style and title of the instruments issued by General Councils, was according to Dumont (Corps Diplomat. 179) as follows; "Sacrosancta Generalis Synodus, in *Spiritu Sancto* legitime congregata, Universalem Ecclesiam representans, ad perpetuam rei memoriam."—Accordingly in the Council of Trent it was proposed that the Seal of the Council should be a large leaden one, with the *Holy Spirit* as a *dove* engraven on it, and the name of the Council. Dupin, *ib.* p. 9. So too the *dove* appears hovering in my picture over the Council. And similarly the *dove*, between Peter and Paul's effigies, is the frontispiece to the Jesuit Harduin's Collection of the Councils.

ingly promulgated its dogmas. Of course, with such an assumption,—an assumption essentially impious, as implying that God might contradict Himself, and that the rule which He had pronounced sufficient, and neither to be added to nor diminished from,<sup>1</sup> was insufficient,—I say, with such an assumption, and while on questions of religion and faith discarding more or less the *written* Scripture, and pronouncing by another rule, that of *tradition*, said to be in the priesthood's keeping, it could scarcely be but that its oracles would be those of falsehood rather than truth: and this was indeed the case on a mighty scale. For what were its dogmas? *Image and saint-worship*,<sup>2</sup> *transubstantiation and adoration of the Mass*,<sup>3</sup> *auricular confession*<sup>4</sup> and the *compulsory celibate of the Clergy*,<sup>5</sup> *indulgences for remission of sins*,<sup>6</sup> *the existence of purgatorial fire, and benefit to suffering souls in it from the suffrages of the faithful and private masses*,<sup>7</sup> *the Pope's universal supremacy, and necessity of submission to him in order to salvation*,<sup>8</sup> *the coequal authority with inspired Scripture of the Apocrypha and of tradition*,<sup>9</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Is there not a special regard to *Rome* in that concluding curse in the Apocalypse, ch. xxii. 18, 19, on him who should add to, or take from, the words of that prophecy?

<sup>2</sup> Adopted by the Romish Church from the *χρηστικ*, or *oraclular* Decrees,\* of the 2nd Nicene or 7th General Council. So, in fine, the C. Trent, Sess. xxv. Hard. x. 167.

<sup>3</sup> *Transubstantiation* was affirmed in the 4th Lateran (Hard. vii. 18); the *worship of the mass*, or consecrated wafer, with the *latvia* due to God himself, in the Council of Trent, Sess. xiii. Can. 6. (Hard. x. 83.)

<sup>4</sup> Lateran iv.

<sup>5</sup> Lateran i.; Can. 21.

<sup>6</sup> 1st Lateran, Canon 11; "Eis qui Hierosolymam proficiscuntur, &c., suorum peccatorum remissionem concedimus." Hard. vi. ii. 1112.

<sup>7</sup> Council of Trent, Sess. xxv. Hard. x. 167.

<sup>8</sup> The 5th Lateran Council solemnly adopted the famous Bull, "*Unam Sanctam*," of Boniface to this effect. See my Vol. ii. p. 85.

<sup>9</sup> The importance of this principle was early felt by the Church when apostatizing. We have already (p. 156) seen Leo I's recognition of it.—To the 6th General Council held at Constantinople (A.D. 680) the then Pope wrote; "Fidei quam percipimus per *apostolicam Apostolorum Pontificum traditionem*, et sanctorum quinque Generalium Synodorum." (Hard. iii. 1078.) And in the 7th (or 2nd Nicene) which inculcated *image-worship*; "His qui spernunt. . . *traditionem ecclesie*, . . perhibentes quod nisi de Veteri ac Novo Testamento eviderent fuerimus edocti, non sequemur doctrinas sanctorum patrum, neque sanctorum synodorum, Anathema!" † (Hard. iv. 42.) In the Council of Trent the same point was insisted on as essential. Sess. iv.; (Hard. x. 22.) It is noted by Ranke i. 203.

\* I have already had occasion to notice the use of this word in Papal or Conciliar Decrees. I observe another example in the voice of Pope Gregory X, when presiding over the 2nd Lyons' General Council in 1274; "Perpetue sanctionis *oraclulo* declaramus." Hard. vii. 709.

† In the same Council the following Article of faith and confession was adopted, well of a piece with the former: "His qui assumunt eloquia, quæ a divinâ Scripturâ adversus *idola* proferuntur, in venerandas *imagines*, Anathema!" Hard. ib.

"*Idola seponens*," said Irenæus of Antichrist. How curious the coincidence of

the appropriation to the Church (or, as was here meant by the term, the ecclesiastical order) of the office of interpreting Scripture,<sup>1</sup> and consequent denial of the right of private judgment,—these, and other such like, were the unscriptural dogmas laid down by the Western Councils. These however, the Pope and Priesthood promulgated, as before said, even as with the authority of the *Holy Spirit*; on this presumption of the Councils' holiness, and plenary inspiration by the Divine Spirit, had *images* or *pictures* of them hung up among other holy things in the Churches, for the devout contemplation of the worshippers;<sup>2</sup> and moreover required to the dogmas and Canons laid down by them the

<sup>1</sup> Council of Trent.

<sup>2</sup> Both in Eastern and Western Christendom the Ecumenic Church Councils were not infrequently thus set up in a picture, or *εικων*.

At the beginning of the reign of Philip Bardanes, the secretary Agatho, who was employed in transcribing the Acts of the 6th General Council, complains of the new Emperor having destroyed its records, and also having deposed from its pedestal an *εικονα Συνοδου*, or *Image of the Council*, which had by the previous king been set up in some vestibule of the palace, by the church of Santa Sophia, and in its place substituted his own *εικων*.—The statement is repeated by *Anastasius the librarian*, and *Ado in his Chronicon*: with this variation and addition, that the Emperor removed a *picture* of the six great (Ecumenic Councils from the wall, and sent to Rome ordering the removal of all such images or pictures from the churches *there* too; but that the Pope and Roman people, to mark their contempt and rejection of his mandate, had an *image* or *picture* of the six great Councils erected in St. Peter's.

Both Baronius, ad Ann. 711, and Mosheim, viii. 2. 3. 9, give the narrative: and, as it seems to me illustrative, as well as curious, and has never, I believe, been noticed of late years, I subjoin the three original authorities. It surprises me that neither Baronius nor Mosheim should have referred to the first, which is of all the fullest and most authentic.

1. *Agatho*, the librarian of Santa Sophia, and secretary to the 6th Council spoken of, thus writes. (ap. Harduin iii. 1836.) *Ενθυ και παραχρημα, βασιλικη εξουσια και αυθεντια χρησημενος, προ της οικειας εισοδου την μεν απο χρονων ηδη αναθεμισαν εικονα της αυτης αγιας εκτης Συνοδου, πλησιον και μεταξυ της τεταρτης και εκτης σχολης, εν τοις προαυλιωις του βασιλικου παλατιου, κατενεχθηναι προσεταξε: μη αλλως φησας εν τοις ουκ ουσιν αυτου βασιλεις εισερχεσθαι καταδεχεσθαι, πριν η μη τουτο γενησεται: θεσπισας εξουσιαστικως και τουτο, ωστε την προσηγοριαν Σεργιου τε και Ονωριου, και των λοιπων συν αυτοις υπο της αυτης αγιας και οικουμενικης Συνοδου εκβληθεντων και αναθεματισθεντων, εν τοις ιεροις των αγιατων εκκλησιων διπτυχοις ανακηρυττεσθαι, και τας αυτων αναστηλουσθαι \* κατα τοπον εικονας.*

Then, after mention of Bardanes' death, and the orthodox Anastasius' succession to the Imperial throne, and of the letters sent by the Patriarch of Constantinople to the Roman Pope Constantine, with an account of what had occurred, he thus proceeds.

*Επειη δε μετα την κατενεξιν της ανωτερω δηλουμενης συνοδικης τελειας εικονος,*

fact with this patristic expectation, and the cause and manner of its accomplishment! The saints' "*imagines*" were of the Papal Antichrist's own authorization, (see p. 180, Note 5,) and under his own control and management; the Pagan "*idola*" of a party once different and opposed.

\* Compare on this expression a passage from Zonaras on a coin of Isaac Comnenus, cited by Eckhel viii. 256: *Τω στατηρι Ιαυτον ανεστηλωσεν ανατεταμενον την χειρα* "in staterc sc *frugi* jussit."

worship of implicit reverence, obedience, and submission.<sup>1</sup> And this from first to last. For, however the constituent members of the Councils might some few times differ on other points, in this they never varied:<sup>2</sup>—viz. in requiring

ὁ ταυτην αθεσιμωσ προσταξας κατενεχθηναι, Βαρδανης ὁ αλιτηριος και παραφορος, εν τῃ οὕτω λεγομενῃ του Μηλιου καμερα, [και] τας ἁγιας και οικουμενικας πέντε Συνοδους, και μονον επι της εικονος αναστηλωθηναι προσεταξεν ἑαυτον, εν τῃ μεσω ταυτης αμα τῃ Σεργιω στηλογραφησας ορθοσταδον, αναγκαιως πανν και αγαν ἀρμοδιως των αυτων δυο προσωπων εξ εκεινης κατενηνηγμενων, ἡ της αυτης ἁγιας και οικουμενικης ἱκτης Συνοδου αναζωγραφησις, συν ταις αλλαις πεντε, γεγενηται κοινης ἰορτης και ευφροσυνης . . παντι γεγονυιας, τῃ της ἁγιας εκκλησιας φιλοθεω πληρωματι, επι τῃ καταστασει και ειρηνη των ἁγιωτατων εκκλησιων.

2. *Anastasius* (apud Baronium). “Ejus (sc. Philippici Imperatoris) professionem fidei Constantinus Pontifex Romanus respuit. Hujus rei causā, zelo fidei accensus, omnis cœtus Romanæ urbis *imaginem* quam Græci *rotaream* vocant, sex continentem sanctas ac universales Synodos, in Ecclesia B. Petri erexit. — Etenim, inter alia nefanda, idem Philippicus Imperator sanctas sex Synodos œcumenicas picturâ effigiatas à pariete abradi præcepit: contra quod Imperatoris facinus Pontifex nitens, quas ille destruxit ipse eo modo quo erant ante restituit.”

3. *Ado*, Chronicon, ap. B. P. M. xvi. 802. “Philippicus Imperator . . pravi dogmatis litteras Constantino misit Pontifici: quas ille cum apostolicæ sedis consilio respuit; et hujus rei causâ fecit picturas in porticu S. Petri, quæ Acta sex Synodorum universalium continent. Nam et hujusmodi picturas, eam haberentur in urbe regiâ, Philippicus jusserat auferri.” He adds, ad ann. 717; “Theodosius Imperator . . ut regnum accepit, cum esset Catholicus, imaginem illam *venerandam* in quâ sanctæ sex Synodi erant depictæ, et a Philippico fuerat dejecta, pristino loco in urbe regiâ erexit.” \*

See the notice of this subject in the 2nd Part of our Church Homily on the Peril of Idolatry. And compare the copy here appended of an ancient Picture of the 1st Roman Council, once in the Church of St. Silvester. In which Picture we should mark the grandeur of Pope Sylvester presiding, † and littleness comparatively of the Emperor Constantine beside him.

<sup>1</sup> As early as the 11th century we find it declared by Pope Leo IX to be the faith of the Roman Church that the decrees of the seven General Councils, previously held, including of course the 2nd of Nice, were to be “received and *venerated*, even as the *four Gospels* :”—“omnimodè recipio, et velut quatuor evangelia veneror.” Hard. vi. 904. And so again, in the 2nd Lateran Council held at Rome, A.D. 1122, Pope Paschal profest a similar veneration as due alike to the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, and to the decrees of the Universal Councils: “Se Scripturas sacras Veteris et Novi Testamenti, et Concilia Universalia veneranda, suscipere ac venerari, quæ Catholica Ecclesia suscipit et veneratur.”

The requirement of implicit submission to them is still in force. The following is the oath to be taken by Romish priests on presentation to a benefice. “All things delivered, defined, and declared by the sacred Canons of the General Councils, and particularly by the Council of Trent, I unhesitatingly believe and profess.” This occurs in the Creed of Pope Pius IV; said by Bishops Doyle and Murray, before the Parliamentary Committees on Ireland, to be one of the most approved summaries of Romish faith: the others specified by Bishop Doyle being the Decrees of the Council of Trent, and Catechism of the Council of Trent. So too Dr. Milner. †

<sup>2</sup> The Council of Constance, for example, as much as the most entirely Papal of the Councils. This point is well stated by Dean Waddington, iii. 137.

\* The Reader who may have visited the splendid Library of the Vatican at Rome, will not fail to remember, as he reads this, the great series of *Pictures of the Councils* which there cover the walls.

† Καλος και μεγαλος, συνθ' ἑμασιν, ὡπε θεος περι.

‡ Contrast Art. XXI of the Church of England: “Things ordained by General Councils as necessary to salvation have neither strength nor authority, unless . . they be taken out of *Holy Scripture*.”

the human mind to bow and fall prostrate before the oracles they pronounced, even as before God's own word.<sup>1</sup>—And what as regarded them that would not so bow down? These they anathematized and excommunicated, as heretics.

But this leads me to the last point mentioned of the Image.

4. "The Image caused that as many as would not worship it *should be put to death.*"—I have observed that whosoever received not nor submitted to the Decrees of the Council, were anathematized by it and excommunicated as heretics. Now let it not be forgotten that by the Canon Law, generally received in Christendom, an excommunicated heretic was out of the protection of the law; and, as such, liable to be put by any one to death.<sup>2</sup> But, besides this, the *extirpation of heretics* was a professed object in almost all of the convocatory Bulls of the Councils General of the West;<sup>3</sup> and by the Canons, or voice of the Councils, their death was decreed, and provision made for accomplishing it. Thus in the 3rd Lateran Council there was the decree respecting *Cathari, Publicani*, and other like heretics; pronouncing anathema against them, and forbidding that any should harbour them while alive, or when dead give them Christian burial.<sup>4</sup> Again, in the 4th Lateran Council, Canon 3, the secular powers were expressly subordinated to the spiritual, for the purpose of exterminating such heretics; (a Canon subscribed to, like the rest, by the representatives, politically convened for this purpose, of the secular powers;) and crusades, with the usual promise of remission of sins to the crusader, stirred up against them.<sup>5</sup> And in subsequent General Councils the same "*debitæ pœnæ*"<sup>6</sup> were adjudged to the disobedient:—not in those

<sup>1</sup> The word here used for *worshipping*, it should be observed, is *προσκυνησασαι*, of which I give the force in the paraphrase above.

<sup>2</sup> "Homocidas non esse qui excommunicatos trucidant." Quoted before, p. 191, Note <sup>6</sup>.

<sup>3</sup> From the 2nd Lateran to that of Trent, excepting only those of *Lyons*.—So much was the extirpation of heretics an object of the Popes convocing Councils, that Bingham, vii. Pref. 26, quotes *Prætorius*, saying, "That in the 9th and 10th centuries there was a perfect interregnum of heretics;" apparently because there were no Councils. And so too the Prior Rorencio cited in my Vol. ii. p. 361, top Note.—On the 5th Lateran see my Vol. ii. p. 445. On the other Councils see Harduin.

<sup>4</sup> See Vol. ii. pp. 425, 426.

<sup>5</sup> See Waddington ii. 174, 175.

<sup>6</sup> 5th Lateran. See my Vol. ii. p. 452.

only of unquestioned Papal supremacy, as the two of Lyons and the 5th Lateran ; but, to the full as much, (witness the sentences against Huss and Jerome and their Bohemian followers,<sup>1</sup>) in the Councils of Constance and Basle ; and, finally, in that of Trent.<sup>2</sup>

So that, we see, the same spirit of persecution, even unto blood, against those faithful ones who would worship God only, inspired the antitype of the IMAGE OF THE BEAST from first to last. In all its fresh oracular voices, as it was set up afresh from time to time, it showed that on this, as on other points, it preserved its individuality of character unchanged. And as, in the visions of Daniel, the great *Heathen* Empires were fitly represented under the symbols both of an Image and a Wild Beast, as being alike setters up of themselves to be worshipped, and persecutors of the faithful saints,<sup>3</sup>—so were the same two symbols with equal fitness pictured to St. John in prefiguration of the POPEDOM of later ages. For *its* IMAGE too was set up to be worshipped :<sup>4</sup> and the two WILD BEASTS, its authors, were the ready instruments to execute the sentence of the IMAGE, that “whosoever would not worship it should be put to death.”

## CHAPTER VIII.

### THE BEAST'S MARK, NAME, AND NUMBER.

“AND he causeth all, both small and great, rich and poor, free and bond, to receive a mark on their right hand,

<sup>1</sup> See Waddington, iii. 187, &c., on the condemnation and murder of Huss and Jerome by the supposed *popular and liberal* Council of Constance.—So in the Council of Basle too we find that the *Bohemians* met condemnation. And the Pope, although so angry with the Council as both to transfer it, and declare all its other acts *null* and *void* after his Legate's leaving it, yet made on this one point special exception. Wadd. iii. 165, 166.

<sup>2</sup> Trent Sess. 25. Hard. x. 179, 191, &c.

<sup>3</sup> Such I conceive to have been the meaning of the symbols.—As to the *self-worship* set up, Nebuchadnezzar's *Babylonian* Image of gold was but the representative of his own greatness ; and the *Persian* Darius expressly superseded all other worship by that of himself. So too the *Macedonian* Alexander, *Syro-Macedonian* Antiochus Epiphanes and *Pagan Roman* Emperors required for themselves a worship such as was due to God only.

<sup>4</sup> Of course the worship of the *Beast's Image* was perfectly consistent with that of the *Beast* : just as that of Augustus with that of *his own capital city, Rome* ; noticed Tacit. Ann. iv. 37.



or on their forehead : and that no man might buy, or sell, save he that had the mark, [or] the name of the Beast, or the number of his name.—Here is wisdom. Let him that hath understanding count the number of the Beast: for it is the number of a man : and his number is 666.”<sup>1</sup>—Apoc. xiii. 16—18.

It is not quite clear whether the *second Beast*, or the *Image*, be the nominative to the verb “causeth,” with which the passage before us opens. Nor is it material. For the Image is but the mouthpiece of the second Beast ; and the second Beast the agent or superintendent, in order to the fulfilment of the enactments of the Image. We may perhaps prefer to understand it, in common with most other interpreters, as the *second Beast*. As to the requirement that all should be made to receive on their right hand, or on their forehead, the mark, name, or number of the Beast, it has been so well and fully illustrated by former commentators (especially in what regards *the number*<sup>2</sup>) from customs prevalent in the Roman world about the time of St. John, and its application to the Popes and Papal Clergy has been so clearly shown, that I have little more to do in the present Chapter than to abridge from them.—I shall give the ILLUSTRATION first ; the APPLICATION afterwards.

I. It appears then that it was common at the time of St. John, and indeed both long before and long after, for three classes of persons to have certain *στιγματα*, or marks of appropriation, imprinted on them, viz. *slaves*, *soldiers*, and the *devotees* of one and another god ;—that the impression was generally on the *forehead* or the *hand* ;—and that the mark was sometimes the simple *name* or *characteristic emblem* of the master or the god, sometimes (in the devotee’s case) the god’s particular hieroglyphic *number*.

Thus,—as examples of the *mark* or *name*,—it was with

<sup>1</sup> In verse 17 the *or* is wanting in A and C. In verse 18 C and some later MSS. read *χρῆς*. See p. 246 Note <sup>1</sup> *infra*.

<sup>2</sup> Particularly by *Daubuz* *ad loc.* and *Clarke*, in his elaborate work on the Dragon and Beast.—*Mr. Rabett* has also published a work on the *Name and Number of the Beast*, which I have only seen, while revising this Work for my 4th Edition. It strongly advocates the same name and number that I do.

the Sicilian emblem of a horse that the enslaved Athenians were branded on the forehead in Sicily.<sup>1</sup> It was with the *master's name or mark* that Roman slaves were stigmatised on their foreheads;<sup>2</sup> and the *Emperor's name or mark* that Roman soldiers bore imprinted on their hand.<sup>3</sup> Further, among devotees, those of the god Bacchus are specified as branding themselves at times with the ivy-leaf, sacred to him.<sup>4</sup> To which I may add the example of the Hindoos, marked even to the present day on the forehead with the hieroglyphic of the god they are consecrated to.

As to inscription with a particular *number*, as sacred, this was either some *simple* number, consecrated to the devotee's god, according to the Pythagorean and Platonic mysteries of numbers;<sup>5</sup>—or perhaps the *number of the letters in his name*;<sup>6</sup>—or, as it might be, the number made up of the *numerical values of the constituent letters of the name*.—Now it is evident that it is the *last* kind of number which is here intended as “the number of the Beast.” For it is elsewhere called “the number of his name:”<sup>7</sup> and that this cannot mean the number of letters in his name, may be inferred from the largeness of the enigmatic number: for who can suppose a name containing 666 letters?<sup>8</sup> It is therefore this last method of mystic numbering which

<sup>1</sup> Και τουτους ως οικετας επωλων, σιζιζοντες ιππον εις το μετωπον. Plutarch, Vita Nicias.—A horse running loose is frequent on Syracusan medals. See Eckhel, or other Numismatists, on Sicilian coins.

<sup>2</sup> So Valerius Maximus speaks of the custom for slaves, “literarum notis inuri;” and Plautus calls the slave “literatus.” Ambrose (De Obiit. Valentin. 58) says “Characterē domini inscribuntur servuli:” and Petronius notes the *forehead* as the place of stigma; “Servitia ecce in frontibus cernitis.” See Daubuz, pp. 600, 603.

<sup>3</sup> Ælian says; Στιγματα εστι των στρατευομενων εν ταις χειρσιν. Ætius; “Stigmata vocant que in facie, vel in aliâ parte corporis, inscribuntur; qualia sunt militum in manibus.” Vegetius; “Victuris in cute punctis milites scripti. . . jurare solent.” So that it was a kind of tattooing. Ambrose (ibid.); “Nōmine imperatoris signantur milites.”—Perhaps, says the Benedictine Editor of Ambrose, St. Paul alludes to this when he says, (Gal. vi. 17.) “I bear in my body the marks, *στιγματα*, of the Lord Jesus.”

<sup>4</sup> Χαρασσεισθαι και δια πυρος εις το σωμα παρασημη Διονουσου κισσοφυλλω. So the Author of the 3rd Book of Maccabees.

<sup>5</sup> E. g. the number 3 was sacred to Minerva, 4 to Apollo, &c. See Clarke, p. 10.

<sup>6</sup> The Marcisian heretics regarded 24 as a sacred number; because this was alike the number of letters in two quaternions of their Æons, or demi-gods: the first quaternion being, Αρηθος, Σειγη, Πατηρ, Αληθεια; the second, Λογος, Ζωη, Ανθρωπος, Εκκλησια. Ib. 13.

<sup>7</sup> Apoc. xv. 2.

<sup>8</sup> So Mr. Clark, 33. And, besides, enigmas, of which the nature is this,—the number being given to find the name,—could only on this principle of numbering be distinct and discoverable: words of the same number of letters being innumerable.

alone seems here to call for illustration.<sup>1</sup> It was called by the Greeks *ισοψηφία*, or *numeral equality*: such calculations being made for the most part according to the *Greek* value of the constituent letters of the name; though sometimes according to their value in *Hebrew*, also. And the usage appears to have obtained very largely alike among *Heathen Greeks*, *pseudo-Christian Gnostics*, and even *Christian Fathers*;—not to say also among *Jewish Cabbalists*.

Thus, among the *Heathens*, the Egyptian mystics spoke of *Mercury*, or *Thouth*, under the number 1218, because the Greek letters composing the name *Thouth*, when estimated according to their numerical value, together made up that number.<sup>2</sup> By others Jupiter was evoked under the mystical number 717; because the letters of *Ἡ ΑΡΧΗ*, the *Beginning*, or *First Origin*, which was a characteristic title of the Supreme Deity worshipped as Jupiter, made up that number:<sup>3</sup> and Apollo under the number 608, as being that of *ἥσ*, or *ἕσ*, words expressing certain solar attributes.<sup>4</sup>—Again, the pseudo-Christian or semi-Pagan Gnostics, from St. John's time downwards, affixed to their gems and amulets, of which multitudes remain even to the present day,<sup>5</sup> the mystic word *αβρασαξ*, or *αβραξας*: under the idea of some magic virtue attaching to its number 365,<sup>6</sup> as being that of the days of the annual solar cycle; and equal moreover with that of *Μεθρας*, or *Mithras*, the Magian

<sup>1</sup> The illustrations given by Daubuz and Clarke are borrowed in a considerable measure from Martian Capella, a Latin Poet of the date, some say, of the 5th century; some (as Clarke, p. 15) B.C. 50. A somewhat large difference!

<sup>2</sup> Daubuz, p. 605. Thus; ( $\theta=9+\omega=800+\nu=400+\theta=9$ )=1218.

<sup>3</sup> ( $H=8+\alpha=1+\rho=100+\chi=600+\eta=8$ )=717. So the line of Orpheus on Jove;

*Αρχη παντων, παντων τε τελευτη.*

<sup>4</sup> ( $H=8+\nu=400+\varsigma=200$ )=608.—*Huc* good, *ἕσ* shower-giving.

This example is taken from *Capella* by Daubuz and Clarke: and the enigma is thus expressed in verse;

Octo et sexcentis numeris, cui littera trina

Conformat sacrum (mystis) nomen, cognomen, et omen.

*Mystis* is the reading of Daubuz, in place of the *sacrum* of Clarke.

<sup>5</sup> See Walsh's Book on Early Christian Coins, p. 37. He says; "They are not only found in the East, where travellers procure them without much difficulty; but are continually dug up on the banks of the Rhine and Garonne, and in different parts of Spain, Italy, and other western countries."—He adds from Irenæus and Jerome that they were called *amulets*, ("quòd malum amolitur,") as being charms to the wearer.

<sup>6</sup> ( $A=1+\beta=2+\rho=100+\alpha=1+\sigma=200+\alpha=1+\xi=60$ )=365.—Basilides said that *Abraxas* was the highest God; and that 365 heavens were made in honour of him; this being the number of his name. So Tertullian, De Præscr. 46.

name for the *Sun*, whom they identified also with *Christ*.<sup>1</sup>—Once more, (passing over the case of the Cabbalistic Jews, of whose Gematria or  $\iota\sigma\omicron\psi\eta\phi\iota\alpha$ , however, I subjoin an example or two below,)<sup>2</sup> the Christian Fathers themselves fell into the same fancies, and doctrine of mysteriousness in certain verbal numbers. For example, both Barnabas and Clement of Alexandria speak of the virtue of the number 318 as being that of **IHT**,<sup>3</sup> the common abbreviation for Jesus crucified; and partly ascribe to its magical virtue the victory that Abraham gained with his 318 servants over the Canaanitish kings.<sup>4</sup> Similarly Tertullian refers the victory of Gideon with his 300 men<sup>5</sup> to the circumstance of that being the number of **T**, the sign of the cross.<sup>6</sup> In the name *Adam* another father thought to see a mysterious numeral affinity to certain characteristics in the life and history of the second Adam, Jesus Christ.<sup>7</sup> Ire-

<sup>1</sup> ( $M=40+\epsilon=5+\iota=10+\theta=9+\rho=100+a=1+c=200$ )=365. See Walsh, 39—41.

<sup>2</sup> I give three examples. The first and third, among others, are extracted by Mr. Clarke, pp. 28, 29, from Aben Ezra and Kimchi; the second is given by Dr. M'Caul in his Note on Kimchi ad loc.—In Hebrew, the reader will understand, as in Greek, the letters of the Alphabet, in order, express the units up to 10,—then the tens from 10 to 100,—then the hundreds from 100 to 1000, &c.

1. In Zechariah iii. 8, *the Branch*,  $\text{נְּחֻמָּה}$ , was explained to signify *the Messiah*; because in Lamentations i. 16 the Messiah was called  $\text{נְּחֻמָּה}$ , *the Comforter*; and the number of the former word, ( $=90+40+8$ ) as of the latter, ( $=40+50+8+40$ ) was 138.—2. On the same principle the word  $\text{אֲרִי}$ , *serpent*, is made by the Jews one of the names of Messiah, because its numerical value is equal to that of  $\text{מָשִׁיחַ}$ , *Messiah*. “And perhaps,” says Dr. M'Caul, “our Lord may have alluded to this, when he said, As Moses lifted up the *serpent*,” &c.—3. In answer to the question, What is the *lily* ( $\text{לִילִי}$ )\* in the Book of Esther? the Cabbalists replied, *Esther* ( $\text{אֶסְתֵּר}$ ): because both words contain the same number 661.

<sup>3</sup> ( $I=10+H=8+T=300$ )=318.†

<sup>4</sup> Gen. xiv. 14.

<sup>5</sup> Judges vii. 6.

<sup>6</sup> Carm. adv. Marc. Lib. iii. cap. 4:

Hoc etenim signo prædonum stravit acervos,  
Congressus populo Christi, sine milite multo,  
Terceneno equite, (numerus Tau, litera Græca,  
Armatis facibusque, et cornibus ore canente.

<sup>7</sup> The number is ( $A=1+\delta=4+\alpha=1+\mu=40$ )=46. And so, says an African writer confounded with Cyprian,† Christ died at the 6th hour of the day, and ascended on the 40th day from his resurrection, in the 6th millennium of the world. (i. e. according to the Septuagint Chronology).

The conceit that these four letters were chosen to form Adam's name, as being the initials of *ανατολη*, *δυσσις*, *αρκτος*, *μησημβρια*, the four quarters of the world, and indicating that earth was taken from all to form his body, (a conceit found also in the Sibylline Poems,) deserves remark, as an indication of the not infrequent undue imaginativeness of the early Fathers. Clark, 66.

\* Esther i. 2, 5: where our translation is, as of a proper name, *Shusan*.

† I am surprised that they did not note the  $\iota\sigma\omicron\psi\eta\phi\iota\alpha$  with this sacred abbreviation for *Jesus*, of the word  $\eta\lambda\iota\omicron\varsigma$ , *the Sun*: ( $\eta=8+\lambda=30+\iota=10+\omicron=70+c=200$ )=318.

‡ In the Oxford and Amsterdam Editions of Cyprian (1682 and 1691) the Treatise referred to, De Montibus Sina et Sion, is placed among Pseudo-Cyprianic.

næus notes the remarkable number 888 of the name *Ιησους*, Jesus.<sup>1</sup> And in the pseudo-Sybilline verses, written by Christians about the end probably of the second century,<sup>2</sup> and consequently not long after Irenæus, we find (besides other exemplifications of this verbal numeration)<sup>3</sup> enigmas proposed of precisely the same character as that in the text;—the *number* being given, and the *name* required. I subjoin an example or two below.<sup>4</sup>—It will have been ob-

<sup>1</sup> Iren. i. 12, ii. 40. ( $I=10 + \eta=8 + \sigma=200 + \omicron=70 + \upsilon=400 + \varsigma=200$ )=888. See Clark, 23.

It was of course natural that this word should be adopted as a charm by those who looked to charms. The same of the word *Χριστος*. And thus Kircher, in his *Magia Hieroglyphica*, well explains the intent and force of the strange-looking legend  $\text{XNOYMIΣPI}$ , which he found on a Gnostic gem with the figure of a serpent, from its *ισοψηφια* with *Χριστος*; either word making up numerically the same sum of 1480. Thus: ( $X=600 + \nu=50 + \omicron=70 + \upsilon=400 + \mu=40 + \iota=10 + \sigma=200 + \rho=100 + \epsilon=10$ )=1480. Again ( $X=600 + \rho + 100 + \iota=10 + \sigma=200 + \tau=300 + \omicron=70 + \varsigma=200$ )=1480. Walsh, 43.

<sup>2</sup> On the Sibylline verses see Mosh. ii. 2. 3. 15. There is an interest attaches to them from the circumstance of their having apparently (forged though they were) had some influence in the conversion of Constantine. See his quotations from them in the Letter given by Eusebius.

<sup>3</sup> E. g. In Book v. the succession of Roman emperors, from Tiberius to Adrian, is enigmatically noted by mention of the numeral value of the first letter in each of their names in Greek respectively.

<sup>4</sup> The first of my two examples is on the word *Ιησους* (*Jesus*), taken from the 1st Book of the Sibylline Oracles, near the end.

Δη τότε και μεγαλοιο θεει παις ανθρωποισιν  
 Ηξει σαρκοφορος, θνητοις ομοιουμενος εν γη  
 Τεσσαρα φωνηεντα φερει, τα δ' αφωνα δυ' αυτη  
 Δισσων (?) αγγελλων\* αριθμονδ' ολον εξονομηνω.  
 Οκτω γαρ μοναδας, τοσσας δεκαδας επι τουτοις,  
 Ηδ' εκατονταδας οκτω, απιστοτεροις ανθρωποις  
 Ονομα δηλωσει.

i. e. "He will come upon earth, clothed with flesh like mortal men. His name contains four vowels and two consonants: two of the former being sounded together. And I will declare the entire number. For the name will exhibit to incredulous men eight units, eight tens, and eight hundreds." See above Note 1.

My second example, taken from Book I, verse 146, &c., is on some divine title containing the number 1697, under which God addresses himself to Noah.

Εννεα γραμματ' εχω τετρασυλλαβος εμι' νοει με'  
 Αι τρεις αι πρωται δυο γραμματ' εχουσιν εκαστη'  
 Η λοιπη δε τα λοιπα και εισιν αφωνα τα πεντε.  
 Του παντος ε' αριθμον εκατονταδες εισι εις οκτω,  
 Και τρεις τριδεκαδες, συνγ' επτα γνους δε τις εμι,  
 Ουκ αρνητος ιση θειης παρ' εμοιγε σοφης.

i. e. "I am of nine letters and four syllables. Consider me! The three first syllables have each two letters, the fourth the rest; of which letters five are consonants. Of the number the amount is 16 hundreds, 3 thirties, and seven. And if thou under-

\* So my copy of the Sibylline Oracles, Paris, 1599. Clarke, p. 22, has *Δισσων ασραγαλων*. Prof. M. Stuart (*ibid.*) gives the various reading,

τα δ' αφωνα δυ' αυτη  
 Δισσοντ' αγγελλων.



There are here two things to be premised. *First*, the number given in the usual text is unquestionably correct,  $\chi\xi\varsigma'$ , 666. For Irenæus in the most positive manner so states it,<sup>1</sup> and also Hippolytus;<sup>2</sup> nor, of the many solutions suggested by the Fathers, is there any one founded on any other number.<sup>3</sup>—*Secondly*, there is the highest probability of the language and number of the word meant being *Greek*, and not *Hebrew*:—because the Apocalypse was intended for the use of Gentiles, to whom Hebrew was scarcely known;—because the first and last letters of the *Greek* alphabet are expressly selected by Christ in the Apocalypse, and not those of the Hebrew, to express his eternity, “I am  $\alpha$  and  $\omega$  saith the Lord;”<sup>4</sup>—because the numerals in which the enigma is expressed  $\chi\xi\varsigma'$  are *Greek* numerals;—and because Irenæus directly asserts,<sup>5</sup> and all the other early Fathers imply, by making their solutions in *Greek*, that that was understood by *them* to be the language intended by the Divine Spirit.<sup>6</sup> Other languages besides Greek and Hebrew I conceive to be out of the question. More especially in the imperfect numerals of the *Latin* language there is no example, I believe, of calculation on the  $\iota\sigma\upsilon\psi\eta\phi\iota\alpha$  system so early.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>1</sup> It seems there was a reading in some copies extant even then of  $\chi\xi\varsigma'$ , 616 instead of 666;—a reading still perpetuated in the Codex Ephrem, and by the Expositor Tichonius. Against it Irenæus thus inveighs: *Ουκ οίδα πως εσφαλησαν τινες, επακολουθησαντες ιδιοτισμῳ, και τον μεσον ηθετησαν αριθμον του ονοματος, ν' ψηφισμα υφελοντες, και αντι των εξ δεκαδων μιαν δεκαδα βουλομενοι ειναι.* Lib. v. c. 30.

On  $\varsigma'$ , as a Greek numeral formed from the digamma, see Eckhel iv. 383. I shall presently have to revert to this point.

<sup>2</sup> Or pseudo-Hippolytus. *Ἡ δε σφραγίς αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τοῦ μετώπου, καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς δεξιᾶς χειρὸς, ἐστὶ ψῆφος χξς'.* De Consumm. Mundi.

<sup>3</sup> It is the reading, moreover, of all the most ancient manuscripts except the Codex Ephrem; especially of the famous Codex Alexandrinus in the British Museum; a manuscript of the supposed date, says Mr. Tregelles, of the 5th century;—in which manuscript it is written at full length, *ἑξακοσιοὶ ἐξηκοντα ἑξ.*

<sup>4</sup> Apoc. i. 8. So Tichonius in loc.

<sup>5</sup> He says; *Καὶ τον λογον εἰδασκοντος ἡμας ὅτι ὁ αριθμος του ονοματος του θηριου, κατα την των Ἑλληνηνων ψηφον, δια των εν αυτω γραμματων εμφανιεται.* Lib. v. c. 30, apud Euseb. H. E. v. 8.

<sup>6</sup> There is no exception, I believe, whatever among the Fathers of the first six centuries.

<sup>7</sup> So Clarke, p. 59.—The unfitness of the Latin appears in this, that there is but a very small proportion of its letters numeral, viz. M=1000, D=500, C=100, L=50, X=10, V=5, I=1. For it is by a combination of V and X with I, single, or repeated, that the other numbers are made up; there being a difference in the combined value according as the I is on one side or the other of the X or the V; e. g. IV being equal to 4, VI to 6: a combination thus impossible in any distinct  $\iota\sigma\upsilon\psi\eta\phi\iota\alpha$ , and, consequently, excluded. In Latin enigmas of this kind, the word

These two things premised, we proceed to the solution of the enigma, and inference of the name from the number given.—Nor can I conceive any name more appropriate, and in every point satisfactory, than the famous name  $\Lambda\alpha\tau\epsilon\iota\nu\omicron\varsigma$ , given by Irenæus; itself “the name of a man,” viz. of the father of the Latin race, *Latinus*,<sup>1</sup> and of which the numeral value is exactly 666. “It seems to me,” he says, “very probable: since this is a name of the last of Daniel’s four kingdoms; they being *Lalins* that now reign.”<sup>2</sup> He mentions besides, it is true, two other names in the way of solution: one,  $\text{Ευανθας}$ , only in passing; the other  $\text{Τειταν}$ , under an impression of its being, even yet more probably than  $\Lambda\alpha\tau\epsilon\iota\nu\omicron\varsigma$ , the word meant; because judged by him to be a fit name for the last Roman ruler, in other words *Antichrist*, before the grand consummation. But the reasons he offers seem comparatively insufficient.<sup>3</sup>—And Hippolytus, his disciple and follower not very long after, both in the episcopate and in martyrdom, urges the probability of the same name  $\Lambda\alpha\tau\epsilon\iota\nu\omicron\varsigma$ , with much more distinctness and decision of judgment in its favour. And this for the very reason previously suggested by Irenæus; viz. that it was the name of the holders of the fourth prophetic empire: which empire he knew was to continue, though changed, and under the new heading of Antichrist, till Christ’s se-

ought to be one *altogether* made up of letters of numeral values, so as in the DIC LVX proposed by Albertus Magnus, as answering to the 666 of the Apocalypse; a solution *otherwise*, however, objectionable and absurd. This principle is recognised in the ancient example on the word DVX, given by Mr. Clarke:

Qui de quingentis de quinque decemque sit unus,  
Ille meis precibus dignum poterit dare munus.

For DVX in numeral value is ( $D=500 + V=5 + X=10$ ), or 515.

<sup>1</sup> The appellative, as “the name of a man,” did not after this become obsolete. It has continued even to comparatively modern times. e. g. I observe *Latinus Vestanus* among the subscriptions to the 5th Lateran Council, Hard. ix. 1708. And others of the name are recorded in Moreri’s Encyclopædia.

<sup>2</sup> “Sed et LATEINOS nomen habet sexcentorum sexaginta sex numerum. Et valdè verisimile est; quoniam novissimum regnum hoc habet vocabulum. Latini enim sunt qui nunc regnant.” Lib. v. cap. 30.

<sup>3</sup> “Etenim prædictum numerum habet  $\text{Τειταν}$  in se; et literarum est sex, singulis syllabis ex ternis literis constantibus, et vetus, et semotum. Neque enim eorum regum qui secundùm nos sunt aliquis vocatus est *Titan*; neque eorum quæ publicè adorantur idolorum apud Græcos et barbaros habet vocabulum hoc. Et divinum putatur apud multos esse hoc nomen, ut etiam sol *Titan* vocetur ab his qui nunc tenent: et ostentationem quandam continet ultionis, et vindictam inferentis, quòd ille simulat se male tractatos vindicare. Et aliàs autem et antiquum, et fide dignum, et regale, magis autem et tyrannicum nomen.” Ib.—In noticing the circumstance of the word having six letters, he seems to intimate its analogy in that respect to the number 666.



cond coming to take the kingdom with his saints. "It is manifest to all," he says, when speaking of the new Head accruing to the Roman Beast, after the healing of its deadly wound. "For they who now reign are *Latins* (*Λατεινοί*): and the name, transmuted into that of an individual, becomes *Λατεινος*."<sup>1</sup>

I shall presently have to show the peculiar appropriateness in this point of view of the name *Λατεινος*; an appropriateness very far greater than Irenæus or Hippolytus imagined. But let me, before doing so, notice two objections that have been urged against it.—*One* (the least important) is this; that it is a word *indeterminate* in itself, whether to be taken as an *adjective* or *substantive*.<sup>2</sup> But where the force of such an objection? The *adjective* *Λατεινος* taken as a local appellative, might just as fitly be a predicted title of *Antichrist*, as *Ναζωραϊος*, *Nazarene*, of *Christ*.<sup>3</sup>—The *second* and *principal* objection is that the orthography of the Greek word is *Λατινος*, not *Λατεινος*; giving the number 661, not 666; and both Bellarmine, and yet more Bengel and I. E. Clarke after him, have asserted that such is the universal spelling of the word in ancient authors.<sup>4</sup> That this however is not the case appears even from the quotation just given from Hippolytus, to whom they make no reference: for he writes both *Λατεινοί* and *Λατεινος* with an *ει*, like Irenæus; and does not seem, any more than the earlier Father, even to imagine an objection on this score. Now the competency and learning of both these Fathers is undoubted; <sup>5</sup> and, as re-

<sup>1</sup> After mentioning that various names might be found containing the number 666, he simply notes in passing the names *Τειταν* and *Ευανθας*; and then thus proceeds to *Λατεινος*:—*Επειδη προεφθηνεν λεγοντες οτι εθεραπευθη η πληγη του θηριου του πρωτου, και ποιησει λαλειν την εικονα, τουτεστιν ισχυσαι φανερον δ' εστι πασιν οτι οι κρατουντες επι νυν εισι Λατεινοι εις ενος ουν ανθρωπου ονομα μεταγομενον γινεται Λατεινος.* De Antichristo, § 50.

<sup>2</sup> This combines Clarke's second and third objections:—"2. the impossibility of determining whether it be a substantive or an adjective:—3. its *indefinite form*: for, supposing it to be a *substantive*, we are not informed from it what *Latinois* is intended; and, admitting it to be an *adjective*, we cannot determine with what *substantive* it is designed to be connected." p. 44.

<sup>3</sup> Matt. ii. 23; *Ναζωραϊος κληθησεται*. It was an appellation of Christ that formed part of the superscription at his crucifixion; *Ιησους ο Ναζωραϊος, Jesus the Nazarene.* John xix. 19.

<sup>4</sup> See Clarke, p. 38, &c.

<sup>5</sup> It is altogether superfluous to quote testimonies to the learning of one so well known and so revered as *Irenæus*. Of *Hippolytus*, who is less generally known,

gards Irenæus, his attention appears to have been directed, and his discrimination exercised, as will presently be seen, on this very point of the use of the diphthong. I may add further that Andreas, another learned Greek Father who lived some three centuries later, retained the word *Λατεινος*, as one of the admissible solutions.<sup>1</sup> And, turning from later to more ancient authors, it was so written, as Dr. More observes, by the old Roman Poet Ennius,<sup>2</sup> a man among the most learned of his age: <sup>3</sup> also, as Prof. Stuart adds, by the Poet Plautus; <sup>4</sup> and, as Eichhorn, Heinrichs, and more recently Mr. Rabett have observed, upon an ancient bust of Terence, “the *Latein Siren.*”<sup>5</sup>—The truth is, it was one out of two methods of writing the long Greek or

I may observe that *Chrysostom* speaks of him (Orat. 41) as among the luminaries of the Church; that *Jerome* (Ep. 28 ad Lucian.) calls him “*disertissimus*,” and the Roman Martyrology (on Aug. 22) “*eruditione clarissimus*.”

<sup>1</sup> ὡς ἐν γυμνασίου λογῆ πολλὰ ἐσι εὐρεῖν, κατὰ τὸν μακαρίον Ἰππολύτου καὶ ἱτέρου, ὀνόματα τὸν ἀριθμὸν τῆτον περιέχοντα, προσηγορικὰ τε καὶ κυρία· κυρία μὲν οἶον Λαμπητις, Τεταν, . . . Λατεινος [ἐἰα διφθογγῆ]· Βενεδικτος.

It is observed indeed by Bengel; “In uno Andreae codice manuscripto *Λατεινος*, à librario emendante contra Andreae institutum, est repositum: in altero ad *Λατεινος* additur, ἐἰα διφθογγου, aperta licentiæ confessione.” (Clarke, 39.) But he would surely scarce mean to suggest that the correcting copyist was more competent than his author; whose learning is well known. See B. P. M. v. 589.\*

<sup>2</sup> “Quam primum casei populei tenere Lateinci.” So Ennius, cited from More’s Works, p. 595, by Mr. Cuninghame, p. 173. Mr. Rabett’s reference, p. 223, is to Ennius Annal. Lib. i. p. 3. (Ed. Lugd. Bat. 1595.)

<sup>3</sup> See Cicero’s or Quintilian’s respectful notices of him.

<sup>4</sup> “We may refer to the custom of the more ancient Latin, as in *Plautus*, of writing I (the long Latin *i*) by *ei*; e. g. solitei, divei, captivei, preimus, *Lateina*, &c.” M. Stuart on the Apocalypse, ii. 456: a work published subsequently to my first Edition.

<sup>5</sup> *Eichhorn*. “Terentii effigies, in scholis olim suspensa, titulum habuisse dicitur hunc; ‘Siren *Lateina* quam dedit victa Africa.’” So *Eichhorn* in Apoc. xiii. 18, Vol. ii. p. 135: a passage repeated, as from *Eichhorn*, by *Heinrichs* in his 4th Excursus, Vol. ii. p. 246. The latter only objects that it was the ancient form of writing it, and disused in the time of St. John; an objection (see my next Page) that is in fact a recommendation.

Mr. Rabett, p. 224, gives a copy of this Bust of Terence, from an engraving of it on the title-page of Farnaby’s London Edition of Terence A.D. 1651: an engraving said to be from a bust of Terence in the Vatican Library at Rome. Farnaby was a

\* I must observe that in the Latin translation of Andreas given in the B. P. M. v. 613, the word seems at first sight wholly omitted from Andreas’ comment. He is made to allude indeed to solutions given by Hippolytus; and he specifies *λαμπητις*, *βενεδικτος*, *κακος οδηγος*, *αληθης βλαβηρος*, *παλαι βασκανος*, *αμνος αεικος*. But no mention is made of *Λατεινος*. A careful inspection of the passage suggests the mistranslation, or misprint. For “Proprium, exempli causâ, Græcis sit *λαμπητις*, Latinè *Benedictus*, Persicè *Sarmnæus*,” we must read, *λαμπητις*, *λατεινος*, *βενεδικτος*, *Περσαιος*, *Σαρμναιος*. For it is only by Greek computation that *Benedict* and the other two words have the numerical value of 666.—But what *Benedict*? *Heinrichs* (ii. 252) says *Benedict IX*; who was elected Pope A.D. 1033, some centuries after Andreas. And so in, or after, that age some may have applied it. But, if meant of a Pope by Andreas, (which is not likely,) it must have been *Benedict I*, A.D. 573—577.

Latin *i*, in not uncommon use; in regard of the propriety of which authors differed, and fashions changed: just as among ourselves on the question of spelling *Wicliffe*, or *Shakespeare*, with an *e* final, or without. Of this we have abundant evidence in inscriptions on medals and antiques, still extant, of the age referred to.<sup>1</sup> More especially *appellatives* homogeneous with the word in question, such as *Antoninus*, *Faustinus*, &c. &c., are there found (not “*very rarely*,” as Mr. Clarke would have it,<sup>2</sup> but) *very commonly* thus written, *ΑΥΤΩΝΕΙΝΟΣ*, *ΦΑΥΣΕΙΝΟΣ*, &c.<sup>3</sup> Hence critics and antiquarians of different creeds, and without any bias on prophetic theories, unite in asserting its legitimacy. The Benedictine *Montfaucon*, having occasion to speak of *Mithras* on the Gnostic gems as numerically equivalent to 365, states the required orthography to be *Μεθρας*, instead of the more usual *Μιθρας*; observes that this use of the diphthong was most common; and (what is more) cites Jerome speaking of this spelling of the word, numerally, as if in no way strange or incorrect.<sup>4</sup> The Protestant *Scaliger* confines the *propriety* of the use of the diphthong to cases (like the one in question) where it is in the penultima with *νος* following it.<sup>5</sup> And Irenæus himself seems to have anticipat-

man of learning; and quite to be trusted, I conceive, as a faithful copyist of the bust in the Vatican. I regret not to have made inquiries about the bust while at Rome.

Mr. R. also observes, p. 229, that in one edition at least of Strabo, the Aldine, p. 81 (Ed. 1514), the Greek word for Latium is written *Λατειον*.

<sup>1</sup> See Dobson's Variorum Edition of the *Oratores Attici*, iv. 581; where the commentator on the *Consecratio Sæpti* observes that the use of the diphthong *ei* for the long *i*, was most common among the Romans even in the Augustan age, and down to Trajan's. “*Obiter moneam nihil apud Romanos in vetustis lapidibus frequentius esse. In inscriptionibus Augusteum ævum subolentibus frequentissimè invenies ei pro longo i positum. Nec sub Augusto tantùm, sed sub proximè sequentium Imperatorum principatu, hæc diphthongum ei in usu fuisse indicat inscriptio apud Gruter. p. 99. 1; &c. The Commentator had previously observed: “A Doriensibus præcipuè i in diphthongum ei resolvi docent monumenta Peloponnesia à Paciaudio edita. Ibi Νεικηφορος, Ελληνικη, Τειμαρχος, πολειτης, &c.”—It will be remembered that the Latin was of Doric or Æolic origin.*

<sup>2</sup> Clarke, p. 44.—The *extreme rarity*, as he would have it, of the diphthong *ei* in *analogous words*, is the grand objection he makes to the use of it in *Λατεινος*.

<sup>3</sup> See *Mionnet's Greek imperial medals*; where the words *Βαλβεινος*, *Μακρινος*, *Μαξιμεινος*, *Αυτωνεινος*, &c. &c., occur frequently; the other spelling being used elsewhere. So i. 500, 501, ii. 78, 148, 225, 236, 345, &c.—See also Spanheim *De Usu Num.* 80, &c., and Eckhel v. 75, on the earlier use of the *ei* for the long Latin *i*, in Roman *Consular* coins.

<sup>4</sup> *Montfaucon*. ii. 226. (Engl. Ed.)—The word in its more usual orthography is given by many Greek writers, Christian as well as Pagan. So e. g. Strabo, *Lib. xv.* p. 1064 (Ed. Casaub.), *Ἡλιον, ὃν οἱ Περσῆαι καλοῦσι Μιθραν*; also the Christian writer *ustin Martyr*, pp. 296, 304 (Ed. Colon.): &c.

<sup>5</sup> *Scaliger* on *Euseb.* *Chronic.* p. 106. (Lugd. Bat. 1606.) It is properly admissible,

ed him in this discriminating judgment. For, in suggesting *Τειταν*, he notes the spelling with the *ει*, as if *there* peculiar;<sup>1</sup> but, in regard of *Λατεινος*, seems to take for granted the orthography of the spelling.—In truth, on looking at the words given by ancient writers as words of *mystic numerals*, it strikes me that this, the *more antique method* of writing, was almost *made a point of* in framing the verbal mystery, or enigma.<sup>2</sup> For, besides that *Mithras*, as just before observed, was by them written *Μειθρας*, although *Μιθρας* was the usual orthography,—and *Titan* *Τειταν* by Irenæus, as one probable solution of the Apocalyptic enigma,—I find *Σειγη* to have been the manner in which the Gnostics spelt the name of their *Æon*, when used in numeral enigma, not *Σιγη*,<sup>3</sup> and *Χρειστος*, not *Χριστος*;<sup>4</sup> also that *ἐπτακεισχειλιους* and *Χρειστιανους* was the orthography adopted by Jerome, to make out the equinumeralism of these words with each other, and with the number 1946.<sup>5</sup> These, with *Λατεινος*, are all the examples I have met with of the long *i*, in words of this class handed down to us from the first four centuries.—So that the objection from the spelling falls to the ground, if I mistake not, altogether. And the word *Λατεινος*, originally recommended by the high double authority of Irenæus and Hippolytus, and recommended yet

he says, in such words as *Αντωνιουος*, *Σαβεινουος*, *Λατεινουος*; but not in words like *Τειμητης*, *Νεικη*, &c., though frequent on coins and gems.

<sup>1</sup> "Sed et *Τειταν*, primâ syllabâ per duas Græcas vocales ε et ι scriptâ, omnium nominum quæ apud nos inveniuntur magis fide dignum est."

<sup>2</sup> Says Prof. Stuart, ubi suprâ; "When Heinrichs observes that Plutarch and other late Greek writers do not employ *ει*, but only *ι* in such cases, this proves nothing against the method in question: for the less usual method of orthography would naturally be that which best comported with the writer's design of partial concealment." My plea for the archaic spelling goes, it will be seen, further than this.

<sup>3</sup> See my Note 6, p. 241 suprâ.

<sup>4</sup> "Sed et *Christus*, inquit, (i. e. the Gnostic teacher,) litterarum est *oeto*." (Irenæus i. 12.) In order to having which number, as Grabe observes, the word must be written *Χρειστος*.—I may add that, in the somewhat similarly enigmatic figure of an *acrostic*, the Sibyl (like Irenæus) used *Χρειστος* for *Χριστος*. So B. viii.; cited approvingly alike by Constantine, ap. Euseb. Ad Sanct. c. 18; and by Augustine, C. D. xviii. 23.

<sup>5</sup> "Omnes qui censentur vocabulo Christiano, quos Dominus 7000 tempore persecutionis Jezabel, et fugæ Eliæ, relinxisse se dicit. . . Quòd autem numerum 7000 ad Christianorum nomen diximus pertinere, supputa Græcè *ἐπτακεισχειλιους* et *Χρειστιανους*, (or *χριστειανους*), et eundem numerum summamque reperies, id est 1946." \* Comment on Zech. vii. 23. The passage seems to me to be one well deserving observation. See in Clarke, p. 55, the remarks on it borrowed from *Seutiger*.

\* Some editions give the number as 1941: in which case one *ε* must be eliminated from either word.

more by its own intrinsic appropriateness,—its number (in the word's usual mystic orthography) 666, its name that of a man, and name too of the then holders of that fourth of the four great mundane empires, out of which Antichrist was to rise,—stands forth for our acceptance disencumbered on this point, and free.<sup>1</sup>

And indeed in this last-mentioned point of view, viz. as a popular and local appellative, it had, when applied to the *lust* or *antichristian head and form of the Roman Beast*, an appropriateness unfolded in subsequent history that the Fathers little anticipated:—an appropriateness such that I doubt not, had Irenæus known it, he would have regarded the name as not merely one out of two almost equally probable solutions, but the *only* and all but *certain* solution.—It is this. In the time of Irenæus, though the then reigning emperor and nation *might* be called, as he observes, *Latins*,<sup>2</sup> yet the appellative so applied was unusual; the *nation* being *Romans*, the *language* only called *Latin*.<sup>3</sup> But so it was that, a few centuries after, when the Western Empire had broken up into ten barbaric kingdoms, with Rome as their common religious centre and capital,—preparatorily, according to prophecy, to the development of Antichrist,—so it was, I

<sup>1</sup> Let me here add three or four most unsuspecting testimonies of learned men to the point for which I contend, viz. the perfect admissibility of *Λαρευος* spelt with the *ε*, as a solution of the prophetic enigma.—And 1st, *Malvenda* the learned Dominican, in his book on Antichrist. After citing Scaliger's vindication of Irenæus' orthography of the word (see my p. 250 Note <sup>9</sup>), he affirms their truth quite positively; “*Hiæ adeo vera sunt, &c.*” Vol. ii. p. 195.—2. Next, the celebrated and certainly not over-credulous Biblical critic *Michaelis*. In his sketch of an admissible interpretation of the Apocalypse, (ch. xxxiii. § 7 of his Introduction to the Study of the New Testament,) he thus speaks on the point now before us. “I think it not improbable that the most ancient explanation of the mystical number 666 is the true one; according to which *Λαρευος* is denoted: the Greek letters in it, taken as numerals, making out precisely the number in question.”—3. *Eichhorn* is just as decided as Scaliger as to the admissibility of the *ε* in *Λαρευος*, and as to *Λαρευος* being the word intended. As to solutions in Latin or Hebrew he considers them, like myself, out of the question.—4. *Ewald* divides the probability between *Λαρευος* in the Greek, supposing 666 to be the number; and the Hebrew *קס"ו קס"ו*, *Cæsar Rome*, supposing the number to be 616.—5. Professor *M. Stuart*, though himself advocating Ferdinand Benary's solution of *קס"ו קס"ו* *Neron Cæsar*, yet admits, as we have seen, Note <sup>1</sup> p. 249 and Note <sup>2</sup> p. 251 *supra*, that no valid objection is maintainable on the score of orthography against *Λαρευος*.

<sup>2</sup> So Virgil *Æn.* i.

. . . . genus unde Latinum,

Albanique patres, atque altæ mœnia Romæ.

<sup>3</sup> “The Gentile name of *Latinus*, or a *Latin*, was in the victorious days of the Republic and Empire, almost lost in the more favourite Gentile name of *Romanus*, a *Roman*.” Faber on the Proph. ii. 346. (Ed. 1810.) Under the idea of *Nero* being the antichristian man intended, Heinrichs very naturally expresses his inability to perceive why the numeral of *Romanus* was not rather the one given. ii. 246.

say, that just at that critical conjuncture the Easterns, separating themselves from the nations of the West, instead of the national appellation of *Greeks* which more properly belonged to them, somewhat remarkably appropriated to themselves the distinctive appellative of *Romans*:<sup>1</sup> and affixed to those Western kingdoms, one and all, connected with Rome, (and indeed precisely on account of their connexion with Rome,<sup>2</sup>) the very appellative of *Latins* here predicted in enigma. Nor did the latter fail to accept, and adopt, the title.<sup>3</sup> So that it became thenceforward the peculiar distinctive title of the Roman Empire in its *last* form;—including both *Body* and *Head*, the two *Beasts* and the *Beast's Image*. It was the Latin world, the Latin kingdoms, the Latin Church, the Latin Patriarch, the Latin Clergy, the Latin Councils.<sup>4</sup> Indeed the Romanists of the West did on their part whatever might yet more add to the appropriateness of the Apocalyptic appellation. To use Dr. More's words, "They Latinize in everything. Mass, prayers, hymns, litanies, canons, decretals, bulls, are conceived in Latin. The Papal Councils speak in Latin. . . The Scripture<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Ῥωμαῖοι*. So the Byzantine writers *passim*. See J. E. Clarke, pp. 173—176.

<sup>2</sup> Not on account of the *languages* of the Western Romano-Gothic nations: for these were not Latin, though based on the Latin; but a mixt Patois, called *Romaunt*. See respecting the Romaunt my Chapter on the Waldenses, Vol. ii. p. 372.

<sup>3</sup> Jerome, as early as the time of the first Gothic invasion, applied the term to his countrymen, the Italian Romans. In his Preface to Isaiah he writes; "Quante difficultatis, ut *Latini* nostri mihi ignoscant, si prolixius locutus fuero." A century later, Justinian orders his Decrees to be written "*Latinis verbis inter Latinos*." Index on *Decretum*.

<sup>4</sup> This is the distinctive designation given by *Gibbon* to the Western Papal Kingdoms after the completed division of the empire:—by *Gibbon*, almost always accurate, almost always *Apocalyptic*, in his historic pictures and even phraseology! So Clarke, *ibid*. Even as regards the chief of the Latin kings, crowned "Emperor of the Romans" by the Pope, the Byzantine emperors, from after the times of Charlemagne and Lothaire I, "refused to prostitute to the kings of Germany the title of *Roman Emperors*." *Gibb*. ix. 195.

As examples in authentic documents of this appropriation of the title by the Papal kingdoms and Popes, J. E. Clarke cites two extracts: one from an edict of the *Council of Basle* (A.D. 1437) which designates itself as "*copiosissimam subventionem promissione Græcorum cum Latinis*:" the other from a *Bull of Pope Eugenius IV*, of nearly the same date, which speaks of the "*sanctissima Latinorum et Græcorum unio*."—So again the *Latin* kingdom of Jerusalem, &c.—It strikes me too as deserving notice, that in the German the more ancient mode of spelling the word has been retained,—*Latein*, *Lateinisch*; especially as the German Empire was so long the *Latin Empire*, in connexion with Rome.

<sup>5</sup> The Council of Trent, as is well known, declared the *Latin Vulgate* to be the only authentic version; and their Doctors have preferred it to the Hebrew and Greek text itself, though written by the prophets and apostles.—See the exemplification of this given by me in Vol. ii. p. 81, from Cardinal Ximenes.

is read in no other language under Popery than Latin. . . In short, all things are Latin."<sup>1</sup>

I subjoin in a note a few other of the more remarkable solutions of the Apocalyptic numeral enigma, bearing on the Papacy; <sup>2</sup> not as intending in the slightest measure to

<sup>1</sup> This extract is appropriately given by Bishop Newton, Clarke, and others. So too in Bale, p. 257, *infra*.

<sup>2</sup> Of other solutions of PAPAL APPLICATION, let me first give a few in *Greek*, then in *other languages*.\*

1. *Greek*.—1. Ἡ Λατινὴ βασιλεια: which in numbers = (8 + 30 + 1 + 300 + 10 + 50 + 8 + 2 + 1 + 200 + 10 + 30 + 5 + 10 + 1) = 666. This is Mr. Clarke's famous solution, with the more usual spelling of the word Λατινοϋ. He illustrates the remarkable nature of the solution by a list of above 400 other kingdoms, similarly, or otherwise legitimately expressed in Greek; but of which *not one* amounts in the number of its name to the precise value of 666.

2. Pareus gives, among other solutions, Ἰταλικά ἐκκλησια = (10 + 300 + 1 + 30 + 10 + 20 + 1 + 5 + 20 + 20 + 30 + 8 + 200 + 10 + 1) = 666. Here the Æolic termination of Ἰταλικά given may perhaps be considered legitimate, the Latin being of Æolic origin. I have tried the names of every other national Church instead of Ἰταλικά (*Italian*); —viz. *Greek, Nestorian, Eutyehian, Jacobite, Abyssinian, Armenian, English, Lutheran, Swedish, &c.*: but none else answers.

3. Παπισκοϋ (with the *diphthong*), given in the Codex Claromontanus of Irenæus (Clarke, p. 48): which in numerals = 80 + 1 + 80 + 5 + 10 + 200 + 20 + 70 + 200 = 666. —I give this for its curiosity, not correctness; the proper word for Pope being of course Παπας. But what the date of this marginal or interpolated reading? Was it before the xiith century? And is it the memorial of an unknown Greek Christian, suspecting the true character of the *Popes* as *Antichrist*, even before the Waldenses? See my Vol. ii. pp. 394, 420, &c.

<sup>3</sup> Αποστατης, an *apostate*; advocated by Wraugham and Faber.† Of which the number (if the σ be taken as the numeral σ' = 6) stands thus; (1 + 80 + 70 + 6 + 1 + 300 + 8 + 200) = 666.—The objection is, that the Greeks never in their *ισοψηφια* so counted the στ as contracted into the numeral σ': this latter having its origin not from any combination of σ and τ, (a strange idea!) but from the digamma.‡ Its form σ' was assumed afterwards. Thus Irenæus notices the number of *περιστέρα*, a dove, as 801; which arose from counting the σ and τ as 200 and 300. The same as regards *Χριστοϋ*, or *Χρειτοϋ*.§—Mr. Faber suggests that the mystery might consist in this very circumstance of the coincidence in form between the two signs being that which was afterwards to arise. But the objection of any such origin attaching to it as from *sigma-tau*, and of any such numeral use as of *sigma-tau* above-stated, seems obviously and altogether fatal. Moreover, were the mystery what Mr. F. makes it, how could the Christians of St. John's time be reasonably set on calculating the number?

\* While revising this work for my 4th Edition I observe in Malvenda, Vol. ii. pp. 194—199, a long list of words in solution of the enigma; but scarcely any that seem to me worth adding to my own list.

† i. e. in the Sacred Calendar. Its *original* solution was Λατινοϋ.

‡ Not so, objects Mr. Rabett, p. 18; not from the *digamma*; but "from the 6th Letter of the Samaritan Alphabet." He refers to Beverege's Arithmet. Chronol. p. 215.—If Mr. R. will read the learned summary of Eckhel on the subject, Vol. iv. pp. 383—390, he will see that the σ' came from the digamma, and the digamma from the Phœnician or Hebraic Alphabet. "De *episemi* Vau [sive notâ VI] origine et naturâ, deinde et valore, et cùm *digamma* Æolico nexu, hic nonnulla disputabimus," &c.—As to Mr. R.'s statement, as if from the learned Bishop Blomfield, that "the construction of the sigma-tau did not take its origin till the 13th or 14th century," I do not understand it. Eckhel, p. 383, gives all its various forms on the *old Syrian, Greek, and Roman coins*; and σ as the *most usual*. But, as to its *numeral* value, it was *never* used on Mr. Faber's principle, for στ, so far as I know; and such a use indeed seems to me not only absurd, but incredible. § See p. 251 Note 4.

interfere with that which I have urged as the one and only true solution, but for curiosity and information. And I would call attention very specially to Mr. Clarke's of 'H *Λατινη Βασιλεια*: which is indeed so remarkable that, were it but *the name of a man*, I should have thought the Divine Spirit might have had it also in view; as an alternative solution involving the word *Latin* in its more usual, though not the mystical, orthography. But that which alone completely answers to *every* requirement of the sacred enigma, and which I therefore fully and unhesitatingly believe to be the one intended by the Spirit, is Irenæus' solution, *ΛΑΤΕΙΝΟΣ*. And the total failure of every solution of other tendency, I mean of every one of which the object has been to turn away the application from the Popedom to some quite different enemy, or supposed enemy of Christ's Church, whether Pagan, Protestant, or<sup>1</sup> Mahom-

II. In *Latin* (see Clarke p. 60) we have, 1. VICARIUS GENERALIS DEI IN TERRIS: which is said, I think, to have been the appellation given to the Pope in the Council of Trent; and of which the successive numeral letters are V=6, I=1, C=100, I=1, V=5, L=50, I=1, D=500, I=1, I=1, I=1; altogether 666.—2. That of Irenæus, VICARIUS FILII DEI: of which Fleming's Editor (Ed. 1793) says, p. 138, that it was inscribed by some one of the Popes over the door of the Vatican.—3. Walter Brute (says Foxe iii. 185) proposed DEX CLERI.

To which let me add, 4. from Bishop Bedell, PAULO V. VICE DEO. I made mention, p. 182 *suprà*, of a Jesuit placing the picture of Pope Paul V at the head of a tower of Theses dedicated to him, with the inscription underneath, "*Paulo V Vice-Deo, Christianæ Reip. Monarchæ Invictissimo, et Pontificiæ Omnipotentis Conservatori Acerrimo*:" the copies of which Theses were sent as Novels from Rome. "This new title *Vice-Deo*," \* says Bedell's Biographer (p. 68), "and the addition of *Omnipotentis* gave much matter of wonder at Venice. And the next day it was omitted about the city that this was the picture of *Antichrist*; for that the inscription PAULO V VICE DEO contained exactly 666, the number of the Beast." It was Bedell himself who made the discovery, and communicated it to Paolo and the chief Divines; by whom it was laid before the Duke and Senate of Venice. Burnet says that it was entertained as if it had come from heaven; and was publicly preached on, as certain evidence that the Pope was Antichrist.

III. In *Hebrew* the most famous perhaps is רומית, *Romiith*, as the feminine of רומי, said to mean *Roman*, and supposed to agree with Hebrew words for *Kingdom*, *Beast*, or *Church*. But it is feminine, and so not the "name of a man." Moreover Mr. Clarke (p. 59) asserts that רומי does not mean *Roman*, but *Rôme*.

Similar to which is that which Foxe gives in his *Eicasm* in Apoc. רומניש, *Romanus*.

IV. Let me add a solution given in *Arabic*, in a Letter from Persia, by my late lamented friend *Robert Money, Esq.*, of the Bombay Civil Service. It is the Arabic word *Catoolikee Lateen*, of which the numerals are as follows:

ق	ط	و	ل	ك	ي	ا	ت	ي	ن	}	= 666.
60,	10,	400,	1,	30,	10,	20,	30,	9,	6,		

<sup>1</sup> It may be well to give a few chief examples, for the reader's satisfaction, of *other*

\* It was, however, by no means new. See what I have quoted from Innocent's Decretals, p. 182, Note <sup>4</sup> *suprà*; and, p. 153, of Pope Symmachus, some 800 years yet earlier.



medan, has only served to make it the more remarkable, and the more convincing.<sup>1</sup>

*than Papal reference*; whether as applied to PAGANISM, PROTESTANTISM, or MAHOM-MEDANISM.

I. PAGAN. Of these, 1st, the most plausible *Latin* solution is perhaps the one proposed by *Bossuet* in his Apocalyptic Exposition.

He suggests the name *Diocles Augustus*, as designating the great Pagan Imperial persecutor *Dioletian*; and of which the numeral letters amount to the required sum as follows: (D=500 + I=1 + C=100 + L=50 + V=5 + V=5 + V=5)=666.—But in the first place the objection occurs of its being a solution in *Latin*, whereas there is every reason (as before observed by me) to believe that *Greek* was the language intended: and one too in which more than half the letters are numerally valueless. Further, if *Diocles* was the original name of *Dioletian*, it was laid aside altogether on his elevation. Never was such a conjunction of titles seen, or heard of, as that of *Diocles Augustus*. See my examination of the Romish Præterist Apocalyptic Scheme, in the Appendix to my Vol. iv.

For Ewald's and Benary's *Hebrew* solution referring to Nero, נְרוֹ קַיִס, see p. 253.

II. PROTESTANT. 1. Such are the various words absurdly coined in Greek, *Latin*, Hebrew, with a view to its application to Luther:—e. g. Λουθερανα: the proper Greek version of his name being of course Λυθερος, Λυθηρος, Ληθερος, or Λυθηρος: also Σαζονεος, the *Saxon*; Σαζονικος being the proper adjectival form:—again, in Latin, *Martin Luter*; and in Hebrew לִיטְרֵר (Luther); with the absurd insertion of the 5. See Clarke, pp. 52, 58. 2. Equally absurd is that devised against *Huss* (apud Malvenda ii. 199), *Ιεαν 'Υς*.

III. MAHOMETAN. Here the most famous is that proposed by *Genebrard*, (Archbishop of Aix in Provence about 1580,) and followed by *Massuet*, viz. Μαωμερις, or Μωαμερις, to designate *Mahomet*. Bishop Walsley adopts it, and says that its orthography is established by the use of the word in *Euthymius*, *Cedrenus*, and *Zonaras*. And, with its orthography thus vouched for, so plausible did it appear to a learned writer in the *British Review*, No. 36, that he made it almost the basis of his scheme of Apocalyptic interpretation.—Strange indeed must it seem to a classical reader, even prior to examination, that the Greek Byzantines should have selected for a masculine appellation a termination in *ις*, properly feminine; not to say too that they should entirely leave unexpressed the Arabic guttural *h*, beginning the second syllable. And in fact, on examination, the asserted use of the word by *Euthymius*, *Cedrenus*, and *Zonaras*, turns out to be a direct falsehood. Mr. Clarke thus states the real facts of the case in regard of its use by the Byzantine Greeks; and, after personal examination, so far as I have had the opportunity, I can authenticate in good part his statements:—"There is nothing more false than this assertion; for, of the seven different ways in which Mohammed's name is written in Euthymius and the Byzantine historians, not one is the orthography in question. The seven different modes of writing his name are Μωαμερ, Μωαμεδ, Μωαμεθ, Μωαμεδ, Μωαμεθ, Μουχουμερ, and Μαχουμερ." Clarke, pp. 53, 54.\*

How could Mr. Burgh permit himself to write, as he has, (pp. 257, 446) that "the number 666 has by some been applied to *Pagan*, and by some to *Papal Rome*;—by the Protestant to the *Pope*, by the Papist to *Luther*, and by others to *Mahomet*; and with just as good warrant in all cases?" Not to speak of other points that have been fully discussed above, had *Luther* or *Mahomet* that local connexion with the *seven hills* which Mr. B. acknowledges that the Beast must have?

† Let me just add, though not seeing reason to suppose any such chronological mystery in the word, † that two curious *chronological* solutions of the word have been suggested; the *one* anti-Papal, the *other* Papal.

The one is that of the *Magdeburgh Centuriators*; who suggest that it was in the year A.D. 666 that the Papal command was issued by Pope *Vitalian* that public wor-

\* His authorities are *Euthymius*, *Nicetas*, *Cedrenus*, *Cananus*, *Zonaras*, *Theophanes*, *Constantine Porphyrogenitus*, and *Cantaeczenus*.

† I have only observed one ancient example of *chronological omen* from the number of the name; viz. in the case of 'Ρωμη: of which the number being 948, the Sibylline oracle predicted 948 years to be the duration assigned to Rome. So in B. viii. I have alluded to this in the Note, Vol. i. p. 231.

2. I am to show the application to the *Papal Clergy* of what is said of the *second Beast's imposing on men the mark, name, and number of the first Beast*, his principal:—the meaning being (if we transfer symbolic into plain language) that the Papal Hierarchy and Clergy, whether by legal enactment or otherwise, would cause the inhabitants of the Roman earth universally to *devote themselves to the Papal Antichrist*: and this both in *profession and action*,<sup>1</sup> even as *soldiers to their emperor, slaves to their master, devotees to their God*.

Now of all this the fulfilment stands out, and has indeed already been shown to do so, as palpable matter of fact in the history of Western Christendom. We have seen the enactment by General Council, (the *Image of the Beast*), under dictation of the congregated Western Hierarchy, of the famous Bull *Unam Sanctam*; which declared it to be

ship should be alone in *Latin*.—A view suggested by our English Protestant Centuriator Bale also; though not without reference too to the *Λατίνος*. “Vitellianus oratoris monachos in Angliam misit, . . . circa A.D. 666, qui à Christo nato numerus est nominis Bestiæ, ut fluctuantes in susceptâ fide Papisticâ confirmarent, et ut Antichristi caractere credentes suos signarent. Horas Latinas, cantiones Latinas, ceremonias missas et idolatrias Latinas, aliasque inanes nugas, ceremonias, &c., omnes in templis Latinè fieri disposuit, juxta Græcam dictionem *Λατίνος*, quæ per literas numerales predictum Bestiæ numerum perficit.” Script. Cent. i. p. 71.

The other is the application of the Beast's number to the duration of *Mahommedanism* and *Mahommed*, made by Pope Innocent III, in his Convocatory Bull to the 4th Lateran Council. After mentioning the Christians' possession of the Holy Land, &c., till the time of Gregory I, and a little later, he says; “Sed ex tunc quidam perditionis filius *Machomettus* pseudo-propheta surrexit. . . Cujus perfidia etsi usque ad hæc tempora invaluerit, confidimus tamen in Domino quòd finis hujus Bestiæ appropinquat: *cujus numerus*, secundum Apocalypsim Joannis, *intra sexcenta sexaginta sex clauditur*. . . Ex quibus jam pœne sexcenti sunt anni completi.” \* A.D. 1213. (Hard. vii. 3.)

Not very long after this Roger Bacon express the same opinion. “He interprets the prophetic number 666 as indicating the appointed term of the Mahometan apostasy; and joyfully anticipates the final downfall both of its empire and creed, as even then at hand, “aut per Tartaros (Holaghous Khan), aut per Christianos.” So in his *Opus Majus*, p. 167, says Forster; who himself interprets the 2d Beast as symbolizing Mahommedanism. *Hist. of Mahommedanism*, i. 232.

For Joachim Abbas' curious solution, making the first 6 of the numeral signify the world's six ages, &c.,—see my sketch of his Apocalyptic Scheme, in the App. to Vol. iv.

<sup>1</sup> “Accipiunt inscriptionem (notam scilicet criminis) in fronte, propter professionem; in manu, propter operationem.” Augustin De Civ. Dei, xx. 9. 3.

\* I must beg the reader not to pass from this extract without observing two things:—1st, that Pope Innocent, like one of the authors just before quoted, spelt the word Mahommed *Machomettus*, not *Maometis*: 2nd, that in reference alike to St. Paul's prophecy of the *Man of Sin* and the Apocalyptic prophecy of the *Beast*, he (the *Pope*) did not interpret them of an *individual* of brief duration, but of a *power and empire*, secular and ecclesiastical, already then of 600 years' continuance.

Take up what ground they may, whereby to escape from the application to themselves of the prophecies of Antichrist, the Romanist advocates are sure to be their own refuters.

essential to every man's salvation that he should be *subject* to the Roman See.<sup>1</sup> And, accordantly therewith, both the secular Priests and those of the monastic orders,—Benedictines, Dominicans, Franciscans, and afterwards Jesuits,<sup>2</sup>—having in the first instance taken on themselves the vow of obedience, and received the Romish crossing on their hands,<sup>3</sup> in public sign thereof, imposed it on all other classes. It was these that administered to Kings and Emperors the oath of submission, obedience, and fealty to Christ's Vicar the Pope;<sup>4</sup> these that marshalled the Crusaders as *soldiers* under the Roman Banner,<sup>5</sup> to do the bidding of their Papal Lord; these that inculcated on the people respect and reverence to him, even as to a *God*.<sup>6</sup>—And of this their devotedness they required a visible sign to be received, as in public profession. The Princes were to receive a ring on the fingers of their right hand from the consecrating priest, in token of it.<sup>7</sup> The Crusaders against heretics were to wear on their vesture the Papal cross.<sup>8</sup> On the commonalty,—on *all*,—*confirmation* by the Bishop (as well as baptism) was enjoined; and then the receiving from him in holy chrism the *cross* on the *forehead*.<sup>9</sup> This was to be the mark, or *character*, imposed: I use here the very Tri-

<sup>1</sup> See generally pp. 218, 235 *suprà*.

<sup>2</sup> See Mosh. xiii. 2. 2. 24. 26.

<sup>3</sup> *Sum Pontificale Romanum*, p. 49, (Ed. 1627,) on the ordination of priests. "Tu Pontifex cum oleo catechumenorum inungit unicuique ambas manus, simul junctas, in formam crucis:" and again; "Producit manu dextrâ signum crucis super manus illius quem ordinat." This before giving the candidate the cup and paten.—So too Martene de Rit. ii. 85.

<sup>4</sup> See p. 187.

<sup>5</sup> The Pope was wont to send the *Banner of St. Peter* to the crusaders, with the *Cross* and *Papal Keys*; as noted before, p. 211. See Ducange on *Vexillum S. Petri*.

<sup>6</sup> See, as before, p. 218.

<sup>7</sup> See Martene ii. 221—229; where different ceremonials of coronation of Emperors, Kings, and Dukes are given. In most the *ring* was to be put on the finger of the Prince with the words, "Accipe regie dignitatis annulum, et per hunc in te Catholicæ fidei cognosce signaculum."—In another the words are, "Accipe annulum, signaculum fidei sauctæ . . . per quæ scias . . . hostes repellere, hæreses destruere, et Catholicæ fidei perseverabilitati [sic] connecti." The King's hands too were anointed, after taking the oath of submission to the Pope. *Ibid.* 208, &c.

<sup>8</sup> So in the 4th Lateran Council, "crucis assumpto caractere." By the rule of Innocent IV they were also to bear a cross (inscribed, I presume) in their hands. *Ibid.* vii. 19, 83.

<sup>9</sup> There was to be a repetition of this sign of the cross by the people themselves. So Bellarmine in his *Dottrina Christiana Breve*. M. "In che consiste principalmente la Fede di Christo? D. In due misteri principali, che sono rinchiusi nel segno della Santa Croce;" adding: "Il segno della Santa Croce si fa mettendo primo la mano destra al capo, dicendo, In nome del Padre; poi sotto al petto, dicendo, E del Figliuolo; finalmente alla spada sinistra, ed alla destra, dicendo, E dello Spirito Santo."

dentine term.<sup>1</sup> Besides which, attendance on the Mass, confession to the priest, participation in the sacramental elements transubstantiated at consecration,<sup>2</sup> the solemn oath of allegiance to Rome,<sup>3</sup> and in the dying hour extreme unction,—these were further signs of profession imperatively inculcated. To those who complied there was understood to attach, in the patronage and favour of the Roman Church and Pope, a kind of amulet of salvation. And never surely did Gnostic rest on his mystic name and number with such superstitious faith in its efficacy, as the Papal devotee on these marks (the *crooked* marks<sup>4</sup>) of the Dragon-substituted Beast.

On the other hand, what to the recusants? The prophecy speaks of a tremendous *penalty*, enjoined by the second Beast, against all that would not assume the badge of devotion to the first Beast before him. "He caused that no man might *buy*, or *sell*, save he that had the mark or name of the Beast, or the number of his name." And has not precisely the same been shown to have been the enactment and practice of the Romish Hierarchy and Clergy against the heretics? A canon of the 3rd Lateran Council, under Pope Alexander III, commanded that no man should entertain or cherish them in his house or land,

<sup>1</sup> The Canon 9, Sess. 7, of the Council of Trent is entitled *De Characteribus*; and states the doctrine as follows. "Si quis dixerit in tribus Sacramentis, baptismo scilicet, confirmatione, et ordine, non imprimi *characterem* in animâ, hoc est signum quoddam spirituale et indelebile, unde ea iterari non possunt, anathema sit." Hard. x. 52.

On which Martin Chemnitz, in his *Examen Decretorum Concilii Tridentini*, observes thus: "Forsan autem tam pertinaciter Deus ipsos sinit dimicare, pro tuendâ opinione characteris in confirmatione et ordinibus, ut manifestum sit apud quos sit, et experitur, character ille enjus multa fit mentio."—Further, Junius thus observes on the above. "Their chrism by which in the sacrament of confirmation (as they call it) they make servile unto themselves the persons and doings of men, signing them in their *foreheads* and *hands*: and, as for the sign left by Christ, and of the holy sacrament of baptism, they make it void. For, whom Christ hath joined to himself by *baptism*, this Beast maketh challenge unto them by her greasy chrism; which he doubteth not to prefer before baptism both in authority and efficacy."

<sup>2</sup> Participation in the sacrament was enjoined once a year by the 4th Lateran Council, three times by the Council of Toulouse, in the 13th century. See my Vol. ii. p. 371.

<sup>3</sup> The *oath* of allegiance to Rome, "à singulis Catholicis præstandum," was enjoined in the 12th Canon of the same Council. Hard. vii. 178.

<sup>4</sup> *Heuman*, somewhat imaginatively, contrasts the sign  $\chi\rho\sigma$  of *Christ*, (as displayed in the *Labarum*, &c.) with that of the enigma so similar, but involving the  $\xi$  of the *crooked* serpent,  $\chi\xi\rho$ , 666.—And so indeed *Tichonius* before him. See my notice of him in the Appendix to Vol. iv.

Dr. Wordsworth still more imaginatively, I must say, suggests the figure of the Papal cross keys, in the Papal medals.

or *exercise traffic* with them.<sup>1</sup>—The Synod of Tours, (just when the Waldenses and Albigenses had begun to excite attention,) under the same Pope Alexander, passed a law that no man should presume to receive or assist the heretics, no not so much as to exercise commerce with them in *selling* or *buying*.<sup>2</sup> And so too, as express in Pope Martin's Bull, the Constance Council.<sup>3</sup> How the mass of the Clergy has urged its execution in other days throughout the Popedom is notorious. The history of Romish Ireland has furnished, and still furnishes, many recent examples. Witness the proceedings at Dingle, Achill, and elsewhere, wherever the preaching of the Gospel has had its converts. The same as regards the converts in Madeira, from the preaching of that man of God, Hewitson.<sup>4</sup> In fact the law remains unrepealed. This is still among the *debitæ pœnæ* due to heretics.—It was just the same fearful penalty of interdict from buying and selling, traffic and intercourse, that had been inculcated long before by the Pagan Dragon's representative, Diocletian, against the early Christians.<sup>5</sup> So literally on this point, as well as on others, was the prophetic statement about the lambskin-covered Beast fulfilled, "Having horns like a lamb, it spake as a dragon."

## CHAPTER IX.

### THE BEAST'S 1260 YEARS.

#### § 1.—THE YEAR-DAY PRINCIPLE.

THE Beast's predicted period of 1260 *days* reminds us that the time is now come for considering the propriety of that principle on which I have hitherto proceeded in my explanations of the several numerically expressed chronological

<sup>1</sup> "Ne quis eos in domibus vel in terrâ suâ tenere, vel fovere, vel negotiationem cum eis exercere, præsumat." Hard. vi. ii. 1684.

<sup>2</sup> "Ubi cogniti fuerint illius hæresis sectatores, ne receptaculum iis quisquam in terrâ suâ præbere . . . præsumat: sed nec in venditione aut emptione aliquid cum eis omnino commercium habeatur." Hard. ib. 1597. <sup>3</sup> Ib. viii. 908.

<sup>4</sup> See the sentence of excommunication pronounced against them in 1843, by the Papal Vicar-General at Funchal, in Hewitson's *Life*, pp. 155—157.

<sup>5</sup> So Bede in his Hymn on Justin Martyr, quoted by Mede and Newton :

periods enunciated in the Apocalyptic prophecy; <sup>1</sup> viz. of regarding a *day* as meant to signify a *year*. The great and notorious fact of the Popedom having lasted in power some 1200 *years*, or more, and seeming now near its dissolution, accordantly with the prophetic period of 1260 *days* assigned to the Beast, if construed on the *year-day* principle,—and that too of the accordance of prophecy and history on the same principle, in regard of the other Apocalyptic prophetic periods already discussed by me, viz. of the *five months* of the Saracen Woe, the *hour day month and year* of the Turkish, and the  $3\frac{1}{2}$  *days* of the slain witnesses seeming to lie dead,—cannot but help to impress conviction on my own mind of the truth of the principle. At the same time it is clearly desirable, and even requisite, on so important a point, to consider the grounds of the interpretation more at large; and to weigh with deliberation and candour the objections which Dr. S. R. Maitland and others have of late years so elaborately and so influentially advanced against it.<sup>2</sup> I purpose therefore in the present Section, *first* to state *the presumptive à priori evidence that suggests itself in its favour*, (I mean à priori to any supposed fulfilment,) not however without brief re-allusion to the subse-

Non illis emendi quidquam,  
Aut vendendi copia:  
Nec ipsam haurire aquam,  
Dabatur licentia:  
Antequam thurificarent  
Detestandis idolis.

Daubuz observes, p. 597, that this was one of the penalties of the brand of *arqua* among the ancient Greeks.

<sup>1</sup> Relating to the first or Saracenic Woe,—the Second or Turkish Woe,—the Witnesses' Death and Resurrection,—the Woman's travailing in birth, and subsequent destined sojourning in the Wilderness,—and the ten-horned Beast's time of prospering. See Vol. i. pp. 456, 521, 522, Vol. ii. p. 458, and in the present Volume pp. 19, 65, 161—163.

<sup>2</sup> Especially Mr. Burgh and Dr. Todd.—I select *Dr. R. S. Maitland*, because, I believe, it is allowed by every competent judge that of all the controversial writers on his side he is the one who has argued with the greatest learning and ability against the year-day system. His five principal Pamphlets on the subject are entitled, *An Enquiry into the 1260 years, &c.*; *A Second Enquiry*; and *Replies to the Morning Watch, Archdeacon Digby*, and *Mr. Cuninghame*; published respectively in the years 1826, 1829, 1830, 1831, 1834: also a subsidiary Pamphlet on *Antichrist*, published in 1830.

I am not aware that either *Burgh* or *Todd* have added anything to the strength of the cause. Their arguments are mainly *Dr. Maitland's*. This *Dr. Todd* has fully admitted; and, in acknowledgment, dedicates his work on *Antichrist* to him. It ought to be observed, however, that not a little of these arguments had been urged before by Romanist or German controversialists and critics.

quent corroborative evidence of history:—*next*, to state and answer Dr. Maitland's and others' *arguments against it*; especially the *indirect* arguments, in which consists in fact their main strength.—I reserve for my Appendix a more particular examination into those two great systems of Apocalyptic interpretation,—the *wholly past*, advocated by Bossuet, Stuart, &c., and *wholly future*, advocated by Dr. Maitland and his school,—which are alike based on the principle of the prophetic *day* being restricted to its simple *literal signification* of a day, the prophetic *καιρος* to its *literal signification* of a *year*.<sup>1</sup> This would here detain us too long. But, of course, if these systems be proved, as I believe they will be, utterly impossible, their fall must of itself involve the fall of the *day-day* chronological system, which is inseparable alike from the one of them and the other.

I. THE PRESUMPTIVE À PRIORI EVIDENCE AGAINST THE DAY-DAY, AND IN FAVOUR OF THE YEAR-DAY PRINCIPLE, IN DANIEL'S AND THE APOCALYPTIC PROPHECIES.

1. And here, 1st, let me suggest that which arises out of *the nature of the prophetic symbols*.

It is to be observed that the Apocalyptic prophecies to which the controversy relates are confessedly *symbolic* prophecies;—alike that of the scorpion-locusts, the lion-headed horses from the Euphrates, the two sackcloth-robed witnesses, the sun-clothed Woman driven into the wilderness, and the ten-horned Beast from the abyss and sea. At least this is confessed, on either side, in regard of all but the prophecy of the two Witnesses.<sup>2</sup> Now in such prophecies it were surely reasonable to expect, even prior to

<sup>1</sup> The principle applies, of course, not only to the prophetic chronological periods that are expressed in *days*, but to others expressed in *months* and *years*: not only to the 1260 *days*, but to its equivalents, *a time, times, and half a time*, (i. e. three and a half years,) and also *forty-two months*.

Let me take this opportunity of observing, in illustration of a *time καιρος*, meaning *a year*, and so the period of a *time times and half a time* being equivalent to  $3\frac{1}{2}$  years, or 1260 *days*, that Mr. Daubuz (p. 544) quotes from *Eustathius Antiochenus* the following; 'Η χειλιῶν γεννᾶ ἀπαξ τοῦ καιροῦ' once in the *year*:—also that the equality of the 42 *months* to 1260 *days*, appears from comparison of Gen. viii. 3, 4 with Gen. vii. 11; which fixes 30 days to the month.

<sup>2</sup> Dr. Maitland (see his *Second Enquiry*, pp. 16, 17) would understand nearly the *whole* of this prophecy literally; i. e. as predicated of two individual Prophets, who, after literally performing the signs described, are to be literally killed by some anti-

investigation, that a certain propriety and proportion of scale between the symbol and the thing symbolized would be observed in respect of the *time*, as well as of other circumstantials, noted in the picture. Could it be supposed that Scripture would quite neglect that canon of propriety, which natural taste has inculcated on the poet and the painter? I am speaking just now, it will be understood, of the observance of chronological proportion in a *general* way; not of the *particular year-day scale* of proportion. And, in proof that this is not unobserved in sacred symbolic prophecy, a single example may suffice:—it is one on which no difference of opinion can exist. In the xvth chapter of Ezekiel, the *Jewish nation* being symbolized under the figure of a *woman*, the *youthful period* of the nation is represented under the type of *that woman's youthful age*, and time of growth to womanhood: i. e. a period of some 400 years and more, from Isaac's birth to Israel's entering into covenant with God at Sinai, under that of some 15 or 20.<sup>1</sup>—Bearing this in mind, when we turn to a prophecy like that of the ten-horned Beast under consideration, and find from the parallel vision in Daniel that it represents the last of the four great empires of the world, each of long duration, in its last, most largely described, and most remarkable form,<sup>2</sup>—the simple fact of

christian person or power symbolized by the Beast, and then literally to rise from the dead, &c. So too (nearly) Mr. Burgh.

I must not omit to beg the Reader to mark here, in passing, a specimen of the fitfulness of the application of the literal principle by these interpreters:—the *Beast symbolic*; the *two Witnesses*, though in the same figuration, *literal*!

<sup>1</sup> A similar chronological proportion of scale, if I may so say, between the personifying symbol and nation symbolized, is observable in Isa. liv. 4, 6, Jer. ii. 2, xlviii. 11, Ezek. xxiii. 3, Hosea ii. 15, &c.

Even where the representative symbol is not a *person*, or *animal*, it may yet have its own scale of time, appropriate to the mutations figuratively ascribed to it in the picture or poem; and, if so, this is observed and applied. So, for example, in symbolizations under the figure of a *flower*, or longer-lived *tree*, in their state of growth and decline.—Indeed, even in symbolizations by wholly *inanimate* objects, a similar observance of the fit scale of time may be often seen. So e. g. in Horace's symbolization of the Roman nation, and its civil wars, under the figure of a storm-tossed ship returning into port;—"O navis referent, &c.;" where the *brieger* storm represents the *longer* civil commotions.

<sup>2</sup> Dan. vii. 17, 23; "These great Beasts are four *kings* which shall arise out of the earth." "The fourth Beast shall be the fourth *kingdom* upon earth."

We may observe here the interchange of *kings* and *kingdoms* in the Angel's explanation. Both Dr. Maitland (Second Enquiry, p. 11) and Mr. Burgh (Apocalyptic Comm. p. 250) are somewhat indignant at the year-day interpreters expounding the *ten horns* of the Apocalyptic Beast as *ten kingdoms*; whereas the Angel says, "These



the *miniature proportion of time* attaching to Ezekiel's *symbol*, in the example of miniature symbolization just referred to, might reasonably I think have induced suspicion even *à priori*, (I mean previous to the time of the fourth empire passing into the form to which the chronological period of the 1260 days had reference,) that these 1260 days,—a term in its *literal* sense not inappropriate as predicated of a *symbolic Beast's* time of chief vigour,—might yet be intended to *figure some much longer time*, as that of *the empire symbolized*.

2. There arises a presumption in favour of the principle contended for out of God's declared purpose of *making the near approach of the consummation evident at the time of its approaching*; yet, *till then, so hidden as to allow of Christians always expecting it*.

"It is not for you," said Christ to his disciples, "to know the times or the seasons;" when asked by them after his resurrection, whether that was to be the epoch of the restoration of its ancient dominion to Israel, as Messiah's destined kingdom.<sup>1</sup> And yet he had also declared most distinctly that there should be such signs, and such evidence, for some little time before his coming to establish his kingdom, (just as the budding fig-tree was a sure sign of approaching summer,) that the disciples then living would be able undoubtingly to gather from them that it was nigh, even at the doors:<sup>2</sup>—a declaration well agreeing with that with which Daniel's Book closes, that the prophecy was to be sealed only till the time of the end; and then knowledge

are *ten kings* that shall arise." The precedent above given might have satisfied them.—"In Dan. vii. 17," says Gesenius, "קִנְיָוֹת [lit. *kings*] stands for *kingdoms*."

Properly speaking, I conceive, the *ten horns* represent each one a *line of kings*; and the *body of the Beast* the *popular constituency*, (some way federatively united under a common head,) of their ten kingdoms.

<sup>1</sup> Acts i. 7.

<sup>2</sup> Matt. xxiv. 32, 33.—Olshausen, in answer to the alleged inconsistency of Matt. xxiv. 34, "This generation shall not pass away," &c., compared with verse 36, "But of that day and hour knoweth no man," thus replies. "The mode of expression here adopted is the only one that can be conceived of as suited to the circumstances of the case. Had Christ intended to say that his coming was yet very distant, such a statement would have entirely destroyed the ethical import of the prophecy; viz. the incitement to watchfulness which it was designed to produce. And if, on the other hand, he had said nothing at all about the time when these things would come to pass, this total negativeness would have been no less paralyzing in its influence."

Says Grotius, De Ver. Relig. Christ. ii. 7; "Deo de industriâ suum in hoc consilium celante, Christiani mundi exitium quasi de proximo imminens opprobriantur."

to be increased, and the wise to understand.<sup>1</sup> Now, with regard to this latter declaration by Christ, I see not how such an assurance could be come to by Christians living at the time, with any feeling of strong conviction, unless that self-same epoch might appear to be clearly marked out in prophecy, as the term of some prolonged prophetic chronological period, dated from a known epoch of commencement, and marked by characteristic events as waymarks in its progress continuously, even to the consummation. Any mere present signs, such as of the wars, famines, pestilences, or gospel-preaching, spoken of in Matt. xxiv., would *by themselves* be scarce sufficient; seeing that in the world's subsequent history such have occurred already, and yet the end has hitherto not taken place.—It was with a kind of instinctive sense of the necessity of some such chronological evidence, in order to a justification of their impressions as to the then nearness of the consummation, that the ancient fathers made appeal to a supposed typical indication that our world's duration, in its present form, was limited by God to six thousand years; of which six millennaries, according to the chronology most current among them, a short remnant only then remained.<sup>2</sup> Of course such an inference from the type of the six days of creation might be fanciful; and the truth of the Septuagint mundane chronology on which they rested more than questionable.<sup>3</sup> I only adduce the case as showing their instinctive sense of the necessity of some such evidence, drawn from a prolonged prophetic period, in order to the justification of any express conviction as to the nearness of the world's ending. And many at the present time, who put aside the idea of any such chronological evidence having been given to fix the epoch of Christ's coming, confess unconsciously to the same necessity, by acknowledging their own utter uncertainty whether it may be near, or still *ages* distant.<sup>4</sup>—But then, ad-

<sup>1</sup> Dan. xii. 4, 9, 10. The Rabbi Nachmann, in a passage which will be cited presently under the second main head in this Chapter, comments on this passage to much the same effect.

<sup>2</sup> See my Vol. i. pp. 231, 395—398.

<sup>3</sup> See my critical notice of the subject in the concluding chapter of this Apocalyptic Commentary.

<sup>4</sup> "Of the yet remaining length of Rome's career we know nothing certain from prophecy. It may be that the sorceress has still before her *long ages* of iniquity: it

mitting this, and by consequence admitting the probable revelation of some long prophetic period, or periods, bearing on that great event, like those I speak of, the question occurs, how could such revelation consist with Christ's other declaration as to its not being given to Christians to know the times and the seasons, at least not until the time of the end,—and as to their duty of ever looking for Christ's coming, as what might happen even in their own days,—supposing that those periods were express in their *literal plainness*? Surely it would need that they should be express under a kind of *chronological cypher*, if I may so say, susceptible of explanation on a smaller or a larger scale; and perhaps too, let me add, that more than one possible epoch of commencement should attach to them.—To the conclusion thus arrived at from abstract reasoning the corroboration of *precedent* is not wanting. Precisely such a chronological, but ambiguously express, kind of evidence was given in Daniel's 70 hebdomads, to prepare God's people, as the time drew near, for Christ's *first coming*:—those hebdomads being etymologically explicable on a smaller scale of time, or a larger; of *days*, or *months*, it might be, or of *years*; and their commencing epoch (that of the going forth of a certain decree for the rebuilding of Jerusalem) one which might fairly be construed of *Cyrus'* decree, *primarily*, as well as of those of Darius and Artaxerxes, *secondarily* and *thirdly*.<sup>1</sup> Now is it likely that there should have been given evidence like this, to keep the Jews in expectation and waiting for *Christ's first coming*; and that, as regards *his second coming*, all such evidence should be wanting?—It will be observed that the reason here given for some such chronological ambiguity as I speak of is quite distinct from, and independent of, that arising out of the symbolic nature of certain chronological prophecies, mentioned before; though cases might be, and such indeed are those of the several Apocalyptic chronological prophecies,

may be that we are now resisting her latest arts." So Mr. C. Maitland; Apostolic School of Prophecy, p. 404.

<sup>1</sup> That of Cyrus (Ezra i. 1) B.C. 536; that of the second year of Darius Hystaspes (Ezra iv. 24, vi. 1, Hag. i. 1) B.C. 520; that of the 7th of Artaxerxes (Ezra vii. 7) B.C. 458; and of the 20th of Artaxerxes (Neh. ii. 1), B.C. 445. I give Mr. Fynes Clinton's dates.

in which the two reasons might co-exist, and apply together.

3. And this leads me to speak of *the particular chronological cypher* involved in the prophetic periods which concern my present argument; and of the *a priori* probability of its being that of a *day* for a *year*.

First and foremost there suggests itself in favour of this *year-day* cypher the self-same chronological prophecy of Daniel's 70 hebdomads of which I was just speaking. For the Hebrew word *shabua* there used, and which I translate *hebdomad*, though etymologically applicable to *any* septenary measure of time, was yet in Scripture, when standing *by itself*, so as in Dan. ix. 24—27, without any adjunct to define *what* measure of time, used simply and solely, if I mistake not, of septenaries of *days*.<sup>1</sup> Insomuch that they who first heard the prophecy might very naturally have supposed that Messiah's coming was to be but 70 sevens of *days* after the issuing of the edict; and thus perhaps been the more quickened to take zealous part in the return from Babylon, and restoration of Jerusalem. Nor probably were they disabused of such mistaken expectations, and led to regard the period as one of 70 sevens of *years*, until the 70 sevens of *days*, (perhaps too till the 70 sevens of *months*),<sup>2</sup> reckoned from the last of the several Persian Edicts for Jerusalem's restoration, had past away without Messiah's manifestation.<sup>3</sup> Now, were there to be ambiguity of expression in the prophetic chronological periods respecting the time of Christ's *second* coming, what so probable an ambiguity as that which attached to the prophetic chro-

<sup>1</sup> See p. 274 *infra*.

<sup>2</sup> Chrysostom Adv. Judæos B. v. recognises this triple ambiguity of the prophetic term in itself, and the decision of its particular value by the event. 'Ἑβδομαδες γὰρ ενταυθα οὐκ ἡμερῶν φησιν, οὐδὲ μῆνων, ἀλλ' ἐνιαυτῶν.

<sup>3</sup> In connexion with this point the time of Malachi's prophesying seems to me observable. According to Usher the date of this was about B.C. 416. Others date it a little earlier, or a little later. Now since 70 hebdomads of *months*, or 490 months, would equal 41 years, and since, if we deduct this time from 458 B.C. the epoch of Artaxerxes' first Decree, the date resulting is 417, and deducting it from 445, the epoch of Artaxerxes' second Decree, the date resulting is 404 B.C., it follows that Malachi prophesied just as this last concluding epoch of Daniel's prophecy of the 70 hebdomads was expiring, construed on the principle of their meaning hebdomads of *months*; and when consequently it might be needful that the Jews should be afresh reassured as to the certainty of Messiah's coming. "The Lord whom ye seek," said Malachi, "shall suddenly come to his temple:" adding that a special messenger, like Elijah, would be sent, as the immediate herald and precursor before him.

nological period that defined the time of Christ's *first* coming?<sup>1</sup>

Besides which prophetic precedent there was the famous parallel case of the prophet Ezekiel's symbolic representation of *years* by *days*, during the self-same Babylonish captivity in which Daniel's prophecies were delivered. We read that in the 5th year of Jehoiachin's captivity (B.C. 594), having been solemnly instituted to the prophetic office, Ezekiel was directed to make known to his fellow-exiles by the river Chebar, near the Euphrates, both the impending fate of Jerusalem, then soon about to be besieged, together with its last king Zedekiah, by the forces of the king of Babylon, and also God's reason for the judgment.<sup>2</sup> With which object he was to exhibit, sketched on a tile, a picture of Jerusalem as besieged by the enemy: himself lying prostrate with his face toward the pictured city, first 390 days on his left side, then 40 days upon his right side; and being restricted all the while to what was almost a famine diet, like the poor Jews whom he thus represented, shut up under the straitness of the siege in Jerusalem. But wherefore this abandonment of them by God, to sufferings such as he exhibited in the character of their representative: and wherefore these particular and prolonged periods of his prostrate attitude? "Thou shalt lie upon thy *left* side," it was said, "and lay the iniquity of the house of *Israel* upon it. For I have laid upon thee the *years* of their iniquity, according to the number of the *days*, 390 days; so shalt thou bear the iniquity of the house of Israel. And, when thou hast accomplished them, thou shalt lie again on thy right side; and shalt bear the iniquity of the house of Judah, 40 days. I have appointed thee each *day* for a *year*." It seems a little doubtful what the prophet's prostrate posture was to designate: whether Israel's long previous debasement in idolatry;<sup>3</sup> or its then present and

<sup>1</sup> A more particular and critical discussion of this argument from the hebdomads of Daniel will be given under the head of objections: one of the grand objections urged against the *year-day* theory having reference to it.

<sup>2</sup> Ezek. iv. 1—17; the date being given Ezek. i. 2. Compare 2 Chron. xxxvi. 9, 10.

<sup>3</sup> So Vitringa on Is. i. 2 (vol. i. pp. 34, 37); who reckons the 300 years of *Israel's* apostasy from the 4th year of Rehoboam to Zedekiah's captivity; *Judah's* 40 years of apostasy from the 13th of Josiah to the same terminating epoch.

On the same view the 390 years is dated by Archbishop Newcome from Jeroboam's

long future prostration of helplessness, distress, and punishment.<sup>1</sup> But, however that might be, this is expressly stated, that the number of *days* he was to lie signified the number of the *years* of Israel's sin, or punishment: a *day*, on the symbolic man's part, a *year* on the part of the nation symbolized.—This was surely a very remarkable example of the *year-day* principle, in an act of *symbolization* by God's prophet: and all in accordance with my primary argument drawn from the propriety of a miniature measure of *time*, in case of a miniature type or symbol, as of an individual for a *nation*. How indeed could Ezekiel have lain 390 *years* recumbent?<sup>2</sup>

Add to this the principle observed in the divinely ordained Jewish institutions of parallelizing certain periodical festivals of *days* by similar periodical festivals of *years*, (c. g. the 7th sabbath *day* by the 7th sabbath *year*,<sup>3</sup>) besides other more particular analogies,<sup>4</sup> and we shall see how na-

setting up the calves, B.C. 975, to the final sacking of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar's army, about B.C. 586. Judah's 40 years include, according to the same expositor, 15½ years of Manasseh's reign, 2 of Ammon's, 11 of Jehoiachim's, 3 months of Jehoiachin's, and 11 years of Zedekiah's; in all 40 of which (interrupted however by the pious Josiah's reign) gross idolatry had prevailed in Judah.

Possibly, if so, there may have been allusion in the prophet's posture, pressing with his weight upon the ground, to the manner in which God had been so many years wearied by Israel's sins: as in Amos ii. 13; "I am pressed under you, as a cart is pressed that is full of sheaves." Thus *Wagenseil* ("Tela Ignea," Mantissa de LXX Hebrdom. p. 61) writes on the passage; "Propheta super latus dextrum et sinistrum tot dies cubare jubetur quot annos *Deus* domûs Israelis, et domûs Judæ, *peccata tacitus pertulerat*."

<sup>1</sup> So (as Bp. Horsley in loc. observes) *Jerome* in ancient times; who reckons Israel's 390 years of punishment from Tiglath Pileser's conquest of the land of Naphtali, in the reign of Pekah King of Israel, to the decrees that restored liberty to the Jews in the last year of Artaxerxes Mucmon, whom he supposes the Ahasuerus of Queen Esther: or else from Pul's invasion in the reign of Menahem, 12 years before Pekah, with the end 12 years earlier in the reign of the same Artaxerxes. The 40 years of *Judah's* punishment *Jerome* reckons from the 1st of Jehoniah to the 1st of Cyrus:—a chronology (as Horsley observes) requiring correction.

*Venema*, who similarly views the posture as one of *punishment*, suggests that Ezekiel's 430 days of prostration had a double *prophetic* reference: the one, in the literal sense of *days*, to the 400 or 500 days of *Jerusalem's* siege by Nebuchadnezzar; the other, in the sense of *years*, to the Jews' prolonged period of servitude and affliction, from the temple's destruction to the establishment of better times under the Maccabean Prince Jonathan. (Compare Haymo, p. 280 *infra*.) "A destructo enim templo per Chaldaeos usque ad principatum Judæ Maccabæi sunt anni 421; adde Judæ sex, et tres Jonathanis; habes 430." In Dan. xii. 1—3. § 239.

*Bishop Horsley*, on Ezek. iv., inclines to the same general view.

<sup>2</sup> So M. Stuart ii. 461. He forgets however that what could not be done by a symbolic man in real life could not with propriety be predicated of him, or of any animal of similarly limited existence, in the symbols of vision.

<sup>3</sup> Levit. xxv. 3.

<sup>4</sup> Especially in the case of the spies, Numb. xiv. 34: "After the number of the days in which ye searched the land, even *forty days*, each day for a year, shall ye

tural it must have been for the Jews to suppose that Daniel's period of the 70 hebdomads meant hebdomads of *years*, if they did not mean hebdomads of *days*. The same of course as regards his other great prophetic periods, reaching to the consummation; <sup>1</sup> more especially those with

bear your iniquities; even *forty years*:" the *days* having reference to the representative individuals, the *years* to the nation.

This case is of course not a direct or complete one to our point. Presuming the ten spies to have indulged in unbelief all the *forty days* of their travelling through Canaan, (a supposition not improbable,) and the body of the Israelites to have maintained the same murmuring, unbelieving spirit, during the *forty years* in the wilderness, so as indeed is stated in the passage, "Forty years long was I grieved, &c."—then the *forty days' sin* of the representatives might perhaps he said to have *figured* the *forty years' sin* of the people represented. But, according to the account in Scripture, it seems rather a proportion between the times of the *sin* and of the *punishment*. Israel, by assenting to the spies' unbelief, took on itself their *forty days' sin*; and was sentenced, in consequence, to *forty years' punishment*.

Let me take occasion to allude to a prophecy generally overlooked, that in Isa. xx. 2, 3, as perhaps involving the year-day principle. "The Lord spake to Isaiah, Go loose the sackcloth from off thy loins, and put off thy shoe from thy foot. And he did so, walking naked and barefoot. And the Lord said; Like as my servant Isaiah hath walked naked and barefoot *three years*, for a sign . . . on Egypt and on Ethiopia, so shall the king of Assyria lead away the Egyptians and Ethiopians captives." Now it appears that it was in *three years* that the Assyrians were to conquer and enslave Egypt. And, if the reader will consult *Vitringa*, or other critics (e. g. some in the *Critici Sacri*) on the passage, he will find that the meaning of verse 3 may be, that Isaiah walked barefoot *for a sign of three years*, or of what was to happen in or for three years, to Egypt. And Vitranga makes the suggestion, (in which Dr. A. Clarke follows him,) that Isaiah may probably have walked *three days*, on the *year-day* principle, in symbol of the *three years*.

An example of a different kind occurs in Amos iv. 4: a passage thus translated in our authorized version, "Bring your tithes after *three years*;" (compare Deut. xiv. 28;) but in which the original is  $\text{אַחֲרֵי שְׁלֹשָׁה יָמִים}$ , "after three of *days*."

<sup>1</sup> I do not except the "*seven times*" specified in Nebuchadnezzar's vision, as the appointed time of the royal tree continuing cut down, from the category of chronological prophecies to which the *year-day* principle is probably to be applied. The tree itself primarily symbolized Nebuchadnezzar: and, as there was nothing of a *miniature scale* in the symbol, as compared with the thing so symbolized, the *seven years*, if predicated of the *tree* in the first instance, which seems very doubtful,\* might yet, without violation of propriety, symbolize an equal period of desolation to the *monarch*. But the question still remains, Did Nebuchadnezzar experience this most extraordinary judgment and recovery simply in his *individual* character, or as a *symbolic man*: (see my Vol. i. p. 301:) i. e. as the mystical representative of the Assyrian empire and Babylon, governed by him? For my own part, considering the extraordinary nature of the judgment,—the fact of its being so fully recorded by Daniel,—the circumstance of Nebuchadnezzar being addressed on occasion of another prophecy as the representative of his nation, ("Thou art the head of gold,")—and that of the symbolic tree, when cut down, being bound with a band of *brass* and *iron*, the metals significant of the *Greek* and *Roman Empires*, which for ages held sway over the prostrate region of Babylon,—all these considerations, united with that of the prediction that *Assyria* specifically is to recover in the latter day from its apostasy, (see Isa. xix. 24, 25,) induce me to suspect that *Nebuchadnezzar's in-*

\* The Decree, "Let seven times pass over *him*," (Dan. iv. 16,) might, it seems to me, be applied to the living *person* symbolized, (whoever that might be,) as well as to the *tree* symbolizing:—especially as what is said in the immediate context of his "having a portion with the beasts of the field," could scarce be applied to the tree; still less that which is added, "And let a beast's heart be given him."

which we are here more immediately concerned of the 1260 days. They too might seem similarly susceptible of explanation, in the sense of a *day* for a *year*.

4. And if, even *à priori*, such might seem a fair judgment about them, how much more so *now* when, as already observed at the beginning of this Chapter, so many prophetic periods have apparently had a year-day fulfilment:—when too the ten kingdoms, (kingdoms singularly answering to the ten toes of Nebuchadnezzar's image, and ten horns of Daniel's Wild Beast,) that sprang up, as we have seen, out of the ruin of the Western Empire in the 5th and 6th centuries, after continuing in much the same divided form for about 1200 *years*, seem now on the eve of some new organization; and when the Papal power, that sprang up coincidentally with those ten kingdoms, the very counterpart of that little horn among the Beast's ten horns which had the duration of  $3\frac{1}{2}$  times or 1260 *days* of power assigned it, after lasting in power for some 1200 *years*, seems also on the eve of some fateful change and catastrophe!—On this point however I will not just at present dwell further. I may briefly recur to it ere concluding this Chapter; and to the unnatural view of the prophecies in question to which the day-day theory forces those who *now* embrace it.—Let us for the present turn to consider the *objections* of objectors.

## II. OBJECTIONS TO THE YEAR-DAY PRINCIPLE, AS APPLIED TO THE PROPHECIES IN QUESTION.

Of these objections some are *more direct*; some (indeed the chief part) *indirect*. They may with advantage be considered separately.

### 1. And of the *direct* let me, 1st, mention Dr. S. R. Mait-

sanity and degradation typified that of *his empire* in its apostasy from God; and the *seven times 360 days*, that past over him in that state, the *seven times 360*, or 2520 *years*, that would have to be completed, ere Assyria's recovery to a sound mind at the termination of the *times of the Gentiles*.\*

---

\* We must remember it is not unprecedented for an individual person to be made the subject of a prefigurative vision, and yet himself to prefigure in that very action, or character, something future. So Joseph and his brethren, for example, were symbolized in the dream of the sun, moon, and stars;—their own history being not improbably typical, as many expositors have suggested, of that of Christ and the Jews.



land's general objection to arguments, such as I have urged primarily, drawn from the propriety of a *lesser* time in a miniature *symbol* being made figurative of a larger time in the *real thing symbolized*.

The objection, which seemed not a little obscure and enigmatic in the first instance, (and indeed still seems so),<sup>1</sup> was in fine thus elaborated by its author. "You take (if I may so speak) the *word* goat to mean the *thing* goat, and the *thing* goat to represent the *thing* king: but you take the *word* day (not to represent the *thing* day, but) at once to represent the *thing* year:—and this is precisely the point which distinguishes the case from that of Ezekiel." But this representation rests altogether on misapprehension. Our reasoning in explaining the prophecies under consideration is in fact not different, but precisely the same, as in explaining Ezekiel's precedents;—alike the general one first cited by me, and that too to which Dr. M. alludes in particular. For just as, on the woman's symbolizing Israel, the *woman's youth*, of short duration, was used to symbolize the *nation's youth*, of long duration,—and as, on Ezekiel's symbolizing Israel, *his 390 days* of prostration figured *Israel's 390 years* of prostration, whether in sin or punishment,<sup>2</sup>—so, on the hypothesis of the Beast symbolizing Antichrist and Anti-Christendom, we contend<sup>3</sup> that the *1260 days* predicated of the *Beast's* being in power, were meant to figure *1260 years* as the duration in supremacy and power of the *empire of Antichrist*.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> In his Second Enquiry, p. 3, Dr. M. had thus expressed himself, in speaking of his opponent. "If by the word *day* he means *day*, as much as by the word *goat* he means *goat*, all further argument on my part would be needless." On this a Reviewer in the Investigator (Vol. i. pp. 429, 430) observed, that, while fully admitting what Dr. M. required, he did not therefore approximate at all nearer to his conclusion; and at the same time expressed a doubt whether he rightly understood his meaning. In a subsequent Publication, the *Reply to Mr. Cuninghame*, p. 105, Dr. M., noticing the Reviewer's remark, confesses to a consciousness of the difficulty of clearly expressing his argument, and then (p. 106) propounds it in the words given above in my text.

Perhaps, adds Dr. M., Wagenseil (Mantissa de 70 Hebd. p. 61) meant something of the same objection, when thus writing on Ezek. iv. 6; (this is in immediate sequel to the passage cited by me p. 269 supra:) "Hic ergo vox *dies* ad *annum* significandum *physicè*, ut ita loquar, adhibetur, non *grammaticè*." But the *physicè* is surely quite sufficient for our purpose.

<sup>2</sup> See Venema's view to the latter effect, cited p. 269 Note<sup>1</sup> supra.

<sup>3</sup> I ought perhaps to have used the first person singular, not plural; as other year-day interpreters might possibly prefer to state the case otherwise.

<sup>4</sup> A distinction has been thought to be made by Dr. M. between *numeral visible symbols* and *numeral periods expressed orally*; as if the *former* might properly, and

2. As regards my *second* presumptive argument, drawn from Christ's declaration that, though it was not given to Christians to know the times and seasons, yet, as the time of the consummation drew near, there should be evidence of it sufficiently clear to each faithful inquirer,—conditions necessitating, it was said, the evidence of *chronological periods* reaching to the event, but *mystically exprest*, it is of course, from its very nature, not subject to the objection against *mystically exprest* periods that has been urged by Dr. Maitland and others from sundry prophetic periods known to be *literally exprest*, in prophecies *where no such temporary concealment was intended*.<sup>1</sup>—But then, on the other hand, comes Mr. K. Arnold's quite different objection as to the *ineffectiveness* of any such mystically exprest prophetic periods to produce conviction, at the time when they *should* produce it. Because, says he, at the arrival of the time to which the period had seemed to point, construed on the *year-day* principle, some new idea might arise of the prophetic day's value: e. g. of its standing for 1000 *years*, rather than *one year*; according to the saying that "one day is with the Lord as 1000 years."<sup>2</sup> But the distinct limitation of the prophetic ambiguity of expression to that between *days* and *years*, in our two grand precedents of the 70 hebdomads announced by Daniel, and the symbolizations of time acted out by Ezekiel,

on this account, be construed *figuratively*, the *latter* not so: a reference having been made by him to the dreams of Pharaoh and his butler and baker, in proof that chronological number *might* be represented, as well as other circumstantials of the picture, to the *eye*. The Reviewer in the Investigator before alluded to, noticing this, (i. 430,) observes justly that a large number, like 1260 or 2300, could not be visibly represented like a small one, such as in each of the dreams referred to.\*

The Reviewer supposes Dr. M. also to maintain that, *unless declared and explained*, so as in Ezekiel's case, we may not argue from it for a *year-day* interpretation of other periods of *days* noted in symbolic prophecies. And he justly answers; "We are bold to say that he would find no 'express warrant' in Scripture for the explanation of one half the types, symbols, and figures it contains: and (so) no man would be justified in giving any interpretation to them, fulfilled or unfulfilled." Ib. p. 432.—Mr. Burgh makes a similar objection, p. 443.

<sup>1</sup> Maitland, Sec. Enquiry, p. 30; M. Stuart ii. 460.

<sup>2</sup> Strictures, p. 63.

\* The Reviewer says, respecting those dreams; "Why a certain number of *branches* and *baskets* should mean *days*, while a number of *kine* (and *ears of corn*) signified *years*, we apprehend no man could determine."—I imagine that the wine-cup bearing and the bread-basket bearing were *daily* acts; and that so each basket, and each vine-branch to be squeezed into the wine-cup, might fitly signify a *day* to their bearers: again, that each ear of corn being a type of its harvest, and each kine of its generation,—and the harvests being *annual*, and the kine calving *annually*,—seven of them might as fitly figure seven *years*.

might almost of itself suffice to contravene the force of any such objection. Besides that it is not this evidence *by itself* that we suppose to operate conviction with the inquirer. By no means. We suppose it to be in conjunction, as before said,<sup>1</sup> with the fulfilment already of previous connected predictions, standing out like waymarks in the continuous chain of prophecy; and also with that of "signs of the times:"—signs of events actually passing, as the consummation draws nigh, on the world's theatre; and these striking, various, and characteristic.

3. Then, as to the *year-day* scale itself, and the great primary *precedent* urged for it of *Daniel's* 70 *shabuas*, or *hebdomads*, our objectors, while admitting that the only ambiguity of meaning in the prophetic word *shabua* was whether it meant a hebdomad of *days* or of *years*, (an admission of great importance,) do yet contest the force of Mede's declaration as to its being a word always *used* in sacred Scripture, *when standing by itself*, so as in Daniel, for a hebdomad of *days*; and consequently one which needs the application of the *year-day principle*, to give it the value of seven *years*, its here confessedly true value.<sup>2</sup> For awhile I was myself led aside by the arguments and assertions of Dr. S. R. Maitland and Dr. M'Caul, to suppose it incorrect or exaggerated. But more careful attention to the matter convinces me of Mede's correctness. Taking the Masoretic pointing there are but *eleven* Scripture passages that contain the exact noun, either in its singular or other forms, without any defining word of time following it, besides the *six* in the prophecy before us. And in *every* case these have the sense of *hebdomads of days*. I subjoin a list of them.<sup>3</sup> Dr. S. R. Maitland has indeed stated that in the

<sup>1</sup> p. 265.

<sup>2</sup> So at least Dr. Maitland and his friend and coadjutor Dr. M'Caul confess, in common with the mass of Protestant expositors. But Dr. Todd and others regard even this prophecy of the seventy weeks as still unfulfilled. See p. 290 *infra*.

The early Fathers too differed about it. *Ireneus* and *Hippolytus* interpreted it as to be fulfilled in the time of Antichrist before Christ's *second* coming; *Chrysostom* and *Augustine*, as fulfilled on Christ's *first* coming. See especially the Epistles of *Augustine* and *Hesychius*, Ep. 198, 193, in the Benedictine Edition of *Augustine*.

<sup>3</sup> The passages are as follows: in the *singular*, Gen. xxix. 27, 28; \* in the *dual*,

\* *Josephus* has suggested that this may be used of the second septenary of *years* of Jacob's service. But Dr. M'Caul admits, with the mass of expositors, that there is here meant by it a septenary of days. And so indeed the context plainly proves.

Mishna the word is used *by itself* with reference to *years*, as well as *days*. But the Rabbinical use of it, two or three centuries after the Christian æra, cannot counterpoise the different use of it in Scripture.—As to *Ezekiel's* precedent also, I must add, it has been objected that it was a symbolic representation of the *past*, not of the *future*. But this, we have seen, is doubtful. Nor, even admitting it to be so, can I see how this affects our inference from the example, as marking out the use of the *year-day* principle by God's prophets, in symbolizations of time.

4. As to the actual asserted fulfilments in past history of certain of the prophetic periods, construed on the *year-day* scale, objection has been made to one and another of them as unsatisfactory. All quite, as it seems to me, without reason; at least in regard of the fulfilments as stated by myself, more exactly, I believe, than by most of my predecessors. But in all these cases the Reader has the facts before him; and can best judge for himself.

Next, as to the *indirect* objections of objectors;—more especially those set forth by Dr. S. R. Maitland. These have reference to *the novelty of the system*,—to *the differences and the unsatisfactoriness of Apocalyptic expositions based on it*,—and to *certain insuperable difficulties with regard to historical facts*, which he asserts to be necessarily involved in it.<sup>1</sup>

1. *The novelty of the year-day principle of interpretation; as one altogether unknown in the Christian Church from the days of Daniel to those of Wicliffe.*<sup>2</sup>—The state-

Lev. xii. 5; in the *plural*, Exod. xxxiv. 22, Deut. xvi. 9, 10, 16, Numb. xxviii. 26, 2 Chron. viii. 13, Jer. v. 24.—Besides which there are three passages where the defining word of time  $\text{יָמִים}$ , *days*, is added; viz. Dan. x. 2, 3, and Ezek. xlv. 21. On the details, and Hebrew criticisms connected with these passages, I must refer my readers to a Paper in the Appendix.

<sup>1</sup> Dr. M.'s several grounds of objection are thus briefly summed up by himself at the end of his Second Enquiry, p. 136:—"the unprecedented nature of the required interpretation, as having been totally unknown to the Church of God, who were most deeply interested in it, from the days of Daniel to those of Wicliffe;—the total inability of expositors, even when they assume the period, to make anything of it in which they can agree among themselves;—the actual want of real conviction and faith in these fulfilments of prophecy which is found in the Christian Church, and absence of appeal to them in controversy with infidels;—and the difficulties which must be got over with respect to historical facts." (N.B. Wicliffe lived from 1324 to 1384.)

<sup>2</sup> It may be well to give the fuller statement on this point, made p. 77 of his Second Enquiry. "Familiarly as even the most superficial readers have now learned

ment thus broadly made was a little, though but little, qualified in a later publication by Dr. Maitland; with the which however I was unacquainted, till after I had made my own researches to ascertain the correctness of his assertion. This qualification, and the modified yet still strong assertion of the novelty of the year-day principle in Dr. M.'s latest publication on the subject, shall in due course be noticed.<sup>1</sup> For the present I think it best to lay the facts of the case, as they presented themselves in the course of my inquiry, before the reader.

And it is, I believe, the fact that, for the *first four centuries*, the days of Antichrist's duration, given in Daniel and the Apocalyptic prophecies, were interpreted literally as *days*, not as *years*, by the Fathers of the Christian Church. This was however, as a little while since intimated, only according to the Lord's declared intention, that, *not knowing the times and the seasons*, the disciples might so, even whilst his advent was far off, watch as in near expectation of it. And thus,—just as *down to the fall of Jerusalem* the early Christians, perhaps viewing the Jewish false Christs as the initiatory fulfilment of the prophecies of Antichrist, anticipated *that* catastrophe as what would immediately precede their Lord's coming,<sup>2</sup>—so their successors in the Church looked perpetually for *the disruption of the Roman Empire into ten kingdoms*, as a sign of its near approach: that disruption being looked to by them as what would mark the time of *Antichrist's* revelation; and, in accordance with the *literal* interpretation of the prophetic periods, as the forerunner, *at only 3½ years' interval*, of the coming of the Son of Man.—Such was the expectation of Irenæus, Hippolytus, Tertullian, Cyprian, Lactantius, Cyril, Chrysostom, Jerome; in fine, of the Fathers generally, until Augustine.<sup>3</sup>

But, just when the breaking up of the Roman Empire

to talk of the 'prophetic style' of 'a day for a year,' I believe that any such interpretation of the prophetic period of Daniel, or of *any other period*, was altogether unknown by the Jewish Church before the Christian era,—by the Apostles of our Lord,—by the primitive Church,—by the Fathers: in short, that no man ever thought of interpreting the days mystically; or that any period of 1260 years was marked out, during (to say the very least) the *first twelve centuries of Christianity*."

<sup>1</sup> p. 282 *infra*.

<sup>2</sup> See my Historical Introduction, Vol. i. p. 54.

<sup>3</sup> See my Vol. i. pp. 228—230, 234, 389, &c.

had begun, *Augustine*,—though not differing from his predecessors in the expectation of a *personal* Antichrist, destined to continue in power for  $3\frac{1}{2}$  literal years,—did yet apply to the ten-horned Apocalyptic antichristian Beast another and secondary meaning; which involved an interpretation of the  $3\frac{1}{2}$  years predicated of that Beast's duration quite different from the literal, and on a scale greatly enlarged. For he expounded it to symbolize the whole body of unbelievers, whether in open profession or in heart, who, under the guidance of many Antichrists, or antichristian teachers, constituted that impious state and kingdom which ever has been, and ever will be, opposed to Christ's people and kingdom in this world: that which in his time had already lasted near 400 years, reckoned from the time of Christ's ministry and death; and would comprehend also, as he expounded, within its period of duration, all that remained of time to the world's end.<sup>1</sup> This his view of the Apocalyptic Beast was perpetuated in after ages; and chiefly by those who followed him as their master. Thus *Tichonius*, or else his interpolator in the 5th century,<sup>2</sup> in one passage repeats (unless indeed it was the original of) *Augustine's* exposition of the Beast;<sup>3</sup> in another expounds the 1260 days to signify the whole period from Christ's sufferings to the end of the world;<sup>4</sup> in another, and with

<sup>1</sup> De Civit. D. xx. 9. 3: "Quæ sit ista Bestia, quamvis sit diligentius inquirendum, non tamen abhorret à fide rectâ ut ipsa impia civitas intelligatur, et populus infidelium, contrarius populo fideli et civitati Dei." He then speaks of its comprehending not only open enemies of Christianity, but such as "fidem profitentur et infideliter vivunt; . . . vocanturque non veraci effigie, sed fallaci imagine, Christiani." And he speaks of them as to continue to the end of the world.—Again, in a valuable Treatise on 1 John ii. 18—27, he dwells on the truth that if we are not members of Christ we are members of Antichrist; the latter including all those who in mouth profess Christ, but in works deny him.

<sup>2</sup> There is considerable doubt as to the name and age of the author of this Commentary. I must refer the reader to my discussion of the question, in the notice of *Tichonius' Apocalyptic Comment* given in my Appendix to Vol. iv. The conclusion there come to is, that the main substance of the Comment is by *Tichonius*, the African Donatist of the latter part of the 4th Century; but with certain alterations introduced, and an abbreviation into an Homiletic form, by some Presbyter of the Latin Catholic Church in the 5th Century, probably an African.

<sup>3</sup> "Non abhorret à fide ut Bestia ipsa impia civitas intelligatur, id est congregatio vel conspiratio omnium impiorum, quæ Babylonia dicitur: . . . ipse est populus infidelium, contrarius populo fideli et civitati Dei." So *Tichonius*, Hom. xi. There is added a further statement about the *Image of the Beast*; the same that is given in my Note, p. 221 supra; a statement copied from *Augustine*; unless *Augustine* copied from *Tichonius*.

<sup>4</sup> On the Witnesses prophesying 1260 days, he says: "Numerum novissimæ persecutionis dixit, . . . et totius temporis à Domini passione."—Again, on the woman's being

regard to the "time times and half a time," suggests that by a time may be understood either a year, or 100 years; <sup>1</sup> the latter scale of measurement being so adjusted probably as to bring down the ending to near his own days. <sup>2</sup>—Again, *Primasius*, an Augustinian of the 6th century, <sup>3</sup> explains the 42 months, 1260 days, and time times and half a time, as specially designating the time of Antichrist's last persecution; yet generally signifying also the whole time of the duration of the Church. <sup>4</sup>—The same is the mystical as well as literal interpretation given of the 1260 days, or its equivalent periods, by *Andreas*, Bishop of Cæsarea, probably of the middle of the 6th century; <sup>5</sup> by the venerable *Bede* of the 8th century; <sup>6</sup> by *Ambrose*

1260 days in the Wilderness: "Mundum istum non incongruè eremum accipimus; ubi, usque in finem, Christus ecclesiam gubernat et pascit." *Ib.* Hom. viii. ix.

<sup>1</sup> *Ib.* Hom. x: "*Tempus et annus intelligitur, et centum anni.*"—In Vitringa on Apoc. xi. 2, a statement of Scaliger is quoted to the effect that in Holy Scripture a time (or a year) is put for 100 years. On which (as Dr. Maitland has also observed) Vitringa exclaims, "Quàm hoc doctè et piè cogitatum;"—wishing there were evidence of its truth. In Justin Martyr's Dialogue with Trypho we find the same interpretation ascribed to the Jews of his time. But this passage in Tichonius furnishes the only example of it that I have met with among Christian writers.

<sup>2</sup> If the chief writer of the Tichonian Apocalyptic Commentary was of the age that I suppose, viz. the last quarter of the 4th Century, and the thought had crossed his mind of calculating the 3½ times from Titus' introducing the abomination into the holy place of Jerusalem, so as Walter Brute did afterwards from Hadrian's, (see Note<sup>2</sup> p. 283 infra,) then 3½ times, each valued at 100 years, would close about A. D. 420, or shortly after the time when Tichonius wrote.

<sup>3</sup> *Primasius'* subscription as *Bishop of Utica* is appended to the records of the 5th General Council held at Constantinople, A. D. 556. His Commentary on the Apocalypse was found in the monastery of St Theodoric at a town called *Sanctum Caput*, not far from *Lyons*. B. P. M. x. 145.—As to his Augustinian principles, they appear strongly in all his writings that I have looked into.

<sup>4</sup> Thus on the Woman's 1260 days sojourning in the wilderness *Primasius* says; "Isto dierum numero, qui tres annos et sex menses faciunt, omnia Christianitatis tempora significat, ex quo Christi prædicatio cœpit, et usque in finem fructificans crescit." So too on the 3½ times:—and again on the 42 months of the Gentiles treading the Holy City; "Non novissimam tantùm persecutionem significat, sed etiam Christianitatis tempus omne." B. P. M. x. 314, 317.

<sup>5</sup> See the discussion of *Andreas'* age in my Notice of his Apocalyptic Commentary in the Appendix to Vol. iv.

On Apoc. xi. 2, "They shall tread down the holy city forty-two months," *Andreas* says: τὰς τεσσαρακοντα δύο μηνᾶς σημαντικὰς τῆς τε χρόνου βραχυτητος, ὃν κρατεῖν τὰ τῆς νεας διαθηκῆς μυστηρια μεχρὶ τῆς τε Χριστοῦ παρουσίας ὑπελαβόν. His own opinion inclined however to construe it of the literal 3½ years of Antichrist's expected reign.

<sup>6</sup> On the Woman's being fed in the wilderness 1260 days, Apoc. xii. 5, *Bede* says; "Isto dierum numero, qui tres semis annos facit, omnia Christianitatis tempora complectitur; quia Christus, cujus hæc corpus est, tantum in carne temporis prædicaverit." And so again on the 3½ times in verse 14.—He afterwards, in speaking of the Beast's 42 months of supremacy, thus connects the last 3½ years of his paroxysm of persecution with his previous state: "Ante tres semis annos non aperto ore blasphemam, sed in mysterio facinoris: quod, factâ discessione, et revelato homine peccati,

*Ansbert* of the 9th century;<sup>1</sup> and by *Berengaud*, the Benedictine monk,<sup>2</sup> and *Bruno Astensis*, in the 11th and 12th.<sup>3</sup> So that in fact we have almost a catena of expositors from the 5th to the 12th century, advocating a certain mystical meaning, (though not the one we contend for,) as well as a literal meaning, to the Beast's period of the 1260 days.

And moreover, very remarkably, though they did not in regard of this particular period suggest the mystical meaning that we argue for, and apply to the 1260 days the year-day scale of enlargement, yet with regard to another smaller Apocalyptic period (the  $3\frac{1}{2}$  days of Apoc. xi. 8) they did nearly all,<sup>4</sup> and after them sundry others also, both apply and argue for it:—alike *Tichonius* and his near contemporary *Prosper*, *Primasius* and *Ambrose Ansbert*, *Haymo*, *Berengaud*, and *Bruno of Asti*. See the citations below.<sup>5</sup> In which

nudabitur. Tunc enim dicet, *Ego sum Christus*; nunc vero, *Ecce hic Christus, et ecce illic.*"

<sup>1</sup> On Apoc. xi. 2, respecting the Witnesses prophesying 1260 days in sackcloth, *Ambrose Ansbert* says; "Sicque (attendamus) mille ducentis sexaginta diebus specialiter tempus Antiehrsti; ut tamen retroacta tempora, que nunc voluntur, illi dies comprehendant: quatenus initium fidei Christianæ et consummationem, principium persecutionis Christianæ, et finem, contineant." So on the 1260 days of the Woman's being in the wilderness, as comprehending both the last paroxysm, and all before. B. P. M. xiii. 522, 534.

The work of this learned Benedictine is dedicated to Pope Stephen; that is (as is supposed) Pope Stephen VI; about A.D. 890.

<sup>2</sup> This is the writer whose Apocalyptic Comment is printed in the Appendix to the Benedictine Edition of Ambrose, and whom I have already quoted Vol. i. pp. 297, 473, Notes<sup>1</sup>: in the latter passage assigning to him the date generally given of the 9th century; but which, as will appear in my notice of him in the History of Apocalyptic Interpretation, is probably two centuries too early.

*Berengaud* hints to us his name, veiled under a numeral enigma, very similar to that of the *Number of the Beast* in my Chapter preceding. "Quisquis nomen auctoris scire desideras, literas expositionum in capitibus septem Visionum primas attende. Numerus quatuor vocalium quæ desunt, si Græcæ posteris, est 81." Now the first letters of these seven Visions, or Parts, are BRNGVDS; and if the Greek vowels ε ε α ο be inserted, whose joint numeral value is 5 + 5 + 1 + 70 = 81, the given number, we have the name Βερεγγαυδος.—On Apoc. xii., commenting on the Woman's time times and half a time, of being fed by God in the wilderness, he says that by it may be meant, "tempus à passione Christi usque ad finem mundi: in quo spatio temporum animæ sanctorum, id est ecclesiæ, dapibus gloriæ cœlestis patriæ in cœlesti beatitudine pascuntur."

<sup>3</sup> On Apoc. xii. 5 *Bruno* thus writes; "Per dies 1260 omne tempus à Christi prædicatione usque ad diem ultimum intelligimus." B. P. M. xx. 1697. *Bruno*, some time Abbot of the Benedictine Monastery on the Monte Casino, was made Bishop of Segni by Gregory VII, about A.D. 1079; and died A.D. 1123 under the 2nd Calixtus. *Ib.* 1296.

<sup>4</sup> All except *Andreas* and *Bede*.

<sup>5</sup> 1. *Tichonius*. "Vident de populis, &c., corpus eorum per dies tres et dimidium; id est annos tres et menses sex." He adds: "Quomodo autem poterunt habitantes terram de duorum nece gaudere, cum in unâ civitate morerentur, et munera invicem



citations it will be seen that *Tichonius* supports this view of the  $3\frac{1}{2}$  *days* of the Apocalyptic witnesses lying dead meaning  $3\frac{1}{2}$  *years*, from considerations of the improbability of that being done within the city in  $3\frac{1}{2}$  *days* which is said to have been done during the time of these witnesses lying dead,—viz. its inhabitants sending gratulatory gifts to each other, &c.; when, almost ere the gifts could be sent, the witnesses would have risen:—that *Primasius* and *Ambrose Ansbert* refer, by way of corroboration, to the case of the 40 years' judgment on Israel in the matter of the spies, "a *year* for a *day*," as it was said:—and that *Haymo* and *Bruno* of *Asti*

mittere, si *tres dies* sint: qui, antequam gaudeant de nece, contristabuntur de resurrectione." Hom. viii.

2. *Prosper*. *Dimidium Temporis*, Cap. 16: "Tres et dimidius *dies* tribus *annis* et sex mensibus respondent, quibus potestas erit Antichristo; eisque suppletis coram oculis inimicorum Helias et Enoch ascendentes in cœlum ibunt." B. P. M. viii. 48. —Prosper was a Notary of Pope Leo the Great; and, some say, Bishop of Riez, or Rhegium. He too was an Augustinian; speaks of the contemporary *Arians* as anti-christians; wrote against the Pelagians, and quotes *Tichonius*. c. 5, 13. See *ibid*. *Prolegom.* and *Cave*.

3. *Primasius*. "Tres *dies* et dimidium possumus intelligere tres *annos* et sex menses; quos in ultimâ hebdomadâ Danielis quoque prophetia prænuntiat afuturos. More Scripturæ loquentis utentes, quod dictum legimus de quadraginta diebus quibus exploratores terram Chanaan circumierunt, annus pro die reputabitur; ut hic, versâ vice, *dies* pro *anno* positus agnoscat." B. P. M. x. 314.

4. *Ambrose Ansbert*. "Hoc in loco, per *trium dierum* spatium ac *dimidii, triennii* et *sex mensium* summa describitur: more videlicet Scripturæ loquentis; quæ aliquando, sicut a toto parte, sic plerumque à parte totum ostendit." He then refers to the judgment on Israel, in connexion with the spies' report, Numb. xiv.; "Annus vobis pro die reputabitur," just like *Primasius*: and adds; "sicut ibi pro diebus anni, ita hic pro *annis* dies ponuntur." B. P. M. xiii. 525.

5. *Haymo*, Bishop of Halberstadt; who died A.D. 853. (*Cave*.) "Tribus *diebus* et dimidio; id est tribus *annis* et dimidio: quibus regnabit Antichristus. Ita enim hic *dies* pro *anno* positus est, sicut et in V. T." He refers to the case of *Ezekiel*,\* as well as to that of the Israelitish spies, in corroboration.

6. *Berengaud*. "Possumus per tres *dies* et dimidium tres *annos* et semis intelligere, quibus ii duo prophætæ predicaturi sunt."

7. *Bruno Astensis*. "Videntur per tres *dies* et dimidium; id est toto tempore regni Antichristi. . . . Quod autem *dies* pro *anno* ponatur, audi quid *Ezechieli* Dominus dicat; 'Et assumes iniquitatem domûs Judæ quadraginta diebus, dicm pro anno.'" B. P. M. xx. 1695.

8. To whom let me add the later authority of *Albertus Magnus*, Bishop of Ratisbon in the xiii<sup>th</sup> century, who died A.D. 1280. "Et post *dies* tres et dimidium: id est post tres *annos* et dimidium, post mortem Antichristi. Sic sumitur *dies* pro *anno*." He adds however, as an alternative, and more probable solution, that the resurrection of the Witnesses was to be on the fourth *day* from their death. In Apoc. xi.

Also that of *De Lyra* of the xv<sup>th</sup> century; who speaks of the two slain Witnesses being raised up "post tres *annos* et dimidium, à morte civili, in medio civitatis magnæ; id est congregationis Antichristo adhærentis." A passage referred to by me, Vol. ii. 436, in my account of the Witnesses' death and resurrection.

---

\* Like *Venema* long afterwards (see my p. 269), he explains *Ezekiel's* typical 430 *days* as figurative of Israel's destined 430 *years* of captivity: "Significata est in his *diebus* captivitas decem tribuum, 340 [lege 430] *annis* futura."

justify it by the parallel case of Ezekiel lying on his side 390 days, to signify 390 years;—i. e. a *day* for a *year*.— Besides whom both *Cyprian and his Biographer Pontius* apparently in the 3rd century, and *Theodoret* unquestionably about the middle of the 5th century, adopted and applied the *year-day* principle to quite other prophetic periods:—the *former* in reference to a *day's* respite of Cyprian's martyrdom, promised to the saint in vision, which he interpreted (rightly interpreted, as the event proved) to signify a *year*; <sup>1</sup> the *latter* (one of the most learned of all the Greek Fathers)<sup>2</sup> with reference to Daniel's prophecy of the 70 hebdomads. For these hebdomads Theodoret assumes to mean primarily and literally hebdomads of *days*; but, on the *year-day* principle, explains them to signify hebdomads of *years*: viz. the 490 years that the Jewish law would continue in force, from the time of the decree going forth for the rebuilding of Jerusalem, to the abrogation of the law by Messiah.<sup>3</sup>

†<sup>1</sup> The Deacon *Pontius*, in his *Life of Cyprian*, (Amsterdam Ed. 1691, p. 7.) tells of a vision revealed to that eminent Father by night; wherein he seemed to be called before the tribunal of the Proconsul, and a young man there present to intimate to him that he was to suffer martyrdom. Cyprian's narration proceeds: "Intellexi sententiam passionis futuram. Rogare cepi . . . ut dilatio mihi vel *annis diei* prorogaretur, donec res meas legitimâ ordinatione disponerem. Et . . . ille juvenis, qui jamdudum de passionis indicio gestu potius quàm sermone prouiderat, . . . concessam dilationem que in crastinum petebatur, contortis post inuicem digitis, significare properavit." On which Pontius thus comments. "Quid hæc reuelatione manifestius? Ante illi prædicta sunt omnia quæcumque postmodum subsequuta sunt. Dilationem petit crastini, . . . postulans ut res suas die illo quem impetrauerat ordinaret. Hic *dies unus* significabat *annum*, quo ille post visionem acturus in seculo fuerat, quo hoc illi ante annum fuerat ostensum. Nam eo die post exactum annum coronatus est. . . *Diem* autem *Domini*, etsi non *annum* in diuinis litteris legimus, *promissioni tamen futurorum* debitum *illud* tempus accipimus."\*

<sup>2</sup> See Dupin's eulogium on him. "Il est rare que ceux qui se sont appliqués aux ouvrages de piété aient été bons critiques. Theodoret a eu toutes ces qualités. L'on peut dire qu'il a également bien soutenu les caracteres d'interprete, de theologien, d'historien, de controversiste, d'apologiste de la religion, et d'auteur d'ouvrages de piété." Add to this that, being skilled in Hebrew as well as Greek, and born and living as bishop where the Syriac was the spoken language, Theodoret was perhaps of all the Greek Fathers the one whose opinion should have most weight on the point in question. He was made Bishop of Cyrus in Syria A.D. 420; and died there A.D. 457 or 458.

<sup>3</sup> Μετα δε την της Ιερουσαλημ οικοδομιαν διαρκησασιν [ο λαος σβ] επι τετρακοσια και εννενηκοντα ετη κατα νομον πολιτευομενοι τωσπτον γαρ αι ιβδομηκοντα ιβδομαδες ποιωσι χρονον, ημερας εκασης εις ενιαυτον λαμβανομενης. Theodoret on Dan. ix. 24.

\* Mr. C. Maitland, p. 177, offers the following very extraordinary remark on this: "The story of Pontius is worth repeating, if only as showing that the *year-day* interpretation was as yet unknown in the Church." The learned Oxford Bishop, who edited the book, shows his different view of the matter by a brief Note of reference, subjoined to the words "*dies unus significabat annum*," as follows: "Vid. Num. xiv. 33, Ezek. iv. 6."

I have only to add that the famous *Joachim Abbas*, near the close of the xiith century, in his Apocalyptic Comment, applies the principle to another Apocalyptic period, viz. that predicated of the *scorpion locusts*; explaining their 150 *days* to mean very possibly 150 *years*.<sup>1</sup> Also the 42 *months* of the Witnesses prophesying in sackcloth he explains as *so many generations*:<sup>2</sup> which, on his defined scale of 30 years to a generation, makes 1260 *years*, answering to the symbolic Witnesses' 1260 *days*: a calculation evidently applied by him also to the 1260 days of the Woman's wilderness sojourning, and the Beast's 1260 days of power.<sup>3</sup>

Thus, instead of the novelty of the year-day principle, as at first in the strongest and most unqualified terms asserted by Dr. Maitland, or even as afterwards asserted by him, in terms somewhat modified, yet still very strong,—I mean subsequently to his controversy with the Morning Watch<sup>4</sup>—we find the following to have been the facts of the

<sup>1</sup> So *Joachim Abbas* in Apoc. ix. 5. "Sed quare quinque mensibus? Fortè quòd quinque menses habent dies 150: et solet aliquando dies designare annum; 30 vero dies unam annorum generationem."

<sup>2</sup> "*Quadráginta duo menses, quibus prædicant induti saccis, significant totidem generationes.*" i. e. (as on Apoc. ix. 5)  $42 \times 30 = 1260$  years.

<sup>3</sup> See my sketch of *Joachim's* Apocalyptic Comment in the Appendix to my Vol. iv.; also the Tabular Scheme at the close of that Sketch.

<sup>4</sup> The Morning Watch asserted the antiquity of the application of the year-day principle of exposition, if not to the 1260 days, yet to the  $3\frac{1}{2}$  days of the Witnesses lying dead. But it was unfortunate in its three exemplifications: giving for one, as from a work of *Ambrose*, the statement which is really *Berengaud's*, quoted in my Note on p. 280; then an interlinear gloss on *Jerome*, which, if genuine, (a point doubtful, says Dr. M.) is scarce earlier than the 12th century; finally, the *Comment of De Lyra*, one not written till the 14th century. (As early however, let me say, as Dr. M.'s primary terminus of the age of *Wicliff*. See p. 275 *suprà*.)

Dr. Maitland, however, while thus setting aside the examples of the Morning Watch, fell himself on a really early and genuine patristic example of the thing;—that of *Primasius*, which I have given above. This he intimates to be the only one known to him. And, passing it over with a tone of contempt, scarce to have been expected from such a vindicator of the Fathers, (see Second Enquiry, pp. 77, 78,) and such as *Primasius* certainly did not deserve,—asserts that the *main* question of the controversy (it being on the 1260 days) is not touched by reference to the  $3\frac{1}{2}$  days: and then thus finally re-urges his argument of the *novelty* of the year-day interpretation:—"I must repeat over and over again, that the spiritual common sense of the Church of God in every age, from the days of Daniel to those of *Wicliffe*, is set in array against the fundamental point of Mr. Cuninghame's system: for it considered the [1260] days as literal days; and knew nothing, and looked for nothing, in the character of Antichrist, but an individual infidel persecutor." Reply to Cuninghame, 57.—He had previously said in his Second Enquiry, p. 65; "The doctrine has been maintained, so far as I know, by every writer of his (*Lacunza's*) Church, except *Pastorini*, from the time of St. Peter to the present hour."

It seems to me that the *main* point at issue was the novelty of the principle of interpreting a *prophetic day* as a *year*, not the novelty of one particular application

case:—that from Cyprian's time, near the middle of the 3rd century, even to the times of Joachim and the Waldenses in the 12th century, there was kept up by a succession of expositors in the Church a recognition of the precise *year-day* principle of interpretation; and its application made, not without consideration and argument, to one and another of the chronological prophetic periods of days, including the shorter one of those that were involved in the prophecies respecting Antichrist; though not, *so far*, to that of the 1260 predicted days of Antichrist's duration. An inconsistency this very obvious; and only to be accounted for, I think, by the supposition of some providential overruling of men's minds: whereby they were restrained from entertaining the view, and carrying out their own principles, so long as it would necessarily have involved the conclusion of Christ's advent being an event very distant.<sup>1</sup>—Further it appears that, so soon as ever it was possible to entertain the year-day principle, and yet to have an expectation of Christ's advent being near at hand, so soon the application *was* made of it to the 1260 days predicted of Antichrist's duration in Daniel and the Apocalypse. At the close of the 12th century *Joachim Abbas*, as we have just seen, made a first and rude attempt at it; and, late in the 14th, the Wicliffite *Walter Brute* followed.<sup>2</sup> This fact seems to me most remarkable; and in no little measure corroborative of the general view I have offered of the intent of the enigmatic form of the prophetic periods. It prepared men for the application of the prophecy of the Apocalyptic Beast, and his mystic predicted 1260 days of prospering, to the PAPAL

of it. If the sense of antiquity was not against, but in favour of it, in the interpretation of *one* prophetic chronological period of days, its authority must be small indeed against the application of the same principle to *another* chronological period, every way of the same character, and in the same prophecy.

<sup>1</sup> Compare Gibbon's remarks, ii. 300.

<sup>2</sup> See Foxe, iii. pp. 143, 146 et seq., for a full and very interesting account of Walter Brute: or the Appendix to my Vol. iv., where this account is abstracted. Brute asserts Daniel's and the Apocalyptic periods of 1260 and 1290 *days* to signify so many *years*, after the precedent of Daniel's seventy weeks, signifying weeks of *years* not *days*: makes the 1260 days of the abomination of desolation being in the Holy Place to have had its commencement on Adrian's final destruction of Jerusalem; "from which time hitherto," says he, "have past near about 1290 *days*, taking a *day* for a *year*, as Daniel takes it in his prophecies:" and moreover (p. 143) applies the prophetic period to the time of the preservation of Christianity through all that interval in England, just as of the Woman in the wilderness.—See further some interesting observations on the *Wicliffite* and *Hussite* understanding of the *days* as *years*, in Brooks, p. 353.

ANTICHRIST; with light gradually clearer and clearer, in the times of and following on the Reformation.<sup>1</sup>

I must not forget to add that, in illustration of the asserted novelty of the *year-day* principle of prophetic explanation, the authority of *Jewish Rabbis* has been appealed to, as well as that of Christian patristic and middle-age writers. And Dr. Todd has expressed himself as to the non-existence of any such *Jewish Rabbinical* authority, with as much confidence as Dr. Maitland about patristic and middle-age *Christian* authority:—"Where, I may ask, is the evidence that the *Jews* (or any body else) in the xiith century believed the *days* in Daniel's prophecy to mean *years*?"<sup>2</sup> But the reply of historic fact is as much against Dr. Todd on this point, as against Dr. Maitland on the other. Mr. Faber has urged, and not without much reason for his opinion, that there is probable evidence in a Talmudic comment on Micah v. 2, 3, to show that certain Rabbis of the Talmud, as early as the 2nd and 3rd centuries of the Christian æra, recognised the *year-day* principle as one applicable to symbolic prophecies in Scripture.<sup>3</sup> And, if we pass from them

<sup>1</sup> The *year-day* principle scarcely broke on *Luther's* mind: and he had once a serious notion of a prophetic *time* being perhaps equal to *thirty years* of Christ's life; and so the *time times and half a time*, or 105 years, measured from the *fall of Constantinople*, ending near his own time. Table Talk, ii. 3.—But we find it hinted at by *Melancthon*. (See my Vol. ii. pp. 140, 141.) And the *Magdeburgh Centuriators* fully advocated the *year-day* principle, and applied it to the Papacy: as also most Protestants afterwards; e. g. *Arctius*, *Osiander*, \* *Foxe*, &c.

<sup>2</sup> On Antichrist, p. 363.—Of course Dr. S. R. Maitland's statement, "*No man ever thought of interpreting the days mystically for the first 12 centuries of Christianity*," includes, by implication, all *Jewish* expositors up to that time, as well as Christian. But Dr. Todd *expressly* refers to them.

<sup>3</sup> The prophecy reads thus: "Thou Bethlehem Ephratah, though thou be little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee shall He come forth that is to be ruler in Israel; whose goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting. Therefore will he give them up, *until the time that she which travaileth hath brought forth.*" On which the following is noticed in the Massechet Sanhedrin, in the Section beginning *Chelak*, as the comment of some certain Rabbi, called emphatically *Rab*. "Dixit Rab; Non erit filius David, id est Messias, veniens, donec dominetur vel prævaleat *Regnum nequam* (Glossa R. Salomonis; *id est Romanum*) super Israel *novem mensibus*; sicut dictum est Mich. v. 2; 'Propterea dabit eos (Glossa R. Salomonis, *Israel*) usque in tempus in quo *parturiens parturit*. Glossa R. Salomonis;

\* On the prophetic clause, "Power was given to him to prosper 42 months," *Osiander* observes that this is equal to the *time times and half a time*. Then; "*Angelica tempora, angelicos menses intelligere necesse est; 1260 dies angelicos, hoc est totidem annos nostros civiles.*" De Ult. Tempor. Nuremberg 1544. See my Vol. ii. p. 141. This view of the *prophetic days* as *angelic days*, and angelic days as measured not by the *diurnal* revolution of the *earth*, but the *annual* revolution of the *sun*, was common with the Reformers; and, as a view somewhat curious and ingenious, though of course not trustworthy, deserves observation.

to the more learned Jewish Rabbis of 12th, 13th, and following centuries, we shall find the same principle distinctly adopted and affirmed: first by the famous Saadia Gaon and Solomon Jarchi; next by Abarbanel; and a complete succession of other Jewish doctors, down even to our own times.<sup>1</sup>

Thus the charge of *novelty* of interpretation proves on

*Et hoc sunt novem menses.'"* And the same again in the Section *Schibbat Jamin*; "Dixit Rab; Non erit filius David, id est Messias veniens, donec regnum nequam dominetur in universo mundo novem mensibus: sicut dicitur Mic. v. 2, 'Dabit eos propterea usque in tempus quo parturiens parit, et residuum fratrum suorum convertentur ad domum Israel.'"

These extracts are transcribed by Mr. Faber in his Provincial Letters, i. 144, from Raymond Martin's Pugio Fidei, pp. 396, 397. They are from the *Gemara*, or *Comment on the Mishna*, (the writers of which Comment began writing in the 3rd century of the Christian era,) ch. xi. § 34; and are also given by Cocceius.

As to the precise intended purport of the Rabbinical exposition of the verse in Micah, chronologically considered, our view of it must vary according as we judge one or another of the pre-Gemarist Rabbies to have been its author. But, on every probable variation on this point, the comment seems only explicable on the year-day principle of construing the 9 months, or 270 days, of Zion's pregnancy as 270 years.

1. If *Rabbi Akiba* was the writer, the famous associate and *προσπικτης* of Barchocebas on his revolt A.D. 130 from the Romans, then, applying another clause in the Comment, which dated the beginning of the Roman domination over Israel 180 years before the destruction of the temple, the Rab must be understood to have insinuated that, as 270, 180, or 90 years was all that remained of the prophetic period from after A.D. 70, or the destruction of the temple, they were at the epoch of Barchocebab's revolt within 30 years of its termination; and consequently at but that interval from the overthrow of Rome, and birthday of Israel's triumph.

2. Supposing the *Rab* to have been *Rabbi Judah*, one who was chief of the Sanhedrin in Tsiפורis and Tiberias, down to the close of the 2nd century, or beginning of the 3rd, and of whom Lightfoot says, (Vol. iii. p. 394, Ed. Pitman,) "he was called sometimes eminently *Rabbi*, and no more, sometimes *Rabbi Judah the holy*, sometimes *our holy Rabbi*," if, I say, *he* was the writer, and *that* the time of his writing, then, on the *year-day* principle, reckoned from Pompey's siege of Jerusalem, and reduction of Syria to a Roman province, which event happened B.C. 63, the ending of the mystical 9 months would fall in the 270th year from B.C. 63, or A.D. 207: or, if computed from Augustus' reduction of Judæa itself to a Roman province, the terminating epoch would be some 60 years later. In either case, on the *year-day* computation, it would well suit what we cannot but suppose to have been R. Judah's object, in cheering his oppressed fellow-countrymen by the idea of their deliverance being near.

3. I am told that Wolf, in his "Catalogus Doctorum Gemariorum," says that *Rav* (a common *prænomēn* to all the Doctors of Gemara), when spoken of *absolutely*, as in the citation above, means *Abba Aribba*, who presided over an Academy at Sora till A.D. 243. If so, and this was the *Rav* who so commented on Micah, then, computed from Augustus' reduction of Judæa into a Roman province, the explanation that I have just given will equally suit, on the *year-day* principle. On any other I see not how it can suit at all.

<sup>1</sup> The famous Rabbis Saadia Gaon and Solomon Jarchi, of the 12th and 13th centuries, reckoned that the time of the end, and complete redemption of Israel, would be 1335 years from the destruction of the second temple: also that this redemption would begin 45 years earlier, or 1290 years from the temple's destruction, according to Daniel's declaration, "From the time that the daily sacrifice shall be taken away, and the abomination of desolation set up, there shall be 1290 days: blessed is he that watcheth and cometh to the 1335 days." The additional 45 years they explain as the interval between the redemption of the dispersed and of the outcasts; also that during it the royal Messiah will hide himself; then appear, and the redemption be

examination to apply to the anti-year-day critics, rather than to those who advocate the year-day principle, in prophecies such as those under consideration. And the question which has been urged with so much air of triumph against the latter may, with but a little change of expression, be urged against the former:—"Where for 14 centuries, down even to the Reformation, among Christian interpreters, and also, with scarce an exception, among Jewish,<sup>1</sup> can there be shown a *single protest against the year-day principle*; though thus from earliest antiquity applied to certain Scripture prophecies, as we have seen, both by the one and the other?"

## 2. I turn to Dr. Maitland's *second* class of objections,

completed.—Herewith the Rabbies Abraham Ben Chaja, Bechai, Hananael, Moses Ben Nachman,\* and R. Levi Ben Gershon fully coincide.

Further it appears that on referring to Aben Ezra's explanation of the 2300 evenings and mornings of Dan. viii. 14, "in common with the Christian doctors," as *literally* 2300 days, or 6 years and 3 months, "being the duration of Israel's distress in the days of Antiochus Epiphanes," Abarbanel "smites them on the head," according to Eliakim Ben Abraham, and "knocks them down:" saying that this "is a fiction of their imagination," and that the *days* signify *years*.

The above is abstracted by Mr. Cuninghame, at pp. 510—514 of the 4th Edition of his Apocalyptic Commentary, from a Hebrew Treatise by Eliakim Ben Abraham, printed in London, A.D. 1794: the Second Part of which is entitled בניה לגירי = *An Explanation of the Times*; and contains an account of the interpretations of the numbers of Daniel by all the most learned Jewish Doctors.

Mr. Cuninghame also states with reference to Amos iv. 4, and our English authorized version of it, "Bring your sacrifices every morning, and your tithes after three *years*," though the Hebrew is literally "after three ימי or *days*," that this is the translation also given by Kimchi and Ben Melek, who affirm that *days* are here used for *years*.†

<sup>1</sup> I here say *scarce*, because *Aben Ezra*, as cited above, and also by Dr. Maitland, in his Second Enquiry, p. 46, may be deemed an exception.—Dr. M., like Faber, cites from Raymund Martin's *Pugio Fidei*.

\* Subsequently to the printing of my 4th Ed. I became acquainted with Wagen-seil's *Tela Ignea Satanae*, a book to which, as noted p. 272 *suprà*, reference was made by Dr. M. There is in it a full report of *R. Moses Ben Nachman's* Disputation with the Dominican Brethren, Paul and *Raymund Martin*, (whose *Pugio Fidei*, says Wagen-seil, is in every one's hands,) at Barcelona in Sept. 1263, before King James of Arragon, on the great questions of difference between Jews and Christians. In this he explains the 1290 *days* of Dan. xii. just as Saadia Gaon, &c., before him, as 1290 *years*; referring to Lev. xxv. 29, and Gen. xxiv. 55, in illustration of the *year-day* principle: against which however, from the absence of any numeral before *days*, exception may be made as hardly cases in point. Elsewhere in Wagen-seil, p. 334, *R. Isaac*, a Portuguese Jew of the 15th century, is cited, applying the principle to the 2300 *days* of Dan. viii., as signifying beyond doubt ("sine dubio") the 2300 *years* of Jewish affliction. So in his *Munimen Fidei*.

† There is, Mr. C. observes, an evident allusion in this to Dent. xiv. 28, where the Israelites are commanded at the end of *three years* to lay up the tithe of their increase, for purposes of mercy and charity.—Amos iv. 4 is referred to by me p. 270 *suprà*.

such as have reference to the *discrepancies, and the unsatisfactoriness, of Apocalyptic expositions based on the year-day principle of interpretation.*<sup>1</sup>

In illustration of the greatness of these *discrepancies*, Dr. M. contrasts in particular the very different solutions proposed by some of the more popular expositors of the year-day school both of the *six first Seals* and of the prophecy of *the two Witnesses' death and resurrection*:<sup>2</sup> in the which Mr. Burgh follows him, and enlarges further on the discrepancy and variety of the lists of *ten Papal kingdoms* alleged by them to answer to the Beast's ten horns.<sup>3</sup> And undoubtedly on the two former points the differences are great.—But is it clear that the *day-day* principle is the real cause of the difference; or that the *year-day* principle of interpretation contains within itself a preservative against such differences, and a guarantee, on main points at least, of uniformity of sentiment? Why, the differences between interpreters on the *day-day* principle are so mighty and so fundamental, that it seems perfectly amazing how a writer of the acuteness and learning of Dr. S. R. Maitland should have ever put forward a criterion of interpretative truth that so recoils against his statement and his theory.

First there will strike the inquirer, as he considers the matter in this point of view, the primary and grand division of the *day-dayists* into those of the *Præterist* and

<sup>1</sup> At p. 86 of his *Second Enquiry* Dr. Maitland quotes the following from a writer in the *Eclectic Review*: “When we reflect on the number and talents of the men who have attempted to illustrate the visions of St. John, and their great discordance of opinions, it would seem as if there must be something *radically* wrong,—some fatal error at the very foundation of all their systems of explanation, which is one great cause of the mistakes and confusion that appear to pervade them all.” Then Dr. M. proceeds to state his conviction of this fundamental error being the *prejudice of the year-day*.

<sup>2</sup> *First Enquiry*, pp. 48—52.

<sup>3</sup> Burgh's *Apocalyptic Commentary* (Ed. 4), pp. 436, 441.—Both on the *Seals*, and on the *ten Horns*, he quotes from a work of Mr. Tyso, of which one primary object appears to be the exhibition of the discrepancies of former Protestant expositors. On the *Seals* the following brief tabular view that he gives may suffice as a specimen:

	Cuninghame.	Keith.	Frere.	Faber.
First Seal	A.D. 33	A.D. 96	A.D. 312	B.C. 627
Sixth Seal	A.D. 1792	The Judgment.	A.D. 1789	A.D. 313.

On the *ten horns* he states, as the result of Mr. Tyso's examination of twenty-eight authors, that their lists exhibit *sixty-five* different kingdoms.



those of the *Futurist* Schools: the one declaring confidently that the whole of the Apocalyptic prophecy, or nearly all, was fulfilled ages ago; the others, as confidently, that it all waits its fulfilment in the events of a yet unrealized future: a difference of course affecting the views of Seals, Witnesses, Beasts, everything.<sup>1</sup>—Nor can the disciples of either *day-day* school agree among themselves. Of the *Præterist*, for example, there is one large sub-division represented by those who suppose a special reference to the times of Nero or Domitian, and of Jerusalem's destruction by Titus; a class comprehending the chief of the most noted modern German expositors, as Eichhorn, Ewald, Heinrichs, Hug, Moses Stuart:<sup>2</sup>—while another large sub-division, of which Bossuet is the chief representative, and to which Bishop Wiseman, I believe, thinks it safest for the Romanists to intrust themselves and their cause, refers the chronology of that part of the Apocalyptic prophecy which concerns Rome to the æra of Diocletian and Julian; and of that which is thought to concern Jerusalem, to the wars of Trajan and Hadrian against the Jews.<sup>3</sup>—The same too as regards the *Futurists*, with whom I am more particularly concerned in this present discussion. Thus, to exemplify from four of the most eminent among them, Drs. Maitland, Burgh, Todd, and the Oxford Tractator on Antichrist,<sup>4</sup> let us compare their several views respecting the *Beast Antichrist* and his empire,—the *saints* noted as the objects of his persecution,—and the fated *territorial scene* of the dominion. And, behold, 1st, whereas the Oxford Tractator and

<sup>1</sup> See my notices of both Præterist and Futurist expositors at the end of the sketch of Apocalyptic interpretation in my last Volume; and the critical notices of them which follow.

<sup>2</sup> With subdivision of course into the *Neronists* and the *Domitianists*; according to the view taken of the date of the Apocalypse: most of this class taking the *Neronic*; some, as Eichhorn, the *Domitianic*.

<sup>3</sup> See *ibid.*—As regards Bossuet let me just observe that he considers the history of the Church to have been prefigured in the Apocalypse under a threefold division:—viz. 1st, its commencement and earlier sufferings, primarily from the *Jews*, out of whom the elect are sealed, Chap. vii., and whose destruction nationally is foreshown in the first four Trumpets, Chap. viii.; then from *Pagan Rome*, as foreshown in the visions of the two Witnesses, Dragon, and two Beasts, with the destruction of Pagan Rome, under the title of Babylon, following, Apoc. xi.—xviii.:—2. its millennium of reign and prosperity, as fulfilled under the Papal supremacy, after the destruction of ancient Rome, Apoc. xx. 1—7:—3. its last persecution under Antichrist, on the loosing of Satan, Apoc. xx. 7, still future.—See my notice of Bossuet in the Appendix to Vol. iv.

<sup>4</sup> I believe, Dr. Newman.

Burgh, in accordance with all the old Fathers, agree that Daniel's 4th Beast out of which Antichrist was to rise, or its equivalent the Apocalyptic Beast, is most assuredly the Roman empire,<sup>1</sup> but that its decuple division, answering to the ten toes of the iron legs of the symbolic image, and ten horns of the Beast, has not yet taken place,—the Beast itself however, or Roman Empire, being still perpetuated and in existence,<sup>2</sup>—Drs. Maitland and Todd, on the other hand, contend that the 4th great prophetic empire, answering to the iron legs of the quadripartite image and the 4th of the four prefigurative Beasts, is yet to come: Dr. Maitland moreover affirming that it is as clear as a thing can be clear, that the Roman empire has long ceased to exist; and that nothing but “the exigency of system” can make “writers of Commentaries on the Prophecies” affirm gravely the contrary:<sup>3</sup> also that he expects the Antichrist to arise not out of the geographical platform of the Roman empire proper, but out of one of the 4 divisions of Alexander's Greek kingdom.<sup>4</sup>—2. Whereas the Oxford Tractarian, agreeably with the general voice of the Fathers, would have the *saints* against whom Antichrist would direct his persecutions (i. e. the Antichrist prefigured by Daniel's and the Apocalyptic Beast) to signify the faithful of the *Christian Church*, without any reference to the *Jewish nation*,<sup>5</sup> Messrs. Maitland and Burgh unite in explaining

<sup>1</sup> “I am fully agreed that the 4th of these Beasts (of Daniel vii.) was the Roman empire; as I am also that with it, in its last state, the Beast before us (the Apocalyptic) is identical: as it is also with the last state or division,—the feet and ten toes,—of the political image described in Daniel's 2nd chapter.” So Burgh, p. 249.

So too the Tractator in Sermon 4 on Antichrist.—The inconsistencies of the writer of these four Sermons will be alluded to more fully, in my examination of the Futurist Scheme of Apocalyptic exposition in the Appendix to Vol. iv.

As regards the *Fathers* let me observe that, while *so far* agreeing in Mr. B.'s view, neither Irenæus, Hippolytus, nor any other Patristic of the four first centuries that I know of, give any intimation of *two* great disruptions and decemregal divisions of the Roman Empire, such as Mr. Burgh's view would require. The expectation they held was of *one* great approaching disruption of the Empire; and, on this, of Antichrist's immediate or at least speedy manifestation. See my Vol. i. pp. 229, 389, et seq.; also my *List*, of Apoc. Interpretation, Periods 1 and 2.

<sup>2</sup> “But I deny that the state of the Roman Empire symbolized here by the ten horns crowned, as well as the tenfold division of this 4th empire in both prophecies of Daniel, has been ever yet realized.” Burgh, *ibid.*

<sup>3</sup> On Antichrist, p. 6.

<sup>4</sup> *Ib.* p. 11.—A difference this involving of course a total difference, as between Messrs. Maitland and Burgh, in the view of the constitutencies of the supposed still future ten kingdoms of Antichrist.—As for Dr. Todd, he denies the fourfold partition, which Dr. M. admits, of Alexander's empire.

<sup>5</sup> Irenæus, Hippolytus, Victorinus, Cyril, &c., expected that Antichrist would restore the temple at Jerusalem, and have the Jews as *associates* against God's servants. So

them to mean pre-eminently and primarily the converted *Jews*.<sup>1</sup>—3. Whereas Dr. Maitland<sup>2</sup> observes sarcastically on “the *little world* that has been made on purpose” (viz. by the *year-day* expositors) for the scene of Antichrist’s reign, &c., i. e. the “*Roman-Western-imperial-papal-habitable earth*,” he himself regarding it as *the whole munulane globe*, Mr. Burgh<sup>3</sup> supposes the prophetic *earth* spoken of in the visions of the Trumpets and the two Witnesses, to be the yet smaller land of *Judæa*: nay, and *Dr. M. himself* (!) suicidally explains the selfsame phrase “all the earth,” in Dan. ii. 39, as the *Roman world*.<sup>4</sup>—Indeed, even as regards *Daniel’s hebdomads*, they are at the antipodes of each other. For, while Drs. Maitland, M’Caul, and others consider this prophetic period to have been *fulfilled*, in the sense of seventy sevens of *years*, at Christ’s *first* coming and the subsequent destruction of Jerusalem.<sup>5</sup> Dr. Todd regards it as a prophecy of seventy sevens of *days*, and as yet to be *fulfilled* near the time of Christ’s *second* coming.<sup>6</sup>—Among later novelties of difference we find Mr. C. Maitland, the day-dayist, affirming the Apocalyptic Babylon to be Papal Rome as it *has* been; while Mr. Burgh and others affirm that it means Rome only as it has *not* been:—and Mr. J. Kelly declaring that the rider of the white horse in the 1st Seal is *Antichrist*, Mr. W. Kelly that it certainly is *not Christ*; <sup>7</sup> while nearly all the rest of their brethren declare it as certainly to be *Christ*.<sup>8</sup>—But it is quite needless to enlarge further.<sup>9</sup> What

Irenæus v. 25; “Ad quem (sc. Antichristum) fugit vidua oblita Dei, id est *terrena Jerusalem*, ad ulciscendum de inimico.”

<sup>1</sup> See Burgh’s Lecture 13 on the sealing of the 144,000. Maitland (on Antichrist, p. 14) infers the fact from the Angel’s saying to Daniel, Dan. x. 14, “I am come to make thee understand what shall befall *thy people* in the latter days.” For he takes for granted that what he calls the *Infidel King* (I prefer the designation of *self-deifying King*) of the vision following, in Dan. xi. 36, is the same as the *Antichrist*, or *Little Horn* of Dan. vii.:—a point which some may think doubtful, though I myself incline to the same view. See my exposition of Dan. xi. in the 4th Volume.

<sup>2</sup> Second Enquiry, p. 101.

<sup>3</sup> On the opening of the 7th Seal, p. 197.

<sup>4</sup> On Antichrist, p. 6.

<sup>5</sup> Maitland, First Enq., p. 5; M’Caul, p. 37. So too, with the reservation however of the *last* hebdomad, as still future, Burgh on Apoc. p. 439; and Trotter, “Plain Papers,” p. 292.

<sup>6</sup> On Antichrist, p. 192. Says Dr. Todd; “Nor am I quite sure that commentators are justified in taking the word  $\text{שָׁבַע}$  to mean *weeks* of *years*.” What will Dr. M. say to this?

<sup>7</sup> In proof Mr. W. K. (p. 104) nearly copies my own argument, Vol. i. p. 124.

<sup>8</sup> e. g. Burgh, Todd, Govett, &c.

<sup>9</sup> It is worth observing that both the one class of the *day-day* expositors, and the

has been said will, I think, suffice to show, that although the differences may have been great among year-day interpreters, the day-day system has proved, to say the least, a principle of union no whit more successful.<sup>1</sup>

As to the alleged *unsatisfactoriness of former year-day Commentaries*, both on the points alluded to and many others, (a view of them in which I of course more or less agree,) the objection does not affect the present Commentary. It must be judged of on its own merits. I have certainly myself no fear of defectiveness of evidence being fairly proved against it. In a subsequent Chapter<sup>2</sup> I shall have to present a general summary of its evidence. For the present let me only observe, in reference to those two self-same particular prophecies on which Dr. Maitland has dwelt, as furnishing the most characteristic specimens of the unsatisfactoriness of the year-day expositions, I mean the *six first Seals* and the *Death and Resurrection of the Witnesses*,<sup>3</sup> that I am perfectly content they should be made the *primary* tests of my own: as well as that too of the *Beast Antichrist*, and his adjuncts, as described in the Apocalypse; on which Dr. M. also insists, as exhibiting the failure of year-day expositors. I would only desire, in order to the more thorough completeness of the trial, that a *double* testing process should be applied to my historical expositions of the three prophecies: and that the examiner should not only look to detect flaws, if such

other, alike shrink from any real testing of the prophetic periods by *fact*.—The *Præterists* say that the periods are not to be construed *exactly* as  $3\frac{1}{2}$  years; that being rather the duration of the type of Antiochus Epiphanes. Yet some add that the Jerusalem siege, during which Gentiles trod the holy precincts, was *not much more*. Thus Eichhorn, on Apoc. xi. 2, after saying that the time of the Jewish war to the destruction of Jerusalem was 4 years, not  $3\frac{1}{2}$  only, he adds, as the real explanation, that  $3\frac{1}{2}$  years was a kind of standard time of public calamity with the Jews: “Solenne Judæis fuit ad  $3\frac{1}{2}$  annorum spatium omnis calamitatis publicæ tempus revocare.” And Bossuet, also, on Apoc. xi. 2; “C’est ici un nombre mystique. Ne retombons dans la petitesse de vouloir trouver des nombres précis.” At the same time he is glad to be able to refer to one persecution of the Christian saints, viz. Valerian’s, as *not much more* than  $3\frac{1}{2}$  years.—On the other hand the Futurists have all the vagueness of the uncertainties of the future, to admit of their supposing of an exact future  $3\frac{1}{2}$  years fulfilment.

<sup>1</sup> Since the above (substantially) was printed in my first edition, Mr. Birks has displayed on a more extensive scale, and with convincing power, the contrarieties of the *day-day* interpreters.

<sup>2</sup> Part vi. chap. 5.

<sup>3</sup> “We point the infidel to the captive Jew and the wandering Arab; but who challenges him with the *slain Witnesses*? . . . We send him to muse on the ruined city of David, and to search for the desolate site of Babylon; but who builds his arguments on the *opened Seals* of the Apocalypse?” First Enquiry, p. 84.

there be, in the proposed solutions, but further consider if he could himself devise symbolic pictures that would so exactly figure what I have referred them to. At least let this second process be followed in testing the interpretation of the *six first Seals*; it being that on which all the rest follows. I have myself tried it in the way I speak of. And I cannot but think that others like me will find, on doing so, that to devise a succession of symbolic representations so brief and simple, yet so complete and correct, alike in regard of historic fact and historic philosophy, chronological and national appropriateness of symbol, dramatic concinnity, and the requirements of scriptural analogy, in relation to the great subject which I assert them to have prefigured, is quite beyond their power.

3rdly, there are *two historical difficulties* that have been urged with great effect by Dr. Maitland against all explanation of *the Apocalyptic Beast* as symbolizing the *Popedom*;—an explanation so essentially connected with the *year-day* system advocated by Protestants, that it may be deemed part and parcel of it. The *one* has reference to the fact of many, who are yet considered to have been *saints of Christ*, living and dying during the earlier centuries of the Papacy *in ignorance of the Pope's being the predicted Antichrist*;<sup>1</sup>—the *other* to the alleged *necessary participation of all such* (according to the same *year-day* interpretation) *in the tremendous curse and perdition of Babylon itself*.<sup>2</sup>

But with regard to the *first*,<sup>3</sup> I would beg to ask, where is the declaration to be found in Scripture prophecy, that *so soon as Antichrist appeared*, so soon he would be known and recognised by all Christ's saints as the predicted Anti-

<sup>1</sup> See Note <sup>3</sup> *infra*.

<sup>2</sup> See p. 295 *infra*.

<sup>3</sup> "Is it credible that the Church of God had to wander up and down through a period of nearly three centuries, [the 6th, 7th, and 8th,] inquiring when she was delivered into the hand of a cruel and blasphemous tyrant? . . . The delivery of the saints into the hand of their persecutor was surely a solemn act. . . And might we not expect that this solemn act of her delivery would be known in her assemblies, registered in her calendar, commemorated in her services, and never lost sight of by her members? But, instead of this, . . . one generation after another past away, and the secret was not discovered." *First Enquiry*, p. 57.—He specifies these three centuries, as comprehending the chief commencing epochs of the Papal Antichrist's reign, given by *year-day* expositors.

christ?<sup>1</sup> Or where is the statement made of his adopting from the very beginning of the 1260 days (so as Dr. Maitland asserts)<sup>2</sup> such a course of violence and persecution of the saints, as must necessarily and at once have forced upon them the recognition of him in his true character? The declaration in the *Apocalypse* is simply that "power was given him to prosper<sup>3</sup> forty-two months:" the declaration in *Daniel*, "that the saints would be given into his hand for the equivalent period of a time, times, and half a time."<sup>4</sup> Which last declaration implies indeed his authorized rule and domination over the saints, (as well as over others,) through all that period, and so the recognition by them of their political or ecclesiastical subjection to him: but it does not imply the exercise of his authority and power all the while against them, in the way of active persecution and war.<sup>5</sup> On the contrary, from the prophetic account of the two witnesses, it might rather be inferred that, whereas the Gentiles or paganized Christians would tread the Holy City throughout all the 1260 days, and consequently cause the testimony of the witnesses to be rendered by them all that time in sackcloth, yet it would not be till the period had considerably advanced, that the Beast, i. e. Antichrist, would make war on them and their gospel-witnessing, and so force upon their notice this crowning feature of his antichristian character.<sup>6</sup>—Not unaccordant with which is the tenor of that other prediction, that "the Image of the Beast caused that as many as

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Todd's statement (p. 231) that, when Antichrist comes, he shall be known, and identified with the prophecies of Scripture, "*beyond the possibility of question,*" reads strangely after his citation, in reference to him, of Christ's saying that, if it were possible, the false Christs should deceive even the elect; and it is altogether unwarranted by Scripture!

<sup>2</sup> "The prophecy foretells not the *bondage* but the *destruction* of the saints. . . The tyrant makes no offer of *servitude*; nor could they accept it if he did. They are to obey or to die; they resist and are slain." Second Enquiry, p. 94, 95. He goes on to make this apply to the whole of the 1260 days of the Beast's reign.

<sup>3</sup> *ποιησαι*. See Note <sup>1</sup>, p. 110.—Dr. Maitland (Answer to Cuninghame, p. 85) would take the marginal reading *to make war*. But he has no right to insist on a meaning which is dubious; and further to construe the *war* (if that word be supplied after *ποιησαι*) as all directed against the *saints*.

<sup>4</sup> Dan. vii. 25.

<sup>5</sup> Compare the force of the same expression in Dan. ii. 38; "Whosoever the children of men dwell, the beasts of the field and the fowls of the heaven hath he given into thine hand, and hath made thee ruler of them all."

<sup>6</sup> See my Vol. ii. pp. 411—422.—Such was precisely *Cyril's* view; Cat. xv. "At first he shall pretend to humaneness of character;" then afterwards "show himself as God, and persecute the church." See my Vol. i. p. 389.

would not worship the Beast's image should be killed." For, the Image being of course subsequent in time to the lamb-like Beast that formed it, and the lamb-like Beast's own rising subsequent in time to that of the first Beast,—the dicta and the acts of the Image must à fortiori have been later than the commencement of the 1260 days of that first Beast's reign. In fact, if my view be correct that *Papal General Councils* were meant by the *Image*, (nor do I fear any one's disproving it,) forasmuch as these were first formed only in the xiith century,<sup>1</sup> they could not have embraced in their persecuting enactments any one of those three centuries, (the 6th, 7th, and 8th,) to which Dr. M. has most particularly referred, as a period to which the absurdity applied of Christ's saints being persecuted even to death by Antichrist, yet not knowing him.<sup>2</sup>—This varying state of the saints during the 1260 years has been illustrated by comparison with that of Abraham's seed in the 400 predicted years of trial from Isaac to the Exodus:<sup>3</sup> during *all* of which these latter were to be strangers, I might perhaps say dependents, in the land of their pilgrimage; but during *a part* only persecuted and oppressed, so as to have the bondage enter into their soul.—Again, as to the temporary ignorance of the *Pope's* real character as *Antichrist*, we may perhaps not inappropriately compare it with the temporary ignorance of Jewish saints before them in regard of the character of *Jesus* as the *Christ*. For we know that for many years after Christ's birth, and for some even after his proclamation by John the Baptist and the opening of his ministry, there were sincere Israelites who so far failed to recognise him. In the one case, as in the other, the development of the evidence was to be gradual.<sup>4</sup>—

<sup>1</sup> See my Chapter vii. p. 238, *suprà*.      <sup>2</sup> See the extract Note <sup>3</sup> p. 292, *suprà*.

<sup>3</sup> Gen. xv. 13; "And God said to Abram, Know of a surety that thy seed shall be a stranger in a land that is not theirs, (and they shall serve them, and they shall afflict them,\*) four hundred years." (I write the clause as a parenthesis, accordingly with the view which I take of the passage, in common with Dr. Maitland. Answer to Cuninghame, p. 85.) Mr. Cuninghame with great justice adverts to this parallel. *Strictures on Maitland*, p. 49. Nor does Dr. M.'s parenthetical construction of the clause, given above, destroy the force of the parallel.

<sup>4</sup> It seems possible from Daniel's description of Antichrist's *horn* as at first *little*,

---

\* Observe here the change of the nominative, and compare it with a similar change in Apoc. xi. 13, noted Vol. ii. p. 483; where may be seen other examples.

Only it must be remembered that this temporary ignorance of the Pope's being the predicted Antichrist, would not involve the reception of his antichristian doctrine, in so far as regarded the *essentials* of the Christian faith. This, we know, could not be with the elect.<sup>1</sup> And in fact we have seen reason to believe, on good historical evidence, that throughout the earlier, as well as later half, of the 1260 years of Papal domination, there were those who faithfully witnessed for Christ's doctrine, in contradistinction to that of him whom yet they knew not to be the predicted Antichrist :<sup>2</sup> and also others, weaker in discernment, faith, and courage ; (such, for example, as the Carthusian monk mentioned at my p. 68 supra ; ) who, like the 7000 of the Lord's secret ones of old, were known to God, though not to man, as not bowing the knee to Baal.

The *second* historical objection (one urged with even yet more force by Dr. Maitland against the *year-day anti-Papal* view of the prophecy) is derived from that awful denunciation by the Angel of Apoc. xiv. ; " If any man worship the Beast and his Image, and receive his mark in his forehead or his hand, the same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God ; and he shall be tormented with fire and brimstone ; and the smoke of their torment ascendeth up for ever." For he justly supposes that no year-day interpreter will be prepared to contend that among all that were visibly connected with Rome through the 1260 years, there were none of God's saints. And then, after urging the incredibility " that when God had pronounced so heavy a curse on all that might worship the Beast, or receive his mark, He should actually have concealed from his Church that most important fact, that the person or power whom they religiously believed to be their spiritual Head, and the very Vicar of Christ upon earth,—whom under this view

but afterwards assuming a great mouth,—that it may then in the symbol have overtopped the other ten : in which case it must have appeared to the prophet to grow larger and larger, in gradual development.—I prefer, however, to explain the little horn as a symbolic of the Pope's small *temporal* power ; the great mouth of his mighty *spiritual* pretensions.

<sup>1</sup> " To deceive, if it were possible, the very elect." Matt. xxiv. 24. This, if applicable in the first instance to the false prophets before Jerusalem's destruction, would seem from the various prophecies of Antichrist to be applicable to him, and his times, also.

<sup>2</sup> See my Chapter on the Witnesses.



they received with reverent honour and worship,—and whose mark they took upon them in simple faith that it was the seal of the living God,—that this personage was indeed THE BEAST, the great enemy of their God and Saviour,”<sup>1</sup>—he states it as a necessary corollary of the *year-day* system, that all in past ages who did thus act, must be supposed (a supposition doubtless incredible) to have received the Beast’s mark, and so, according to the prophecy, “to have *past into perdition*.”<sup>2</sup>

I consider this to have been probably the most effective and influential of all Dr. Maitland’s arguments. Yet how simple and complete the answer! It needs but to remember that the vision of that third Angel, and his warning voice, has of course its *proper chronological position* in the prophecy, just as all the other prefigurative visions: and that this its position is *at the very end of the predicted 1260 years*; for it follows after a declaration of the close impending fall of Babylon,<sup>3</sup> and only a little before the sign of the coming of the Son of Man to judgment.<sup>4</sup> Whence the inference that it prefigures a warning voice probably *even yet future*:—a warning to be given to such of God’s saints as may be *then* in Babylon, (and that such there will be, *even then*, appears from the parallel warning voice of another Apocalyptic Angel crying, “Come out of her, my people,”<sup>5</sup>) precisely like what was given to Lot on the night before the destruction of Sodom. And we might just as well argue that the anti-Sodomitic Angel’s implied denunciation against all who *afterwards* remained in Sodom, that they would “be consumed in the iniquity of the city,” had reference to residents within it during *the whole previous period* of its flagrant wickedness,—thus involving God’s servant Lot himself in the tremendous catastrophe that followed,—as to make the Apocalyptic Angel’s curse embrace such as might have been residents in Babylon, and non-recusant subjects of the Papal Beast, before ever the warning voice was uttered, and during the whole previous period of the Beast’s domination. The very basis of Dr.

<sup>1</sup> Why might not Antichrist’s incoming be as an Angel of light? 2 Cor. xi. 14.

<sup>2</sup> Second Enquiry, pp. 99, 100.

<sup>3</sup> Apoc. xiv. 8.

<sup>4</sup> Apoc. xiv. 14.

<sup>5</sup> Apoc. xviii. 4. Let me beg the reader’s particular attention to this.

Maitland's argument seems to me to be nothing more nor less than an *anachronism*.—Besides that, as may easily be shown, his own futurist prophetic theory is just as liable to the objection as the historical.<sup>1</sup>

I have now, as I trust, — either in the observations of the present Section, or in critical notices in other parts of my Work,<sup>2</sup>—replied to almost every objection of consequence that has been urged either by Dr. Maitland, or others, against the *year-day anti-Papal* scheme of Apocalyptic interpretation. And, assuming the *aggressive*, I might further abundantly corroborate the truth of my views on this subject, by showing the essential inconsistency and unsoundness of that counter-view of Apocalyptic interpretation advocated by them, which would construe the 1260 days, predicated of Antichrist's dominancy, as simply so many days *literally* taken. But it would detain us too long. I must reserve it for the Appendix in my last Volume.<sup>3</sup>

Let me only, ere concluding, beg my readers never to forget the standing test of Daniel's symbolic image, when considering the *Futurists'* view of the year-day question. It is of course essential to their theory to explain its last and final empire of iron, in whole or in part, as that of the supposed yet future Antichrist. But how so, and yet preserve the continuity of the statue? Where, on that theory,

<sup>1</sup> For, considering that his fancied Antichrist of the future is expected by our critic from the very first to have such power given him of doing all kinds of wonders and miracles, as to deceive the world into the idea of his being God, wherefore (it might be argued after Dr. M.) should they who are thus led to look on him as God, and whose mark they take on themselves in this belief, incur consequently this most terrible denunciation of the Apocalyptic Angel? Dr. Maitland's prophetic theory is a mere postponement of the difficulty suggested by him, not a removal of it.

<sup>2</sup> See my discussion of his argument on the Beast's *seven heads*, p. 117, &c. *suprà* : and of those on the true meaning of *εαυτον*, the true character of the *Paulikians*, &c., as Witnesses for Christ, and the right view of the predicted *Antichrist's religion*, in my critical Notices in the Appendices to Volumes ii. and iv.

With regard to that which *Mr. Burgh* has made his *primary* argument against the Protestant view of the *Popes* being St. Paul's *Man of Sin* and *Antichrist*, viz. that the Man of Sin is spoken of as an *individual*, (Second Advent, Lect. 2.)—an argument which has been also often urged by others, especially Romanists,—the reader may remember that it is answered p. 95, Note 3.\* But indeed it seems to me needless to amplify on a figure of speech so notorious in every language, and in writings alike sacred and profane.

<sup>3</sup> Viz. in my Critique on the Futurist Scheme, Vol. iv.

\* Let the Romanist objectors look further to the quotation Note 1, p. 208 *suprà*, in which the individual *Peter* is used to include the whole *line* or *succession* of Popes following him in the See of Rome; also to Pope Innocent's explanation of the Man of Sin as *Mahommedism*, in Note \*, p. 257.

has the mighty Roman Papal empire, with its associated kingdoms of Western Christendom, now of near 1260 *years'* duration, a place in the symbolic image? Mr. Burgh's idea of its being but the continuance of Augustus' old Roman empire, and so included in the undivided part of the statue's iron legs, leaving the division of the ten toes to a future Antichrist, is too palpably contrary to historic fact, as we saw, not to be rejected by the more acute and learned of his futurist brethren themselves.<sup>1</sup> But what then the counter-view of these dissentients, Todd and Maitland? Whether the third great empire, symbolized by the belly and thighs of brass, mean the Macedonian Empire<sup>2</sup> or the imperial Roman,<sup>3</sup> is a point on which they seem to differ. But on this they agree,—that the whole of the *iron legs* was meant to figure the yet future empire of *Antichrist*:<sup>4</sup> a view implying that between the *lower end of the brazen thighs* and the *beginning of the iron legs*, there was, or else ought to have been, a *gap in the statue*, in token of some *twenty* or some *thirteen unrepresented* centuries! I cannot but think that it would have almost sufficed to disabuse Drs. Maitland and Todd of what I must beg to call their hallucinations on this subject, if they had but appended a lithograph of the statue, sketched according to their view of it, for the benefit of their readers: with the iron legs separated at a distance by some empty void from the thighs of brass; or dangling, suspended from above the knee-joints, by a long thin thread!

§ 2.—COMMENCING AND TERMINATING EPOCHS OF THE BEAST'S PREDICTED 1260 YEAR-DAYS OF SUPREMACY.

And what then, on this our *year-day* theory, are we to view as *the commencing epoch*, or *epochs*, to Antichrist's 1260 years of empire? On this point I have already incidentally spoken, in the course of my historical sketch of

<sup>1</sup> See p. 289 *suprà*.

<sup>2</sup> Dr. M. supposes the *Babylonian*, *conjointly with the Persian*, to have been the 1st of Daniel's four great mundane empires, figured in the image; the *Macedonian* the 2nd; the *Roman* ("which has now long ceased to exist") the 3rd; *Antichrist's*, yet future, the 4th. See his Tract on Antichrist, pp. 5, 6. Also my notice of him, at p. 289, already referred to.

<sup>3</sup> See Todd's Antichrist.

<sup>4</sup> See, again, p. 289 *suprà*.

Antichrist's development. But it may be useful briefly to revert to the point more directly and specifically. I purpose therefore in the present Section to make a few observations with reference to it, in part recapitulatory of what was before stated, in part confirmatory; and with some further explanations also added on the subject. They will serve, I think, not only to fix clearly on my readers' minds the chronology of the *commencing* epochs spoken of; but also to prepare them for my historic view of the *primary* epoch of *termination*, to be given in Part V.

It may be remembered then that in a preceding Chapter, after mentioning the *two* commencing epochs of the 70 predicted years of Israel's Babylonish captivity, and the desolation of Jerusalem and its temple, as my precedent for assigning *two* commencing epochs to the Beast's 1260 days,<sup>1</sup>—each, it was intimated, with its corresponding epoch of termination,—I noted the epoch of the *promulgation of Justinian's Code and Decretal Epistle to the Pope*, A.D. 529—533, as very probably that of the *primary* commencement of the Papal Beast's

<sup>1</sup> See the Note p. 163 *suprà*.—The fact of there being two beginning dates, and two correspondently ending dates, to the predicted seventy years of the Jews' captivity in Babylon and Jerusalem's desolation, has been often noted. So (Proleg. in Zach.) Vitringa: "Est pulcherrimum Petavii aliorumque observatum periodum 70 annorum, decretorum punitioni Judææ gentis, ad perfectum implementum prophetiæ *bis* representatum esse. A primo anno Nebuchodonosoris (quem Scriptura copulat cum quarto Jehoiakimi) ad 22 exeuntem Cyri, \* quo captivitas est soluta, anni sunt 70. Adde Cyri 8, Cambysis et Magi 8, Darii 2; fiunt 88. Deductis annis 18 restant 70 [= intervallum] ab *excidio urbis [et templi]* usque ad annum 2 Darii;" the year when he issued the Decree for the rebuilding of the temple. So too Lightfoot, Vol. ii. p. 320.

The passage from Vitringa is cited by Davison, at p. 309 of his Warburton Lectures; who observes, "that this equality of time between the whole duration of the captivity and the desolation of the temple, though not coincident the one with the other, is certainly a remarkable fact." So too Scott on 2 Chron. xxxvi. 21, and Ezra vi. 13. Compare 2 Kings xxiv. 1, xxv. 8; Jeremiah xxv. 1; Ezra i. 1, iv. 24, vi. 1—8; Zech. i. 1.

Thus, though Jeremiah simply mentioned one period, "Judah shall serve the king of Babylon seventy years," (Jer. xxv. 11, 12, xxix. 10),—yet, we see, there was in fact a double commencement to this 70 years' captivity, and a double deliverance corresponding. First Nebuchadnezzar, after besieging and taking Jerusalem, carried away king Jehoiakim and many other captives, (*Daniel* among them,) B.C. 606: 70 years after which, B.C. 536, *Cyrus* issued his Decree for the Jews' return. Next in the year 589 or 588, Zedekiah having rebelled, Nebuchadnezzar again attacked, took, and destroyed Jerusalem, with its temple, and carried away all that remained of any consideration to Babylon: from which date 70 years brings us to the Decree of *Darius Hystaspes*, about B.C. 519 or 518, in the time of the prophets Haggai and Zechariah.

\* This is the first year of Cyrus' enlarged and sole reign, after the subjugation of Babylon. It is so designated Ezra i. 1.

1260 predicted years of supremacy. In proof of the appropriateness of the epoch I stated, and illustrated somewhat fully from history, the concurrent facts following:—1. that of Western Christendom having just then emerged from the Gothic flood in the form of ten kingdoms, like that of the ten-horned Apocalyptic Beast, all in ecclesiastical subordination *de jure* by the imperial decree to the Patriarchate of Rome; <sup>1</sup>—2. that of the Roman Patriarch having just then had given to him in solemn Church Council, and unhesitatingly assumed to himself, as but his due, the blasphemous title and character of CHRIST'S VICAR, or ANTI-CHRIST; <sup>2</sup>—3. that of the code of Imperial law, on its then solemn revision and publication, both confirming to the fullest extent the Pope's ecclesiastical supremacy, and in no slight measure recognising and sanctioning his antichristian pretensions and character. <sup>3</sup>—It was further shown that the Roman Popes,—thus antichristian themselves, and the espousers of doctrines false and superstitious,—having by the same law been confirmed in their judicial supremacy as judges of faith and heresy, there resulted by necessary consequence a legal intolerance (whether as yet enforced or not) of faithful witnessing for Christ; <sup>4</sup> so that Christ's *two symbolic witnesses* might be supposed to have thenceforward begun their predicted 1260 *years of prophesying in sackcloth*.—To which I might add that through the then revival, though under Christian name, and in the professing Church, (so as elsewhere described by me, <sup>5</sup>) of the old polytheistic worship and ceremonies, a third symbolic figuration, to which the same period attached, seemed also to have then had fulfilment, viz. of  *Gentiles in spirit, and worship, occupying the courts of the professedly Christian temple, and treading the Holy City*: <sup>6</sup>—

<sup>1</sup> See pp. 146, 147.

<sup>2</sup> p. 157.

<sup>3</sup> See pp. 160—162.

<sup>4</sup> p. 164. "Heretics were deprived," says Gibbon, "under Justinian's iron yoke, not only of the benefits of society, but of the common birth-right of men and Christians." viii. 320. So in reference to Justinian himself primarily; but the statement is equally applicable to the Popes, as administrators both of Justinian's and of the Pope's own law.

<sup>5</sup> See my Vol. i. pp. 330—337.—Gibbon notes the revival of Paganism as *beginning* in professing Christendom very speedily after the destruction of professed Paganism by Theodosius. But the Apocalyptic prophetic periods refer to Rome's anti-Christianism as *established* in power after the empire's revival in a new form on emergence from the Gothic flood; according to Apoc. xii. 15—17, xiii. 1.

<sup>6</sup> Apoc. xi. 2.

moreover, through all this, and through the corruption of Church-doctrine, that of the *Woman*, the *faithful* professing Catholic Church, once visibly incorporate before men, disappearing from view, and entering as it were on a *wilderness-state*, exiled and invisible.<sup>1</sup> So that this epoch might seem to answer to all of the four probably parallel periods of 1260 years, noted in Chapters xi., xii., and xiii. of the Apocalyptic prophecy; the *nobilis quaternio vaticiniorum*, as Mede calls them.—I wish now to add that the epoch has not been fixed on, as a fit commencing epoch to the period of *Papal supremacy*, for the first time by modern expositors. It is one noted by earlier Protestant writers, as *Brightman*,<sup>2</sup> *Cressener*,<sup>3</sup> *Mann*,<sup>4</sup> &c. : and by Romanists too; e. g. the Jesuit *Gordon*,<sup>5</sup> and *Gothofred*, Editor of the Justinian Code. The latter more especially, speaking of Justinian's decretal epistle to the Pope, notes it as the first Imperial recognition of the primacy of Rome over Constantinople; i. e. of its *absolute* primacy. "It is hence evident," he says, "that they who suppose *Phocas* to have been the first that gave Imperial recognition to the primacy of the Roman See over that of Constantinople are in error; *Justinian* having acknowledged it before."<sup>6</sup>—At the same time it

<sup>1</sup> Apoc. xii. 14. See pp. 45—52, and 65—68 *supra*.

<sup>2</sup> Brightman (on Apoc. xiii. 3) refers to Justinian's Decree and that of Phocas conjointly, as the healing "plaisters" of the Roman Beast's deadly wound.

<sup>3</sup> Cressener, B. iv. c. 1. His epoch is that of Justinian's reconquest of Italy.

<sup>4</sup> "Imperium Romano-Papale tunc natum videtur quum Papam omnium ecclesiarum [Greek, *παντων ιερων του θεου*] caput esse dixit Justinianus, (Cod. L. i. Tit. 1.) A. D. 533, 534: idque non verbo tantum significavit, sed missis ad eum episcopis quasi legatis." So *Mann*, quoted by Bishop Newton on Apoc. xiii.

<sup>5</sup> Ad Ann. 533: "Justinianus ad summum Pontificem legatos mittit, et epistolam de dubiis circa res fidei: in qua egregie Romani Pontificis testatur primatum, et omnium vocat ecclesiarum caput." He refers to Anastasius.

<sup>6</sup> "Ilic collige errare eos qui volunt Imperatorum Phocam primum pro Gregorio Magno Pontifice sententiam tulisse contra Joannem Patriarcham Constantinopolitanum; cum ex his verbis constet tempore Justiniani primatum summo Pontifici donatum fuisse." So the Jurist *Gothofred*, cited by Cuninghame, p. 191.—Compare Godfrey of Viterbo, p. 303.

It is observable that *Paul Warnefrid*, in his History of the Lombards, notes conjointly the promulgation of Justinian's Codex, institution of the Benedictine monastic Order, and Lombard settlement in Pannonia, A. D. 526, as remarkable synchronous events, or nearly so. B. P. M. xiii. 165.—Compare in Miley's "*Rome Pagan and Papal*," ii. 221, the monk Benedict's mention of Justinian's Law, in his supposed speech to Belisarius; as just then promulgated, and as recognising the Roman Bishop's supremacy as the head of all Churches.

I see that A. D. 531, the middle year of the four 529—533, was *astronomically* memorable by the appearance of Halley's famous comet, of 575 years' period: an appearance noted by Gibbon as among the awful portents of the reign of Justinian. vii. 412.

was also stated by me that this epoch could only be regarded as a *primary* and *partial* epoch of commencement to the Beast's 1260 days; because, though *de jure* bound in a manner to Rome as their ecclesiastical head, yet *de facto* the kings of the Western world themselves were not as yet all subject to the Roman See; a non-connexion arising out of the still continued Pagan or Arian faith of several.

2. And thus, it may be also remembered, I alluded to *Phocas' Decree*, in recognition and confirmation of the Papal supremacy, as constituting a fit and complete *secondary* commencing epoch to the Beast's 1260 predicted years of prospering.<sup>1</sup> Let me now, in reference to this epoch, note a few important events which rendered not the one year only, but the four that may be associated with it, from 604 to 608, (like the four associated with Justinian's Decree from 529 to 533,) not a little remarkable. It was in 604 that the Emperor Phocas, Maurice's murderer and successor, first opened his friendly communications with Pope Gregory the First,<sup>2</sup>—the primary step to the Decree that followed: also in that same year that the crowning of the first Catholic (i. e. Roman Catholic) king of the Lombards took place; which marked the accession of the Lombards, last of the ten kingdoms, like as of all the rest before, to the recognition of the spiritual supremacy of Rome.<sup>3</sup> It was in 606 or 607<sup>4</sup> that Phocas promulgated his Decree above-mentioned, in acknowledgment of the primacy of the See of Rome above that of Constantinople, and so above all others. And, once more, it was in 608 that he further

<sup>1</sup> See pp. 162, 163.

<sup>2</sup> See the quotation from Dr. Burton, Note 1 p. 304. Says the Edinburgh Reviewer of Milman (Jan. 1858); "Gregory triumphed with exultation over the slaughter of Maurice, and eulogized in the most fulsome terms one of the most execrable monsters that ever usurped a throne. But, as Bayle observes, Maurice had favoured the Patriarch of Constantinople; and Gregory saw the destruction of a rival authority in the sanguinary triumph of Phocas."

<sup>3</sup> It was the king *Adalold*. He had been baptized in the *Catholic* or *Romish* faith a little before, through the influence of Queen Theodalind, his mother, with King Agilolf; and in this year, according to Muratori, was solemnly crowned, as colleague with his father, in a meeting of the great Diet of the Lombard nation at Milan; King Agilulf, says Paul Diaconus, and the ambassadors of Theodobert II, king of Metz or Austrasia (one of the kings noted p. 146 *suprà*), being present. See P. Warnefrid, B. P. M. xiii. 181, 182; and Muratori ad ann. 604.

In the same year, according to Gordon, the ecclesiastical organization of *England* was begun by Augustine's appointment of Bishops to London and Canterbury.

<sup>4</sup> *Gordon* and *Baronius* make it A.D. 606; *Muratori* 607.

marked his favour to the Pope by giving him the *Pantheon* :—a temple which, originally dedicated to Cybele and all the Pagan gods, was now characteristically dedicated to the *Virgin Mary* (the Cybele of the Papal system) and all the *martyrs*; and in the rites of the corrupt *Christian* worship wherein, thereupon and thenceforward celebrated, a notable illustration was presented of the transfer of the spirit of Paganism into Rome's so-called Christian ritual.<sup>1</sup>—Alike in this case, as in the former, the epoch was noted as a remarkable one in different ages, as well by Romanists as by Protestants. Two original authorities on the subject, those of Anastasius and Paul the Deacon, I have quoted elsewhere.<sup>2</sup> A list of early Protestants referring to it is given below.<sup>3</sup> Of Romanists let me only observe that the very learned Muratori notes the Decree and epoch as important and deserving of observation.<sup>4</sup> And a pillar, not many years since excavated at the base in the Roman Forum, and with an inscription thereby brought to light that connects it with

<sup>1</sup> A.D. 608 is Muratori's date.—See on the affinity of the two rituals the quotation from Gibbon (just a little while since referred to) in my Vol. i. p. 330.

<sup>2</sup> At p. 163 *suprà*.—Let me add that of *Ado*, in his *Chronicon*; B. P. M. xvi. 800. "Phocas, rogante Papâ Bonifacio, statuit sedem Romanam caput esse omnium ecclesiarum, quia Constantinopolitana Ecclesia primam se omnium scribebat. . . Phocas, rogante alio Bonifacio Romano Pontifice, in veteri fano quod Pantheon vocabatur, ablati idololatriæ sordibus, ecclesiam beatæ Virginis Mariæ et omnium Martyrum dedicari jussit: ut, ubi quondam non Deorum sed Dæmoniorum cultus agebatur, ibi deinceps omnium fieret memoria Sanctorum."

<sup>3</sup> First *Luther* himself: "The Pope and Turk both began almost at one time under the emperor Phocas." Table Talk ii. 3, 343. Then next *Osiander*; who dated it similarly "à *Focâ* Imperatore, qui Papatum, seu Primatum, publico edicto stabilivit." So too *Bullinger* speaks under the fifth Trumpet, and on Apoc. xiii., xvii. (Concion. 39, 57, 74), of the Papacy having been established by Pope Gregory I and the *Decree of Phocas*. Again *Foxe*, the Martyrologist, (p. 145,) cites *Chytreus* on the Vision of the Witnesses, thus writing: "If the commencing date, on this principle of angelic months and years, be dated from Alarie's taking of Rome, the ending date would be A.D. 1672: if from *Phocas' Decree*, its ending would be A.D. 1866." And so, *once more*, Paræus, on Apoc. xii. 14.

<sup>4</sup> "Fu assai breve la vita di questo Papa (Bonifazio III): con tutto cio non fece egli poco per avere ottenuto, secondo ch'è lasciarono scritto Paulo Diacono ed Anastasio Bibliotecario, che Foca con un suo decreto dichiarasse qualmente la Chiesa Romana è capo di tutte le chiese." *Annali d'Ital.* ad ann. 607.

Gieseler, 2nd Per. § 115, Note<sup>33</sup>, adds the following curious versified notice of Phocas' grant by Godfrey of Viterbo, in his *Pantheon*, written about A.D. 1186.

Tertius est Papa Bonifacius ille benignus  
Qui petit à Phocâ munus per secula dignum,  
Ut sedes Petri prima sit. Ille dedit.  
Prima prius fuerat Constantinopolitana:  
Est modo Romana, meliori dogmate clara.



the history just given, still stands their memorial; its appellation being *The Pillar of Phocas*.<sup>1</sup>

I have felt justified in the idea of there being intended a *secondary commencing epoch*, such as this, to the 1260 years' predicted period of Papal rule, and with a *secondary* and more complete *epoch of termination* corresponding,—not only because (as before stated) of there being in other Scriptural chronological prophecies such double commencements and double terminations;<sup>2</sup>—but because too both Daniel's prophecy and the Apocalypse seem to hint not obscurely at the destruction of Papal Rome and its power as a result not instantly completed, but rather a process involving some considerable interval of time between its incipency and its completion;<sup>3</sup> also because the length of the interval between the endings of the 1260 and the 1335 years, noted in Daniel xii. as *the time of the end*, (an interval very possibly corresponding with the former,<sup>4</sup>) is *75 years*:—just about the same as between the Justinian commencing epoch and that of Phocas.

But has not the 1260 years' destined period of the

<sup>1</sup> The *Pillar of Phocas* spoken of is a Corinthian fluted column of Greek marble, and standing on a pyramid of eleven steps. In 1813, the Duchess of Devonshire having made an excavation round it, an inscription was discovered on its base, stating that a gilt statue had been placed on the top of it to the Emperor Phocas by the then exarch of Italy, in the year A.D. 608. Dr. Burton, in his book on Rome, gives the inscription at full. The date is thus defined. "Die Prima Mensis August. Indict. Und. ac Pietatis ejus Anno Quinto;" the 11th of the Indiction, and 5th of the reign of Phocas. Now of that Indiction the first was the year 598; the eleventh, the year 608: and, as Phocas began his reign A.D. 602 or 603, its fifth year comes also to A.D. 608. The occasion of the honour is stated to be, "Pro innumerabilibus Pietatis ejus Beneficiis, et pro Quietate procuratâ Italiae, ac conservatâ Libertate." Dr. Burton justly refers this to his concessions to the Pope. In 604, he says, just before Gregory's death, "Phocas wrote to him, proposing an orthodox confession of faith, acknowledged the supremacy of the Roman See, was very liberal to the Roman churches, and allowed the Pantheon to be converted to Christian purposes: all which must have been extremely gratifying to a Pope in the 7th century." Thus the four years from 604 to 608 are notable in the history of Phocas' aggrandizement of the Papal See: and from 529 to 604 is seventy-five years, from 533 to 608 also seventy-five years.

<sup>2</sup> See the Note p. 299.

<sup>3</sup> The judgment of the 7th Trumpet, which we have reason to suppose *primarily* ended the 1260 years of the Beast's prospering, was to be outpoured in seven vials. So in the Apocalypse. In Dan. vii. 26 the judgment, on sitting, was said "to consume and destroy it [the Beast's dominion] *unto the end*:"—an expression implying time.

<sup>4</sup> Dan. xii. 7—12. I say *very possibly* these 75 years may be thus measured from the *primary* ending of the 1260 years' period. At the same time, let me add, it is also very possible that they are to be dated from the *second and complete* ending of the 1260 years; as will be more fully stated when we come to the discussion of Dau. xii. in my 4th Volume.

Beast's prospering, as measured from the *earlier* of our two commencing epochs, already expired? And has time, the great revealer of secrets,<sup>1</sup> set his seal to the truth of our general view of the subject, by unfolding at that its expiration a new and different æra, of such momentous and hostile bearing on the Popedom, as to constitute it a fit primary though imperfect epoch of termination to the period: so fit a one as to prepare us for anticipating with increased assurance a second and more complete epoch of termination at the expiration of 1260 years, as measured from the *second* and *later* epoch of commencement? Of course, in forming my whole judgment on the matter I have had strongly imprest on my mind the great facts of the years 1789—1793, just 1260 years from the date of *Justinian's Code* and *Decretal Letter*, which affirmed the Roman Pope's universal supremacy, being the epoch of the outbreak of the *French Revolution*; by which a blow was dealt to the Papal power from which it has never recovered.—To enter on this however is not my present business. The symbolic vision of the Beast in Apoc. xiii., which we have had so long under consideration, exhibited it in its palmy state of supremacy during the 1260 mystic days of its prospering. The primary end of that period, in the outbreak of the great French Revolution, I conceive to coincide with the 7th Trumpet's sounding in the Apocalyptic prophecy. And the development of that Trumpet is to constitute the subject of the next or Vth Part of this Commentary.

## CHAPTER X.

### THE LAMB'S POLITY OF THE 144,000 ON MOUNT ZION, AND ITS FIRST OMEN OF TRIUMPH.

“AND I looked, and behold the Lamb<sup>2</sup> standing on the

<sup>1</sup> ἐκδίδασκει πανθ' ὁ γηρασκων χρονος. Æschylus, Prom. V.

<sup>2</sup> τὸ ἀρνιον. So A and C with the definite article; which is accordingly inserted in the critical Editions generally; as of Griesbach, Scholz, Heinrichs, Tregelles, Wordsworth.

Mount Zion, and with him an 144,000, having his name, and his Father's name,<sup>1</sup> written on their foreheads.

And I heard a voice from heaven, as the voice of many waters, and as the voice of a great thunder: and the voice which I heard was as that of harpers<sup>2</sup> harping with their harps. And they sing [as it were<sup>3</sup>] a new song before the throne, and before the four living creatures, and the elders. And no man could learn that song but the 144,000, which were redeemed from the earth.—These are they which were not defiled with women; for they are virgins. These are they which follow the Lamb whithersoever he goeth. These were redeemed from among men, being the first-fruits unto God and the Lamb. And in their mouth was found no lie:<sup>4</sup> for they are blameless [before the throne of God].

And I saw another angel flying in mid-heaven, having the everlasting gospel, &c."—Apoc. xiv. 1—5.

But what meanwhile of Christ's true saints and servants? Could there be omitted, even in the *supplemental* series of visions that we are now considering, a notice of these also; to indicate their existence, position, and the chief successive epochs of change affecting them, during that long and dark period of the Beast's reign? Not so. Just as in the *former* series of visions, or *Part within written* of the Apocalyptic scroll, there had been both intimations given, and visions represented, concerning this the Lord's people, in the midst of others figurative of the growing apostasy, and the punishments consequent thereon, of the rest of Christendom,—and *first*, and on the prefiguration of the earliest marked commencement of the Apostasy, they had been depicted to St. John as the 144,000, elect by divine sovereign grace from out of the midst of the 12 tribes of the mystic Israel, or professing Church, with God's own mark on their fore-

<sup>1</sup> το ὄνομα αὐτοῦ καὶ τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ. So A, B, C, and the critical Editions.

<sup>2</sup> Καὶ ἡ φωνὴ ἦν ἡκουσα ὡς κιθαρῶδων. So A, B, C, and the critical Editions generally. Our authorized translation reads, καὶ φωνὴν ἡκουσα.

<sup>3</sup> [ὡς] ᾠδὴν καινὴν. Griesbach, Scholz, Heinrichs, Wordsworth reject the ὡς: Tregelles retains it.

<sup>4</sup> ψευδὸς lie. So A, B, C, and the critical Editions; instead of the δόλος of the received text. They also leave out the ἐνώπιον τοῦ θρόνου τοῦ Θεοῦ, given in our authorized translation after ἀμῶμοι εἰσι, in the next clause.

heads, and God's own guarantee of indestructibility amidst the plagues coming on the earth,<sup>1</sup>—*then* intimation been given of an intervention of Christ himself in favour of the cause committed to them, and of the cleansing for them of the temple of Christian worship, followed by the visible elevation of witnesses for Christ from out of their number to a high position of comparative authority and power,<sup>2</sup>—*then*, in fine, on the 7th Trumpet's sounding, a figuration been made of the opening to the wide world of the purified mystic temple, now seen in heavenly elevation,<sup>3</sup> and a declaration of the time of the consummation being included in that Trumpet, and of the saints' final triumph and judgment on their enemies,—so in this supplemental series we have three precisely corresponding notices of them, if I mistake not:—*viz.* 1st, in the vision of the 144,000 with the Lamb on Mount Zion; 2ndly, in that of the outburst of harpings and a new song, heard from the mystic temple in heaven, which song was only understood, it is intimated, by the 144,000: 3rdly, in that of the sending forth of the message of the everlasting gospel to every nation and people in the wide world under heaven; followed by a rapid sketch of certain consequent events ending in the consummation and the judgment.—The last of the three æras so depicted concerned the 7th Trumpet, I conceive, like as the last in the former series of visions; and so it belongs to the 5th or next Part of my Commentary to develop it, not to this. The other two I now proceed to notice.

1. And, as regards the *primary* symbol depicted in vision, its direct and evidently intended contrast to that previously depicted in Apoc. xiii. will doubtless at once strike the reader:—the one that of Antichrist as a Wild Beast, the Dragon's creature and substitute; with a lamb-personating Priesthood in attendance, to assist him in

<sup>1</sup> Apoc. vii. See my Vol. i. pp. 259, 274—276, 293, &c.

<sup>2</sup> Apoc. x. 1—xi. 1, 2, 12.

<sup>3</sup> Apoc. xi. 19. The heaven in which the temple was seen, when thus opened to the world, must be carefully distinguished from that of the manifestation of the divine glory and presence: the latter being ever figured by the *inmost sanctuary* distinctively of the temple of vision, with the 24 elders and the throne of Jehovah.

playing off his part as a God on earth, and a usurper of Christ's functions, titles, offices, prerogatives, and dignity ; with Babylon, the seven-hilled Babylon, for his capital and throne ; and all the world wondering after him, worshipping his image, and receiving the impress of his mark and name :—the other that of Christ, the true Lamb, standing on Mount Zion,<sup>1</sup> the citadel of the city which was David's royal seat in the olden times, and type, under a better dispensation, of Christ's own royalty and the polity of the saints ; with the little company of the 144,000, marked with his own name and his Father's on their foreheads, gathering round him as their King :—while, at the same time, the sad and desolated appearance of the lower slope of the holy city adjacent, and the treading of the adjacent outer and even inner temple-court by the Gentile adherents of the Beast, testified further probably, at the opening of this vision, to the success thus far of the Beast Antichrist's usurpation.<sup>2</sup>—The truth of this prefigurative vision, as realized in the history of Western Christendom, or Anti-christendom, from the time of the Roman Popes' first successful establishment of their rule as Christ's pretended Vicars on earth, and that of the evangelic Christians excommunicated by it as heretics, has been already shown at large. And, as St. John must be looked upon as having seen these visions in the character of a *symbolic man*, representative of *the apostolic line of true Christian ministers*, through the æras successively depicted,<sup>3</sup> so here too the truth of the prefigurative vision appears distinctly on the page of history. For assuredly, from the time of the first establishment of the Papacy, it was with Christ's servants the averted view from the Papal Antichrist, and his pseudo-Christian priesthood

<sup>1</sup> Standing ; not enthroned, like the Beast.

<sup>2</sup> Compare Apoc. xi. 2, on the holy city being trodden during the Beast's 1260 year-days by the heathen of the outer court of the symbolic temple ; and Apoc. xii. 14, on the Woman, the true catholic visible church, having the wilderness as her home for the 1260 years. Also Isa. i. 8 : "The daughter of Zion is left as a cottage in a vineyard, and as a besieged city."

The reader must carefully distinguish between this *earthly Zion* in the figurations, as the symbol of the saints' *polity* during their earthly state, (just as the pictured *earthly temple* symbolized their *earthly church-worship*), and the *heavenly Jerusalem*, of Apoc. xx., where there was *no temple*, the symbol of their completed polity and church, in a better state.

<sup>3</sup> See especially Vol. i. 300, &c. ; also Vol. ii. 115, &c.

and mundane Catholic Church, to Christ, the Lamb of God, and his true spiritual Church of *the faithful in heart*, whose names are written in heaven, known to Christ distinctively from others, though not so known to men, the blessed company of all true believers,—I say it was the clear fixt view of this which, more perhaps than anything else, ✓ was their preservative from absorption by the ever increasing power, as well as errors and seductions, of the great Apostasy. Already, ere the completion of the apostasy, and manifestation of the Papal Antichrist, we have seen that a revelation of this the true Church of Christ, distinctively from the professing, with reference to its origin, character, and destiny, had been communicated from above, through the teaching and ministry of the great Augustine:¹ nor was it ever lost sight of afterwards by the really faithful, from the earliest Papal times down to the depths of the middle age. At which latter epoch, together with this continued view of Christ and his Church of the 144,000, a clearer and distincter view was also obtained, and never thenceforth abandoned, of *Papal Rome* as nothing less than ✓ the Apocalyptic Babylon, or city of *Antichrist*, in direct opposition to *Zion* the ideal city of *Christ*. Such, we have seen, was the view received and taught by the Waldenses;² such by the Wicliffites, Hussites,³ Moravians, &c.; down even to the Reformation.

Nor will it be uninstrucive to the reader to mark now, as before, in connexion with the descriptive sketch here given, the fact of the Pope's usurpation to himself and his adherents, during the 1260 years of his supremacy, of all the characteristics here ascribed to Christ and his saints. For the Pope's *Roman City*, according to them, was the *Holy City*:⁴ his supremacy and see its mystical *Mount*

¹ See my Part i. Chap. vii. § 4.—“Ubi Christus, ibi Ecclesia.”

² So the Waldensic Treatise on Antichrist: “En l'Apocalyps J. Xt. admonesta per propria vouz, e comanda lo sio poble issir de Babilouia, . . . e conjoinguer se a Hierusalem sancta cita.” Monastier ii. 346, 348.

³ See the Hussite medal in my Vol. ii. p. 460.

⁴ “Holy Rome.”—The sermons of Councils and bulls of Popes offer many examples of the Romish Church, or *Civitas*, being represented under the character of *the heavenly Jerusalem*. See those cited in my Vol. ii. pp. 442—445.—So *Pagan Rome* too was in earlier times called *ουρανοπολις*.

Strange that at this time of day, and in this kingdom, there should be found any to designate *Papal Rome* as the *Holy City*!

*Zion*:<sup>1</sup> the professing Christendom subject to him *the twelve tribes of Israel*:<sup>2</sup> they that became crusaders at his mandate, against infidels *or heretics*, the *takers up of the cross to follow Christ*;<sup>3</sup> and the vow-bound monks and nuns of his jurisdiction the Apocalyptic 144,000, privileged hereafter to follow the Lamb, as the *virgin bride* of Christ.<sup>4</sup> So we have here another example of *allusive contrast*.—On the other hand, against the very view of Christ's true Church, here implied to have been realized by those whom St. John symbolized as Christ's *election of grace out of the professing Church*,<sup>5</sup> the redeemed by his blood, the living by his life, and first-born and adopted sons of God,—against this view the Papal Beast, both by his own mouth and that

<sup>1</sup> So Gregory X, A.D. 1272; “Nos qui civitatis veri David, religionis videlicet Christianæ, circæ cuius regimen . . . ininitur.” Hard. vii. 669; &c. And again Leo X in the 9th Session of the 5th Lateran Council: “Postquam ad universalis ecclesiæ curam et regimen . . . divinâ dispensatione vocati fuimus, ex summo apostolatus apice, tanquam ex vertice montis Zion, ea prospicere cepimus, &c.” Hard. ix. 1742. Elsewhere the Pope and Papal Church are made to be the inextinguishable lamp in Jerusalem promised, 1 Kings xi. 36, to David. So Hard. ix. 1684: &c.

<sup>2</sup> In the 5th Lateran Council, for example, Session 6, and in that of Trent, Session 1, the Bishops were addressed as the rulers of the twelve tribes of Israel;—“Vos, Patres, qui sedetis super sedes duodecim judicantes:”—“Sedemus tanquam judicantes duodecim tribus Israel; quibus comprehenditur universus populus Dei.” The latter quotation is from the Papal Legate's opening address at Trent. Hard. ix. 1687, x. 14.—Compare this with what I have said Vol. i. p. 259 of the twelve tribes of Israel, out of which Christ's 144,000 were taken, being Apocalyptically used to designate professing Christendom.

<sup>3</sup> So Innocent III, in his Letter convoking the 4th Lateran Council, of those that took up the cross against the Saracens; Hard. vii. 1. And in Canon 3 of the Council precisely similar praises and privileges were adjudged by him to crusaders against *heretics*. Ib. 19.

<sup>4</sup> So Martene de Rit. ii. 188, from an ancient ritual of the middle age, on a nun taking the vow:—“ut tribunal æterni regis ascensura, celsa palatia cum eisdem merearis portionem qui sequuntur Agnum, et cantant canticum novum sine cessatione.” And again, on her consecration; “Ut eas sociare digneris inter illa 144 millia infantium, quæ virgines permanserunt; et se cum mulicribus non coinquinaverunt; in quorum ore dolus inventus non est.” Elsewhere in the same office the appellation *immaculate* is given to the consecrated nun: the exact Latin rendering of the ἀμωμος of the Apocalyptic passage under consideration.—So too in the once celebrated *Golden Legend* (History of All Halloween) on the excellence of Virgins; “They may have privileges. They may have the crown called *Aureola*. They only shall sing the new song. They shall follow always the Lamb, &c.”\*

<sup>5</sup> There is an implied reference to *the sealing vision*.

\* Jerome curiously opposes this verse 4 to Vigilantius' statement, that the saints after death slept in Abraham's bosom, or under the altar of God, and so could not be present at their tombs. “Tu Deo leges ponis? Tu apostolis vincula injicies? ut usque ad diem judicii teneantur custodiâ, nec sint cum Domino suo; de quibus scriptum est, Sequuntur Agnum quocumque vadit? Si Agnus ubique, ergo et hi.” (Quoted previously, Vol. i. p. 336, Note 3.)

But the yet more ancient Epistle of the Churches of Vienne and Lyons, A.D. 177, speaking of Vettius Epagathus, says that he was a genuine disciple of Christ, “*following the Lamb whithersoever he might go* :” so showing that they construed the vision, like myself, as figurative of all true-hearted Christians *whilst on earth*.

of his Image, directed his fierce anathemas. Did not this, by the deadliest of heresies, in his view, make life and salvation to originate from, and depend on, direct union with *Christ*, not *Christ's Vicar*? So on this point, as well as on others, the followers of P. Valdes, Wicliffe, and Huss, in those early and dark days, fell successively under his ban;<sup>1</sup> and, like them, Luther and Calvin afterwards:—nor these alone; but also the *Jansenists* somewhat later; men who, though *in Rome*, (a memorable exemplification of the co-existence of the two characteristics,) were yet not *of Rome*.<sup>2</sup>—But, though condemned, anathematized, and heaped with opprobrium before the tribunals of the Beast and his Image, their record was far different on high. For the sake of Him who loved and redeemed them, we here read that they were “without fault *before God*.”<sup>3</sup>

2. Next followed a figuration of some forward step in the history of the 144,000; some remarkable and happy crisis, as it would seem, in their fortunes; as if the commencement of, or first step to, the great promised final triumph. For, whereas the previous long-continued state of the Holy City, during the Beast's reign, had been, according to the prophetic announcement, that of being trodden by the Gentiles, and the state of the mystic Temple that of defilement with the presence and gentile idolatries of those adherents of the Beast,<sup>4</sup>—while of Christ's people it was that of oppression, solitariness, and mourning,

<sup>1</sup> Luther at the Diet of Worms said; “I have not blamed all the Councils, but the *Council of Constance*: because, in condemning this statement of Huss, ‘*Ecclesia Christi est universitas predestinatorum*,’ it condemned the Article of the Creed, ‘I believe in the Holy Church Universal.’”—In the trials of the earlier Wicliffites, (as of Lord Cobham, for example,) the difference as to the true definition of the Church was among the most prominent points of difference between the Papists and the Reformers. See Hard, viii. 410, 1200; Merle ii. 265.

<sup>2</sup> The 73rd Proposition of *Jansenius* condemned by Clement XI. A.D. 1713, was as follows. “*Ecclesia est cæteris filiorum Dei, . . . adoptatorum in Christo, subsistentium in ejus personâ, redemptorum ejus sanguine, viventium ejus Spiritu.*” The Pope condemned this and others,—which are in fact little more than Augustine's own statements, developing the Scriptural principle of God's free electing grace,—as “*falsas, perniciosas, impias, blasphemias, hæresim sapientes, hæreticas, &c.*” Hard. xi. 1637, 1640. Cited before in the Note in my Vol. i. p. 317.

Let me be permitted to recommend a perusal of these Propositions, so condemned, to all who would wish to know what Popery really is.

<sup>3</sup> ἀμωμοί [ἐνωπιον του Θεου]. Compare my observations on the words ἐνωπιον του θηριου, said in Apoc. xiii. of the lambskin-covered Beast's responsibility to the Beast Antichrist as his supervisor, p. 206—208 *suprà*. The words within brackets are implied, if not exprest

<sup>4</sup> Apoc. xi. 1, 2.



—we find them here depicted not solitarily, as before, and all without sympathy, occupying Mount Zion, the citadel of the mystical Holy City,<sup>1</sup>—but with harpers (temple-harpers as we shall presently see) harping a new song in symphony with them; and a voice as of many waters and of a great thunder,—that is, of people and princes,<sup>2</sup>—uniting to swell it. There can be no question, I conceive, as to some happy crisis in the earthly fortunes of Christ's saints and people being so prefigured:—some crisis during the Papal Beast's reign,<sup>3</sup> and previous to the universal missionary preaching of the Gospel to every nation and people of the world, noted in a succeeding verse, as of an æra next after following. The only point for inquiry is, *What* crisis? Nor does there seem to me to be ground for hesitation in expounding it of the *Reformation*.

For, besides the circumstance of that being the earliest, indeed *only* epoch of triumph to the anti-Papal saints, noted before the seventh Trumpet in *the former series* of visions,—I refer to the figurations in Apoc. x. xi. of Christ's glorious intervention in their favour, the rejection of the heathen from the mystic temple, the resurrection and ascent of Christ's witnesses, fall of the tenth part of Babylon, and

<sup>1</sup> In the case of *David*, the conquest of the stronghold of the literal Mount Zion from the Jebusites, was a preliminary to his occupation of all Jerusalem. So 1 Chron. xi. 5—8. "And David took the castle of Zion, which is the city of David." Presently after which follows; "And David dwelt in the castle; . . . and he built the city even from Millo, round about: and Joab repaired the rest of the city." So too in the case of the *Maccabean* brothers, who regained the Temple and Mount Zion from the heathen enemy, above twenty years before they were able to dislodge them from their more newly built citadel on Mount Acra. Prideaux ii. 155, 222. (5th Ed.)

And hence St. John's seeing Christ figured as with his saints standing on Mount Zion, might perhaps at first sight be deemed *in itself* the symbol of some epoch of triumph over the enemy, such as at the Reformation. But it must be observed that Christ is here depicted in the character of the *lamb*, the suffering lamb: and simply as *standing* on the Mount; without any such mark of forcible and triumphant descent to seize it, as e. g. in Apoc. x.—And as, with Christ's faithful ones, Zion was ever a favourite figure of the true but invisible polity of the faithful, and it was always felt and understood that Christ was with it, even when most oppressed by the enemy,—I hence infer that the primary emblem of the Lamb, with his 144,000 on Mount Zion, depicted generally Christ's polity of the faithful all through the Beast's reign; and especially, as stated in my text, from the æra when the marked separateness of the two counter-polities forced itself on the view of those faithful witnesses for Christ, whom St. John at this point of the heavenly drama represented. This well agrees with my view of the next emblem of the burst of temple harplings, &c., soon following; as figuring the epoch of their first partial triumph at the Reformation.

<sup>2</sup> Compare Apoc. xix. 6; "I heard as it were the voice of a great multitude, and as the voice of many waters, and of mighty thunderings, saying Alleluia."

<sup>3</sup> This of itself refutes Daubuz' singular view, referring the vision and song to the Church's triumph under *Constantine*. The Papal Beast had not then risen.

voice thereupon from heaven giving God glory,<sup>1</sup>—I say, besides that this circumstance might *à priori* lead us to expect that in *the present and parallel series* that most notable crisis of triumph would not be passed over in silence, it may further be shown that all the most marked characteristics of the vision before us do also agree with it; and so agree, as they do with no other epoch whatsoever in the history of Christ's true Church, since the establishment of the Papacy.

Thus, first, with regard to the *voice* or *song* which the Evangelist heard, we are told that it was that of "*harpers harping with their harps, and singing a new song before the throne, and before the four living creatures, and before the elders.*" Now, had it been simply said to be sung *before the throne*, the idea would have been admissible of its being the song of the blessed Spirits themselves:—those that within the innermost temple of vision, or Holy of Holies, figuring the place of the Divine manifestation, were depicted throughout the Apocalyptic visions as ever present before Him that sat upon the throne; and from time to time offering Him, with their golden harps and voices, the tribute of adoration and praise. But, as it is, the harpers were evidently separate from that blessed company; and thus mortals, not immortals. And, as the scene of the harping, being *before the heavenly company in the Holy of Holies*, would seem to have been the mystic *temple-court*, of which I have so often spoken as the perpetual fore-ground of the Apocalyptic visions, and by consequence the harpers mentioned to have answered to the *Levite temple-harpers* in the Jewish ritual,<sup>2</sup>—and forasmuch, further, as it was evidently a harping in unusual numbers and of unusual joy, and the occasions of any such unusual choruses and harpings of the Levites in the ancient ritual were almost uniformly those either of the dedication, purification, or reformation of the temple,—as in the times of Solomon,

<sup>1</sup> See the Comment on this in my Vol. ii.

<sup>2</sup> "And David separated to the service . . . those who should prophesy with harps, and with psalteries, and cymbals. . . These were for song in the house of the Lord; with cymbals, psalteries, and harps, for the service of the house of God." 1 Chron. xxv. 1, 6.

Hezekiah, Josiah, Ezra, Nehemiah, and the Maccabees,<sup>1</sup>—therefore we seem bound to interpret the present symbolic harpings of some similar ecclesiastical rejoicing, at some similar purification, re-construction, or re-dedication of the mystical temple, or Church, during the Popedom.<sup>2</sup> And what and when this, but that selfsame re-construction of it which was so strikingly prefigured in Apoc. xi. 1, 2, in the former series of visions, and realized at the glorious *Reformation*?—The later burst of song which symphonized with the rise of the missionary spirit at the epoch of

<sup>1</sup> 1. On the induction of the ark into *Solomon's* temple, and its dedication: (2 Chron. v. 11 :) “It came to pass when the priests were come out of the holy place, (for all the priests that were present were sanctified; . . . also the Levites which were the singers, all of them of Asaph, of Heman, of Jeduthun, with their sons and their brethren, being arrayed in white linen, having cymbals, and psalteries, and harps, stood at the east end of the altar, and with them an hundred and twenty priests sounding with trumpets,) it came even to pass that the trumpeters and singers were as one, to make one sound to be heard in praising and thanking the Lord: and they lifted up their voice with the trumpets and cymbals, and instruments of music, and praised the Lord; saying, For he is good, for his mercy endureth for ever.”

2. On *Hezekiah's* cleansing the temple: (2 Chron. xxix. 16, &c. :) “And they brought out all the uncleanness that they found in the temple of the Lord, . . . and they sanctified it. . . . Then Hezekiah rose early, and gathered the rulers of the city, and went up to the house of the Lord. . . . And they brought a sin-offering. . . . And he set the Levites in the house of the Lord with cymbals, psalteries, and harps. . . . And the Levites stood with the instruments of David, and the priests with the trumpets. . . . And, when the burnt-offering began, the song of the Lord began also with the trumpets, and with the instruments ordained by David, king of Israel. And all the congregation worshipped, and the singers sang, and the trumpeters sounded.”

3. On *Josiah's* purgation of the temple, and solemn passover, it is said (2 Chron. xxxv. 15), how “the singers, the sons of Asaph, were in their place, according to the commandment of David, &c. :” implying their participation, with voice and instrumental music, in the service.

4. On *Ezra* laying the foundation of the new temple: (Ezra iii. 10 :) “And when the builders laid the foundation of the temple of the Lord, they set the priests in their apparel with the trumpets, and the Levites . . . with cymbals, to praise the Lord after the ordinance of David. . . . And they sang together by course, praising and giving thanks to the Lord. . . . And all the people shouted with a great shout, when they praised the Lord, because the foundation of the house of the Lord was laid.”

5. On *Nehemiah* dedicating the walls of the new-built Jerusalem: (Neh. xii. 27 :) “And, at the dedication of the wall of Jerusalem, they sought the Levites out of all their places, to bring them to Jerusalem, to keep the dedication with gladness; both with thanksgivings, and with singing, with cymbals, and psalteries, and harps.”

I add this because of the Apocalyptic vision depicting the occupation of Mount Zion, as well as of the temple, by Christ's followers.

6. On *Judas Maccabeus* restoring the altar and worship of the temple: (1 Macc. iv. 54 :) “At what time and what day the heathen had profaned it, even in that was it dedicated with songs and citherns and harps and cymbals. Then all the people fell upon their faces, worshipping and praising the God of heaven, who had given them good success. And so they kept the dedication of the altar eight days; and offered burnt-offerings with gladness; and sacrificed the sacrifice of deliverance and praise.”

<sup>2</sup> The restoration of the Jewish temple by Ezra and Nehemiah was figuratively applied to the *Romish* reformation of the *Romish* Church in the Council of Trent. Sess. i. Hard. x. 14.

the 7th Trumpet's sounding, or of the French Revolution, —and to which some have supposed the song to refer in this vision,<sup>1</sup>—had nothing at all of the same *ecclesiastical* character in it; nothing answering to the extraordinary Levitical harplings in the court of the mystic temple. Moreover it is that which has its own proper place in the Apocalyptic prefigurations somewhat later in this chapter;<sup>2</sup> and perhaps too in the other parallel series of visions.<sup>3</sup>

Secondly, what is said of the voices that here symphonized being as *the voice of many waters, and of a great thunder*, well agrees with my exposition; implying, as it did, the uniting of both nations and princes in the song. For such was notoriously the case at the Reformation: as in Germany, Denmark, Sweden, the Dutch provinces, Switzerland, and England. Which last especially, the tenth part of the city, re-constructed as an evangelic anti-papal State, and with a “pure and reformed Church” attached to it, became thenceforward allied, as it were, visibly before men, to the Apocalyptically figured citadel of Mount Zion; and a chief earthly defence to Christ's truth and saints against the assaults of Rome.

Lastly, what is said of the *song* sung on the occasion, strongly tends to the same conclusion. For, we must observe, it is spoken of very remarkably as both a *new* song, and one that *none could learn but the 144,000*. Now of the various *new songs* sung by the Church of God, in its vicissitudes,<sup>4</sup> the principal topic is mostly either that of *deliverance from external enemies and danger*, or that of *some fresh revelation of Himself and his grace*: the former appreciable in a measure by all concerned in it,<sup>5</sup> the latter by those only that have been taught of God. And what then was the peculiar subject and character of the new song

<sup>1</sup> E. g. Mr. Cuninghame, pp. 252—256.

<sup>2</sup> Viz. in the voice of the Angel with the everlasting gospel in Apoc. xiv. 6.

<sup>3</sup> I refer to the song of the harpers by “the glassy sea as it were mingled with fire,” in Apoc. xv. 2. On which however I speak doubtfully, as more obscure.—See on both these voices my Part v. Chap. viii. intrâ.

<sup>4</sup> New songs are noted Exod. xv. 1; Judges v. 12; Psalm xxxiii. 3, xl. 3, xevi. 1, cxliv. 9; Isa. xlii. 10; also Rev. v. 9.

<sup>5</sup> E. g. who among the Israelites but could enter into the new song sung on occasion of the overwhelming of Pharaoh in the Red Sea, or of the victory over Sisera at Kishon?

sung at the Reformation? Doubtless the wonderful deliverance vouchsafed them from Papal might and oppression mingled in the saints' song of thanksgiving on the occasion. But, as to that which was its most characteristic, as well as most glorious subject, listen to the account given of it by him who was the chief precentor:—"Learn to know CHRIST, Christ crucified, Christ come down from heaven to dwell with sinners! Learn to sing *the new song*, THOU JESUS ART MY RIGHTEOUSNESS; I AM THY SIN: Thou hast taken on thyself what was mine; Thou hast given me what is thine."<sup>1</sup> It was *this* in fact that was introduced, as their very essence, into the new reformed rituals and services; this (amidst differences on lesser points) into the *Harmony*, as it was called, of *the Reformed Confessions*.<sup>2</sup>—And never certainly was there a song of which it might more truly be said that not *all*, but comparatively *few* only, could really enter into it; in fact none but the 144,000, the election of grace, illuminated and quickened by Christ's own Spirit. As it is said; "And no man could learn that song but the 144,000 which were redeemed from the earth."

3. But this leads me to a step onward in my subject.—For, if there be a figuring of the *Reformation* in this striking vision of the temple-harpings, as I trust has been proved, then the fact of this declaration as to the non-understanding of the new song by any but the 144,000 passing on in its predictive force to the next prefiguration, viz.

<sup>1</sup> Quoted before, Vol. ii. p. 98.

<sup>2</sup> "*Harmonia Confessionum*:" a work first published in 1581. See the Preface to a valuable English translation of it by the Rev. P. Hall, which has been lately printed.

Its occasion, it seems, was this. The rulers and pastors at one of the synods of the Reformed Church in France, and especially those present at one at Frankfort in 1577, desired *one common Confession* to be drawn up; partly in answer to the Papists, who charged them with the variety and multitude of their Confessions, partly because of the Lutherans being about to publish their *Formulary of Concord*. For fear of departing from the standards of faith of those who had sealed them with martyrdom, this plan was abandoned. But the people of Zurich and Geneva suggested that a *Harmony of Confessions* should be drawn up. This was entrusted to Beza, Daneau, and Salnar, and chiefly executed by the latter. The National Synod of the Reformed Churches of France gave their sanction to it in 1583.

Smaller differences caused the enemies of Protestantism to call it *Concordia discors*. So Bossuet in his famous *Variations des Protestans*. But they are, after all, differences on *minor* points, by comparison.

that of the first angel flying in mid-heaven with the everlasting gospel, (for nothing intervenes but a sketch of the character of the 144,000,) I say this circumstance would seem to indicate the continuance of the melancholy truth intimated, from the epoch figured in the one clause even to that figured in the other. And I have only, in what remains of the present Chapter, briefly to illustrate the sad fact, thus predictively implied in the clause before us, from the actual history of the Reformed Churches, as extended from the establishment of the Reformation to the French Revolution.

I pass over Belgium, Spain, Portugal, Italy, because these were countries where Protestantism never established itself, but was crushed and expelled, almost as soon as introduced, by the old Papal weapons of the Inquisition, the fire, and the sword.<sup>1</sup> And I only pause on *France*,—where, though introduced under better auspices, it was also crushed and expelled a century later by persecution, religious civil wars, and at length the revocation of the edict of Nantes,—just to observe that this was not until it had there exhibited itself in a character rather chivalrous and military, for the most part, than religious;<sup>2</sup> and until even of the martyrs in its cause not a few had shown but little understanding of that *new song*, though still the prominent characteristic of their confessions and their liturgies.<sup>3</sup>—But what of the countries where Protestantism was cradled and established? What of Northern Germany, Denmark, Holland, England, and the Reformed Cantons of Switzerland? Alas! in each of them too we shall find

<sup>1</sup> I have alluded to this before, Vol. ii. p. 487.—For a brief historic sketch on this and the other particulars noted by me in what remains of this Chapter, I may refer to *Dr. Barthe's* interesting little Summary of History on Christian Principles, translated by the Rev. R. F. Walker, and published by the Religious Tract Society.

<sup>2</sup> I need but refer to *Henri Quatre* himself, by way of exemplification.

The translator of Barthe observes, p. 358, that both Bengel and Saurin regarded the subsequent sufferings of the Hugonots of France as in part a chastisement for their having taken up the sword, contrary to the spirit of their Lord's injunctions, Matt. xxvi. 52. An injunction the more observable, because repeated in Apoc. xiii. 10.

<sup>3</sup> Of course it is not intended to represent the number of the really faithful and evangelic among the Hugonots as small. Doubtless, though comparatively few, they were yet a goodly number. See, for example, Merle D'Aubigue's 3rd Volume on the Reformation. And let me suggest, as alike interesting and instructive on this subject, the French biographies in Mr. Colquhoun's lately-published Volume, called "Life in the olden Time in France and Italy."

illustrations of the truth of the predictive clause before us too unequivocal.

Take the case of *Germany*. We are told that the last days of Luther were saddened by a sense of the inadequate sensibility shown even then, on the part of the mass of Protestants, to the real character and blessedness of the gospel-truths so zealously professed by them, and by a presage of worse to come.<sup>1</sup> And, though the blessed Spirit of the Reformation had by no means then withdrawn its influence, yet soon after Luther's death in 1546, in a measure, and still more after Melancthon's in 1563, the presage began to have its fulfilment.<sup>2</sup> Ere the close of the 16th century the spirit of the German Protestant Church is to be looked back upon as that of cold, lifeless orthodoxy;—of orthodoxy skilled in the science, controversies, and polemics of dogmatic theology, but with little of the holy and the practical in it, little of the holding forth in spirit and in act of the word of life:<sup>3</sup> so that the confession was forced on the German Protestants that the scourge of the *thirty years' war*, from 1618 to 1648, in which Protestantism itself was perilled,<sup>4</sup> came not prematurely or undeserved. At its close, and when, through the kindness of Him who in judgment remembered mercy, the threatened destruction was averted,<sup>5</sup> and safety and independence insured to the Protestants, there was no answering to the benefit received. The previous dead orthodoxy continued.<sup>6</sup> And, when it developed greater energies, they were the energies only of a bolder spirit, bold in the pride of its own intellectual power; just

<sup>1</sup> Luther's Table Talk, i. 12, 13, &c.:—a presage often vauntingly referred to by the Romanists; e. g. in the *Ages of Faith*. Bishop Patrick, commenting on the notice of Judah's apostasy under Manasseh, son to the pious reformer Josiah, in 2 Chron. xxxiii. 9, 10, cites a very similar presage expressed by Victorin Strigel, Theological Professor at Heidelberg, in his Lecture on that same passage delivered in the interval between Luther's death and that of Melancthon. And, adds Patrick, "This we have seen fulfilled, both in Germany, and France, and other places."

<sup>2</sup> In this view of the decline of the German Protestant Church I have followed the accounts of Rose (in his Cambridge Sermons), Pusey, Barthe, and Mosheim.—Dr. Pusey in the first Part of his Enquiry is understood to have given Professor Tholuck's views on the subject.

<sup>3</sup> So Barthe, pp. 398, 399.

<sup>4</sup> So again Barthe, *ibid.* In my 2nd Vol. p. 482, I had occasion to notice how, after the German Emperor's first great success over the Protestants, whence the great 30 years' war, he issued the *Restitution Edict*.

<sup>5</sup> Chiefly through the instrumentality of the truly great *Gustavus Adolphus*, who fell at Lutzen in the cause.

<sup>6</sup> Pusey ii. 288.

as it was once said, "Thy wisdom and thy knowledge it hath perverted thee:"<sup>1</sup>—a spirit which judged of Scripture by its own weak philosophy, not of its philosophy by Scripture; and so opened the way towards direct scepticism and apostasy. The name of *Semler* marks the introduction of the principle; the *neology* of the latter half of the 18th century was its completion.<sup>2</sup> Could there be understanding,—the least understanding,—in the minds of these pseudo-Protestants, of that *new song* which had graced the birthday of Protestantism; the song of redemption and justification by an atoning and mediating Saviour? It was this very doctrine that was the special object of their contempt and hatred.<sup>3</sup> They cast away, as the follies of a barbarous age, those evangelic confessions and liturgies of their forefathers that witnessed to it.<sup>4</sup> And of the divine Gospel itself they denied the inspiration: adjudging that it was for the greater part<sup>5</sup> intended and fitted only for the Jews and the Judaic age; and had but little in it of eternal truth, or eternal philosophy.<sup>6</sup>

It has been said by a late lamented theologian, to whose work I have had some reference in the foregoing observations, that the cause of this sad apostasy in the German Lutheran and Reformed Churches is to be traced to their want of a suitable clear Confession of faith, a Liturgy embodying it, and ecclesiastical government enforcing it.<sup>7</sup> But surely it was while the Confessions and symbolic Articles of faith (imperfect it might be, yet imbued with the genuine spirit of evangelic religion) were in actual use,

<sup>1</sup> Is. xlvi. 10; the opposite text to Mr. Rose's Sermons.

<sup>2</sup> See Mr. Rose's sketch of Semler, both in the text of his 2nd Discourse, and the notes appended.

<sup>3</sup> "Semler undertook to defend the errors of Pelagius.—In our Lord's satisfaction he rejected all notions of the justice of God as requiring it: in our reconciliation he maintained that no external work of a mediator was concerned, but that the whole was a moral operation within the human mind." Rose, 54.

<sup>4</sup> This was done, Mr. Rose says, p. 44, about the middle of the xviiiith century.

<sup>5</sup> On their famous, or rather infamous, theory of *accommodation*,—a theory representing that the words of Christ and his apostles were spoken not according to truth, but with *accommodation* (quite irrespective of truth) to the views of their auditors, for the time being, whether tinged with Jewish or Gnostic prejudices,—see Rose, pp. 47, 51.

<sup>6</sup> *Ib.* p. 70. If there were any *enduring* truths in Christianity (which was allowed by these philosophers) they asserted them to have been taught by Christ unconsciously. *Ib.* 71.

<sup>7</sup> Rose, p. 14.



and strictly enforced by government authority,<sup>1</sup> that defection began in the German churches.—And what of *England* moreover, and the *English Church*, to which all these advantages attached? As the eye ranges down two and a half centuries of its history, subsequent to the establishment of the Reformation under Edward the Sixth and Cranmer, and contemplates first the successful attempts of Laud, with no small part of the clergy assenting, at corrupting that Church and ritual, in which the new song was so sweetly chanted; by admixture and addition of Popish ceremonies and superstitions,—then, after the reaction of fanaticism in the civil wars, the irreligion and avowed free-thinking in vogue among the English *laity* at least of the times of Charles the Second,—then the heartlessness of the theology of the English Church in the century that succeeded, and want and even hatred too generally of spirituality,<sup>2</sup>—the inference may seem warranted that no provision, however excellent, of human forms and human helps can give or preserve a taste for evangelic doctrine; more especially for that which contains within it the very essence of evangelism, the doctrine of justification by living practical faith in the Lamb of God. For this the individual teaching of Christ's own Spirit is needed. The natural man understandeth it not. It is spiritually discerned.<sup>3</sup>—Such is the lesson everywhere taught in Scripture. Such it is that is taught here;—"No man could learn that song but the 144,000 that were redeemed from the earth:" that is, those only whose secret history St. John had seen sketched a little before in vision, as chosen by free grace out of the mass of the professing Israel, and illuminated, and quickened, and sealed by the Spirit of the Lord Jesus. Indeed I must beg my readers to mark how this history of Protestantism illustrates it.<sup>4</sup> After the conversion of the *Protest-*

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Rose states from Schrokh that the Lutheran Churches were held together by the required subscription till the middle of the 18th century: also that from the middle of the 17th to the middle of the 18th century it was enforced, in some of the German Protestant States, even on all officers of State. *Ib.* pp. 15, 30, 115.

<sup>2</sup> It was said by Bishop Horsley, that during the larger half of the xviiiith century the clergy substituted for the great doctrines of the gospel a system little better than heathen ethics.

<sup>3</sup> 1 Cor. ii. 14.

<sup>4</sup> So *Barthe*: "Within the first hundred years after the Reformation it was sufficiently evident that the general character of the Protestant Church did not amount

*ant nations* to orthodox Christianity at the Reformation,—just as after the conversion of the *Roman nation* to Christianity under Constantine, and after the yet earlier calling of *the nation of Israel* out of Egypt to be God's people,—it still proved to be only an election,—an individual election of grace out of the national election,—that had any real appreciation of divine gospel truth.

Some such, however, there were all along, doubtless, amidst the ever-increasing defection of their brethren, in the churches of Protestantism. Illustrious names stand pre-eminent, as of those by whom, among others, the torch of truth was transmitted down, in the ecclesiastical annals of each country of Protestant Christendom :—in *Germany*, for example, those of Arndt,<sup>1</sup> Spener,<sup>2</sup> and Franke,<sup>3</sup> of the Lutheran Church ; not to speak of others in the Moravian community also :<sup>4</sup> in *England*, within the pale of the established Church, of Hooker and Usher, Hall and Leighton, Beveridge and Hopkins, Walker and Venn ; without it, of Baxter and Howe, Watts and Doddridge ; and, whether within or without it, of Whitfield and Wesley. And it is, I think, deserving of remark, that of these not a few, like the admirable Spener, made the very point prominent in their doctrine which is noted respecting these 144,000 in the Apocalyptic statement ;—viz. that none but the converted and illuminated by the Spirit of God can rightly understand the Gospel, or belong to the kingdom of the Lord Jesus.<sup>5</sup>—Their *character* is here still held up for our

to the character of a communion of true believers in Jesus : and that the spirit of it could just as easily remain cold and dead with an evangelic confession of faith, as with a Popish one." p. 401.—The view given by *Dr. Pusey* is much the same.

<sup>1</sup> See the testimonies to this eminently pious man *Arndt* in *Barthe*, p. 400, and *Pusey*, Part i. p. 55. His "immortal Work on True Christianity," *Dr. Pusey* states (p. 54), "was translated into every language of Europe, and valued by pious minds of every succeeding age." It was published in 1605. And after his death, which happened in 1614, just before the thirty years' war, he was through this work almost more influential for good than even in life ; more especially from the circumstance of its forming the mind very mainly of his successor *Spener*.

<sup>2</sup> See for an account of this "admirable man," as *Dr. Pusey* calls *Spener*, *Pusey's Historic Inquiry*, Part i. p. 67, and Part ii. p. 314, Chap. x. : also *Barthe*, p. 400. He flourished after the thirty years' war ; and died early in the xviii century.

<sup>3</sup> *Franke* was a disciple in a manner of *Spener*, as *Spener* of *Arndt*. The beautiful History of the Orphan House, raised by him at Halle, has made his name familiar to most readers. See *Pusey*, p. 87.

<sup>4</sup> See Professor *Sack's* testimony to the excellence of the Moravians, in the letter prefixed to *Pusey's Inquiry*, p. 13. On this point who can differ ?

<sup>5</sup> "Spener's aim was to obtain a communion of Christians whose consciences

instruction; the same after the joyous temple-harpings of the Reformation, as before it. "These are they that were not defiled with women; for they are virgins." So their inward purity and following after holiness is intimated; and their membership in that holy Church of the redeemed, which is now affianced, and hereafter to be presented, as a chaste virgin to Christ. "These are they that follow the Lamb whithersoever he goeth." So both their *active practical self-denying* character is notified, as those that would copy their Lord's example in works of piety, charity, and benevolence; and also their following him in his course of *suffering* and *patience*: as it was once said by himself, "Whosoever will come after me let him take up his cross, and follow me;"<sup>1</sup> and again by St. Paul to the Hebrew Christians,<sup>2</sup> "Going without the camp, bearing his reproach." Which latter point may perhaps be prominently meant in the intimation; the *Lamb* being Christ's title in his *suffering* character.—And certainly all this had its fulfilment in the history of those I speak of. Their practical piety and usefulness in their day and generation stand out conspicuous in the biographical records.<sup>3</sup> And it appears also too clearly from them that they had to exercise much of the grace of patient endurance and suffering. For the names of not a few were cast out, and titles of opprobrium attached to them, and even civil penalties:<sup>4</sup>—I speak, observe, not

should have become awakened to that certain verity, that nothing but heartfelt conversion, and our being born again, can fit us for the kingdom of God; that no public confession of faith, be it ever so scriptural and orthodox, can suffice for such a purpose." Barthe, 402, 436.—Dr. Pusey states that it was one of the things objected against Spenser by his enemies, that he taught that Holy Scripture was then only a source of religious knowledge, when understood according to the meaning of the Holy Spirit; and that ministers were mere guides to the real Teacher, the Holy Spirit, and Christ in him. Pusey, p. 83. His *Collegia Pietatis* (for an account of which see Pusey, Part i. p. 75, also Barthe, 400,) were very effective in inculcating this important doctrine; especially after the institution of the College at Halle.

<sup>1</sup> Mark viii. 34.

<sup>2</sup> Heb. xiii. 13.

<sup>3</sup> The want of *practical* Christianity was the grand defect urged by the *Pietists* (for so the followers of Spenser and Franke were called) against the Lutherans of their day; and its necessity so insisted on that it was actually made a charge against them. It was objected (of course *falsely*) to the *Pietists*, "that by making *holiness of life* a part of the essence of Christianity, they mingled it up with the covenant of grace, and with the matter of justification." So Dr. Pusey, Part ii. p. 298; who does full justice to the sincerity, laboriousness, practical piety, and eminent usefulness of these men: speaking therein not his own judgment only, but that of the most eminent, pious, and respectable of living German theologians.—See too Mosheim xvii. 2. 1. 26, et seq.

<sup>4</sup> The edicts against the German *Pietists* are given by Dr. Pusey, Part i. p. 98,

of the sentences or acts of *Papal* Governments and Churches, which of course stigmatized them as heretics ; but of those of the professedly *Reformed Protestant Communities* to which they belonged.—However, as it is here added, their record was on high : “ In their mouth was found no guile ; for they are without fault before God.”<sup>1</sup> Nay, even in this world a tardy justice was at length rendered to their worth.<sup>2</sup> Moreover, yet again, thus was God's acceptance of

and Part ii. p. 293. They were stigmatized as persons associated with the heresies of Pelagianism, Socinianism, Jesuitism, Arianism, &c. Ibid. p. 99. And, besides the civil edicts procured against them, popular violence was excited also. Ibid. So also Barthe, p. 400 ; who states that *Arndt* was charged, on account of his writings, with sinning against the Holy Ghost.—With regard to those of corresponding character in England, the history of the *Nonconformists* of the 17th century will suggest exemplifications of an earlier date : and, as a notable example of a later date, I shall only refer to Cowper's description of *Whitfield*, in his Poem on Hope.

*Leuconomus* (beneath well-sounding Greek  
I slur a name a poet must not speak)  
Stood pilloried on infamy's high stage,  
And bore the pelting storm of half an age ;  
The very butt of slander, and the blot  
For every dart that malice ever shot.  
The man that mention'd him at once dismiss'd  
All mercy from his lips, and sneer'd and hiss'd :  
His crimes were such as Sodom never knew ;  
And Perjury stood up to swear all true : &c.

<sup>1</sup> Compare the view previously given (viz. in Apoc. vii. 14) of their recognition in another world, and after death, as *αμαρτοι*, in consequence of having washed their robes, and made them white in the blood of the Lamb.

<sup>2</sup> Having referred to Dr. Pusey for a testimony to the *German Pietists*, let me add Cowper's, following on the extract above given, to one of not dissimilar spirit in *England*.—He considered doubtless that *Whitfield's* ecclesiastical irregularity, in an age and state of the Church very different from the present, was an error only of judgment : and was not withheld by it from doing justice to the noble devotedness of his Christian character.

Now, Truth, perform thine office ; waft aside  
The curtain drawn by Prejudice and Pride ;  
Reveal (the man is dead) to pondering eyes  
This more than monster, in his proper guise.  
He loved the world that hated him : the tear  
That dropp'd upon his Bible was sincere.  
Assail'd by scandal and the tongue of strife,  
His only answer was a blameless life ;  
And he that forged, and he that threw the dart,  
Had each a brother's interest in his heart.  
Paul's love of Christ, and steadiness unbribed,  
Were copied close in him, and well transcribed,  
He follow'd Paul :—his zeal a kindred flame ;  
His apostolic charity the same :—  
Like him cross'd cheerfully tempestuous seas,  
Forsaking country, kindred, friends, and ease :  
Like him he labour'd ; and like him, content  
To bear it, suffer'd shame where'er he went.  
Blush Calumny ! and write upon his tomb,  
If honest Eulogy can spare thee room,

them declared ; “ These are they which were redeemed from among men, being the first-fruits to God and to the Lamb : ”—the first-fruits, I presume, accepted by, as well as devoted to, Him ;<sup>1</sup> before that greater ingathering that was to follow under the millennial and better dispensation.

As the 18th century advanced, however, into its third quarter, the voice of the 144,000 waxed fainter and feebler, and the tokens of their presence more obscure, in all the continental Protestant countries and churches. In the German churches, both Lutheran and Reformed, neology and rationalism, as before said, began to rule supreme ; and its spirit extended in a measure to the kindred churches of Sweden<sup>2</sup> and Denmark. In Holland there was a death-like torpor, and absence of spirituality and life, alike among the Protestants and the Jansenists. In the Swiss Church direct Socinianism had taken place of the piety and confession of Calvin.—Thus, even though symptoms were not wanting of Popery having become aged, and reft of its old strength and vigour, there accrued no triumph from this to the Gospel. Rather, in case of any new form of attack on gospel-truth,—such as threatened from the infidelity which was then rapidly unfolding itself in unprecedented boldness and strength, especially in France,—there appeared as little of power to oppose it, and as little of inclination, among

Thy deep repentance of thy thousand lies,  
Which, aim'd at him, have pierced the offended skies :  
And say, Blot out my sin, confess'd, deplored,  
Against thine image, in thy sight, O Lord !

<sup>1</sup> The word is one extending to the *first-born* of cattle and of male children. So Exod. xxii. 29 ; “ Thou shalt not delay to offer the *first* of thy *ripe fruits* : . . the *first-born* of thy sons shalt thou give unto me. Likewise shalt thou do with thine oxen and with thy sheep,” &c. In Levit. xxiii. 10, direction is given as to the particular first-fruits of the *corn-harvest* ; the first sheaf whereof was to be taken to the priest, and waved before the Lord.—The symbol is applied to *Israel* in its early faithfulness by Jeremiah ii. 3 ; “ Israel was holiness unto the Lord, and the first-fruits of his increase.” Also by the Apostle St. James i. 18, to the Christian converts *generally* ; “ Of his own will begat he us with the word of truth, that we should be a kind of first-fruits of his creatures : ” and by St. Paul, Rom. xvi. 5, and 1 Cor. xvi. 15, to the first converts of Achaia *particularly* ; “ the well-beloved Epenetus, and the house of Stephanas, which are the first-fruits of Achaia.” Compare the title *πρωτοτοκος* given to Christ Col. i. 18, Apoc. i. 5.

The observation that the *first-born* were included among the Jewish *first-fruits*, may perhaps not be unimportant towards the fuller understanding of the Apocalyptic clause referred to.

<sup>2</sup> See Count Rosenblad's testimony to this, in Owen's History of the Bible Society, ii. 370.

those Protestants, as even among the members of the Polity and Church of the Papal Antichrist. In England almost alone the salt seemed not to have lost its savour; and the light, instead of burning more dimly, to burn somewhat brighter. Elsewhere the darkness thickened. The visible prospect loomed sadly before the eyes of the Christian contemplatist. Could it be that the blessed Reformation itself had ended in failure?

To any such passing doubt or fear in the mind of St. John, if such might have arisen from that last intimation about the 144,000 at this point in the progress of Apocalyptic drama, the vision next ensuing of the Angel flying in mid-heaven gave to it sufficient answer:—a vision which ✓ signified at once the fact of the hour of God's judgment against his enemies in Anti-Christendom having arrived;<sup>1</sup> (thereby identifying the epoch in this supplemental series of figurations with that of the 7th Trumpet's sounding in the prior series;)<sup>2</sup> and that too of the missionary speeding forth throughout the world, so as never before, of the everlasting Gospel. To the servants of God living at the time prefigured, a similarly striking and cheering answer was given, as it appears to me, in the corresponding outburst, and the eventful occurrences, good as well as evil, synchronizing with it, of the great FRENCH REVOLUTION.

<sup>1</sup> Apoc. xiv. 6, 7.

<sup>2</sup> Apoc. xi. 18.—See on the synchronisms of the two series, *generally*, the Introductory Section of Part iv. pp. 1—5 *suprà*; and, on the *particular* synchronism here intimated, Ch. i. Part v. next following.



# PART V.

---

THE ERA OF THE  
FRENCH REVOLUTION,  
AS FIGURED UNDER THE SIX FIRST VIALS OF THE  
SEVENTH TRUMPET.

---

APOC. XI. 15—19, XV., XVI. 1—14, AND XIV. 6—8.

---

A. D. 1789—1848.

---

## CHAPTER I.

ON THE SEVENTH TRUMPET'S APOCALYPTIC SYNCHRONISMS,  
GENERAL SUBJECTS AND RESULTS, AND PROBABLE  
HISTORICAL COMMENCEMENT AT THE EPOCH  
OF THE FRENCH REVOLUTION.

“AND the seventh Angel sounded: and there were great voices in heaven, saying, ‘The sovereignty<sup>1</sup> of this world hath become our Lord’s and his Christ’s, and He shall reign for ever and ever.’ And the four-and-twenty elders, which sat before God on their thrones, fell upon their faces, and worshipped God; saying; ‘We give thee thanks, O Lord God Almighty, which art and wast;’<sup>2</sup> because thou hast

<sup>1</sup> ἡ βασιλεια. So A, B, C; and the critical Editions generally; instead of *αι βασιλεια*, so as in the received text, in the plural. I adopt Mr. Tregelles’ rendering of the word.

<sup>2</sup> The *και ο ερχομενος* of the received text is omitted in A, B, C; and by the critical Editions generally.



taken to thee thy great power, and hast reigned. And the nations were angry; and thy wrath hath come; and the time<sup>1</sup> of the dead, that they should be judged; and that thou shouldest give reward unto thy servants the prophets, and to the saints, and to them that fear thy name, small and great; and shouldest destroy them which destroy (or corrupt)<sup>2</sup> the earth.’ And the temple of God was opened in heaven:<sup>3</sup> and there was seen in his temple the ark of his covenant.<sup>4</sup> And there were lightnings, and voices, and thunderings, and an earthquake, and great hail.”<sup>5</sup>—Apoc. xi. 15—19.

We have now to revert to the *Seventh Trumpet’s sounding*.—And first, in the present introductory Chapter, let me premise a brief view of this Trumpet’s *Apocalyptic synchronisms, and form and order of development*: (a point this which is absolutely necessary, in order to our having the pathway clear before us as we proceed:) then the predicted *general subjects and results* of the Trumpet; and its probable epoch of *historic commencement* at the great *French Revolution*.

## I. THE APOCALYPTIC SYNCHRONISMS OF THE SEVENTH TRUMPET.

It may be remembered by the reader that at the com-

<sup>1</sup> C has the curious reading of κληρος, instead of καιρος; the *lot* of the dead.

<sup>2</sup> διαφθειραι τους διαφθειροντας την γην. C reads διαφθειραντας in the *past* participle.

I incline to suppose this second meaning of διαφθειρω to be intended, in part at least, by the participle, from the circumstance of a similar conjunction of, and antithesis between, the two senses of φθειρω in the very parallel passage, 1 Cor. iii. 17, *Ει τις τον ναον του Θεου φθειρει, φθειρει τουτον ο θεος* “If any one *defile* the temple of God, him will God *destroy* :” besides other considerations, on which see my Note <sup>4</sup>, p. 335 *infra*.

<sup>3</sup> Some MSS. omit the clause εν τω ουρανω, “in heaven;” some read ο εν τω ουρανω. Which last is the reading adopted by Wordsworth. On the other hand Scholz and Heinrichs read, agreeably with the received text, ηνοιγη εν τω ουρανω. And Tregelles prefers so to read also. The doubtful point (which is one of importance) seems to me to be decided in favour of the received reading by the fact of its being the *undoubted and only reading* in the manifestly parallel passage of Apoc. xv. 5; και ηνοιγη ο ναος της σκηνης τη μαρτυρι εν τω ουρανω.

<sup>4</sup> διαθηκης. It is clear that this word ought to have been here translated *covenant*, not *testament*. Indeed so, I think, always in the N. T.; specially inclusive of Heb. ix. See the paper on this point in my Appendix to Vol. ii.

<sup>5</sup> Και σεισμος, και χαλαζα μεγαλη. Perhaps the adjective may be meant to apply to the σεισμος, as well as the χαλαζα; the difference of genders in the two nouns not necessarily forbidding this. Then it will be, “And a great earthquake, and great hail.”

mencement of my Part IV. I called attention to the indubitable marks in Apoc. xii. and its sequel, as far down as Apoc. xiv. 5, of a *retrogression* in the Apocalyptic visions: <sup>1</sup>—a retrogression of which the evident object was to furnish full and explicit explanation on one most important subject that was only alluded to before; I mean the history and character of the *Beast from the abyss*, spoken of in Apoc. xi. 7 as the slayer of Christ's two Witnesses. And I suggested its agreement with the form of the seven-sealed Apocalyptic scroll, written *within* as well as *without*: seeing that this form is most simply explicable by the supposition of its two sides being inscribed with two *chronologically parallel* lines of prophecy.—Hitherto this parallelism seems to have been palpable. The circumstance of the remarkable prophetic period of the 1260 days, or years, being declaredly involved in either series, from a date of common commencement, after certain preliminary events noticed alike in both, down to the end, or at least very nearly the end, of that period in either case,—this circumstance, I say, is an indication of chronological parallelism not to be mistaken. For let it be remembered that in the *first* of the two series, after a figuring of long-continued persecutions of the saints <sup>2</sup> under the supremacy of the powers of one political heaven, (viz. that of *Rome Pagan*,) there was described as following, under quite a new and different political heaven, <sup>3</sup> *the 1260 years of the Witnesses' sack-cloth-robed testimony*; synchronically with Gentiles of the outer temple-court treading down the Holy City, in evident association with the *Beast from the abyss*, the figured murderer of Christ's Witnesses: and that the fated time of God's decisive judgment against these corrupters of the earth, <sup>4</sup> and consequently (may I not say?) of the primary ending of the 1260 years, was defined as not beginning until the sounding of the seventh Trumpet.—Again, similarly, in the *second* series, after a figuring of the *Pagan Roman Dragon's* persecution of the saints, and of his being at length overcome and cast down from his political heaven,

<sup>1</sup> See pp. 1—3 *suprà*.

<sup>2</sup> Viz. in the Vision of the souls under the altar in the 5th Seal.

<sup>3</sup> The old political heaven having in the 6th Seal been dissolved and past away.

<sup>4</sup> Apoc. xi. 18.

through the blood of the Lamb and self-sacrificing devotion of his martyred saints, there is described as next following thereupon *the 1260 years of the Woman's (or faithful Catholic Church's) exile in the wilderness*; and, coincidentally with it, of the triumphant reign of the Dragon's substituted successor, the *Beast from the Abyss*, the new grand enemy to the Woman's, or faithful Church's, *witness-bearing children*. Nor is there any intimation of God's decisive judgments beginning against this enemy,<sup>1</sup> and consequently of any primary ending to the Beast's 1260 years of prospering, (for the joyous *temple-harpings* and *song* noted in Apoc. xiv. 3, intelligible as that song was to none but the little company of the 144,000, could not be viewed as more than a presage of any such consummation,) until the Angel's cry in mid-heaven announcing it, the same that was charged with the preparatory preaching throughout the world of the everlasting Gospel. Hence, I say, the manifest parallelism of the two series; down to the synchronical epochs of the seventh Trumpet's sounding in the *first* series, and the gospel-bearing Angel's flight in the *second*.<sup>2</sup>—Nor I think, if we look with care, shall we fail to see proof of the continued parallelism of the two series, as we trace their respective visions still further onward.

For thus much will be found to be quite clear:—viz. 1st, that the same series of visions which we have been lately considering (that on *the Part without* of the Apocalyptic scroll) continues onward in its course, uninterruptedly, to a symbolization of the closing judgment on apostate Christendom at the end of the xivth Apocalyptic Chapter; and 2ndly, that then the former series, (on *the Part within*), which at the sounding of the seventh Trumpet was broken off suddenly, as we saw, leaving its mighty subjects all unfolded, is reverted to, and resumed, and continued onward in an unfolding of the subject-matter of that Trumpet, even to a precisely parallel symbolization with the other just noted, of the closing judgment against Christendom. Let me illustrate these two points.

1st, then, I say, in what remains of Ch. xiv. the visions

<sup>1</sup> Apoc. xiv. 7.

<sup>2</sup> See my Chart for illustration.

advance step after step continuously towards, and up to, the consummation of God's judgments against apostate Christendom. For what their subjects? First, and next after the pointed intimation that we have already considered of a failure of sympathy with the temple-harpings and new song on the part of all but the 144,000 with the Lamb on Mount Zion, there comes the vision of a missionary Angel, with the Gospel in hand to preach to all nations;<sup>1</sup> "*the hour,*" it was emphatically said, (let the reader well mark this,) "*of God's judgment having come:*"—then that of a second Angel with the cry of Babylon's falling, and that of a third with the warning voice of an impending judgment of fire on the Beast and his followers:—then an intimation from heaven of the dead that had died in the Lord being thenceforth blessed; and, immediately after, the sign of the Son of Man in heaven preparing to reap the earth's harvest:—then, finally, a symbolic vision of the vine of the earth be-

<sup>1</sup> I subjoin the whole passage referred to, that the reader may have it all under view in unbroken continuity.

"And I saw another angel fly in the midst of heaven, having the everlasting gospel to preach unto them that dwell on the earth, and to every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people: saying with a loud voice, Fear God, and give glory to him; for the hour of his judgment is come: and worship him that made heaven, and earth, and the sea, and the fountains of waters.—And there followed another angel, saying, Babylon is fallen, is fallen, that great city; which made all the nations drink of the wine of the wrath of her fornication.—And another third angel followed them, saying with a loud voice, If any man worship the beast and his image, and receive his mark in his forehead, or in his hand, the same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God, which is poured out without mixture into the cup of his indignation; and he shall be tormented with fire and brimstone in the presence of the holy angels, and in the presence of the Lamb: and the smoke of their torment ascendeth up for ever and ever: and they have no rest day nor night who worship the beast and his image, and whosoever receiveth the mark of his name.—Here is the patience of the saints: here are they that keep the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus.—And I heard a voice from heaven saying unto me, Write, Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord from henceforth: Yea, saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labours; for their works do follow them.—And I looked, and behold a white cloud: and upon the cloud one sitting like unto the Son of Man; having on his head a golden crown, and in his hand a sharp sickle. And another angel came out of the temple, crying with a loud voice to him that sat on the cloud, Thrust in thy sickle and reap: for the time is come to reap; for the harvest of the earth is ripe. And he that sat on the cloud thrust in his sickle on the earth; and the earth was reaped.—And another angel came out of the temple which is in heaven, he also having a sharp sickle. And another angel came out from the altar, who had power over the fire; and cried with a loud voice to him that had the sharp sickle, saying, Thrust in thy sharp sickle, and gather the clusters of the vine of the earth; for her grapes are fully ripe. And the angel thrust in his sickle into the earth; and gathered the vine of the earth; and cast it into the great wine-press of the wrath of God. And the wine-press was trodden without the city; and blood came out of the wine-press even unto the horse-bridles, by a space of a thousand and six hundred furlongs."—Apoc. xiv. 6—20.

ing cast into the great wine-press of the wrath of God, and there trod by Christ; a judgment this last most manifestly of *the consummation*.—After which, what next? Behold, 2ndly, the subject is here suddenly changed, the continuity interrupted. And, instead of the figurations advancing still onward to things subsequent to the winepress-treading,—such e. g. as a description of the Lamb's marriage, or of the New Jerusalem,—instead of this, St. John speaks now again of *the temple of God appearing opened in heaven*, (a very remarkable symbolization,) precisely as he described it to have appeared *opened in heaven at the sounding of the seventh Trumpet*,<sup>1</sup> immediately prior to the abrupt breaking off of the former series of visions; (i. e. of the *Part within written*;) just as if reverting to, and resuming, that earlier interrupted vision: also of seven vial-bearing Angels coming forth out of the Temple, charged with *the seven last plagues* of God's wrath, which plagues seem evidently to constitute the development of those of the before-mentioned 7th and final Trumpet:—just at the last of which plague-vials we are told of Christ appearing with a vesture dipped in blood, connectedly with *his treading the wine-press of God's wrath*; <sup>2</sup> a vision that we can scarce mistake in supposing chronologically coincident with, or immediately consequent upon, that of *the treading of the wine-press* described, as a little while since said, in the *supplementary* series, or *Part without written*, at the end of Apoc. xiv.—Which being so, and the striking chronological notice in the vision of the Gospel-bearing Angel, Apoc. xiv. 7, of “*the hour of God's judgments having then come*,” seeming similarly, as just before observed by me, to mark the parallelism of that vision in the same *supplementary* series, with the earlier and primary development of the 7th Trumpet's judgment in the *other*, the fittings of the *loop* and the *tache*, at both the *commencement* of this closing part in either of the two series, and at its *ending*, seem sufficiently obvious.<sup>3</sup>

I said that the *seven Vials* appear evidently to be the development of the *seventh Trumpet*. And I think the

<sup>1</sup> Apoc. xi. 19.

<sup>2</sup> Apoc. xix. 13—15.

<sup>3</sup> Let me beg my readers to consult on this point the Chart of the seven-sealed Apocalyptic scroll, at the beginning of my Commentary.

Reader will agree with me, that on this point too we can scarce be mistaken. For, besides that the analogy of the seventh Seal's development in the seven Trumpets would naturally suggest a similar development of the seventh Trumpet under the next succeeding septenary of Vials,—besides this, I say, it is to be remembered, that the revealing Angel in Apoc. x. 7 distinctly spoke of the seventh Trumpet as that in which God's mystery was *to be finished*; a fact asserted also in the anticipatory songs sung on that Trumpet's sounding. And could the *finishing* Trumpet (of which, and of its divine judgments of wrath, there appears, be it observed, no other development) fail to include, or run parallel with, those Vials in which were the *last* plagues of God's wrath? <sup>1</sup> Besides that in the latter case the scenic figuration in the foreground was precisely that same of “the temple of God appearing opened in heaven,” which was represented at the sounding of the 7th Trumpet.<sup>2</sup>

Proceed we next to consider, as proposed,

IIIndly, THE GENERAL CHARACTER OF THE EVENTS AND RESULTS OF THE SEVENTH TRUMPET; as notified once and again, *anticipatorily to their development in the seven Vials.*

I say *once and again*, because, having under my former Head established, as I hope, the fact that the seventh Trumpet had its development in the seven Vials, we have not only the anticipatory song sung by heavenly chanters on the sounding of the 7th Trumpet, from which to draw an answer to this point of our inquiry, but also the anticipatory song heard sung by those that had gotten the victory over the Beast and his Image, i. e. the harpers *on*, or *by*,<sup>3</sup> “the glassy sea mingled with fire,” upon the eve of the outgoing from the temple of the seven Angels charged with the vials of the last plagues of God's anger. The former song has been given at the head of this Chapter. The latter

<sup>1</sup> Και ηλθεν η οργη σου. So the anticipatory song on the sounding of the 7th Trumpet, Apoc. xi. 18. Εχοντας πληγας επτα τας ισχιας, οτι εν αυταις ετελεσθη ο θυμος του Θεου. So the introductory notice of the vials, Apoc. xv. 1.

<sup>2</sup> Και ηνοιγη ο ναος του Θεου εν τω ουρανω, και ωβθη η κιβωτος της διαθηκης αυτου. So Apoc. xi. 19. Και ηνοιγη ο ναος της σκηνης του μαρτυριου εν τω ουρανω. So Apoc. xv. 5. The designation of the tabernacle as the tabernacle of *testimony* in the latter of the two passages implies a reference to the *ark of the testimony* noticed in the former. <sup>3</sup> επι.

(which in due course will be again more fully adverted to) is related as follows. “And they sing the song of Moses the servant of God, and the song of the Lamb, saying; “Great and marvellous are thy works, Lord God Almighty; just and true are thy ways, thou King of the nations!<sup>1</sup> Who shall not fear,<sup>2</sup> O Lord, and glorify thy name; for thou only art holy: for all the nations shall come and worship before thee; for thy judgments have been made manifest.” It is also added, after mention of the temple then appearing opened in heaven, (just, let me repeat, as on the seventh Trumpet’s sounding,) and of the seven Angels coming forth charged with vials of the wrath of God, to be poured out upon the earth, that “the temple was filled with smoke from the glory of God, and from his power; and that no man was able to enter into the temple till the seven plagues of the seven Angels were fulfilled.”

Such are the data on which we have to argue at present. And from these figurations and songs, attendant on the epoch of the seventh Trumpet’s sounding, the following general inferences were to be drawn respecting the new opening æra, and events presignified and included in it.

From *the songs of the heavenly ones*<sup>3</sup> in Apoc. xi. 15—

<sup>1</sup> εθνων is in A, B, and the critical Editions generally, instead of the received text’s ἀγων. In C there is the rather remarkable and interesting various reading αιωνων. On which, were the evidence in its favour more decisive, we should have to compare what is said of the αιωνες plurally in Hebr. xi. 3, and of the great αιων of Messiah’s established reign of which Scripture speaks as the consummation and object of all our earth’s previous αιωνες; the number and mighty duration of which is so grandly illustrated by geology.

<sup>2</sup> σε is omitted by A, B, C, and the critical Editions.

<sup>3</sup> As the word *heaven* is used in the Apocalypse, just as in other Scriptures, both of the *political heaven of earthly elevation*, and also of that *holier heaven in which God’s presence is manifested*,\* it seems doubtful how to take the word here; and whether to ascribe “the great voices in heaven” to certain of God’s people on earth in a state of political exaltation, or to blessed spirits around the throne. In favour of the latter view it may be said that it seems scarcely reasonable to suppose that earthly songs of praise, in anticipation of the coming future, should give the initiative to that of the twenty-four elders mentioned as following: whereas, supposing them to have been the great voices of the *four living creatures* precenting, the order of song would be only that which is expressly described in Apoc. iv. 9, 10: “When the living creatures give glory and honour to Him that sitteth on the throne, . . . the twenty-four elders fall down before Him that sitteth on the throne, and cast their crowns before Him, &c.”—On the other hand the not very dissimilar song of the *harpers by the glassy sea*, mingled with fire, it may be clearly shown (as I conceive) to have been that of *saints on earth*; the whole scenic prefiguration being however in this case (so I expect to show) anticipatory. We have in any case concentering

\* See my Vol. i. pp. 101—103.

18 it was inferable :—1st, that the establishment of Christ's kingdom over the world was near at hand ; according to the Covenant-Angel's declaration under the former trumpet,<sup>1</sup> and as the great and ultimate result of what was to happen under this :—2, that the æra to be comprehended under this sounding would be one in which the nations of apostate Roman Christendom (for the nations, not the Beast, are here distinctively specified) would manifest some remarkable outburst and exacerbation of the passions, whether against Christ himself alone, and his religion, or against each other also :<sup>2</sup>—3, that God's primary providential acts, ere the establishment of his kingdom, would be acts of judgment eminently notable against both the apostate nations, the Beast, and perhaps too the Euphratean invaders, (invaders still existing though in decline,<sup>3</sup>) as alike the corrupters and desolators of the Roman earth :<sup>4</sup>—4, that there

songs, anticipative of Christ's kingdom coming, sung by saints in earth and saints in heaven.

<sup>1</sup> Apoc. x. 7. "Time shall be no further prolonged [i. e. to the Antichrist of the seven thunders] : but in the days of the voice of the seventh Angel, at what time he may have to sound, the mystery of God shall be finished, as he hath promised to his servants the prophets." See Vol. ii. pp. 124—127.

<sup>2</sup> "And the nations were angry," or enraged ; *ωργισθησαν*. Where the object of anger, referred to in a verb like this, is not specified, we must look to the context to explain it. And thus the Lord's having taken to himself his power, with a view to the establishment of his kingdom, being the thing spoken of next before in the present case, it seems natural to refer to *this* cause the anger of the nations. With which view of the passage the prophetic description in Psalm ii. 1 well agrees ; "Why do the heathen rage, &c., against the Lord, and against his anointed ;" contrasted, as here, with the divine anger, "Kiss the Son lest *He* be angry," *οργισθη* : also that in Psalm xcix. 1 ; "The Lord reigneth, be the people never so unquiet" (*οργιζεσθωσαν*). Compare again, Exod. xv. 14 ; "The nations heard," (i. e. of Israel's victory over Pharaoh at the Red Sea,) "and were angry (Sept. *οργισθησαν*) : fear took hold of them, &c." Also Psalm cxii. 10, *αμαρτωλος οψεται και οργισθησεται*.—Since however the word is used elsewhere of the *mutual exasperation* of the parties angered, (as in Gen. xlv. 24, "See that ye fall not out, *μη οργιζεσθε*,") I have thought it well not wholly to exclude the latter idea. Moreover can there well be bitter exasperation against *God*, without exasperation against *man* also ?

*Vitringa's* explanation is to the former effect : "Quippe ultimis illis temporibus, liberationem ecclesiæ proximè præcedentibus, extremum ediderant eonatum ad regnum Christi, si pote, extirpandum, et puriorem religionem supprimendam." And so too *Daubuz*. The circumstance of these eminent and learned commentators having lived and written long before the French Revolution, gives an additional value to their comments on the passage.

<sup>3</sup> Their continued existence, though the *vœe* connected with them was ended, appears from the fact of the overflow from the Euphrates that symbolized them not drying up till the sixth Vial ; as will be more fully shown in my comment on that Vial.

<sup>4</sup> It may be inferred, I think, that there is in the expression *διαφθειροντας την γην*, 1st, a particular reference to the *mystic Babylon, its ruling head, and harlot-Church*, from the circumstance of the word being so applied to Babylon in Apoc. xix.



would be included within the trumpet (though not of course till its consummation) “the time of the dead being judged,” (whatever the meaning of that most remarkable expression,<sup>1</sup>) and of reward being given to the prophets and saints, God’s servants.—Again, from *the song of the harpers by “the glassy sea, as it were, mingled with fire,”*<sup>2</sup> it was to be inferred that there would be on the earth, whether during the time of these judgments, or at their end, certain victorious separatists from the Beast<sup>3</sup> that would recognize God’s hand and justice in them; and mark and hail it as the time for the nations of the world being converted to the knowledge and worship of God.—Then, turning to the *scenic phenomena* concomitant, in the temple and elsewhere,—it was, I think, inferable from the circumstance of *the temple being visibly opened in heaven, and the ark of the covenant appearing*, that there would be at the time indications of the opening of Christ’s reformed Church to the world, in circumstances of exaltation and authority, so as it had never been opened before: <sup>4</sup> (the last previous notice

2, ἥτις ἐφθίρει τὴν γῆν ἐν τῇ πορνείᾳ αὐτῆς: as also in Jer. li. 25; Ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ πρὸς σὲ τὸ ὄρος τὸ διεφθαρμένον, τὸ διαφθίρον πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν, &c. For this last prophecy, I conceive, had a reference secondarily to the New Testament Babylon, as well as primarily to the Babylon of the Old Testament. The passage is one which, with its remarkable imagery, will demand our more particular attention in a subsequent chapter. Compare 2 Peter ii. 12, ἐν τῇ φθορᾷ αὐτῶν καταφθαρήσονται, “they shall utterly *perish* in their own *corruption*.”—2. The reference of the word to *the nations* of apostate Christendom may be inferred from the mention of them in the context as angry against Christ and his kingdom:—and 3. its reference to the *Mahomedan Turks*, not merely from the desolating nature of their false religion and conquests, in other and earlier days, but also from the word being specifically applied to them in Daniel’s prophecy: it being said in Daniel viii. 24, of the *little horn* that was to grow in the latter day out of one of the four horns of the he-goat, and signified, as I doubt not, the Turkman Moslem power, Καὶ θανύσασα διαφθίρει, and again, verse 25, Καὶ δολφ διαφθίρει πολλοὺς. In Chap. vii. *infra* I hope to justify this explanation of Daniel’s prophecy.

It is observable that in Daniel the contrast is marked between the *destructibility*, or *διαφθορά*, of the kingdoms of the world, and the *indestructibility* of Christ’s kingdom; which last *οὐ διαφθαρήσεται εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας*. Dan. ii. 44, vi. 26, vii. 14.

<sup>1</sup> This will be considered afterwards, in the viith and last Part of my Commentary.

<sup>2</sup> Explained in my subsequent Chapter viii.

<sup>3</sup> *Νικωντας ἐκ τοῦ θηρίου*, an expression of which the meaning to this effect will be also shown in my Chapter viii. *infra*.

<sup>4</sup> Vitringa, p. 680, understands as the signification of this symbol, 1st, that the nature of the true Church would be now manifested to men: 2, that there would be a confluence of the fulness of the Gentiles into it, according to the prophecy about the New Jerusalem, “that its gates should be no more shut by day.”

Since, however, it is said, “All nations *shall* come and worship thee,” as of a thing *future*, and the statement is added, “No man could enter till the plagues of the seven Angels were fulfilled,”—and since, moreover, in the development of the Trumpet, no

about the mystic temple having been only that of St. John, in his symbolic character, casting out from it the εθνη, or Paganized Romanists: ) also of God's manifestly thinking upon his covenant,—his covenant of mercy to the world, and triumph to the Redeemer,—to fulfil it:<sup>1</sup>—with one remarkable qualification however, (I beg the reader's attention to this,) that this consummation would not take effect *until after the seven vials had been poured out*, and the smoke of God's presence been manifest as taking vengeance.<sup>2</sup>—From the *thunderings, lightnings, hail, and earthquake* attending, it was to be inferred that there would be some remarkable political revolution and commotions, (perhaps the *hail* might indicate their Northern origin,) at the time of

vision was exhibited, or intimation given, of any great actual ingathering or confluence of nations to Christ, until after the seventh vial had been poured out on Babylon,—it seems to me safest, and most accordant with the prophecy, to explain this figure of the Church opening its gates to the world, during the time of the vials, in the way of *manifestation, invitation, preparation*. Compare Isa. xxvi. 2; "Open ye the gates that the righteous nation may enter in:" and Psalm cxviii. 19; "Open to me the gates of righteousness; I will go into them, and praise the Lord. This is the gate of the Lord, into which the righteous shall enter."

We may observe, in contrast, the state of things when Ahaz prohibited God's worship: "Ahaz cut in pieces the vessels of the house of God, and *shut up the doors of the house of the Lord*, and made him altars in every corner of Jerusalem:" a state of things ended by Hezekiah, who "*opened the doors of the Lord's house.*" 2 Chron. xxviii. 24, xxix. 3. We may compare too the figurative and spiritual application of the phrase made by Christ and St. Paul: Matt. xxiii. 13; "Ye shut up the kingdom of heaven against men:" Acts xiv. 27; "How God had opened the door of faith to the Gentiles." Also Zech. vi. 15; "Then they that are afar off shall come, and build in the temple of the Lord," &c.

The ancient Expositor *Tichonius*, I observe, explains the symbol *somewhat* similarly. "In ecclesiâ incarnationis Christi mysteria patefacta sunt; et . . . intellectum est ecclesiam esse arcam testamenti." Whether these discoveries of the gospel-mysteries were to be confined to the Church, or opened to the world, he does not say. *Bossuet's* view more clearly approximates to my own: "C'est le grand éclat de l'Eglise ouverte à tous les Gentils."

<sup>1</sup> It is often called "the ark of *God's covenant*:" also the "ark of his *strength*," 2 Chron. vi. 41; as symbolizing not only his presence, but also his covenanted promise to act with might for his faithful servants, against his and their enemies. Thus, when the ark of God was taken, Eli felt that Israel's strength was gone. Again it was before the ark that *Dagon* fell; the symbol of all idolatry falling before the Gospel.—There were in it the two tables of the covenant, or ten Commandments; and perhaps the Books of Moses. See Exod. xxv. 16, 1 Kings viii. 9, Deut. xxxi. 26, 2 Chron. xxxiv. 14.

<sup>2</sup> Compare Numb. xvi. 19, 42, 45: where the cloud of God's presence appeared to cover the tabernacle; when stirring himself up to take vengeance on Korah and Israel, as well as in defence of his servants Moses and Aaron. It is this passage, I conceive, that is to be referred to, as the chief precedent and parallel to that before us; the immediate object here being evidently that of judgment against the enemies of his Church, and interposition with power in his Church's defence and favour. The manifestation of God's glory on occasion of Solomon's dedication of the Temple, 1 Kings viii. 11, seems to me a case less in point; though one not to be overlooked in the comparison. So also Isa. vi. 4.

the seventh Trumpet's sounding; just as we inferred the same from similar elemental convulsions attendant on the sounding of the first Trumpet:—a revolution and commotions that would similarly fix the character, and be but the beginning, of other commotions afterwards following under it, and which would more especially mark its consummation.<sup>1</sup>—Yet once more, the circumstance of *seven new Angels from the temple* being employed to pour out these vials of judgment on the apostate Roman earth, instead of the *four Angels of the winds* whose instrumentality had been used hitherto under the six former Trumpets, might possibly indicate that the judgments now commencing would originate from no *external agency*, or *foreign foe*, but from causes and agencies altogether *within the limits of professing Christendom*.<sup>2</sup>

IIIrdly, note we THE GENERAL COINCIDENCE OF THESE PROPHETIC INDICATIONS, in so far as they may seem to have been already unfolded, (*for we have not yet seen the end*,) with THE MORE PROMINENT CONCOMITANTS AND CHARACTERISTICS OF THE GREAT FRENCH REVOLUTION.

First, then, that great Revolution agreed with the Apocalyptic figuration in respect of the important indication of *time*. For it happened just a little while only after the manifest passing away of the Turkish woe; according to the predictive declaration, “The second woe hath past; behold, the third woe cometh quickly.” In proof of this fact I have already observed on a former occasion that, although the victories of John Sobieski and Prince Eugene over the Turks at the close of the 17th century, ending with that of Zenta on the Teiss, A.D. 1697, were a decisive arrest, and indeed repulse, of the Turkish woe,<sup>3</sup> yet it could not then be said to

<sup>1</sup> It may be remembered that the earthquake and lightnings which preceded the first Trumpet's sounding were explained to betoken the political revolution and wars of the Goths, on their first rising against the Romans after the death of Theodosius: the which constituted both the introduction to, and the characteristic of, all the woes that followed from the subsequent Gothic invasions. See Vol. i. pp. 367, 373, 374.

<sup>2</sup> See my observations on these four Angels of the winds, Vol. i. pp. 322, 326, 491—495. The point is one overlooked by commentators; but one of which the evidence seems to me probable; and which, if true, is important. I know no passage where the *winds* are used symbolically of destroyers coming on a nation, except where *external enemies*, or judgments *from without*, are meant.

<sup>3</sup> See the historic sketch of that war by Coxé, in his History of Austria, appositely

have past away. After the consequent peace of Carlowitz, however, (I abstract from a former historic sketch,)<sup>1</sup> it was evident that decay had begun irretrievably within it. And the next great war which, after a long peace with Christendom, called it again into the battle-field,—I mean that of 1769—1774 against Russia, followed by that of 1787 against united Austria and Russia,—a war signalized by victory after victory on the part of the allied forces, and which was ended in the year 1790 by a peace dictated in terms by the conquerors,—I say the progress and end of these wars proclaimed to the world in language too clear to be mistaken, that the Turkman power was no longer a woe to Christendom, but Christendom to the Turkmans. The dissolution or conquest of its empire had become thenceforth, it was evident, only a question of time and European policy.<sup>2</sup> “The second woe had passed away.”—The first of these wars ended, it was said, in 1774. That same year was the date of the American Revolution: and also of the ill-fated Louis the XVIth’s accession to the French throne. And in 1789, just but fourteen or fifteen years after, as the second and more fatal war was drawing to a close, the French Revolution broke out.

Secondly, the French Revolution agreed also in respect of *its own characteristics* with the prefigurations of the seventh Trumpet.—For it was a *political convulsion and revolution*, so as the symbol of the *earthquake* indicated;<sup>3</sup> indeed one of magnitude such that the Apocalyptic prophecy would have been altogether inconsistent with itself had it not noticed it:—it was a convulsion of *internal* origin; and not, like the great judgments previously inflicted on Christendom, one that arose out of the irruption of external invading foes, *from the four winds*:—it was one that issued in *wars* long and furious in Western Christendom, agreeably with the prefiguring symbol of “*thun-*

cited by Faber, S. C. ii. 301—304. I have read that A.D. 1697 is the epoch spoken of by the Turks themselves as that of the fated limit to the extension of their empire.

<sup>1</sup> See Vol. ii. p. 491.

<sup>2</sup> Alison observes, i. 566, that in the year 1790, on this new attack by Austria and Russia, instantaneous destruction seemed to threaten the Turkish Empire; and that it was only averted by the intervention of England, Prussia, and Sweden. I use generally Alison’s 3rd Éd. 1839.

<sup>3</sup> See p. 337 *suprà*.

*derings and lightnings and great hail;*"<sup>1</sup> wars in which *they that had corrupted the earth*, including both the apostate nations themselves, the Pope with his Church and Clergy, and the Turk too, (once its great corrupter and desolator,)<sup>2</sup> were signal sufferers:—it was a convulsion in which the exasperated passions of men manifested themselves, with a virulence unprecedented in the world's history, against both Christ's religion, God's judgments, and their fellow-men; according to the statement, "The nations were angry:"—finally, it was one on the occurrence of which, and during its continuance, there was a most remarkable manifestation of God's remembering his covenant; and, in manner quite unprecedented hitherto, removing long fixt barriers, and opening a view of his true reformed Church, elevated in dignity and power, and of the precious gospel deposited with it, to the whole heathen world.—So in the general. It will all appear hereafter more clearly and fully, as we trace out *in the details* of history the development, in these various points of view, of the great modern æra of the French Revolution.

Let me however, ere entering on these details, take occasion to premise, that since, out of the remainder of the prophecy, that which has to be explained as fulfilled up to the present time involves in it a period of comparatively brief chronological extension,—I mean brief as compared with the long period of the 1260 years already discussed in Parts II., III., and IV., agreeably with its successive prefigurations under two different points of view in either series,—that *within-written* and that *without-written* on the Apocalyptic scroll,—it will I think conduce to clearness to deviate henceforward from the plan I have hitherto acted on, of expounding each series separately in Apocalyptic order; and, instead thereof, to connect more closely together whatever is prefigured respecting the æra we now have to consider, whether on the one side of the scroll or on the other. The series of visions *within-written*, being that in which it is chiefly elucidated, will demand our first and chief attention. This I shall therefore now revert to,

<sup>1</sup> See p. 337 *suprà*.

<sup>2</sup> See Note 4, p. 335 *suprà*.

quitting for it the series *without-written* which we had last under consideration ; and in my next six Chapters shall trace the onward development of the Seventh Trumpet, *in the six earlier of the Vials*, these being all that seem to have been as yet fulfilled. After which I shall, in yet another Chapter, add a notice of whatever *supplementary predictions* may have been given respecting the same period, whether in the one series or the other ;—in Apoc. xi. 15—19, Apoc. xiv., or Apoc. xv. or xvi. :—predictions very interesting, very important ; and of which, as well as of the Vials, we shall be able, I think, not indistinctly to trace the fulfilment, as begun at least, in the events of this momentous æra.

## CHAPTER II.

### HISTORIC EPOCH OF THE SEVENTH TRUMPET'S SOUNDING, OR OUTBREAK OF THE GREAT FRENCH REVOLUTION.

“ AND the seventh Angel sounded, &c.”—Apoc. xi. 15.

Our present main subject is to be an historic sketch, showing the fulfilment of the opening symbols of the seventh Trumpet, in the first outbreak of the French Revolution ; that revolution which was destined to outflow in its fearful issues into the judgments, as I conceive, of the Apocalyptic Vials of wrath.—And, the better to prepare us for it, I wish first to premise a notice how the æra was *introduced* in European history, and with what *anticipations* or *prognostications of the coming future*, in that interval of time, immediately preceding, which elapsed between the passing away of the Turkman woe and the outbreak of the Revolution, or from about A.D. 1774 to 1789 : the rather as this seems to have been almost marked out in the Apocalyptic prophecy as an interval for pause, and looking forward, by that solemn notification, “ The second woe hath past ; behold, the third woe cometh quickly.”

1. The political state of things, then, in the interval referred to, was such that the generality of observers pro-

phesied peace and safety.—With regard to *external* danger, as from the irruption into European Christendom of new barbaric hordes, like the Goths and Huns, or Saracens and 'Turks, in ages previous, we have on record Gibbon's considerate judgment,<sup>1</sup> formed just at the time that I speak of, pronouncing its high improbability. The establishment of Russia, he observes, as a powerful civilized empire, comprehending in its rule what was once the wilds of Sarmatia and Scythia, had contracted the reign of independent barbarism to a narrow space. The 2300 walled towns of modern Germany presented obstacles to invasion from those Eastern wilds altogether unknown in earlier ages. The resisting strength of the twelve powerful though unequal kingdoms, now embraced in the European commonwealth,—states excrcised in the art of war and the military spirit, by the mutual but indecisive contests of rivalry,—was altogether different from that of Roman provinces, which, together with their independence, had lost also all military courage and energy. Finally, the superior physical strength and hardihood of barbarians, which had such weight in the wars of the decline of the Roman Empire, could avail but little against the *artillery* of modern Europe.—Such was Gibbon's augury. And he was here, I think, as elsewhere, not inconsistent in his judgment either with fact or prophecy. The *angels of the winds* had fulfilled their commission. From invasions *from without*, apparently, the European Republic was to suffer no more.—Nor did the princes and statesmen of Christendom discern *from within* any alarming sign of trouble breaking forth. In the course of the century last elapsed, from the time of the wars of Louis the Fourteenth and William the 'Third of England, the rancour of religious differences, once the fertile cause of national strife,<sup>2</sup> had all but subsided. Of the

<sup>1</sup> Decline and Fall, vi. 411—417.

<sup>2</sup> Alison observes that between the *strife of religion* and the *strife of equality* there had intervened a hundred years' repose. History of the French Revolution, i. 519.—So Burke vii. 15.\*

---

\* My citations are from the 8vo edition of Burke's Works, London, 1803. It may be useful to observe that in this Edition, Vol. v., from p. 27, is filled with Burke's great Work on the French Revolution, written A.D. 1790: that Vol. vi. pp. 1—69, contains his Letter to a member of the French National Assembly, written Jan. 1791; pp. 69—269 his Appeal from the New to the Old Whigs, written later in

two chief political changes that had latest occurred,—viz. *first* the accession of *Russia* as a new and powerful member of the European Commonwealth, (a power indebted to the genius of Peter the Great founding it,<sup>1</sup> the suicidal attacks of Charles of Sweden strengthening it, and the sagacious policy of its succeeding Emperors consolidating, and ever impelling it onward with its vast momentum, Westward and Southward,) *secondly*, the aggrandizement of *Prussia* through the victories of the great Frederic,<sup>2</sup>—I say, of these two great events, neither the one nor the other seemed such as to give cause for solicitude. The increased strength of the chief Protestant State in Germany might rather serve as a balance against the previously superior strength of the Austrian Empire, the head in that part of Roman Catholicism:<sup>3</sup>—and, as to *Russia*, though powerful for defence, its poverty, not to speak of its other deficiencies, forbade the idea of its being strong for aggression, at least for many years to come.—The recent revolt of the *United States of America*, and new democratic principles of thought and action suggested by it, as little caused disquietude.<sup>4</sup> It could scarcely be imagined that these could vegetate on European soil. A recent peace too had there composed political differences. “The peace concluded at Versailles in 1783,” says Sir Walter Scott, “was reasonably supposed to augur a long repose to Europe.”<sup>5</sup>

But there were some that had more ominous presentiments as to the coming future. And we must include in

<sup>1</sup> The reign of this Father of the Russian Empire was from A.D. 1682 to 1725.

<sup>2</sup> He reigned from 1740 to 1786.

<sup>3</sup> E. g. had Protestant Prussia been as strong in the xviiith as in the xviiiith century, it is not likely that Romish Austria would have dared to issue the Restitution Edict, and to enforce it in the thirty years' war.

<sup>4</sup> This revolt broke out, as before said, in 1774.—Alison observes that the European potentates contemplated this revolt and its success without fear, and with complacency. i. 150, 151.

<sup>5</sup> Compare other statements in Alison to the same effect, Vol. i. pp. 149, 520: also in Southey's Colloquies, quoted by Fysh, p. xiii. Preface.

---

1791: that Vol. vii. contains smaller pamphlets on the same subject, written by him in the course of the three years from December 1791 to the end of 1794: and that Vol. viii. contains the following:—pp. 1 to 77, his “Letter to a Noble Lord,” (the Duke of Bedford,) written in 1796: and from pp. 77 to the end, his three Letters on the Regicide Peace: viz. 1st, on the Overtures for Peace with France; 2nd, Character of the French Revolution, in regard to other nations; 3rd, on the rupture of the negotiation:—Letters written in 1796.



this number persons of two the most opposite classes and characters:—persons consequently who, though alike expecting convulsions in Christendom, had feelings of course, in regard of what they expected, the most contrary to each other.

The one class referred to was a sect of *infidel philosophers* in France, headed by Voltaire, of whom I shall have to speak more fully afterwards: men who had united themselves in a kind of literary conspiracy against Christianity; and, in the indefatigable pursuit of that object, called in the aid of wit and science, of the licentious and the democratic tendencies of man, of infidel clubs, and cheap infidel publications.<sup>1</sup> Of this antichristian association the great arch-priest Voltaire, writing in 1764, thus expressed his anticipation of convulsions at hand. “Everything is preparing the way for a great revolution. It will undoubtedly take place, though I shall not be so fortunate as to see it. The French arrive at everything slowly, but surely. Light has been for some time gradually diffusing itself: and on the first opportunity the nation will break out, and the uproar will be glorious. Happy those who are young; for they will behold most extraordinary things.”<sup>2</sup>—Have not the oracles of Satan been known at other times too, in the world’s history, to prophesy with superhuman sagacity and foresight of the coming future?

Again, the *Christian philosopher* also anticipated an outbreak;—only one not of freedom and happiness, but of wrath and judgment. As he contemplated the iniquity and infidelity that abounded in professing Christendom,—of Christendom both Roman Catholic and Protestant,<sup>3</sup>—they appeared to him to call for vengeance.

He heard the wheels of an avenging God  
Groan heavily along the distant road.<sup>4</sup>

—The very elements, agitated as they were, at the epoch of 1783 that we speak of, with unwonted convulsions,

<sup>1</sup> Of the celebrated French *Encyclopædia*, their *larger* work, the first of its seventeen volumes was published in 1751, the last in 1765: the editors being D’Alembert and Diderot.

<sup>2</sup> In a letter to M. de Chauvelier. Fysh, p. 19.—So too Rousseau. Alison i. 150.

<sup>3</sup> See on the Protestant declension, pp. 316—321, 324, 325, *suprà*.

<sup>4</sup> Cowper.

seemed to his ear vocal with forewarnings of judgment. I allude to the hurricane-tempest that just then ravaged the West Indies,<sup>1</sup> the re-opening of the volcanic fires of Vesuvius,<sup>2</sup> and eruption of that of Shaptaa Jokul in Iceland, (an eruption terrific beyond all former precedent,<sup>3</sup>) and the earthquake which, protracted from 1783 to 1786, for above three long years convulsed and desolated Calabria.<sup>4</sup> Hark to the musings of our eminently Christian poet of that period, as he considered them.<sup>5</sup>

. . . . . The world appears  
To toll the death-bell of its own decease ;  
And, by the voice of all its elements,  
To preach the general doom.—When were the winds  
Let slip with such a warrant to destroy ?  
When did the waves so haughtily o'erleap  
Their ancient barrier, deluging the dry ?  
Fires from beneath, and meteors from above,<sup>6</sup>  
Portentous, unexampled, unexplain'd,  
Have kindled beacons in the skies. The old  
And crazy earth has had her shaking fits  
More frequent, and foregone her usual rest :<sup>7</sup>  
And Nature seems with dim and sickly eye<sup>7</sup>  
To wait the close of all.<sup>8</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Alluded to by Cowper in the extract appended.

<sup>2</sup> Sir W. Hamilton speaks of there having been nine eruptions (after a long comparative quiescence) from 1767 to 1779, in which last year there was a great one. It was preparatory to another as great in 1794. Eustace, iii. 31, who describes the last eruption, states the number of the eruptions of Vesuvius from A.D. 79 to 1794, as thirty-one ; at the rate of somewhat less than two in a century. Sir W. Hamilton's statement is abstracted in the Encyc. Brit. Art. *Vesuvius*.

<sup>3</sup> Of this extraordinary eruption there is a full description in the Encycl. Brit. Art. *Iceland*. A space of 90 miles long by 42 in breadth, is said to have been covered by the fiery inundation, the depth of the lava being from 16 to 20 fathoms : also that two rivers were dried up by it, and 20 or 21 villages destroyed. In the Faro Isles, 480 miles distant, the whole surface of the ground was covered with ashes, and other volcanic matter from the volcano, when the wind was from the north. Gilbert (*Beauties of Nature*, p. 27) calls it "the most terrific on record."

<sup>4</sup> A full description has been given of this remarkable earthquake by Sir W. Hamilton ; which is abstracted in the Encycl. Brit. Arts. *Geology* (§ 221) and *Calabria*. The shocks were repeated from the beginning of February to the end of March, and extended in a circuit of some 70 miles from the city of Oppido, as a centre. In the narrow Isthmus of Squillace alone 40,000 lives were lost by houses falling on the inhabitants. It was on the night of Feb. 5th that the Prince of Scylla, alluded to by Cowper, who had fled to the sea-shore for safety, was swept away with 3000 of his people by a tremendous wave which overflowed to the distance of three miles from the shore. Geologists have considered it coincident in respect of *cause*, as of *time*, with the violent shocks above-noted in Iceland. Simond, *Tour in England*, ii. 8.

<sup>5</sup> Task, Book ii.

<sup>6</sup> Cowper gives the date, Aug. 18, 1783.

<sup>7</sup> In allusion, Cowper says, to the remarkable fog which covered both Europe and Asia the whole summer of 1783. Simond (*ibid.*) says that in Iceland the sun was not seen for three years. So too the Encycl. Brit. *ubi supra*.

<sup>8</sup> He was not unaware that other predictions needed to have their fulfilment ere the consummation :—adding to the above ;

But grant her end  
More distant, and that prophecy demands

And surely when, after these “frowning signals,” as Christian men regarded them, of God’s displeasure, there occurred another terrific elemental visitation,—when, in the autumn of 1788, a *hail-storm*, with its usual accompaniments of violent thunder and lightning, the most destructive perhaps on historic record, burst upon that country which of all others in Christendom, Rome alone excepted, might seem by its sins loudest to call down vengeance from heaven,—a hail-storm by which, throughout the greater part of France, the autumn, with its golden hopes and aspect, was actually turned into winter,<sup>1</sup>—the grounds of alarm and

A longer respite, unaccomplish’d yet,  
Still, they are frowning signals; and bespeak  
Displeasure in *His* breast who smites the earth,  
Or heals it, makes it languid or rejoice.

<sup>1</sup> This is noted by Alison i. 172. “Even the elements contributed to swell the public discontent, and seemed to have declared war on the falling monarchy. A dreadful *storm of hail* in July 1788 laid waste the provinces, and produced such a diminution in the harvest as threatened all the horrors of famine: while the severity of the succeeding winter exceeded anything that had been experienced since that which followed the disasters of Louis the XIVth.” M. Thiers too notices it.

But there is a much fuller account in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, under the article *French Revolution*; which it seems to me quite worth the while to transcribe. “We cannot here avoid mentioning a physical event, which assisted not a little in producing many of the convulsions attending the Revolution. . . On Sunday, July 13, A.D. 1788, about 9 A.M. without any eclipse, a dreadful darkness suddenly overspread several parts of France. It was the prelude to such a tempest as is unexampled in the temperate climates of Europe. Wind, rain, hail, and thunder, seemed to contend in impetuosity; but the *hail* was the great instrument of ruin. Instead of the rich prospects of an early autumn, the face of nature in the space of an hour presented the dreary aspect of universal winter. The soil was converted into a morass; the standing corn beaten into the quagmire; the vines broken to pieces; the fruit-trees demolished; and unmelted hail lying in heaps like rocks of solid ice. Even the robust forest-trees were unable to withstand the fury of the tempest. The hail was composed of enormous solid and angular pieces of ice, some of them weighing from eight to ten ounces. The country people, beaten down in the fields on their way to the church, amidst this concussion of the elements, concluded that the last day was arrived; and, scarcely attempting to extricate themselves, lay despairing and half suffocated amidst the water and the mud, expecting the immediate dissolution of all things.—The storm was irregular in its devastations. While several rich districts were laid entirely waste, some intermediate portions of country were comparatively little injured. One of sixty square leagues had not a single ear of corn or fruit of any kind left. Of the sixty-six parishes in the district of Pointoise forty-three were entirely desolated; and, of the remaining twenty-three, some lost two-thirds, and others half their harvest. The Isle of France, being the district in which *Paris* is situated, and the Orleannois, appeared to have suffered chiefly. The damage there, upon a moderate estimate, amounted to 80,000,000 of livres, or between three and four millions sterling. Such a calamity must at any period have been severely felt: but occurring on the eve of a great political revolution, and amidst a general scarcity throughout Europe, it was peculiarly unfortunate, and gave more embarrassment to the government than perhaps any other event whatever. Numbers of families found it necessary to contract their mode of living for a time, and to dismiss their servants, who were thus left destitute of bread. Added to the public discontent and political dissensions, it produced such an effect upon the people in general, that the nation

foreboding on this score must have seemed confirmed and multiplied. And this, in the minds of *devout prophetic students*, because, over and above the resemblance of the elemental convulsions and phenomena previously occurring to those told of by Christ in Matt. xxiv., as precursive to his coming again,<sup>1</sup> there was in this hail-storm an additional and ominous point of resemblance to the precise elemental signs noted in the Apocalyptic passage before us, as symbolic of the outbreaking of the judgments of the awful seventh Trumpet;—"There were *lightnings*, and *thunderings*, and an *earthquake*, and *great hail*."—For, though physical phenomena of this kind occur too often to be by themselves, and on their own account, much insisted on by an expounder of prophecy, yet, in its symbolic picturings, we have already seen that *chronological*, as well as *local appropriateness*, has not been altogether unattended to by the divine all-prescient Spirit.<sup>2</sup> And while, with

seemed to have changed its character: and, instead of that levity by which it had ever been distinguished, a settled gloom now seemed fixed on every countenance."

<sup>1</sup> I have seen a very interesting illustration of the impression thus made by comparison of the physical portents then occurring with those told of prophetically by Christ at the Mount of Olives, in the "Lettre d'un Chanoine à un de ses amis sur la proximité de la fin du Monde," written in January 1786. The Letter makes up a pamphlet of 19 pages, and was printed I think at Paris. After saying that the signs of the sun being darkened, and the moon not giving light, or, as elsewhere, becoming red as blood, (Matt. xxiv. 29, Joel ii. 31.) though probably to be construed *figuratively*, like as that of the stars falling from heaven, were yet also probably intended to have a *literal* fulfilment, he then thus parallelizes with them the appearance of the sun and moon in the great fog of 1783, referred to by Cowper;—"ce brouillard extraordinaire qui a eu lieu en 1783,—brouillard repandu universellement sur tout notre hemisphere, et qui a duré pendant plus de trois mois consecutifs. On le voyoit tres frequemment pendant le jour obscurcir le soleil, intercepter ses rayons, et ne lui laisser que son disque, qui se monroit d'une couleur rougeâtre; et, la nuit, donner à la lune une couleur rouge de sang; un evnement presque sans exemple." Then, after reference to various extraordinary physical convulsions, ("revolutions dans la nature,") the same, I suppose, as those which Cowper had alluded to, and national and social disasters, and above all the scourge of the prevailing infidelity, so that Christ, if he came, would indeed not find faith on the earth, he thus in conclusion expresses his anticipation of worse in the coming future, even as if what had already been suffered was but the *first sprinkling of drops, preparatory to the outpouring of God's vials of judgment*. "Quelques grands que soient les maux que nous endurons ce n'est encore là que quelques gouttes de cette coupe fatale que Dieu paroit se preparer à repandre bientôt sur la terre, en punition des iniquités des hommes. 'Hæc omnia sunt initia dolorum.' Heureux ceux qui reconnoitront les derniers signes que Dieu nous a promis; . . . et qui ne seront pas surpris par l'arrivée du Fils de l'homme." Signed with the initials De M. The writer was one of the very very few in France of the spirit of *Lambert*, of whom I shall have to speak in the next Chapter.

<sup>2</sup> On the *local* appropriateness of such symbols I have spoken at large in Part ii. ch. v. § 1, beginning p. 420 in my 1st Volume.

As exemplifications of *chronological* appropriateness in Scripture prefigurative symbols, I may remind the reader of the two following.

1st, those of the *earthquakes, eclipses, &c.*, which preceded the siege and the destruc-

regard to the generality of men, God's purpose in ordaining remarkable elemental convulsions such as I have enumerated, at times of the impending of severe national judgments, may have been simply to awaken a feeling of awe and expectation,—such as, we know, *was* awakened in many, alike by the physical phenomena that preceded Jerusalem's overthrow,<sup>1</sup> the earthquakes and deluges that preceded the Gothic revolt,<sup>2</sup> and the convulsions of which we have just spoken as the immediate precursors of the French Revolution,<sup>3</sup>—it may have been also his intention, in predictively noting them as symbols, that they should serve to the *prophetic student* as a corroborative sign, conjunctively with others less dubious, of the time of the catas-

tion of Jerusalem; compared with the mention of such phenomena in the prophecy Matt. xxiv. 29: in which prophecy they were doubtless intended figuratively in the main, whether as signs precursive of the destruction of Jerusalem, or of Christ's personal second coming. See my Vol. i. p. 55: to the illustrations at which place let me add Josephus' own specific statement, B. J. iv. 4. 5: *Δια γὰρ τῆς νυκτὸς ἀμχανοὺς ἐκρηγνύται χιμῶν, ἀνεμοὶ τε βίαιοι, σὺν οὐβροῖς λαβροτατοῖς, καὶ συνεχεῖς ἀστραπαί, βρονταὶ δὲ φοικῶδεις, καὶ μνημάτα σειομένης τῆς γῆς ἐξάσια.*

2ndly, those of the *earthquakes, flood, and hail* Apocalyptically predicated, either in the Part *within* or Part *without* the scroll, as signs of the great Gothic invasion, and which we saw to have been *literally* realized at the time. See my Vol. i. pp. 374, 375, and Vol. iii. pp. 60, 61. At which latter place I might well have noted the extraordinary and tremendous *earthquake*, which happened A.D. 365, soon after the accession of Valens: under whom occurred the Goths' trans-Danubian passage, revolt, and victory; which was the *primary* epoch, and cause, of the Gothic desolations of the empire: an earthquake whose great extent throughout nearly the whole extent of the Roman world, showed, it has been observed by geologists, that the cause was very deep-seated; and which was followed by an inundation of the Mediterranean almost equally destructive: at Alexandria alone 50,000 having been swept away by it.\* See Amm. Marcell. xxvi. 10, or Gibbon iv. 338—340. As regards the additional *hail* symbol, "mingled with fire," prefigurative of Attila's invasion, we may compare what is told by Philostorgius of natural phenomena correspondent: viz. "the frequent earthquakes which overthrew houses and towers from their foundations;" and also, "inundations of rain waters, and in some places flashes of flame, and sometimes whirlwinds of fire; yea, and hail bigger than a man's fist, which did fall in many places, weighing as much as slbs." Cited by Daubuz, p. 368.

<sup>1</sup> So Josephus *ibid.* Προδῆλον δ' ἦν ἐπ' ἀνθρώπων ὀλεθρῷ τοῦ καταστήμα των ὄλων συγκεχυμένων· καὶ οὐχὶ μικροὺς τίς ἀν' εἰκασαὶ συνπτωμάτων τὰ τεράτα.

<sup>2</sup> "Obsurato sole," said Jerome, (cited by me Vol. i. p. 374,) just at the time of the Goths' first outbreak under Alaric, and when other physical convulsions too were occurring, "omnis mudus jam jamque venturum judicem formidaret." So too Philostorgius, as the conclusion to the passage just cited: "These were plain tokens to denounce the divine anger, which was greater than can be expressed." And so too Gibbon iv. 339, of the earthquake and inundation under Valens; "The subjects of Rome considered these alarming events as the prelude only of still more dreadful calamities; and confounded the symptoms of a declining empire and a sinking world."

<sup>3</sup> So Cowper and the French writer cited above.

---

\* So the great Sicilian flood of which Cowper speaks, in which the Prince of Scylla was washed away, "the Prince with half his people."

trophe, or judgment, predicted under such particular symbols being near at hand.

2. And so at length the mighty political convulsion of this modern age broke out. It was in the year 1788, just a month after the hail-storm, that the united financial and social derangements of the French nation were considered by both king and minister to render necessary the extraordinary and long-disused measure of the *Convocation of the States General*;<sup>1</sup> that is, of the representatives of the nation in its three estates, the clergy, nobles, and people. The day of their primary meeting at Versailles was May 5, 1789. "This," says Alison, "was the first day of the French Revolution."<sup>2</sup> For the minister, as one demented, had doubled the number of the Tiers Etat, so as that the representatives of its body should alone outnumber those of the two other orders.<sup>3</sup> And thus the DEMOCRATIC ELEMENT, which had been long silently growing up to wealth, intelligence, and political ambition, found, all suddenly and strangely, that power was placed within its grasp; nor did they let it slip. Scarce met, the Tiers Etat insisted on all the three forming together one deliberative body: and, on the clergy and nobles refusing, constituted themselves the *National Assembly*; as authorized *even alone* to legislate and act as the nation's representatives. And then, having soon, through firmness and support of the popular voice, overawed the others into submission and coalescence,<sup>4</sup> and in the so united Constituent Assembly swamped the aristocracy of Church and State by force of numbers, they proceeded to enact the part of legislators, as with the authority of the state centered in them: and abolished at one fell swoop

<sup>1</sup> The last previous convocation had been in 1614. Alison i. 168.      <sup>2</sup> i. 181.

<sup>3</sup> Alison i. 170. The numbers were of the *clergy* 293, of the *nobles* 270, (together 563,) of the *Tiers Etat* 565. Ib. 195.

<sup>4</sup> It was May 6, the day after the three Estates assembling, that the Tiers Etat insisted on one assembly. On the refusal of the two other Estates, they opposed till June 17 only *passive resistance*, refusing to proceed to business: but then at length, by a majority of 491 to 90, constituted themselves the *National Assembly*; and, on the Government imprudently shutting the hall against them, met elsewhere, and took an oath never to separate till they had settled the constitution on a solid basis. On the 22nd of June, 148 of the clergy joined them; on the 24th the Duke of Orleans and 46 of the nobles. Then the king yielded; and on June the 27th the whole were formally united in one assembly. Alison i. 200—211.

the whole system of the long-established laws, rights, and customs of the nation, the privileges of the nobility, tithes of the clergy, and monarch's supremacy.<sup>1</sup> "Absolute monarchy," says Burke, "breathed its last without a struggle."<sup>2</sup>—The world looked on with awe. Within two short months from their constitution as the National Assembly they had overthrown everything that might have appeared most stable in Church and State. What changes might not this new lawless democratic power effect in the other European states? And in what spirit? Of that of the *ancient* democracies, when conflicting and dominant, *Coreyra* suggested fearful recollections.<sup>3</sup> And, in their recent attack on the Bastille, the Parisian populace had exhibited a specimen, quite as ominous, of *modern* democratic fury and bloodthirstiness.<sup>4</sup> Thus the Apocalyptic figure of an *earthquake* had not only been realized in France, (indeed so realized that historians and statesmen perpetually adopt the metaphor,)<sup>5</sup> but it was felt that it was that which might extend through Europe.<sup>6</sup> "Already," it was said by Mr. Burke in the year 1790, "in many parts of Europe there is a hollow murmuring under ground; a confused movement is felt. . . that threatens a *general earthquake* in the political world."<sup>7</sup> And he foresaw other evils fast-coming also, with or after the earthquake; even, according to another of the prefigurative symbols of prophecy, the lightnings and

<sup>1</sup> This was August 4. Then all the feudal rights were surrendered by the nobles, and power given of redemption to the tithes: this last act being introductory to the total abolition of tithes. "That night," says Alison, i. 232, "changed the political condition of France." <sup>2</sup> Burke v. 249.

<sup>3</sup> See the awful description, with the historian's profound and philosophic remarks appended to it, in Thucydides iii. 81—84. <sup>4</sup> July 14, 1789.

<sup>5</sup> Mr. Alison, with reference to the decrees of the memorable 4th of August, thus writes: "Nothing could be regarded as stable in society after such a shock. . . The minds of men were shaken as by the yawning of the ground during the fury of an earthquake. All that the eye had rested on as most stable, all that the mind had been accustomed to regard as most lasting, disappeared before the first breath of innovation."—Mr. Fysh, on the French Revolution, (Pref. xxix.) has also cited this passage. And he adds another from Blackwood's Magazine for 1839; "The abuses of the old French Government were such that they could scarcely have been shaken to the ground by anything short of the tremendous moral and political earthquake by which that country was visited." A contemporary, Mr. Hey of Leeds, writing in 1795, naturally draws his figure from the earthquakes of the æra itself. "What a world we live in! The nations are agitated like poor Calabria." Wilberforce's Life, ii. 80. See my notice of this earthquake, p. 345 *suprà*.

<sup>6</sup> "A revolution in France," said Napoleon, "is always, sooner or later, followed by a revolution in Europe." Alison i. 514. <sup>7</sup> Works, Vol. v. 282.

thunderings of war: and these, wars of atrocity and horror unparalleled.—It was evident that a drama had opened in which mightier agencies than those of man were operating.<sup>1</sup> Its issues who could foretell?

## CHAPTER III.

### THE FIRST VIAL.

“AND the nations were angry, and thy wrath is come; . . . and the time that thou shouldest destroy them that destroy (or corrupt) the earth. And the temple of God was opened in heaven; and there was seen in his temple the ark of his covenant; and there were lightnings and voices and thunderings, and an earthquake and great hail.” Apoc. xi. 18, 19.

“And I saw another sign in heaven great and marvellous, seven angels having the seven last plagues: for in them is filled up the wrath of God.<sup>2</sup> . . . And behold, the temple of the tabernacle of the testimony was opened in heaven: and the seven angels went forth out of the temple,<sup>3</sup> which had the seven plagues, clothed in pure and white linen,<sup>4</sup> and having their breasts girded with golden girdles. And one of the four living creatures gave unto the seven angels seven golden vials full of the wrath of God, who liveth for ever and ever. And the temple was filled with smoke from the glory of God, and from his power; and no man was able to enter into the temple till the seven plagues of the seven angels were fulfilled.

<sup>1</sup> “The talent developed was too great, the wickedness too appalling, to be explained on the usual principles of human nature. It seemed rather as if some higher powers had been engaged in a strife in which man was the visible instrument; as if the demons of hell had been let loose to scourge mankind. . . The fancy of antiquity would have peopled the scene with hostile deities, supporting unseen the contests of armies: the severer genius of Christianity beheld in it the visible interposition of Almighty power to punish the sins of a corrupted world.” So Alison i. 6, 7.

<sup>2</sup> The intervening verses about a glassy sea, as it were, mingled with fire, and harpers standing by it that sang the song of Moses and of the Lamb, as well as what is said about the temple opened in Heaven, will be considered in my Chapter viii. *infra*.

<sup>3</sup> B omits the words *εκ του ναου*, both here and in xvi. 1.

<sup>4</sup> A and C have the curious various reading of *λιθον* for *λινον*.



“ And I heard a great voice out of the temple, saying to the seven angels, Go your ways, and pour out the vials of the wrath of God upon the earth. And the first went, and poured out his vial on the earth: and there broke out<sup>1</sup> a noisome and evil ulcer on the men who had the mark of the beast, and on them that worshipped his image.” Apoc. xv. 1—xvi. 2.

Such was the introduction and commencement on the Apocalyptic scene before St. John, of *the Vial-outpouring*; that development of the primary contents of the seventh and last Trumpet<sup>2</sup> of God’s judgments on an apostate world. They were spoken of in the heavenly song that hailed the seventh Trumpet’s sounding, as judgments “*against those that destroyed or corrupted the earth.*”<sup>3</sup> Nor do I know any so clear classification of the figurations that depicted them, as that which is thereby suggested: the *first* of the Vials appearing to figure the spirit and principle of the judgment, as first set in action; the *three next* its continued operation against *the apostate nations of Papal Anti-Christendom*; the *fifth*, judgment against *the very throne of the Beast, or Pope*, the head of the long established antichristian apostasy; the *sixth*, judgment begun, and perhaps completed, against the *Euphratean Turkman*, and the poisonous and false *Mahometan religion*, associated with and headed by him.—I purpose therefore to make each of these divisions the subject of a separate Chapter: reserving for yet another Chapter the striking and contrasted symbol, (a symbol continued evidently through the whole æra of the Vials’ outpouring,) of “*the temple of God appearing opened in heaven* ;” together with certain other symbols, and intimations, of the same character and bearing.

Let me however, before entering on the 1st Vial, make one or two introductory remarks, suggested by the immediate context of one of the Apocalyptic passages that heads my present Chapter, on the Vials generally, and on the four first Vials more in particular.

<sup>1</sup> *εγενηθη*. The authorized translation “*fell on them*” is objectionable; as it seems to imply an infliction from *without*, not an eruption from *within*.

<sup>2</sup> I say *primary*, because there was also included in it, as its ultimate result, the time of the dead being judged, the saints rewarded, and Christ’s kingdom established.

<sup>3</sup> See the Note on this, pp. 335, 336 *suprà*.

As regards then the particular symbol of the *Vials*, or *Cups*, I need scarcely, *first*, remind the Reader of the use of a similar symbol in other Scriptures, in designation of judgment. So in that notable passage, Psalm lxxv. 8: "In the hand of the Lord is a *cup*, and the wine is red; it is full mixt, and He poureth out of the same: as for the dregs thereof, the ungodly of the earth shall wring them out and drink them." So again in another equally notable, Jer. xxv. 15; "Thus saith the Lord God of Israel; Take the *wine-cup* of this fury at my hand, and cause all the nations to whom I send thee to drink it: and they shall drink, and be moved, and be mad, because of the sword that I will send among them." And, yet once more, in that similar passage Isaiah li. 22; "Behold, I have taken out of thine hand the *cup* of trembling, even the dregs of the cup of my fury; thou shalt no more drink it again: but I will put it into the hand of them that afflict thee."<sup>1</sup>—Further, *secondly*, I would observe that in the plagues themselves there is a manifest resemblance to the plagues of ancient Egypt,—its boils, darkness, frogs, and blood-converted rivers;<sup>2</sup> with this implied difference only, that, as Papal Christendom was the *figurative Egypt*, so it would be visited apparently by plagues *figuratively* resembling the Egyptian ones.<sup>3</sup>—As to the circumstance of new angelic agencies being now commissioned to be the executioners of judgment,<sup>4</sup> in place of the four angels of the winds, it might perhaps (as before observed)<sup>5</sup> betoken that these would be no more judgments of *foreign* invasion and aggression, but

<sup>1</sup> The word  $\phi\alpha\lambda\eta$  is often used in the Septuagint to designate the *bowls* used in the services at the brazen altar, e. g. Exod. xxvii. 3, Numb. iv. 14, Nehem. vii. 70; whether for *dry* offerings, or *liquid* libations.—Vitringa, p. 925, prefers to explain the ingredient in the vials as *fire-coals* of God's wrath; so as in Ezek. x. 7; where, however, the word is  $\delta\rho\alpha\zeta$ , not  $\phi\alpha\lambda\eta$ . The intent of the symbol is not affected by this question.

<sup>2</sup> Says Irenæus, iv. 50; "Si quis diligentius intendat his quæ à Prophetis dicuntur de fine, et quæcunque Johannes discipulus Domini vidit in Apocalypsi, inveniet easdem plagas universaliter accipere gentes quas tunc particulatim accepit Ægyptus."

<sup>3</sup> The analogy of interpretation in the case of all the previous Apocalyptic symbols requires this. Moreover in the case of one of the Vial-plagues, I mean that of the *frogs*, such must necessarily be the interpretation: inasmuch as they are said to have come out of the mouths of the dragon, beast, and false prophet; and so could not be literally frogs. Again, in the case of the *waters of the Euphrates dried up* there seems the same undoubted figurative application to the Euphratean horsemen of the 6th Trumpet, or Turks.

<sup>4</sup> Not merely proclaimers of the *time* for the judgments, so as the Trumpet-Angels.

<sup>5</sup> p. 338.

rather judgments of *internal* origin : while the Angels' coming forth from the temple, habited as priests in pure white linen and with golden girdles, might not unfitly signify the special interposition of God's providence in the matter; as done by agents standing before, and commissioned in, his immediate presence.<sup>1</sup> Also the circumstance of one of the Living Creatures, the most eminent of the company of beatified saints in Paradise,<sup>2</sup> giving to these Angels the Vials of God's wrath, might partly indicate its being in vindication of the persecuted saints of former generations that the judgments were now to be poured out on the Roman earth; very much as in the case of God's judgments on Jerusalem, and of those on Egypt, long before.<sup>3</sup> But this is but conjectural.

2. As regards *the four first Vials in particular*, it will be well to remark the similarity in these *four Vials* to the *four first Trumpets*: a similarity which has been often noted, and is indeed too striking to escape the eye of a reader of any observation.<sup>4</sup> More particularly the specified *scene* and

<sup>1</sup> For, among men, priests were considered to be specially employed in God's service, and admitted the nearest into his presence. So, in the main, Vitrina, p. 910.—The circumstance of the *priestly girdle* being *golden* is noted in Exod. xxviii. 8. It was there directed to be made "of gold, of blue, and purple, and scarlet, and *fine twined linen*."

<sup>2</sup> See Vol. i. pp. 87—93.—This is the first mention of any of the saintly company in the heavenly presence, whether the 24 elders or the 4 living creatures, taking part in the *actings out* of the Apocalyptic drama.

<sup>3</sup> The plagues on *Egypt and Pharaoh* are declared to have been for not letting Israel go.—In regard to *Jerusalem*, Christ thus expressed himself as to the cause of the judgments impending over it; "That upon you may come all the righteous blood shed upon the earth, from the blood of righteous Abel to the blood of Zacharias, &c." Matt. xxiii. 35.

<sup>4</sup> I subjoin in parallel columns the descriptions of the four Vials, and the four Trumpets, with a view to their more easy comparison.

#### THE FOUR FIRST TRUMPETS.

"The first Angel sounded; and there followed hail and fire mingled with blood; and they were cast upon the earth; and the third part of the earth was burnt up,\* and the third part of the trees was burnt up, and all green grass was burnt up.—And the second Angel sounded; and as it were a great mountain burning with fire was cast into the sea. And the third part of the sea became blood: and the third part of the creatures which were in

#### THE FOUR FIRST VIALS.

"And the first Angel went, and poured out his Vial on the earth; and there broke out † a noisome and evil ulcer on the men which had the mark of the Beast, and upon them which worshipped his image.—And the second Angel poured out his Vial upon the sea: and it became blood, as of a dead man: and every living soul died in the sea.—And the third Angel poured out his Vial upon the rivers and fountains of waters; and they

\* So the critical Editions generally; *και το τριτον της γης κατεκαη*. The clause is omitted in the received version.

† See Note <sup>1</sup> p. 352.

*subject* of the successive vial-judgments was almost precisely the same in each case as those of the trumpet-judgments corresponding;—viz. the *earth* (i. e. Roman earth), the *sea*, the *ivers and fountains of waters*, and the *sun*. It is of course required by consistency that the same meaning be here attached to these phrases as before: that is, that the *earth* should be interpreted of the territorial state of Western Roman Christendom; the *sea* as including its maritime colonies or provinces; and the *ivers and fountains* as signifying its Alpine streams, and two great boundary rivers, the Rhine and the Danube, with their respective valleys; <sup>1</sup> also the *sun* as the symbol of its royal and imperial ruling powers. Such accordingly will be the principle of my interpretation ensuing.<sup>2</sup>—And let me take this opportunity of observing that if the solution of the *four Vials* on which we are now about to enter, as well as of the *four Trumpets* earlier discussed, be shown, as I think it will be, to answer on this same principle of interpretation to historic fact, that circumstance will constitute of itself the most

the sea, and had life, died; and the third part of the ships were destroyed.—And the third Angel sounded; and there fell a great star from heaven, burning as a lamp: and it fell upon the third part of the rivers, and upon the fountains of the\* waters. And the name of the star is called Wormwood: and the third part of the waters became wormwood: and many of the men died of the waters, because they were made bitter.—And the fourth Angel sounded: and the third part of the sun was smitten, and the third part of the moon, and the third part of the stars; so as the third part of them was darkened, and the day shone not for a third part of it, and the night likewise."

became blood. And I heard the Angel of the waters say, Thou art righteous, O Lord, which art and which wast holy, † because thou hast judged thus: for they have shed the blood of saints and prophets; and Thou hast given them blood to drink. And I heard [a voice from] ‡ the altar say, Even so, Lord God Almighty: true and righteous are Thy judgments.§—And the fourth [Angel]|| poured out his Vial on the sun; and power was given him to scorch men with fire. And the men were scorched with great heat. And they blasphemed the name of God, which hath power over these plagues; and they repented not to give him glory."

<sup>1</sup> See Vol. i. pp. 366, 367.

<sup>2</sup> The same absurdities will of course be found to result here from a *figurative* interpretation of the localities specified, as those noticed by me in Vol. i. pp. 354, 355, on the Trumpets.

\* Scholz inserts the article τῶν.

† I take Tregelles' and Wordsworth's reading, Δίκαιος εἶ ὁ ὢν καὶ ὁ ἴην, ὁσίος, ὅτι πάντα ἐκρίνας, for the received, ὁ ὢν καὶ ὁ ἴην καὶ ὁ ἐσομένος, the latter being unsupported by any adequate MS. authority. Scholz reads ὁ ὁσίος, with the article.

‡ The reading of A and C, and the critical Editions generally, is, Καὶ ἠκούσα τῶν θυσιαστηρίου λεγόντος, omitting the ἀλλοῦ ἐκ of the received text; B, however, has the ἐκ, which would allow of my English rendering in brackets.

§ κρῖσεις.

|| A and C omit the ἀγγέλος of the received text.

plague-boil of Egypt.<sup>1</sup> Supposing either of which to be the sore of the Apocalyptic figure, we must add to its other characteristics of the *noisome*, the *painful*, and the *loathsome*, that also of being in a high degree *infectious*, or *contagious*.<sup>2</sup>—Other solutions seem to me in the comparison less likely and suitable.<sup>3</sup>

Thus then, resolving the metaphor, and turning from the body natural in the figure to the body politic, (just as in the similar metaphor of Isaiah,<sup>4</sup>) we seem bound to interpret

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Baron, in his *Life of Dr. Jenner*, i. 163, concludes on the *small-pox* having been the disease meant by the *boils and blains* that broke out on man and beast, in one of the Egyptian plagues: and, in support of this view, he refers to Philo; who, in his comment on Exod. ix. 9, so descants on the *ἰλκη φλυκτιδὲς ἀναζέουσαι* noted of them by Moses, that Dr. Willes has quoted his words as an accurate description of *small-pox*. Scheuchzer too, in his *Physica Sacra*, commenting on Philo, says: "Non videntur inflammationes hæ ulcerosæ bubones, vel carbunculi pestilentiales, sed tumores inflammatorii, cum vesicis vel pustulis in cute elevatis," &c.—Dr. Baron moreover explains the Athenian plague described by Thucydides, and which was brought from Egypt, as *small-pox*: as also the great plague which depopulated the Roman world in the time of Justinian, and of which I have spoken Vol. i. p. 398.—It seems that Hippocrates, Galen, and other Greek writers, apply the term *λοιμός* to all pestilential epidemics of whatever kind; and do not confine it to what we commonly call *the plague*.—Eusebius (H. E. ix. 8) notes a *λοιμός*, attended with eruption, that occurred in the time of the persecutor Maximin; in which disease the *ἔλκος ἢ φερωννιμῶς, του πυρῶδους ενεκεν, ἀνθραξ προσαγορευομενον*; i. e. a *carbuncle*. Dr. B. explains this too as the *small-pox*; but not quite consistently, as it seems to me, with his own description of "buboes, parotids, and *carbuncles*, as the characteristics of the *true plague*."

Dr. A. Clarke, I observe, inclines to believe *Job's* ulcers too to have been those of *small-pox*.

Compare, on this view of *small-pox* being the plague symbolized, the remarkable fact noted p. 373 *infra*, of its ravages in the French royal family just before the Revolution.

<sup>2</sup> The *non-contagion* theory, which some of late have advocated, had not made much progress in the plague-countries of the Levant themselves, when I was there in 1819.

It is suggested by some expositors that it may very possibly have been the infectious character of *Job's* sore boils that made his friends keep away from him.

<sup>3</sup> "Egypti peculiare hoc malum," says Pliny (xxvi. 5) of the *elephantiasis*, or *leprosy*. And some expositors make *its* ulcer to be the *botch of Egypt*. But in leprosy there are rather *scabs* and *scabs* than *ulcers*. Moreover these scabs are not generally very painful; though Dr. Mason Good, in his *Study of Medicine*, Art. *Leprosy*, has noted certain species of the disease where they are so. Certainly *pain* seems to be a marked characteristic alike of the Egyptian botch meant by Moses, and the Apocalyptic ulcer.

<sup>4</sup> "The whole head is sick, and the whole heart faint. From the sole of the foot even unto the head there is no soundness in it, but wounds and bruises and *putrifying sores*." Isa. i. 6.—So too profane authors, for example Thucydides and Demosthenes, in various places speak of the spirit of faction, and other internal corruptions, as *diseases* of the body politic. Thus Demosthenes, *Θετταλοῖς νοσοῦσι καὶ στασιαζουσι* Olynth. ii.: and in one place, *Περὶ Παραπρεσβείας*, he cites the old lawgiver Solon describing the inward vices of a state,—avarice, injustice, irreligion, &c.,—as what would lead to its self-dissolution, and at length break out into an *ἔλκος*, or open sore:

Ταυτ' ἤδη πάσῃ πόλει ἔρχεται ἔλκος ἀφυκτον. Reiske's Orat. Gr. i. 22 & 422.

Tichonius, commenting on this Vial, says: "Mortalia peccata, quæ sunt *ulcera* in animabus."

the judgment of this Vial as some extraordinary outbreak ✓ of moral and social evil, the expression of deep-seated disease within, with raging pain and inflammation as its accompaniment,—disease of Egyptian origin perhaps, in the Apocalyptic sense of the word Egypt, and alike loathsome, deadly, self-corroding, and infectious,—that would arise somewhere in Papal Europe, shortly after the cessation ✓ of the Turkish woe, and on the sounding of what might answer to the seventh Trumpet's blast; an evil too which would soon overspread and infect the countries of Papal Europe generally, and their inhabitants.<sup>1</sup>—And, such being the force of the symbol, I explain it, in common with many other interpreters,<sup>2</sup> to prefigure that tremendous outbreak of social and moral evil, of democratic fury, atheism, and ✓ vice, which was speedily seen to characterize the French Revolution:—that of which the ultimate source was in the long and deep-seated corruption and irreligion of the nation; its outward vent, expression, and organ in the Jacobin clubs, and their seditious and atheistic publications; its result, the dissolution of all society, all morals, and all religion: with acts of atrocity and horror accompanying, scarce paralleled in the history of man; and suffering and anguish of correspondent intensity throbbing throughout the whole social mass, and corroding it:—that which from France, as a centre, spread like a plague, through its affiliated societies, to the other countries of Papal Christendom; and proved, wherever its poison was imbibed, to be as much the punishment as the symptom of the corruption within.

I spoke of all this as having *speedily* characterized the

<sup>1</sup> *Vitringa's* summary (p. 939) on the nature of the ulcer is this. "Malignum ulcus est, quod magnum creat dolorem, difficiliter sanatur, per totum corpus serpit, et cutem carnemque atque ossa ipsa quoque exedit, simul corpus turpiter deformat:"—very much the same as that which I have given above. His *historical application* however of the figure is evidently quite unsatisfactory and inadequate. He applies it to the corruption of the Roman Church, when so developed as that the Waldenses deemed it a duty to flee its communion. But it is not an epoch of the recognition, but that of the outbreak of the ulcer, that is figured. Further, how were the men of Papal Christendom sufferers from the Waldensian recognition of the ulcerous disease within them?

It will be well for the reader to bear this historical solution of Vitringa in mind; in order that, from observance of its inadequacy, he may the better appreciate the striking accordance with the Apocalyptic symbol of the solution here given.

<sup>2</sup> Galloway, 226, &c.; also Faber, Cuninghame, Keith, &c., on the 1st Vial.

French Revolution. For I wish it to be distinctly noted, that at first, and up to the memorable 4th of August inclusive, when, as before stated, an end was put to absolute monarchy and feudal oppressions in France, its character was by many altogether mistaken: indeed by not a few it was hailed as the harbinger of the triumph of liberty, and jubilee of deliverance to the oppressed in European Christendom.<sup>1</sup> Even the fury of the populace, manifested just previously on the taking of the Bastile, did not quench the ardency of their sympathies and hopes: the destruction of the prison-house of a despotic monarchy being regarded as but the symbol of the destruction of despotism and tyranny itself.—But, speedily after this, the true character of an infidel democratic spirit in power exhibited itself, such as I have described it. First, on Aug. 18 came the National Assembly's *Declaration of the Rights of Man*, that Code of anarchy and revolution.<sup>2</sup> Next, in the *October of that same year*, followed the atrocity of the night-assault by the Parisian mob on the palace at Versailles, the cold-blooded murder of two of the Royal body-guards, ferocious attempt at murdering the Queen,<sup>3</sup> and abduction of the King in bloody triumph to the capital; <sup>4</sup> there to be, together with the National Assembly itself, under the surveillance and power of the sovereign democracy of Paris: then, in Jan. and April 1790, the par-

<sup>1</sup> Alike by statesmen, poets, expounders of prophecy, and ministers of religion. As a specimen of the last, Burke has particularized *Dr. Price*, a dissenting minister, who exclaimed in a sermon, with reference to it, "Lord, now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace, for mine eyes have seen thy salvation."—*Mr. Bicheno* was an example of the same mistake in a prophetic investigator; and *Bishop Watson* in a Prelate of the Church of England.—*Mr. Fox* spoke of it as "the most stupendous and glorious edifice of liberty, which had been erected on the foundation of human integrity, in any time or country:" and similarly, among the French, *Count Mirabeau*. See Burke's Works, Vol. v. 131—133, vi. 90—93, &c.—For poets, it may suffice to suggest the eminent names of *Coleridge*, *Southey*, and *Wordsworth*.

<sup>2</sup> The 1st Article of the New Constitution, framed and promulgated by the National Assembly, was this; "All men are born and remain free, and equal in rights;" the 3rd, "The principle of sovereignty resides essentially in the nation: no body of men, no individual, can exercise an authority that does not emanate from that source." The one proclaimed war against the European orders of nobility, the other against the European sovereignties.

<sup>3</sup> The mob of assassins previously stabbed the bed from which she had escaped. It is in his allusion to this attack on the Queen that Mr. Burke breaks into his celebrated and beautiful apostrophe on the early loveliness of the French Queen, "glittering like the morning-star," &c. v. 149.

<sup>4</sup> The heads of the murdered body-guards being carried on pikes before the royal carriage.

celling out of France into provincial and municipal democracies, subordinate to the central one at Paris,<sup>1</sup> and subjection to them of all power civil, judicial, and ecclesiastical :<sup>2</sup> then, in the *November* following, the confiscation of all the church estates :—then, in 1791, under the *Legislative Assembly*,<sup>3</sup> the speedy ascendancy to power of the Paris Jacobin Club, and numberless affiliated Jacobin provincial Associations; followed by the attack on the palace,<sup>4</sup> massacre of the Swiss guard, imprisonment and dethronement of the King, and murder with demoniacal ferocity of some 5000 Royalists in the prisons :<sup>5</sup>—then under the *National Convention*, or *third National Assembly*,<sup>6</sup> the iniquitous trial, condemnation, and execution of the King, with the Queen's soon following :<sup>7</sup> then, in 1793, the declaration of war against Kings, and fraternization with Revolutionists all over the world :<sup>8</sup> then the reign of terror under Robespierre,<sup>9</sup> the revolutionary tribunal,<sup>10</sup> and civil war and massacres in La Vendée and Lyons ;<sup>11</sup>—massacres in the mass by shooting, drowning, or roasting alive,<sup>12</sup> such as almost to pale the

<sup>1</sup> In illustration of the manifestation, even thus early, of the Assembly's thoroughly revolutionary character, see the extract from the speech of Rabaud de St. Etienne, one of its most eminent members, given by Burke v. 303. At vi. 99 Burke speaks of the new municipalities as the 48,000 French Republics.

<sup>2</sup> The clergy, pensioned according to the new regime by the State, were required to take an oath of adhesion and fidelity to the new constitution.—This ecclesiastical part of the subject is entered into more fully in my vth Chapter.

<sup>3</sup> On Sept. 29, 1791, the *National Assembly*, or, as it has been sometimes called, the *Constituent Assembly*, dissolved itself; on the 1st of October following, the *Legislative Assembly* met. Of its constitution and character Mr. Alison says, that it was such that "if a Demon had selected it, he could not have selected one better fitted to consign the nation to perdition." i. 355.

<sup>4</sup> August 10, 1792.

<sup>5</sup> So we find reported the number of the massacred. Among them was the Princess of Lamballe. See the account in Alison i. 450.—Mirabeau, (or, as some report it, Bertrand de Moleville,) after seeing but a part of these horrors, said that "Liberty slept only on mattresses of dead carcasses." Page's Secret History, quoted by Gallo-way, p. 249.

<sup>6</sup> It met September 20, 1792: the Legislative Assembly having dissolved itself, in sequence to the King's imprisonment, just before.

<sup>7</sup> The King's, Jan. 20, 1793; the Queen's, October 16.

<sup>8</sup> Nov. 19, 1792. Alison i. 584.—"When others wish our alliance," said Fauchet, "let them conquer their freedom. Till then we shall treat them as pacific savages." Ib. 576.

<sup>9</sup> The Girondists were expelled from power by the Jacobins about the end of May 1793; from which time is dated the reign of Robespierre.

<sup>10</sup> This had been instituted in April 1793, for trying crimes against the State, before the fall of the Girondists. But it now became more terrible.

<sup>11</sup> In Lyons in October; in La Vendée in December 1793 and afterwards.

<sup>12</sup> Wearied with the slow operation of the guillotine, the democrat conquerors at Lyons destroyed their prisoners in masses by firing at them with grapeshot.—In I.a Vendée the *noyades* became celebrated: men and women, in vessels-full or in couples,



horrors of Corcyra itself, in the comparison:<sup>1</sup>—then finally, with the threat of dethroning the King of Heaven, as well as kings of the earth, (so did the people rage,<sup>2</sup> and take counsel against the Lord and against his anointed,<sup>3</sup>) the public renunciation of Christianity and of God;<sup>4</sup> followed by the worship of a prostitute as *Goddess of Reason*, with all the orgies of licentiousness accompanying, (a meet sign that *morality*, as well as *mercy*, had perished with *religion*;) the abolition of the Sabbath and of all religious emblems and worship, the proclamation of death being eternal sleep, and finally the procession at Lyons in mockery of Christianity:—in which last-mentioned procession, (I must just sketch the blasphemy,) an altar having been raised to an atheist democrat, a crucifix and gospel was burnt upon it, the consecrated bread trampled under feet of the mob, and an ass, which had been led about the city bearing the sacred vessels, compelled to drink of the sacramental wine out of the communion-cup.<sup>5</sup>—Such was the development of the real character of the Revolution, as the National Conven-

being there drowned by the victorious democrats; and the *noyades* called *Republican baptism* and *Republican marriage*. Again at Pillau they roasted women and children in a heated oven.—In these atrocities Sir Walter Scott says that one regiment assumed to itself, and merited, the title of *Infernal*. (Cited by Keith ii. 232.)—Altogether the massacres during the Reign of Terror are reckoned at 1,022,351. Alison ii. 339, 400.

<sup>1</sup> Πᾶσα τε ἰδέα κατεστή θανάτου' και, οἶον φιλεῖ ἐν τῷ τοιοῦτῳ γίγνεσθαι, οὐδὲν ὁ τι οὐ ξυμβῆθι, και ἐτι περαιτέρω. . . Οὕτως ὠμῆ ἢ στασις προῦκωρησε. Thucydides iii. 81.

<sup>2</sup> See above, p. 325, on *ωργισθησαν*.

<sup>3</sup> Three of the leaders of the municipality, says Alison ii. 83, publicly expressed their determination to dethrone the King of Heaven, as well as the monarchs of the earth. The comedian *Mourot* cried in the church of St. Roque, "God, if you exist, avenge your injured name. I bid you defiance. You remain silent. You dare not launch your thunders. Who after this will believe in your existence?" *ib.* 90.—So when Christ hung on the cross we read of both a similar taunt, and similar endurance of the taunt; "If thou be the Son of God, come down from the cross."—On the execution of Robespierre, July 29, 1794, a poor man, it is related, approached the lifeless body, and exclaimed, "*Yes, Robespierre! there is a God!*" *Ib.* 398.

<sup>4</sup> This was on November 7, 1793.—Gobet, Constitutional Bishop of Paris, according to agreement with the National Convention, attended at its bar with some of the clergy of his diocese, and renounced Christianity; saying that no other religion was needed but that of liberty, equality, and morality. Then followed the procession after the *Goddess of Reason* to Notre Dame;—the Convention, the municipal Sections of Paris, and constitutional bishops and clergy, accompanying, and there placing her on the high altar, and worshipping her.—Notre Dame was after this called the *Temple of Reason*. The proscription of Christianity continued in force for above three years. Burke alludes to this "atheism by establishment," viii. 170, 171. In 1796 the Directory found itself forced to a *toleration* of Christian worship. It was not restored till Buonaparte's first consulship.

<sup>5</sup> This was in conjunction with the massacres of Lyons, Oct. 10, 1793. The names of Fouché and Collot d'Herbois are infamous as the leaders in it. Alison *ib.* 320.

tion settled it, and as the Directory three years after received, and handed it down to the first Consul, Napoleon.<sup>1</sup> And, looking at the fever of infuriate passions that it sprang from, the horrid moral corruption that it both exposed and engendered, the heart-corroding sufferings caused by it, and the infectiousness by which it was its own propagator, with every wind, and in every country adjacent,—what could more fitly prefigure it than the Apocalyptic symbol of the men of Papal Anti-Christendom, as if plague-struck, breaking out all over with its corrupt, loathsome, contagious, eating ulcers? Truly, “the whole head was sick, the whole heart faint: from the sole of the foot even unto the head there was no soundness in it; but wounds, and bruises, and putrifying sores.” As for bandage that might have bound up its miseries, or ointment to mollify them, it had in the madness of the paroxysms of the plague rejected and destroyed them all.—Such were the consequences of the nation’s rejecting God: such the first expression of *his* wrath, in answer to *their* wrath.<sup>2</sup> He gave them up to their own reprobate minds.<sup>3</sup> He left their passions to unchain themselves against their fellow-men; passions earthly, sensual, devilish.<sup>4</sup> He said, “Ephraim hath joined himself to idols; let him alone!”<sup>5</sup>

It has been intimated that, as the literal evil ulcer was peculiarly an *Egyptian* plague, so it might seem that the symbolic ulcer of the Apocalypse was one originating somewhere in the *symbolic Egypt*; i. e. in some country of them *that had the mark of the Beast and worshipped his Image*.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The *National Convention* sate from Sept. 20, 1792, to Oct. 26, 1795; then made way for the *Directory of Five*: which continued the governing Executive, with the two Councils of the 500 and the Ancients, till Buonaparte’s appointment as *First Consul*, Dec. 24, 1799.

<sup>2</sup> “And the nations were wroth, and thy wrath is come:” *τα εθνη ωργισθησαν, και η οργη σου ηλθε.*

<sup>3</sup> Rom. i. 23.

<sup>4</sup> James iii. 15.

<sup>5</sup> Hosea iv. 17.

<sup>6</sup> It may have been observed that the *worshipping of the Beast* is not here specified, in addition to the *worshipping of the image*, so as in Apoc. xiv. 9, 11, and xx. 4; but only “the receiving of the Beast’s mark.” The same is the form of expression also in Apoc. xiii. 15 and xix. 20. It seems to me possible that the two classes of Romanists in the Papal Church may be thus alluded to;—the *Ultra-montane Catholics* and the *Cismontanes*,—the *Italians, &c.*, and the *French*. For of these classes the former regarded the *Pope* as supreme *of himself* and *by himself*; the latter so regarded

—and, as in a *Roman Catholic country*, so probably out of *Roman Catholic principles*. In precise accordance with this it may be shown that the source and first origin of the French revolutionary sore is traceable to the corruptions of the Papal religion itself, among the people and in the kingdoms, (France more especially,) where it was established. And I must beg to pause for a few moments to prove this. For the historic evidence will serve at once to illustrate the imagery of the text; and also to impress upon our minds, how on the scale of nations, as well as of individuals, apostasy from the faith contains within itself, in God's righteous retributive providence, the principle and germ of its own punishment.

I. Thus, first, the *infidelity* and *atheism*, which acted so tremendous a part in the convulsions of the French Revolution, may be considered as both the child and nursling of the Papal system established in France:—its *child*, as having originated in no little measure from the revolting of man's reason at the incredible dogmas propounded by it,<sup>1</sup> and of man's natural moral sense at the cruelties and oppression with which it enforced them;<sup>2</sup>—its *nursling*, as having been not only tolerated by it, in its earlier speculative and quiescent form, but even adopted by many of the most talented and literary of professing Roman Catholics, both lay and clerical.<sup>3</sup> For the Jesuitism in power under Louis XIV, though it had persecuted and banished Protestantism,<sup>4</sup>

*General Councils*: though the latter, as well as former, acknowledged the Pope as Christ's Vicar, and consequently received the Beast's mark.

<sup>1</sup> The reader may see this illustrated from real life in the Rev. Blanco White's Narrative. The scepticism prevalent among the Roman literati about the time of Leo X furnishes an earlier example. Of this I have before spoken Vol. ii. pp. 54, 55, &c.

<sup>2</sup> "Louis XIV had employed the most arbitrary and cruel means, . . . in order to root out Protestantism, and to extirpate every trace of nonconformity within the pale of the Catholic Church. . . . Scarce however had he closed his eyes when . . . the repressed spirit broke out into uncontrollable activity. The very horror of the proceedings of Louis XIV generated opinions at open war, not only with Catholicism, but with all positive religion whatsoever." Ranke's Popes, iii. 202.

<sup>3</sup> "Burnet says that when he was in France, in the year 1683, the method which carried over the men of the finest parts to Popery was this,—they brought themselves to doubt of the whole Christian religion. When that was once done, it seemed a more indifferent thing of what side, or form, they continued outwardly." Burke's Works, v. 272.

<sup>4</sup> By the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, published by Louis XIV in the year 1685. On this, and its consequences to French Protestants, I have observed before.

and persecuted and almost banished Jansenism,<sup>1</sup> and the really spiritual, though nominally Catholic religion, as well of Fenelon<sup>2</sup> as of Pascal, yet cared not to attack, and rather showed indulgence towards, the ingenious infidel speculations, and infidel spirit, of outward conformists.—But the infidelity thus cherished was not always to be merely speculative. So soon as it might have assured to itself complete security from penalty and punishment, so soon its innate hatred to the God of revelation, and to his blessed Gospel, was sure to impel it forward to assume the aggressive. This was quickly seen under the reign of Louis XV, next following. Secured from injury by the very circumstance of its long tolerance and large diffusion, the infidel philosophy collected its strength and venom: and, under Voltaire and other leaders, formed and carried on that celebrated and monstrous conspiracy,<sup>3</sup> of which the *object* was the overthrow of all religion; the *bitterness* expressed in its very motto, “*Crush the wretch*,”<sup>4</sup> meaning Christ and Christianity; and the *organ* atheistic schools,<sup>5</sup> and cheap atheistic publications, everywhere diffused,<sup>6</sup> with all the energy and perseverance of a master-passion:<sup>7</sup> its most effective

<sup>1</sup> See Mosheim Cent. xvii. § ii. l. 1. chs. 40—47, and Ranke iii. 201: also Mendham's Literary Policy of Rome, p. 192; speaking of the Condemnation of the Jansenist Quesnel's assertion of Christians' universal right to read the holy SS. by Pope Clement, in the Bull Unigenitus. (Of which Bull I have spoken before in my Vol. i. pp. 316, 317.)

Of the ruins of the famous Jansenist Convent of Port Royal, destroyed by military force in 1709, at the command of Louis XIV, nothing remains but a few stones. Its beautiful site is at the foot of a rural wooded hill, some four or five leagues from Versailles, with the farm-house that was Pascal's residence crowning its summit. It will be seen by the traveller to the greatest moral advantage after visiting Versailles:—the scene of the holy life and patient sufferings of those persecuted Christians, in immediate contrast with that of the empty glory, and miserable death, of the persecuting king!

<sup>2</sup> See Mosheim, *ibid.* 50.

<sup>3</sup> Alluded to by Burke, Vol. v. 171, 207, viii. 236—238, &c. See too Sir W. Scott in his *Life of Napoleon*, i. 59.

<sup>4</sup> “*Ecrasez l'infame*.” It is the Abbé Baruel who makes this statement.

<sup>5</sup> See the Boyle Lectures on Modern Infidelity by the late Bishop Van Mildert; as referred to by Alwood on the Apocalypse, p. 716.

<sup>6</sup> The publications were for the most part *anonymous*; the tenets not merely infidel, but often atheistical. With these France was inundated, especially from 1758 to 1770. The plan was to print on ordinary paper a number sufficient to pay the expenses; then to strike off an immense edition on inferior paper, and send them to booksellers and hawkers free of cost, or nearly so, for circulation amongst the lower orders at the cheapest rate possible. A club was formed for the purpose of disseminating them, of which Voltaire was honorary president, Le Roi secretary, and D'Alembert, Diderot, Condorcet, and La Harpe, leading members. Fysh on the Revolution, p. 18.

<sup>7</sup> Burke compares the passion with which the philosophers in this conspiracy pur-

*weapon and argument* being the absurdities, hypocrisies, immoralities, cruelties, and wickedness of the Papal Church and religion, as if forsooth a fair representative of Christianity; <sup>1</sup> and its *success* such that the whole literary, and almost the whole popular mind of France, became in the course of the 18th century fully tainted by it. And then when, at the outbreak of the Revolution,—all royal and legal power that might have controlled it having been overthrown,—it aimed its deadly blow against both the religious establishment in France, and religion itself, there was no popular voice or inclination to uphold the one or the other. And first the Papal priesthood, the official leaders in the worship of the Beast and his image, had to experience all the bitterness of privation, contempt, and suffering: and then the nation also,—above all, its nobles and gentry, so long a chief support to the priesthood in the Papal worship, —had to feel throughout its whole body politic the throbbing agonies consequent on the dominancy of a ferocious and relentless atheism.<sup>2</sup>

2. The *moral licentiousness*, which aggravated so greatly the horrors of the Revolution, is also traceable, and yet more directly, to the Papal Jesuit system received and established by Louis XIV in France. For what were the principles of morality inculcated by them under his reign, in their books on ethics and in the confessional? I cite but two: first, “That the transgressions committed by a person blinded by the seduction of lust, agitated by the impulse of tumultuous passions, and destitute of all sense and impression of religion, however detestable and heinous in themselves, are not imputable to the transgressor before the tribunal of God:” secondly, “That those persons may

sued their object of the extirpation of Christianity, to the fanaticism of Mahomet and the Saracens, vi. 20, viii. 255. And so too Sir W. Scott, *ibid.*

<sup>1</sup> So Sir Walter Scott, in his *Life of Napoleon*, Vol. i. p. 27.

<sup>2</sup> Burke follows his quotation from Burnet, given in p. 364 Note <sup>3</sup> above, with the observation that the scepticism indulged in by the French Romanists at the close of the 17th century, was what they subsequently “had too much reason to repent of. They preferred atheism to a form of religion not agreeable to their ideas. They succeeded in destroying that form; and atheism has succeeded in destroying them.”—Even of the philosophers some at length rued the evil they had done. “I know it but too well,” said Le Roi in September 1789, when some one attributed the impending disasters of France to the new philosophy; “and I shall die of grief and remorse.” Fysh, p. 18, *ibid.*

transgress with safety who have a probable reason for transgressing; that is, any plausible argument or authority in favour of the sin they are inclined to commit.”<sup>1</sup> Who can wonder, when such was the morality of their very religion, at the licentiousness of Louis XIV himself, religious bigot though he was, and of his court and nobles? Nor did it, nor could it, stop there. As no counteracting influence arose to arrest it, but rather it was fostered by the rising infidelity,<sup>2</sup> the evil only increased in the reigns succeeding. “The conduct of the Regent Duke of Orleans<sup>3</sup> and his minions,” says Sir Walter Scott, “was marked with open infamy, deep enough to have called down in the age of miracles an immediate judgment from heaven: and crimes, which the worst of the Roman Emperors would have at least hidden in the solitary isle of Caprea, were acted as publicly as if men had no eyes, and God had no thunderbolts.” He adds; “From this filthy Cocytus flowed those streams of impurity which disgraced France during the reign of Louis XV, and which continued in that of Louis XVI to affect society, morals, and literature.”<sup>4</sup>—Such was the state of French morals, and so originated, at the time of the outbreak of the Revolution. And indeed it is remarkable that the very derangement of the national finances, which was the primary cause that necessitated the convocation of the revolutionary States General, had arisen in no little measure from this cause.<sup>5</sup> But what I here wish chiefly to im-

<sup>1</sup> So Mosheim, xvii. 2. 1. 1. 34 (Maclaine's Translation 35).—To the same effect Ranke iii. 140: “Sin they define to be a *wilful* departure from the commands of God. And in what, we inquire, consists this wilfulness? Their answer is, In perfect knowledge of the nature of the sin committed, and in the full consent of the will to its commission. . . According to their doctrine it was enough not to will the commission of sin, *as such*. The less the sinner thought of God during the commission of his offence, and the more violent the passion which hurried him into its commission, the greater was the hope of pardon. *Habit*, or even *bad example*, which limit the freedom of the will, are sufficient exculpations.” These maxims, Ranke states, are taken from elaborate and authentic works, containing rules for the confessional, by some of the more moderate of the Jesuits: and he remarks “how infinitely the boundaries of transgression were thus narrowed, since no man loves sin *for itself*,” and how morality was altogether subverted.—“*Ecce qui tollit peccata mundi*,” was Pascal's sarcastic and indignant exclamation, as characteristic of this their moral code.

<sup>2</sup> Van Mildert observes that the corruption of the female sex was one principal object with the philosophers. *Ibid*.

<sup>3</sup> Regent from the death of Louis XIV in 1715, to the majority of his great-grandson Louis XV in 1723.

<sup>4</sup> Life of Napoleon, Vol. i. p. 55.

<sup>5</sup> “During the whole of the reign of Louis XV France was journeying on to a

press on the reader is, that when the Revolution broke out, *the vitiation of the moral sense of the nation, thus accomplished*, prepared them for the flood of the yet fouler impurity which then inundated all society in France; <sup>1</sup> and thereby (all the sacred and humanizing domestic ties having been thus confounded) for those brutal ferocities which were acted out at the same time, and which were but indeed the natural accompaniments of such brutal licentiousness.

3. The *democratic regicidal principle* itself of the Revolution was precisely that which had been previously advocated, and acted on, by both Papal Jesuits and other Papists in France, lay and clerical, against the Protestants.—So long as the kings of Christendom remained faithful to the Papacy, there was of course no need of recurrence on its part to any but the *monarchical* principle. But after the Reformation, when many monarchs had revolted from the Popedom,—when, besides the Protestant German princes, the revolt had affected royalty in England, where Queen Elizabeth had been even declared *Head* (that is, *temporal Head*) of the Church, and in

national bankruptcy. This arose partly from the impolitic wars undertaken, \* partly from the profligacy . . of the court, partly from the expensiveness of the king's mistresses." Fysh, p. 17. He adds, in illustration of the last-mentioned source of expense, that Madame Pompadour introduced the practice of drawing bills on the treasury, with the king's signature enclosed, but without any specified service;—a practice continued, and with yet more extravagance, by Madame du Barri. Of these bills, observes Professor Smythe, the more the king signed, the more he had to sign; one compliance leading to another. †—See too the disgusting account given by Laerabelle of the debaucheries of Louis XV, cited by Mr. Fysh, p. 11.

<sup>1</sup> So Burke: "France, when she let loose the reins of regal authority, *doubled* the license of a ferocious dissoluteness of manners; . . and has extended *through all ranks of life* . . all the unhappy corruptions that usually were the disease of wealth and power." Vol. v. 86. The revolutionary law of divorce was framed, he observes elsewhere, viii. 174, for the very purpose of demoralizing the nation. "*Marriage*," said Mdlle. Arnaud, "is the *sacrament of adultery*." Alison ii. 91.

---

\* The wars of Louis XIV, which were in great measure *anti-Protestant* wars, figure first in the list. Louis XIV left a national debt at his death of above £50,000,000 sterling. His cruelties against the Protestants in another way affected the finances of his kingdom. For, through his forced expulsion of the Hugonots from France, thousands of his most industrious subjects were lost to it; and trade and manufactures (e. g. the silk manufacture subsequently established in Spitalfields) to a vast amount transferred to other countries.

† Alison, i. 145, states that in 1789 the national revenue was nearly one third short of the charges on it:—the revenue being £18,800,000; the charges on it for the national expenses £16,000,000, interest of debt £10,400,000, together £26,400,000. £20,000,000 of the public debt had been contracted in ways too disgraceful to bear the light.

France Henry the Third, the ruling monarch, was apparently a favourer of the Hugonots, and Henry of Navarre, the heir presumptive, a Hugonot himself,—other political principles seemed expedient at Rome, and were accordingly promulgated and acted upon. By the highest ecclesiastical authorities, both there and in France, the doctrine of *the sovereignty of the people* was asserted.<sup>1</sup> It was laid down that the supreme temporal power was placed by God in *their* hands; and that they thus retained an indefeasible right to alter the forms of Government, resume the sovereignty, and dethrone (some said even to execute) a king, for violation of his duties.<sup>2</sup> So the Romish canonist Bellarmine; so the whole body of the Jesuits; so, A.D. 1587 and 1589, in solemn enthusiastic and twice repeated declaration, the French doctors of the Sorbonne.<sup>3</sup>—And then mark the manner in which in that “most Christian” kingdom, the first-born of the Papacy, this doctrine was at once, on the occasion I refer to, carried out into action. (Let me beg attention to the details: they well deserve it.) First the French *citizens* were stirred up by preachers everywhere, to unite in league against the half-heretical king and government;<sup>4</sup> a solemn *oath of devotion to the popular Papal cause*, even unto blood, administered and taken; and in Paris all the sixteen *sections* of the city organized,<sup>5</sup> with a view to insurrection, by *secret clubs and committees*:—the primary one meeting in a monk’s cell in the Sorbonne; and *delegates from the Provincial towns* (as from Orleans, Lyons, Toulouse, Bordeaux, Rouen) being admitted to the union, all similarly sworn to tolerate not a Hugonot in France, and to remove the abuses of the government. So the mine was prepared: and, on the King ordering the Swiss troops to enter Paris, it exploded. The town was barricaded, the Swiss driven back, the Bastille and Hotel de Ville seized on, the Louvre threatened, King

<sup>1</sup> Ranke ii. 191—193.

<sup>2</sup> I almost copy from Ranke.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 160, 194. In one case nearly forty, in the other seventy members of the Sorbonne were present.—The Pope too was the approver of all. The Jesuit Mathieu was sent to Rome by the Guises, on purpose to inquire the Pope’s opinion; i. e. Pope Gregory XIII. The answer was that he fully sanctioned the insurrection proposed: and, on the Duke of Guise’s earlier successes against the Hugonots, Gregory’s successor, Sixtus V, likened him to Judas Maccabæus. *Ibid.* 155—157.

<sup>4</sup> This was in the year 1587. Its chiefs were of the house of Guise.

<sup>5</sup> It was thence called *the League of the Sixteen*. *Ibid.* 159, 160.



Henry III compelled to take flight, and in a little while assassinated by the monk Clement, with the full sanction and approval of the Papists;<sup>1</sup>—just as Henry IV, a few years after, by another Jesuit fanatic, Ravallac.—Might not one almost fancy that we were reading in all this (a few names and dates only having to be corrected) of the proceedings in Paris on the great modern Revolution?—It was in August 1589 that the assassination of Henry III, as an *anti-Papal* king, followed on the outbreak of *democratic Jesuit clubs* at Paris, *under Papal sanction and direction*. It was in 1789, just 200 years after, that the *democratic outbreak* exploded, in association with *Jacobin clubs* in Paris and the provinces, against a *Papal King*, *Papal Church*, and *Papacy itself* in France; an outbreak ending in that same King's murder. And, as if to mark the connexion and parallelism, in respect of principle and character, of the two transactions, the Jacobin club whence the regicide measure originated, had the pictures of Clement and Ravallac hung up in the gloomy conventual Church of the Dominicans that they assembled in;<sup>2</sup> as the models avowedly looked to by them, to admire and to imitate.

4. Yet once more, in regard to the *atrocities and cruelties* practised *on principle* against the French Papal priests, and their aristocratic and other adherents at the Revolution, it is to be observed that precedents were but copied therein

<sup>1</sup> "In the midst of his own army," exclaimed Pope Sixtus, "was he killed by a poor monk with one stroke." He ascribes this to "the immediate hand of God, who thus testified that he would not desert France." Ranke ii. 178.

The Jesuit Mariana, afterwards, in developing his doctrine of the sovereignty of the people, and right even to put a king to death, if his life were injurious to religion (i. e. the Papal religion), pronounces an eulogium on Jacques Clement. "Jacobus Clemens," he writes, "cognito à theologis, quos erat seiscitatus, tyrannum jure interimi posse, easo rege ingens sibi nomen fecit." Ibid. 192.

The contemporary attempt of the Papacy to stir up the people of England and Ireland against their Protestant Queen, is also noted by Ranke ii. 168. In Popish pamphlets of the time, circulated in England, the murder of Holofernes by Judith is dwelt on, he says, and commended.

<sup>2</sup> See the description in Alison i. 461—464. It was the gloomy nave of the Church of an old Dominican convent at Paris, which had been once the seat of the assemblies of the league of the Guises; and which was now adorned with anarchical symbols, tricoloured flags, and busts of the leading revolutionists of former times. With regard to the portraits of *Jacques Clement* and *Ravallac*, it was some time before the death of Louis XVI that they were hung on the walls. They were decorated with garlands; and the date of the murder which each committed was given below, with the words, "He was fortunate; he killed a king."

of similar atrocities practised in earlier days by the Papal clergy, Papal king, and Papal nobles of France, against their unoffending Protestant brethren. These precedents were in fact remembered, and held out to public notice and execration, at the time. It is mentioned by Burke that the ancient chronicles were searched and cited by the revolutionary leaders for instances of the cruelty of the Popish clergy in other days against those whom they called heretics:<sup>1</sup> and that, more especially, the horrid Hugonot massacre of St. Bartholomew's day<sup>2</sup> was represented in the theatre; the Cardinal de Lorraine, in his robes of function, being depicted on the stage as the chief actor and instigator.<sup>3</sup>—Nor was it in vain. At Paris, (witness especially the Septembrist massacres in the prisons,<sup>4</sup>) at Lyons,

<sup>1</sup> Burke's Works, Vol. v. 256.—The precedents to be found in these chronicles were, alas, too many! The massacres of the Albigenses at and near Toulouse in the xiii<sup>th</sup> century, and of the Albigenses and Waldenses of Dauphiny in the xv<sup>th</sup>, have been already alluded to. These, with many others on a similar scale, occurred before the Reformation. (See my Vol. ii. pp. 20—23, 28, 29, 424—429.) There were others equally atrocious, especially that of St. Bartholomew's day, after it.

<sup>2</sup> The number slain on that day, August 24, 1572, has been variously stated. Sully makes it 70,000; Bonanni, who gives the medal, 60,000; Ranke (ii. 69) 50,000. He adds: "The French thus outdid [in a day] all that the Spaniards had perpetrated in the Netherlands; . . . carrying it [the massacre] into execution in the heat of passion, with the absence of all formalities of law, and by the aid of a *populace drunk with fanaticism*."—The famous Sully describes the difficulty which the Principal of his college had in saving him from the *ferocious priests*, who endeavoured to tear him to pieces; declaring that the orders were to slaughter all Protestants, even *infants at the breast*.—Voltaire in his *Henriade* thus paints the scene:

Ces monstres furieux, de carnage altérés,  
Excités par la voix des prêtres sanguinaires,  
Invoquaient le Seigneur en egorgant leurs freres;  
Et, le bras tout souillé du sang des innocens,  
Osaient offrir à Dieu cet execrable encens.

See generally the interesting account in Sir William Cockburn's *History of the Massacre*; also the medal given at my p. 191 *suprà*.

<sup>3</sup> The fact, which seems to me very striking, is thus stated by Burke, in his *Thoughts on the French Revolution*. "It was but the other day that they [the Parisian revolutionary leaders] caused this massacre [of St. Bartholomew's day] to be acted on the stage, for the diversion of the descendants of those who committed it. In this tragic farce they produced the Cardinal of Lorraine, in his robes of function, ordering general slaughter. Was this spectacle intended to make the Parisians abhor persecution, and loathe the effusion of blood? No! it was to teach them to persecute their own pastors:—to excite them, by raising a disgust and horror of the clergy, to an alacrity in hunting down their order to destruction; . . . to stimulate their cannibal appetites; . . . and to quicken them to an alertness in new murders and massacres, if it should suit the purpose of the Guises of the day. An assembly, in which sate a multitude of priests and prelates, was obliged to suffer this indignity at its door." Works, Vol. v. 260.

<sup>4</sup> A full description of the tragic scenes is given by Alison, i. 444—451, and Fysh, p. 164, &c.—The former, after describing the horrid massacres of the prisoners, begun on *Sunday* Sept. 2, 1792, and continued for three days after, suggests (p. 451) the parallel of the 400 Albigeois burnt at Carcassone.

in La Vendée, and elsewhere, the examples thus set before them were copied too faithfully :—copied by a populace again “drunk with fanaticism ;” only not, as once, that of Popery, but of Atheism ; not, as once, against Protestant fellow-citizens, but against Papists. The *shootings*, the *drownings*, the *roastings* of the Roman Catholic loyalists, both priests and nobles, (not to speak of other injuries great, yet less atrocious,) had all their prototypes in the barbarities of another age, practised under the direction of the Popes and French Papists, both priests and nobles, against their innocent Hugonot fellow-countrymen.<sup>1</sup>

Thus, if the Apocalyptic figure of a *noisome and grievous sore* indicated the outbreak into painful ulceration of corruptions *previously existing* in the body politic of them that worshipped the Beast’s image and bore his mark, the figure was fulfilled in the facts of the French Revolution. Whether we consider the horrors and sufferings arising out of the national atheism, licentiousness, revolutionary demeritism, or bloodthirstiness of spirit then exhibited, they were but the evolution into violent action of the corrupt principles, religious, moral, social, and political, existent

<sup>1</sup> M. Claude, in his *Complaints of Protestants*, quoted by Bicheno, (Signs of the Times, p. 33,) says ; “They cast some into large fires, and took them out when they were half roasted. They hanged others with ropes under their arm-pits, and plunged them several times into wells, till they promised to renounce their religion,” &c. Again at p. 49 Mr. Bicheno adds, with reference to the St. Bartholomew massacre, “that the butchers received orders to slaughter all, even babes at the breast, if they belonged to Protestants : and that the king himself stood at the windows of his palace, endeavouring to shoot those who fled ; and crying to their pursuers, *Kill them ! Kill them !*”

Among the lesser points of parallelism between the two series of atrocities may be mentioned the shutting up of Protestant churches, confiscation of their property, forcing them into emigration, (perhaps there were then 600,000 Protestant emigrés,) and sometimes stopping them on the frontiers, as the unhappy Louis was stopt, and bringing them back for trial and punishment : also, at their executions, stifling their voice by beat of drum, when addressing the bystanders in assertion of their innocence ; just as the voice of the same unhappy monarch was stifled by the sound of the drum at his place of execution. Claude *ibid.*—Let me add, with regard to *Lyons* and its *revolutionary* horrors, that it was the Lyonnese Roman Catholic operatives that drove out all Protestant workmen from Lyons under Louis XIV.

“In our days,” says Schlegel, (Philos. of Hist. ii. 253,) “the emigration of the French nobility has been the great historical counter-blow to the banishment of the Hugonots.” See too the notice of this in Alison’s 1st Chapter.

The circumstance, again, that Voltaire refers to, of the French Romish priests then offering the blood of the innocent Protestants as incense to God, may be compared with that of the atheist democrats of the Revolution, offering the blood of the Romish priests and aristocrats of France as incense to the manes of departed democrats. So by Fouché and Collet d’Herbois at Lyons ; by Robespierre at Paris ; &c.

long before in the nation :<sup>1</sup> and which had been indeed in no little measure infused and cherished, as a part of Rome's religious system, by the Papal Beast that it worshipped.

<sup>1</sup> So the French Father Lambert, writing nearly contemporarily at Paris. "Depuis plus de 60 ans l'irreligion étoit dans le corps de l'Eglise et de l'Etat comme un horrible abcès, plein de corruption et de venin." Exposition des Predictions, Tom. i. p. 22. (Paris 1806.) Again at p. 36 he calls it "*l'ulcère de l'incréduité*;" at p. 32, "*gangrène morale*:" and at p. 53 says that "*le corps de la Gentilité* [i. q. the Apocalyptic *εθνη*] est aujourd'hui comme un malade couvert d'ulcères." And so elsewhere.—This witness to the truth of the Apocalyptic figure, as applied by me, is indeed most remarkable and unexceptionable:—considering, 1st, the writer's undoubted competency to judge of what he wrote about; 2ndly, the place and time of his writing or revising the work, viz. at Paris, from soon after the outbreak of the Revolution to A. D. 1804; (see his Vol. i. pp. 56, 115;) 3rdly, that his language is quite irrespective of the Apocalyptic passage before us, to which, I think, he never alludes. (A notice of Lambert is given in my History of Apocalyptic Interpretation, vol. iv.)

The figure is used too again and again by our own great writer Burke, to depict the same sore evil in France. Thus the infidel democratic spirit is spoken of by him as the "epidemic of atheistical fanaticism," \* "an evil lying deep in the corruption of human nature," † "the malignant French distemper," ‡ of which the Jacobinical writings were "the disgusting symptoms," § and "a plague with its fanatical spirit of proselytism, that needed the severest quarantine to guard against;" || whereof the result, wherever it entered, was "the corruption of all morals," ¶ "the decomposition of all society:" \*\* from which, in France, where it had outbroken in all its venom, the sufferings were to its victims, (and assuredly, sooner or later, to its primary propagandists also,) even in the remembrance, as "living ulcers;" †† while the governing Jacobins "fed like vermin on the distemper, and the festering wounds, of the carcase of their country." †††—Burke, naturally, had most in his mind the *political* evil, Lambert the *religious*.

As the financial difficulties of France arose in part, as I have before observed, from the moral corruptions and profligacy of the French Court, I must not omit to add Sir Walter Scott's comparison of Necker's *Compte Rendu* to "the disclosure of a *wasting sore*, useless and disgusting, unless when shown to a surgeon, and for the purpose of cure."—Cited by Mr. Fysh, p. 28.

It seems that Louis XV died of the *small-pox*, caught from an unfortunate victim of his pleasures; and that his grandson Louis XVI, on ascending the throne, was, together with the rest of the royal family, attacked by the same loathsome malady. On this Mr. F. well observes that "it was an expressive emblem of the grievous and noisome sore about to break out on unhappy France." (p. 19.) And let me beg my readers to compare with this fact what I have said of the Apocalyptic *ελκος*, p. 357, as very probably the *ulcer of small-pox*; also, on the taking of symbols from living realities of the time figured, my remarks p. 347 *supra*.—Dr. Baron, in his *Life of Jenner*, i. 12, notes the remarkable prevalence of small-pox in Europe, in the last thirty years of the 18th century. It was in England, as Jenner's name reminds us, that the antidote was promulgated to the *literal*, as well as to the *figurative* *ελκος*.

\* Burke's Works, v. 278.

† *Ibid.* viii. 215.

‡ *Ibid.* vii. 40.

§ *Ibid.* vi. 250.

|| I rather combine in this than quote. At v. 171, he calls it, "Such a *plague* that the precautions of the most severe quarantine ought to be established against it;" and elsewhere frequently speaks of its fanatical spirit of propagandism.

¶ *Ibid.* viii. 176.

\*\* *Ibid.* viii. 169, 190.

†† v. 140, "The living ulcer of a corroding memory:"—said of the unhappy *royal* sufferer, before the termination of his sufferings in death.

††† viii. 345, "It seems that a hope is entertained that the Directory will have tenderness for the carcase of their country; by whose very distemper, and on whose festering wounds, like vermin, they are fed."—Compare Job's description of his ulcerated frame, "My flesh is clothed with worms." Job vii. 5.

So first and specially in France. But, though the outbreak of the evil was first and chiefly in France, that "*most Christian*" of the ten Papal kingdoms, yet the infidel democratic plague-fever spread speedily to other kingdoms, and its noisome sore broke out there also. It has been noted, both by Burke at the time and by historians subsequently, how the distemper spread, by means of its revolutionary newspapers and affiliated Jacobin clubs, into Savoy and Switzerland, Italy and Germany, the countries of the Rhine, Belgium, Spain, and even Holland and England.<sup>1</sup> In England, through God's great mercy, the true and scriptural religion professed and established in its reformed church, was made the means of repelling and (for a time at least) almost expelling the mischief. In the countries of the Popedom however, (that is, distinctively, in the countries specially marked out as the objects of the first Apocalyptic Vial,)<sup>2</sup> it so rooted itself as to be like a plague

<sup>1</sup> Burke, Vol. v. p. 279. Again, vii. 24: "The seeds of the French spirit of pro-selytism are sown almost everywhere; chiefly by *newspaper circulations*, infinitely more efficacious and extensive than they ever were:" and 26: "The doctrine of the Rights of Man has made amazing progress in Germany: they are infected by it along the whole course of the Rhine, Meuse, Moselle;" and also, he adds, in Suabia, Franconia, and the ecclesiastical Electorates. He afterwards specifies Switzerland, Savoy, Lombardy, Naples, the Papal States, (where it was more poisonous than the miasma from the Pontine marshes, viii. 311.) Spain, Holland: and he observes, p. 91, that France had fitted out a fleet in the Mediterranean to compel the Italian princes to admit French commerce; and, with it, its constant concomitant of *affiliated Jacobin Societies*.—In his Letter on the Regicide Peace, written in 1796, he speaks of the evil as spread in every country of Europe, and among all orders of men who look up to France as a head; its centre being there, its circumference the world of Europe. "Elsewhere," he adds, "the faction is *militant*; in France *triumphant*." viii. 215. In Vol. vii. 57 he says; "The attack does not operate against other countries externally, but by an *internal corruption*, a *sort of dry rot*;" so again unconsciously marking the propriety of the Apocalyptic figure. Compare too my inference from the new Angelic agency employed in the vial-plagues, pp. 338, 353.

Similarly Alison states (pp. 586, 653) how as early as 1792 it was matter of complaint that French affiliated societies spread the "*fever of democracy*" through the whole Maritime Alps, and all the conterminous states.—And Schlegel, in his Philosophy of Hist. ii. 233, writes: "The infidel party in the last century was like a *deadly contagion* of the spirit of the times, infecting all beside and around, above and below it; wheresoever the wind of chance, or breath of fanatic zeal, might carry it." And again, p. 298: "The French Revolution was a general political malady, an universal epidemic of the age. . . Natural contagion, or wilful propagation, spread this disorder over many countries, while France continued to be the centre and focus of revolution."

<sup>2</sup> This distinctiveness has been remarked on by one and another philosophic observer of the phenomena. "The Revolution of 1789 was the breaking out of a *local disease peculiar to the Roman Catholic nations and governments of Southern Europe*. . . The immense triumphs of the Revolution in Roman Catholic countries were owing to the despair created by an effete aristocracy and a hypocritical priesthood. In the east of Europe its success was commensurate with the defects of the old system, and the inward power of reform; but it there never showed the malignity of the disease. This

afflicting them:—the plague alike of irreligion, and of a revolutionary spirit in the breasts of the lower classes against the higher; which prepared everywhere, as will soon appear, for the Gallic sword to follow it.

And thus we are led onward. In the Apocalyptic Vial-outpourings one quickly followed another: and scarce had the noisome ulcer of the *first* Vial developed its earliest malignity in France, and begun to taint with its contagion the states conterminous, when other Vials of wrath,—a *second, third, and fourth*,—involving fearful judgments of *war and bloodshed, by sea and by land*, succeeded.—How could it be otherwise? The malignant spirit of the first Vial had a fury of propagandism in itself, like as if the frenzy of the madman (the *οργη* following the *έλκος*<sup>1</sup>) was on him that had the plague and its lazar-sores. As well might the smoke of Mahommedism from the abyss fail of sending forth its locust-like fanatics to propagate it,<sup>2</sup> as the infidel democratic fanaticism of the Revolution.<sup>3</sup> “The first burst of popular fury,” says Alison, “was followed by an ardent and universal passion for arms.”<sup>4</sup> And again; “Thus commenced the greatest and most bloody . . . war which has agitated mankind, since the fall of the Roman

was exclusively proper to the countries where it was indigenous; viz. France and the South of Europe.” So Niebuhr, as reported by Bunsen, in the Preface to the 3rd Vol. of Miss Winkworth’s *Life of Niebuhr* (1852), pp. xxvi, xxvii.

<sup>1</sup> Thucydides, in his sketch of the outbreak of the democratic spirit at Coreyra, before referred to, uses the Apocalyptic word *οργη* \* of the infuriate political passions and animosities of the antagonist factions; *Οἱ μὲν οὖν . . . τοιούταις οργαῖς ἐς ἀλλήλους ἐχρήσαντο*—many from motives of covetousness; others from the simple *ἀπαιδέυσια οργῆς πλειστον ἐκφερομένοι*. iii. 84, 85, &c.—And so Burke, on the Regicide Peace, speaks of the “*revolutionary fury*,” threatening the nations, viii. 401. And Alison, i. 589; “the frenzy of democratic fury.”

<sup>2</sup> See my Vol. i. p. 448, &c.

<sup>3</sup> “Never shall I think any country in Europe secure, whilst there is established in the very centre of it a state . . . which is in reality a college of armed fanatics, for the propagation of the principles of assassination, robbery, rebellion, fraud, faction, impiety. . . . What if *Mahomet* (instead of being hid, as for a time he was, in the sands of Arabia) had erected his fanatic standard for the destruction of the Christian religion *in luce Asiae*,” &c. Burke vi. 20. I have already at p. 365 Note<sup>7</sup> noticed other passages in which Burke makes the same comparison. It is a favourite with him.

Let me, ere I close my references to this great writer, extract one other passage in which he makes the Apocalyptic emblem of an ulcerated decomposing carcase the groundwork of another picture of this fanatic propagandism of the Revolution: “. . . the regicides and robbers, . . . that from the *rotten carcase* of their own murdered country have poured out innumerable swarms of the lowest and the most destructive of the classes of animated nature; which, like columns of locusts, have laid waste the fairest part of the world.” Letter to a Noble Lord, viii. 70. <sup>4</sup> i. 58.

\* τα ἔθνη ὠργισθησαν.

empire ;” and one too of unequalled “ general exasperation.”<sup>1</sup> The “ infernal energies of the destroying principle” were, in God’s righteous judgment, to be manifested before men :<sup>2</sup>—that principle which, as Alison elsewhere says, “ was destined to convulse the globe.”<sup>3</sup>

## CHAPTER IV.

### THE SECOND, THIRD, AND FOURTH VIALS.

“ AND the second Angel poured out his Vial upon the sea : and it became blood as of a dead man. And every living soul died in the sea.<sup>4</sup>—And the third Angel poured out his Vial upon the rivers and fountains of waters : and they became blood. And I heard the Angel of the waters say, Thou art righteous,<sup>5</sup> which art and wast, the Holy One,<sup>6</sup> because thou hast judged thus : for they have shed the blood of saints and prophets ; and Thou hast given them blood to drink. They are worthy. And I heard [a voice from] the altar<sup>7</sup> say ; Even so, Lord God Almighty : true and righteous are thy judgments.—And the fourth Angel poured out his Vial on the sun ; and power was given him to scorch men with fire. And the men were scorched with great heat. And they blasphemed the name of God, which hath power over these plagues ; and repented not to give him glory.”—Apoc. xvi. 3—9.

We have here described the outspreading of the evil, or of certain judgments and plagues consequent thereon, to different parts of Anti-Christendom.—And first, under the *second Vial*, to its *sea*.

#### I. THE SECOND VIAL.

“ And the second Angel poured out his Vial on the sea :

<sup>1</sup> Ib. i. 377, and 601. So τα εθνη ωργισθησαν. See p. 335 supra.

<sup>2</sup> Burke viii. 372. <sup>3</sup> i. 516.

<sup>4</sup> Or, “ as to the things in the sea :” the reading of the best critical editions being τα εν τη θαλασσα.

<sup>5</sup> Κυριε, “ O Lord,” is omitted in A, C, and the later critical editions.

<sup>6</sup> Or, “ which art and wast holy :” ο ων και ο ην σαιος.

<sup>7</sup> ηκουσα του θυσιαστηριου λεγοντος.

and it became blood, as of a dead man : and every living soul died in the sea.”

The very parallel judgment of the second Trumpet on the western division of the old Roman earth was thus described. “The second Angel sounded ; and as it were a great mountain burning with fire was cast into the sea : and the third part of the sea became blood ; and the third part of the creatures which were in the sea, and had life, died ; and the third part of the ships were destroyed.” And we saw reason to interpret this of the destruction by bloody wars of *the maritime provinces, power, and commerce* of Rome : the agency being that of Genseric and his Vandals ; and the most characteristic feature of the vision *the maritime parts* noted, as the local scene and subject of the judgment. In similar manner we seem bound to interpret the judgment of the second Vial, as a judgment (probably not unconnected with that of the first Vial) that would fall on, and destroy, *the maritime power, commerce, and colonies of the countries of Papal Christendom* : that is, of France, Spain, and Portugal ; these being the only Papal kingdoms to which such maritime colonies and power attached. And the fulfilment of the prophecy, so interpreted, stands conspicuous in the history of the wars that arose out of the French Revolution.

A twofold agency was made subservient, under the overruling of Divine Providence, to accomplish this :—first, that of *the democratic revolutionary spirit* of the first Vial, propagated, like a pestilence, across the sea into the French and Spanish colonies : secondly, that of *the maritime power of England*, long separated from the Papacy, though once the tenth part of its city ; and now the bulwark, not of Protestantism only, but almost of the very profession of Christianity itself.

The *first* agency began to act before the *second*. Its earliest scene of operation was the greatest and most flourishing of the French West Indian colonies, *St. Domingo*.<sup>1</sup> On the news of the meeting and revolutionary proceedings

<sup>1</sup> “As the volcanic shocks, which forty years before destroyed Lisbon, extended . . . across the ocean as far as Peru, so did the revolutionary spirit . . . pass through the countries of the earth ; and at St. Domingo, in the West Indies, there were proceedings as tempestuous as those in Paris.” Barthe, p. 459.



of the National Assembly at Paris, the Frenchmen of that colony in similar revolutionary frenzy planted the tree of Liberty, convoked their National Assembly,<sup>1</sup> and proclaimed equality and the rights of man: but, on the mulattoes and then the negro slaves (the vast mass of the population<sup>2</sup>) claiming their share in those rights, indignantly rejected the claim; and had influence at home to procure a new Decree virtually annulling the celebrated French Decree of May 15, 1791, previously past in favour of at least the *coloured* population.<sup>3</sup> Then began that dreadful civil and servile war of St. Domingo, which continued some twelve years, from 1792 to 1804:—a war in which 60,000 blacks are said to have been slaughtered;<sup>4</sup> but which ended in the utter defeat and expulsion of the French armies,<sup>5</sup> the extermination of the white colonists,<sup>6</sup> and establishment of the island in 1804 as the independent Negro Republic of Hayti.

Meanwhile the great *naval war* between France and England was in progress; which from its commencement in February, 1793, lasted for above twenty years, with no

<sup>1</sup> This was in April, 1790.

<sup>2</sup> Alison, Ch. xxxvii., reckons the Whites in the French part of the island at 40,000, the Mulattoes 60,000, the black or slave population 500,000.

<sup>3</sup> By the Decree of May, 1791, it was declared that all the people of colour, *born of free parents*, in the colonies, should enjoy all the privileges of French citizens.—By the new Decree of Sept. 24 of the same year the arrangement as to the rights and privileges of the various classes of the inhabitants was remitted into the hands of the Colonial Assembly.—It was in protesting against this last Decree that Brissot made the memorable exclamation, “Perish the colonies rather than sacrifice our principles!” \*

<sup>4</sup> Dessalines, in his Proclamation of 1804, “asserted that in the inhuman massacres by the French more than 60,000 of his brethren had been drowned, suffocated, shot, hanged, and otherwise put to death.” Quarterly Review, Vol. xxi., p. 449.

Among the murdered may be reckoned the celebrated *Toussaint l’Ouverture*; one who was, until the Revolution, a negro slave; then the victorious general of his countrymen; and example too, both to them and to the world, how the moral virtues, as well as intellectual talents, might adorn a black as fully as a white man. But in the acme of his glory and usefulness he was at last treacherously kidnapped by General Le Clerc, Buonaparte’s brother-in-law, carried off to France, and left to die by a slow death in a wretched and damp French prison.

<sup>5</sup> An English fleet co-operated with the blacks in the conclusion of the war. To them the French general Rochambeau capitulated with 8000 men, the remnant of the French army.

<sup>6</sup> General Dessalines’ Proclamation (see Note <sup>4</sup> above) led to a general massacre of the whites remaining in the island.

---

\* So Alison, *ubi supra*. In the Quart. Review, Vol. xxi. 435, in an article on the *Past and Present State of Hayti*, this exclamation is attributed to *Robespierre*. And in the Edinb. Review for Jan. 1814, pp. 283, 284, M. de Levis (Souvenirs et Portraits) is cited as reproaching *Barnave* for the saying, as a crime. The variety of report on such a matter is curious.

intermission but that of the short and delusive peace of Amiens: in which war the maritime power of Great Britain was strengthened by the Almighty Providence that protected her to destroy everywhere the French ships, commerce, and smaller colonies; including those of the fast and long-continued allies of the French, *Holland and Spain*. In the year 1793 the greater part of the French fleet at Toulon was destroyed by Lord Hood:<sup>1</sup> in June, 1794, followed Lord Howe's great victory over the French off Ushant: then the taking of Corsica, and nearly all the smaller Spanish and French West Indian Islands:<sup>2</sup> then, in 1795, Lord Bridport's naval victory,<sup>3</sup> and the capture of the Cape of Good Hope;<sup>4</sup> as also, soon after, of a French and Dutch fleet sent to retake it:<sup>5</sup> then, in 1797, the victory over the Spanish fleet off Cape St. Vincent, and that off Camperdown over the Dutch:<sup>6</sup> then, in succession, Lord Nelson's three mighty victories,—of the Nile in 1798, of Copenhagen in 1801,<sup>7</sup> and in 1805 of Trafalgar.—Altogether in this naval war, from its beginning in 1793 to its end in 1815, it appears from James' Naval History that there were destroyed near 200 ships of the line, between 300 and 400 frigates, and an almost incalculable number of smaller vessels of war and ships of commerce.<sup>8</sup> It is most truly stated by Dr. Keith, that the whole history of the world does not present such a period of naval war, destruction, and bloodshed.<sup>9</sup> In the figurative language

<sup>1</sup> December, 1793.

<sup>2</sup> Those restored at the Peace of Amiens were re-taken afterwards.

<sup>3</sup> Off L'Orient.

<sup>4</sup> By Admiral Elphinstone, Sept. 16, 1795. At the Peace of Amiens it was given up; but taken again in 1805 by a British fleet and army under Sir Home Popham.

<sup>5</sup> Under Admiral Lucas.

<sup>6</sup> The one by Sir John Jervis, the other by Admiral Duncan.

<sup>7</sup> A victory by which—in conjunction with the sudden death of the Russian Emperor Paul,\* and the succession to his throne of a man of the most opposite spirit, the Emperor Alexander—the great northern confederacy against England's maritime supremacy was broken up; and, with it, the hindrance to her continuing to fulfil her destined work (as I suppose) under this Vial.

<sup>8</sup> This total destruction of the French marine and commercial power is the more remarkable from the circumstance of Buonaparte's sense of its importance, and craving after "*Ships, colonies, and commerce.*" But all-powerful on land, where he had to fulfil prophecy, he was impotent in what prophecy denied him.

<sup>9</sup> Signs of Times, ii. p. 209. His interpretation of this Vial, so far as it goes,

---

\* He was strangled by a conspiracy of some of his nobles, after giving evidence of insanity.

of prophecy, "The sea became as the blood of a dead man."<sup>1</sup>

Finally, after that all the ships of war and maritime commerce and power of the Papal nations on whom the judgments fell, had been swept from the sea by the English victories, and all their smaller colonies also reft from them, the same revolutionary principle which had long previously introduced civil war and bloodshed into the great French colony of St. Domingo, was now the cause of similar civil wars, bloodshed, and separation from the mother country, of the great Spanish colonies in South America. The colonists there had read the works of the French philosophers and politicians;<sup>2</sup> and during the twelve years, from 1796 to 1808, of Spanish subjection to France,<sup>3</sup> had become familiar with the French revolutionary doctrines. And thus when, on Napoleon's entrapping the King of Spain, and usurping the throne for his brother Joseph, the Spanish nation had risen, and the Cortes, assembled at Cadiz, had promulgated with their own authorization the doctrine of *the sovereignty of the people*,<sup>4</sup>—these colonists were the better prepared to claim their full share of the rights of citizens. And when the claim was rejected,—when the Cortes (like the French colonists of St. Domingo) had decreed that *the slightest tinge of African blood* should be a bar to participation in the rights of citizenship,<sup>5</sup> and England's offer of mediation between Spain and her colonies had been rejected by the former,<sup>6</sup>—then in Mexico, and Venezuela, and Buenos Ayres, and Chili, and Peru, the flames of civil war broke out successively, and spread into an universal conflagration. The atrocities of that war

agrees in what I have given. Only he scarcely adverts in it to the loss of the *maritime colonies* of Papal Anti-Christendom;—a very important branch of the subject in my view. He dwells all but exclusively on the revolutionary naval war.

<sup>1</sup> Somewhat remarkably the very language of the Apocalyptic prophecy was figuratively applied by the leaders of the Revolution at the beginning of the time referred to. Said St. Just in 1794: "Le Vaisseau de la Revolution ne peut arriver au port que sur une mer rougeie de flots de sang." Alison ii. 344.

<sup>2</sup> Quarterly Review, Vol. xvii. p. 561; an Article which gives a brief summary of the origin and earlier progress of the South American Revolutions.

<sup>3</sup> During this time they were virtually separated from Spain; their commerce, and the intercourse with them, being only carried on by the intervention of neutrals. This too was a helping preparatory cause to the revolution which completed and perpetuated the separation.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid. 541.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid.

<sup>6</sup> Ibid. 551.

are said by a writer in the Quarterly Review<sup>1</sup> to have been unparalleled in the civil wars of ancient and modern times. Doubtless he must have forgotten *Lyons* and *La Vendée*, in so writing. Bloody, however, and full of horrors it was. Its result was the independence of the insurgents, and annihilation of the provinces in the character of European colonies.—And the Brazils having been a little subsequently, under the influence of the same revolutionary principles, though by a comparatively unsanguinary revolution, separated from Portugal,<sup>2</sup> the prediction was fulfilled, in a manner the most complete and remarkable, with respect to those greater colonies of Papal Europe, as well as in regard of the lesser before spoken of, “And every living soul died in the sea.”<sup>3</sup>

So was judgment accomplished on both colonizers, colonists, and natives;—all participators alike in the great heresy of Antichrist.<sup>4</sup> And, as regards the European countries, whose colonies they were, may we not in their losses and their sufferings in these civil wars, discern the action of something like retributive justice, for their cruelties both to native Indians and the imported negroes? Justice, divine justice, may wait long: but on iniquitous nations, as well as individuals, it seldom fails to strike hard at the last.

## II. THE THIRD VIAL.

“And the third Angel poured out his Vial on the rivers

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.* 554.

<sup>2</sup> After Don Pedro's leaving it for Portugal in 1821. See *Edinb. Rev.* Vol. xlv. 207.

<sup>3</sup> With this explanation of the term, as signifying the annihilation of the provinces in their character of *European colonies*, it may be well for us to compare the parallel language of the sixth Trumpet. “By these were the third of men killed,” said of the political subversion of the Greek third of the old Roman empire, when conquered by the Turks; as well as that too respecting the African province and Mediterranean islands, when conquered by Genseric, “The creatures which were in the sea, and had life, died,” used in the prophecy of the second Trumpet. Barnev's or Brissot's saying (before quoted), “*Perish the colonies rather than sacrifice our principles,*” is a familiar modern example of the same figure.

<sup>4</sup> The outburst of *atheism*, at the commencement of the French Revolution, must not be supposed to have withdrawn *France* from the character of “worshipping the Beast's image and bearing its mark,” specified as that of the nations judged under the first Vial. This was but a three years' paroxysm of national wickedness and insanity. In May, 1796, permission was given by the Directory to practise again the Christian, and especially the Romish Christian worship: and in 1801, soon after Buonaparte's attaining to the first consulship, he formed a Concordat with the Pope; the first article in which runs thus; “The Catholic religion, Apostolic and Roman, is the religion of the great majority of French citizens.”

and fountains of the waters: and they became blood. And I heard the Angel of the waters say, 'Thou art righteous, which art and which wast holy, because thou hast judged thus: for they have shed the blood of saints and prophets; and thou hast given them blood to drink; for they are worthy. And I heard the altar saying,<sup>1</sup> Even so, Lord God Almighty; true and righteous are thy judgments.'

The parallel judgment of the third Trumpet on the old Western Roman Empire is thus expressed. "And the third Angel sounded: and there fell a great star from heaven, burning as it were a lamp; and it fell upon the third part of the rivers, and upon the fountains of waters: and the name of the star is called Wormwood; and the third part of the waters became wormwood; and many men died of the waters because they were made bitter." And we saw reason to interpret the predicted judgment of the Hun Attila, with his desolating power, fixing himself first on *the middle Danube*, one of the two frontier rivers of the Western third of the Roman earth: then afterwards falling on the *Rhine*, and then on *the Alpine streams that feed the Po*; and, in all the three cases, causing the bitterness of distress, famine, pestilence, and death, to those who drank of the waters; that is, to the inhabitants of the Roman Provinces watered by those streams:<sup>2</sup> the most marked characteristic of this Trumpet being those two frontier rivers, and the valley of the Po, figured as the local scenes and subjects of the judgment.—In the present instance, since the local scene of judgment is similarly "*the rivers* (not the *one third*, for reasons already given)<sup>3</sup> and the *fountains of the waters*," we seem bound by the law of parallelism to interpret the *former* of the two great frontier rivers of Papal Christendom, the *Rhine* and *Upper Danube*; the *latter* of the *Po* and

<sup>1</sup> Ἡ κοίτη τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου λεγούτος. On this compare the notice of the altar in the vision of the 5th Seal, as the covering tomb, as it were, of martyrs self-sacrificed in the cause of Christ. Compare too the speech address by the prophet from Judah to *the altar* at Bethel, 1 Kings xiii. 2; as if itself animate, and sympathizing with those that sacrificed on it. Also Josh. xxiv. 27; "This stone is a witness (*εἰς μαρτυρίαν*), for it hath heard, &c."

<sup>2</sup> See my Vol. i. pp. 381, 382.—Sigonius, after saying, "All was flight, depopulation, slaughter, slavery, burning, and despair, from the Alps to the Apennines," on Attila's falling on Lombardy, adds; "Attila was preparing to go to Rome; but a peace was purchased:" a circumstance that we may note afterwards, as another parallelism to the course of Buonaparte.

<sup>3</sup> p. 356 *suprà*.

*its Alpine tributaries.* And, taking into consideration the sequence of this third Vial on that which precedes it, and supposing our historical interpretation of that former Vial correct, the inference follows, that after the commencement of the judgment of blood on the maritime power and maritime colonies of France and other European kingdoms, a judgment of war and bloodshed would begin to be poured out on *the countries watered by the Rhine and the Danube*, and on the sub-Alpine provinces also of *Piedmont and Lombardy*. Nor, on consulting the chronicle of the French revolutionary wars, shall we fail of discerning the fulfilment of the prediction : and this as distinctly and remarkably as of the prefiguration of the former Vial.

It was in April, 1792, that war was declared by the French National Assembly against the German Emperor ; in the September following against the King of Sardinia : and, ere the close of that year, it resulted that both the *Rhine* began to be notable as one fateful scene of the outpouring of this Vial of blood ; and that advance was made by the French towards a second scene destined to suffer under it, *the Alpine streams of Piedmont and Lombardy*. We read in the annals of that year of the French and Austrian armies conflicting at Mentz, and Worms, and Spire, all situated on the middle Rhine, the very towns that *Attila* long before desolated ; of other armies conflicting in the Austrian Netherlands watered by the Meuse, the last tributary of the lower Rhine ;<sup>1</sup> and also of a third French army advancing into Savoy, as far as the foot of the Piedmontese Alpine frontier :—the infection of the Republican democratic spirit having everywhere,—from Holland in the North to Sardinia and Italy in the South,—prepared for, and facilitated, the progress of French invasion. In 1793 and 1794 the scenes of war and bloodshed were still the same. The French army of the *Meuse*, at first unsuccessful, soon recovered its ground ; and, driving the allies out of Flanders, advanced into Holland : uniting it from early in January, 1795, with France ; and constituting it, like the latter, as a democracy. In like manner the

<sup>1</sup> The Waal, which it joins near its mouth at Gorcum, is the larger branch of the river in the Rhenish Delta.

army of the *middle Rhine*, at first driven back across the river, returned and repulsed the allies in 1794 beyond it, after battles of tremendous bloodshed. In 1795, again, the carnage was renewed, with various success, on the *middle Rhine* and its tributaries; from Luxemburg to Mayence and Manheim: and yet again in 1796.—On quitting its valley, the armies of Jourdan and Moreau advanced from Dusseldorf and Treves towards Nuremberg and Ingolstadt on the *Danube*, as a common centre; victorious at first in many a bloody battle, then at length driven back to the Rhine by the Austrian Archduke Charles; a first commencement to the effusion of the Vial on the *Danube*.—Yet more the *Alpine springs of water* were even now to experience its bitterness. The year that we speak of is ever memorable in history, as that of the first Italian campaign of *Buonaparte* against the allied Sardinians and Austrians. Its course is to be traced from Alpine river to river, along the whole of the North of Italy, from Coni on the Stura to Venice. In the progress of the contest, every river was made a position and battle-field:—during the command of the Austrian general *Beaulieu*, the Bormida, the Tanaro, the upper Po, the Adda with its bridge of Lodi, and Mincio flowing through the Lake of Garda to the Mantuan fortress; then, the veteran *Wurmser* having superseded *Beaulieu*, the Adige and the Brenta; then, on *Alvinzi* assuming the command, the Adige and Mincio again, at Arcola and Rivoli; then, after the *Archduke Charles* had advanced to the succour of his countrymen, the *Tagliamento* and Alpine streams of Carinthia. Who can estimate the carnage? The Alpine fountains of water were indeed turned into blood.—At length in 1797, after Venice itself, at the mouth of the Brenta, had felt the sprinkling of the Vial, and shuddered under that terrible menace of the conqueror, “I will prove an *Attila* to Venice,”—after the Archduke had been again routed in the Carinthian Alpine defiles, and in central Germany too the Austrians had been about the same time defeated, and driven by Moreau and Hoche from Coblentz and Strasburg on the Rhine to Franckfort,—resistance was suspended, and submission made by Austria. And so the treaty of Campo Formio

was concluded ; by which the whole *Valley of the Rhine*, the one local scene of this Apocalyptic Vial,—from its source in Switzerland<sup>1</sup> to its mouth in Holland,<sup>2</sup>—together with the Austrian Netherlands and Palatinate on one side of its central stream, and Wurtemberg, Bavaria, Baden, Westphalia on the other, now united as the *Confederation of the Rhine*, was all ceded or virtually subjected to France ; and also Piedmont and Lombardy, the country noted as another local scene of this Vial, being that of the *Alpine fountains of waters*.

But the Vial had not yet exhausted itself. In the year 1799, on war recommencing, the *fountains of waters* became the scene of the celebrated Italian campaign of *Suwarrow* : and they were again, stream after stream, turned into blood ; as the French were repulsed along the whole line of their former victorious progress, from Verona and Mantua to the Maritime Alps and Western sources of the Po. And again, in 1800, they were made the scene of Buonaparte's second Italian campaign ; a campaign memorable by the passage of the St. Bernard, and decisive and terrible battle of Marengo.—Moreover *the Danube*, the other great frontier river of the old Roman world and Papal Christendom, had now to feel yet more fully than before the outpouring of the Vial. The war was directed by Moreau to Ulm, the first great fortress on the Upper Danube ; and thence, still by the line of the Danube, to Ingolstadt ;—until at length, in the winter following, the victory of Hohenlinden on the Iser, one of its tributaries, having decided the German campaign, peace was again sued for by Austria, on Moreau's advancing down the Danube towards Vienna, and for three years re-established.—Nor was it broken by the war of the third German coalition in 1805, except to bring down the residue of the Vial of wrath on the same fated river and the countries watered by it. The campaign of Napoleon is traced along the Danube, from Ulm and Ingolstadt down to Vienna, and the old adjacent camp of Attila. And, the German Emperor having being forced to retire northward from his capital,

<sup>1</sup> Now the *Helvetic Republic*, under French protection.

<sup>2</sup> Now the *Dutch Republic*, also under French protection.



army of the *middle Rhine*, at first driven back across the river, returned and repulsed the allies in 1794 beyond it, after battles of tremendous bloodshed. In 1795, again, the carnage was renewed, with various success, on the *middle Rhine* and its tributaries; from Luxemburg to Mayence and Mannheim: and yet again in 1796.—On quitting its valley, the armies of Jourdan and Moreau advanced from Dusseldorf and Treves towards Nuremberg and Ingolstadt on the *Danube*, as a common centre; victorious at first in many a bloody battle, then at length driven back to the Rhine by the Austrian Archduke Charles; a first commencement to the effusion of the Vial on the *Danube*.—Yet more the *Alpine springs of water* were even now to experience its bitterness. The year that we speak of is ever memorable in history, as that of the first Italian campaign of *Bonaparte* against the allied Sardinians and Austrians. Its course is to be traced from Alpine river to river, along the whole of the North of Italy, from Coni on the Stura to Venice. In the progress of the contest, every river was made a position and battle-field:—during the command of the Austrian general *Beaulieu*, the Bormida, the Tanaro, the upper Po, the Adda with its bridge of Lodi, and Mincio flowing through the Lake of Garda to the Mantuan fortress; then, the veteran *Wurmser* having superseded *Beaulieu*, the Adige and the Brenta; then, on *Alvinzi* assuming the command, the Adige and Mincio again, at Arcola and Rivoli; then, after the *Archduke Charles* had advanced to the succour of his countrymen, the Tagliamento and Alpine streams of Carinthia. Who can estimate the carnage? The Alpine fountains of water were indeed turned into blood.—At length in 1797, after Venice itself, at the mouth of the Brenta, had felt the sprinkling of the Vial, and shuddered under that terrible menace of the conqueror, “I will prove an *Attila* to Venice,”—after the Archduke had been again routed in the Carinthian Alpine defiles, and in central Germany too the Austrians had been about the same time defeated, and driven by Moreau and Hoche from Coblenz and Strasburg on the Rhine to Franckfort,—resistance was suspended, and submission made by Austria. And so the treaty of Campo Formio

was concluded ; by which the whole *Valley of the Rhine*, the one local scene of this Apocalyptic Vial,—from its source in Switzerland<sup>1</sup> to its mouth in Holland,<sup>2</sup>—together with the Austrian Netherlands and Palatinate on one side of its central stream, and Wurtemberg, Bavaria, Baden, Westphalia on the other, now united as the *Confederation of the Rhine*, was all ceded or virtually subjected to France ; and also Piedmont and Lombardy, the country noted as another local scene of this Vial, being that of the *Alpine fountains of waters*.

But the Vial had not yet exhausted itself. In the year 1799, on war recommencing, the *fountains of waters* became the scene of the celebrated Italian campaign of *Suwarrow* : and they were again, stream after stream, turned into blood ; as the French were repulsed along the whole line of their former victorious progress, from Verona and Mantua to the Maritime Alps and Western sources of the Po. And again, in 1800, they were made the scene of Buonaparte's second Italian campaign ; a campaign memorable by the passage of the St. Bernard, and decisive and terrible battle of Marengo.—Moreover *the Danube*, the other great frontier river of the old Roman world and Papal Christendom, had now to feel yet more fully than before the outpouring of the Vial. The war was directed by Moreau to Ulm, the first great fortress on the Upper Danube ; and thence, still by the line of the Danube, to Ingolstadt ;—until at length, in the winter following, the victory of Hohenlinden on the Iser, one of its tributaries, having decided the German campaign, peace was again sued for by Austria, on Moreau's advancing down the Danube towards Vienna, and for three years re-established.—Nor was it broken by the war of the third German coalition in 1805, except to bring down the residue of the Vial of wrath on the same fated river and the countries watered by it. The campaign of Napoleon is traced along the Danube, from Ulm and Ingolstadt down to Vienna, and the old adjacent camp of Attila. And, the German Emperor having being forced to retire northward from his capital,

<sup>1</sup> Now the *Helvetic Republic*, under French protection.

<sup>2</sup> Now the *Dutch Republic*, also under French protection.

the battle of Austerlitz, a town on one of the northern tributaries of the same great German river, ended the war, and broke the power of Austria.

So had the Apocalyptic Vial now been felt in the whole range of scene allotted it:—as on the Rhine and Alpine fountains of water, so also on the line of the Danube. Indeed it had so made itself to be felt, as to warrant the bold assertion, that in the whole history of European wars,—from the first rise of the ten Papal kingdoms in the sixth century even to the present time,—there is not recorded any one war in which these three valleys of the Rhine, the Danube, and the Po, had been the ensanguined scenes of anything like such carnage; or, to use the figure of the Apocalyptic prophecy, been so turned into blood.

But what the reason for judgments so terrible? Amidst many national sins, which doubtless concurred to evoke them, there was one thus declared to St. John in the verses following: “And I heard the Angel of the waters say; Thou art righteous, which art and wast, the Holy One, because thou hast judged thus: for they have shed the blood of saints and prophets, and thou hast given them blood to drink; for they are worthy. And I heard the altar say;<sup>1</sup> Even so, Lord God Almighty; true and just are thy judgments.”—It does not need that we here enter on the question suggested by this mention of “*the Angel of the waters*,” whether there be attached in God’s providential government particular angelic agencies to particular countries and localities. Direct Scripture proof seems wanting on the point.<sup>2</sup> And certainly we shall not be warranted in inferring it from the figures of a symbolic vision, like that before us. On the main point, however, set forth in the prophetic intimation, we cannot mistake; viz. on the fact of the judgment of the third Vial being

<sup>1</sup> See p. 382, Note 1.

<sup>2</sup> The passage, “But the Prince of the kingdom of Persia withstood me,” in Dan. x. 13, has by some been understood of an Angel specially watching the affairs of that nation. So Lowth and Wintle in loc. But this exposition is at least questionable. Our Lord’s statement, “Their angels do always behold the face of my Father,” (Matt. xviii. 10,) only intimates the fact of particular angels watching over particular *individuals*, if of the children of God.

a righteous retribution from God on the countries and nations judged, for murders previously committed by them on his saints and prophets. And the applicability of this reason for judgment on the nations that I have supposed intended in the prophecy,—the Piedmontese and Austrians and French,—is notorious. The cruelties of the *French* against the associated Waldenses and Albigenses before the Reformation, and the Hugonots and Calvinists after it, —of the *Piedmontese* and their ruling *Princes of Savoy* against the Waldenses of Piedmont in every century from the 13th to the end of the 18th, and of the *House of Austria* against both the Waldenses, the Hussites, and afterwards the Lutherans, in Lombardy, Bohemia, Moravia, the Netherlands, and other of its provinces, have been already briefly sketched in this Commentary.<sup>1</sup> Indeed in the valleys of the Rhine, the Danube, and the Po, there are but few of the localities famed as scenes of carnage and bloodshed in these wars of the Revolution, which may not have other and holier recollections associated with them, in the mind of the Christian traveller, as scenes of the martyrdom or the sufferings of witnesses for the Lord Jesus.<sup>2</sup> Which being the case, and the apparently *retributive* character of these German wars of the Revolution such that the secular historian cannot refrain from remarking it,<sup>3</sup> we may surely

<sup>1</sup> See the references p. 371 Note <sup>1</sup>.—I have ascribed the martyrdoms of Lutherans in the Netherlands to the House of Austria, because of Charles V having begun them, and Philip his son, who continued them with atrocities greatly increased, having inherited the principality not in quality of *King of Spain*, but as a scion of the *Austrian* family.

<sup>2</sup> Besides the local association, on almost a national scale, of the Netherlands with the martyrdoms of Lutheran confessors, of Bohemia with those of the Hussites, and Piedmont of the earlier Waldenses, we should remember that in the thirty years' war, consequent on the German Emperor's Restitution Edict, Moravia, Austria, Carinthia, and Hungary, were scenes of atrocious persecution against the faithful Protestants. See Mosheim xvii. i. 2. 1. 3—8:—also Ranke, Book vii. 2. 3, and Bicheno on the Destiny of the German Empire; who elsewhere (Signs of Times, 42, 46) not without reason, calls it "the bloody House of Austria." It will be interesting also to recollect the memorable murders of Huss and Jerome on the Upper Rhine by the *Lake of Constance*, occupied in 1799 by Massena;—the imperial sentence of death passed against Luther in the Diet of *Worms* on the Middle Rhine;—and the persecuting part acted out against the Lutherans by the Archbishops of *Mayence* and *Cologne*, under sanction of the Empire.

<sup>3</sup> Alison, after describing the campaigns of 1793 and 1794, observes; "The impartial justice of Providence apparently made that terrific period the means of punishing the national sins of both the contending parties." (End of Ch. 16.) But this with reference to *more recent* sins of the two parties: the cruelty of the French Democrats, the injustice of the Allies.

with reason regard these cruelties acted out against Christ's saints in centuries preceding, as (in part at least) the cause of the retribution, agreeably with God's frequent method of deferring judgment for sin to a later generation;<sup>1</sup> and consequently the coincidence between the prophecy and the history, in this respect, as well as others, complete.

Let me just remark, ere concluding my exposition of this Vial, on the appropriateness of those appellatives of God used by the Angel of the waters, "*Thou that art and wast, the Holy One.*" As *the eternal One*, God could not forget, though He might seem to have forgotten, the cries from the scenes of martyrdom that rose up before Him.<sup>2</sup> As *the Holy One*, his judgment against the impenitent perpetrators of the murders of his saints could not but issue.—Also, with regard to *the answering voice from the altar*, let me suggest two not unimportant points indicated by it: *first*, that in the Apocalyptic imagery the great sacrificial altar remained still, as at the beginning, on the scene before St. John:<sup>3</sup> *secondly*, that the prophets and saints referred to by the voice, as murdered by the people and princes of *Rome Papal* judged under this Vial, were thereby recognised as fellow-martyrs, associated in spirit as in place, with *the souls previously gathered under the same altar* from the persecutions of *Rome Pagan*, and depicted in the fifth Seal; indeed as the very brethren there and then prophesied of, as confessors afterwards to come, that were to fill up the number of martyrs before the time of final vengeance.<sup>4</sup>—Besides which, it furnishes a connecting link between that early notice of Christ's martyred confessors in their intermediate state of hopeful waiting after

<sup>1</sup> Matt. xxiii. 35; "That upon you may come all the righteous blood shed upon the earth; from the blood of righteous Abel to the blood of Zacharias the son of Barachias, whom ye slew between the temple and the altar. Verily all these things shall come upon this generation."

<sup>2</sup> So at p. 354 previous.

<sup>3</sup> See my Vol. i. pp. 101, 206.

<sup>4</sup> I subjoin the passage, with a view to its comparison with the one now under consideration. "And when he had opened the fifth Seal, I saw under the altar the souls of them that had been slain for the word of God, and for the testimony which they held. And they cried with a loud voice, saying; How long, O Lord holy and true, dost thou not judge and avenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth. . . And it was said unto them that they should rest yet for a little season; until *their fellow-servants* also, and *brethren, that should be killed as they were*, should be fulfilled." Apoc. vi. 9--11.

death, and the concluding notice in Apoc. xx. 4<sup>1</sup> of their reward in the millennial enthronization with Jesus Christ. And perhaps too it might indicate, conjunctively with other tokens, that the time of that desired consummation was not so very far off. For, judging from the analogy of the voice in the fifth Seal, this second voice from the altar might be conjectured not to issue till the second series of martyrs was completed, or near completion: after which, the reward could not long tarry.

### III. THE FOURTH VIAL.

“And the fourth Angel poured out his Vial upon the sun. And power was given unto him to scorch men with fire. And the men were scorched with great heat.

And they blasphemed the name of God which hath power over these plagues. And they repented not to give Him glory.”

I again resort to the parallel judgment of the *fourth Trumpet*, as a guide to the significancy of this of the *fourth Vial*. The which earlier prophecy was as follows. “And the fourth Angel sounded: and the third part of the sun was smitten, and the third part of the moon, and the third part of the stars; so as the third part of them was darkened, and the day shone not for a third part of it, and the night likewise.” And I showed its fulfilment in the circumstance of Augustulus, the Emperor of the Western third of the old Roman Empire, and thus the third of the sun in its symbolic firmament, being forced by Odoacer the Herulian to abdicate his sovereignty;—an abdication followed by the extinction of the subordinate Roman authorities. It results, as an inference, that there was predicted in the Vial before us the darkening, partially or entirely,<sup>2</sup> either of that power among the ten Papal kingdoms which might be considered as most properly the sun in the symbolic firmament

<sup>1</sup> “I saw thrones; and they sate on them: and judgment was given to them: and I saw the souls of them that had been beheaded for the witness of Jesus and for the word of God; and whosoever had not worshipped the Beast, neither his image:.. and they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years.”

<sup>2</sup> There is no such absolute specification of *the day not shining*, as in the 4th Trumpet-vision; and thus the supposition of a *partial* obscuration seems here admissible.

of Papal Christendom, that is, of the *German Emperor*; or perhaps of the sovereigns of those Papal kingdoms, more in the general: and this as a sequel, chronologically, to the judgments foreshown under the former Vial.

And, to see its accomplishment in the wars of the French Revolution, (not to speak of the earlier and more partial sprinkling of the Vial, when the lights of the Dutch Stadholder and King of Sardinia were in 1794 and 1796 extinguished, just after the earliest sprinkling of the *third* Vial on the *rivers and fountains of waters* of Papal Christendom, —I say, to see its *full* accomplishment,) we have only to proceed in due course with the history. In 1806, the year after the battle of Austerlitz, we read of the German Emperor's solemn renunciation, on Napoleon's necessitating it, of his title of *Emperor of the Holy Roman Empire* and of *Germany*:<sup>1</sup> very much like that by Augustulus on Odoacer's requirement. So the Holy Roman Empire, as it was called, having lasted 1000 years from the time of Charlemagne, was declared to be no more, and the *imperial sun* of Papal Christendom darkened; the Emperor Francis retaining the title of Emperor simply as sovereign of his hereditary Austrian dominions. For it is to be understood that this was not a mere dropping of an empty name of supreme Majesty. By the stipulations of the Treaty of Presburg, and formation of the *Confederation of the Rhine*,—a Confederation chiefly constituted of the Dukes of Bavaria and Wurtemberg, under the Protectorate of France,—the old Germanic imperial constitution was revolutionized, and these princes made altogether independent of the Germanic Emperor.<sup>2</sup> In effect they were at the same time made *Kings, vassal Kings of the French Empire*, not the *German*.—And so began the *king-making* by Napoleon; whereby, within two short years after, most of the other once independent sovereignties of Western Europe were revolutionized, and their *light eclipsed* in the political heaven. First, the power of *Prussia* (of Prussia nominally Protestant, but long since

<sup>1</sup> The Deed is dated Aug. 6, 1806. It was the immediate and necessary consequence of Napoleon's breaking up of the old Germanic empire by the Confederation of the Rhine.

<sup>2</sup> The Act of Confederation was signed July 12, 1806. By it, says Alison, 16 millions of men were at once severed from the German empire.

imbued with French infidelity and German neology)<sup>1</sup> was utterly overthrown in the fatal battles of Auerstadt and Jena,<sup>2</sup> and its king shorn of half his dominions ;—then the *Saxon Elector*, aggrandized with Prussian territory, made *King of Saxony* by Napoleon ;—then his own brother Jerome, similarly aggrandized, constituted *King of Westphalia*, another brother (Louis) *King of Holland*, another (Joseph) *King of Spain and Portugal*, and his general Murat, *King of Naples*. Never before had there been such a subversion of old dynasties, and change to new ones, in the history of modern Europe; never (to use the symbolic phraseology of Scripture prophecy) such a *darkening of the sun*, and *shaking of the powers of heaven*, in the political firmament.<sup>3</sup>—All this was in the years 1806, 1807, 1808. And when in 1809 the Austrian Emperor made another desperate effort to emancipate both himself and the other European sovereignties, and effect for them emergence from eclipse into their former independence and power, the battles of Eckmühl and of Wagram<sup>4</sup> turned his hopes into despair: and (somewhat as in the case of the betrothment to the Goth Astulphus of the Roman Princess Placidia) he only purchased peace by giving his own daughter, the Archduchess Maria Louisa, in marriage to the oppressor ; and with her an implied acquiescence in, and sanction to, Napoleon's usurpations and tyranny.

It is added, “ And power was given him to scorch men with fire ; and the men were scorched with great heat.” It is evidently to *the Angel* who poured out the Vial that this power belonged.<sup>5</sup> But, just as in the case of the Angel

<sup>1</sup> See p. 318 *suprà*.

<sup>2</sup> Oct. 14, 1806.

<sup>3</sup> Matt. xxiv. 29; “ After the tribulation of those days the sun shall be darkened, and the moon shall not give her light, and the powers of the heaven shall be shaken.” —In Owen's History of the Bible Society, i. 371, on the year 1808-1809, the above passage is thus referred to. “ This year presented at its opening a gloomy aspect. . . The distress and perplexity of the European nations were extreme. The *powers of heaven appeared literally to be shaken*; and the hearts of men were everywhere failing them for fear.”

<sup>4</sup> The war was declared by Austria, April 6, 1809; the battle of Eckmühl was fought April 22, of Wagram July 5. Between them occurred the battles of Aspern and Essling, which were favourable to the Austrians, on May 21, 22.

<sup>5</sup> The *sun* is surely the recipient and sufferer, under the vial poured out upon it, precisely as the *earth, sea, and rivers*, under the vials poured on them :—just too as the *sun* was described as the object of judgment in the fourth Trumpet. It seems to



Abaddon that conducted the locust plague of the fifth Trumpet,<sup>1</sup> so here too we may suppose a visible and earthly agency operating, under the invisible angelic agency, to execute the judgment of the Vial. And certainly such an agent was *Napoleon*.—"It was given him to *scorch the men with fire.*"<sup>2</sup> It has been suggested, I think, by Dr. Keith, that there may be an allusion in this expression to the artillery used by the French Emperor, to an extent beyond all former example in military annals, as the great arm of his victories. Nor does he seem to me to be unwarranted in this supposition by the analogy of prophecy. If the fire noted under the sixth Trumpet, as that by which the Greek Empire was to fall, was literally the fire of artillery,<sup>2</sup> why not the same here? It is related that the Mamelucs, after experience in the battle of the Pyramids of the "flaming citadels" which had dissipated their squadrons, designated Buonaparte as the *Sultan Khebir* or *Sultan of fire.*<sup>3</sup>—But the fulfilment of the expression, taken in its common figurative sense of fiery affliction and suffering, is equally clear in the history of the wars of Napoleon. And which of the countries of Western Europe, from Cadiz in the South-western corner of Spain, to the far Russian frontier in the North-west, did not suffer dreadfully from them; until after the epoch of the zenith of the oppressor's power in 1809—1811, when it began to wane; and indeed yet afterwards until its extinction? Even in regard of the French themselves, all victorious as their armies generally were till 1812, the amount of suffering that they had to undergo from the combined rigours of taxation and the conscription,<sup>4</sup> and the reckless mode too of his making war,—without magazines, often without hospitals, to live by plun-

me quite extraordinary that commentators should so generally have been drawn aside, from what both the figure itself of receiving a vial of wrath poured on it, and the analogy of every parallel without exception, show to be the true meaning: and that, in consequence simply of *scorching heat*, an effect of the *literal sun*, being the result of the Vial, they should have supposed the *symbolic sun* of this vision, and not the *outpouring angel*, to be the agent that caused it.

<sup>1</sup> See my Vol. i. p. 451.

<sup>2</sup> See Vol. i. pp. 510—512.

<sup>3</sup> Alison, ch. 26.

<sup>4</sup> "He drained the very life-blood of the people intrusted to his charge, not for the defence of their own country, but to extend the ravages of war to distant and unoffending regions." So Keith ii. 280; from Sir W. Scott's *Life of Napoleon*, Vol. vi. pp. 104, 107.

Alison in his xth Volume states that the conscriptions in France, from 1793 to 1813, amounted to 4,103,000 men.

der, and be murdered in detail as plunderers,—has probably been seldom paralleled.<sup>1</sup>—Yet more, what of the countries conquered by them; both during the actual progress of war, and under the oppressions that followed it? What, even during the wars of recovery? I subjoin, as specimens, a few extracts from testimonies fresh written from some of the later scenes of suffering.<sup>2</sup> And certainly, after reading

<sup>1</sup> “The French army was poured into some foreign country by forced marches, without any previous arrangement of stores or magazines for their maintenance; and with the purpose of maintaining them solely at the expense of the inhabitants. . . This species of war was carried on at the least possible expense to his treasury; but at the greatest possible expenditure of human life, and the incalculable increase of human misery.”—“The officers gave the soldiers authority to secure supplies by what was called *la maraude*, or plunder. . . When marching through a thinly-peopled country, or when . . . the natives and peasants offered resistance, then the soldiers, irritated at the danger they sometimes incurred in collecting provisions, and relentless and reckless, besides indulging in every species of violence, increased their own distresses by destroying what they could not use. Famine and sickness were not long in visiting an army which traversed by forced marches a country exhausted of provisions. These stern attendants followed the French columns as they struggled on. Without hospitals and without magazines, every straggler who could not regain his ranks fell a victim to hunger, to weather, to weariness, or the vengeance of an incensed peasantry. In this manner the French army suffered woes, which till these tremendous wars had never been the lot of troops in hostilities carried on between civilized nations.” Sir W. Scott, 113; quoted by Keith, *ib.* pp. 282, 283.

<sup>2</sup> As a specimen of the sufferings of men on the actual scene of war, the following extracts may suffice. They are borrowed by Mr. Cuninghame (p. 281) from official reports, published by a committee in London, descriptive of the calamities consequent on a later campaign (that of Leipsic) in 1813: the first being a Letter from the City of Leipsic, dated Nov. 1813, and address to the British Nation. †

“We have before our eyes many thousands of the adjacent villages and hamlets, —landed proprietors, farmers, ecclesiastics, schoolmasters, and artisans of every description,—who were some weeks since in circumstances more or less easy, . . . but now without a home, stripped of their all, and with their families perishing of hunger. . . All around is one wide waste. The numerous villages and hamlets are almost all entirely or partially reduced to ashes.”

Again:—“The destruction and distress which marked the countries through which the French army fled from the bloody fields of Leipsic were altogether indescribable. Dead bodies covered the roads. Half-consumed French soldiers were found in the ruins of the villages destroyed by the flames. Whole districts were depopulated by disease. For a month after the retreat no human being, no domestic animal, no poultry, nay, not even a sparrow was to be met with: only ravens in abundance were to be seen, feeding on corpses.”

Again:—“On the borders of Silesia seventy villages have been almost entirely destroyed.”—“In Upper Lusatia the whole tract between Bautzen and Galitz, which has been repeatedly traversed by the marches and countermarches of the armies, is reduced to a desert.”

“At Hamburg 50,000 inhabitants, or perhaps even 70,000, have left, and in part been driven from their homes; destitute of all means, and literally starving for want of the common necessaries of life. . . From the hospitals and infirmaries old and weak persons were driven in herds out of the Altona gate. . . Some, having been long unaccustomed to the air, and exposed half-naked to a cold of 19°, turned mad.”

I conceive that this is but a fair specimen of the miseries experienced in every country of Papal Europe, as it became in turns the scene of warfare.—Similar descriptions appear in the extracts given by the London Committee for the relief of the distressed Germans in 1806. See *Christian Observer*, Vol. v. pp. 67, 381. I may

them, we shall be the better able to appreciate the point and truth of the observation made by Napoleon's own secretary Bourrienne, in regard of these transactions: "When, at a distance from the theatre of glory, we see but the melancholy results which have been produced, the *genius of conquest* can only be regarded as the *genius of destruction.*"<sup>1</sup>—"It was given to the 4th Vial-Angel to scorch men with fire. And they were scorched with great heat."

It is added of the men thus scorched with great heat, that "they *blasphemed* the name of God, who had power over these plagues, and *repented not* to give Him glory." As a second and later notice, to much the same effect, will call for illustration under the next Vial, the present may be passed over more cursorily. Suffice it therefore to say that during the fearful period hitherto specially past in review, from 1789 to 1809,—i. e. from the first outbreak of the revolutionary venom in France to the final prostration of the German Empire, and indeed of all Western continental Europe, in opposing it, no evidence appeared of these judgments having been effective for their intended purpose; no case of the suffering nations renouncing their practical infidelity, or the Papal apostasy, for a purer faith, and turning, like some at the Reformation,<sup>2</sup> to the God that smote them. France, wearied with the absurdity and impolicy of its national *atheism*, had indeed nationally abandoned *it*; for the profession however, not of a true scriptural faith, but again of Popery:—and this chiefly as a principle of tranquillization and control for weaker minds,—the women, the children, the superstitious; while all the energy of the nation, especially at home in the capital, and among the soldiery abroad, continued leavened with the old infidelity. There had been no repenting in France to give God glory. The same was substantially the case in Italy, Germany, Spain,

add, as a specimen of the miseries of *cities besieged*, the case of *Genoa*, so eloquently touched on by Dr. Arnold in his Lectures on Modern History, p. 218.

Both Mr. Cuninghame and Dr. Keith note also, in illustration of the great heat with which the men were scorched under the vial, the exorbitant requisitions imposed on every city and town, upon the French occupying it.

<sup>1</sup> Cited by Keith ii, 284.

<sup>2</sup> "And they gave glory to the God of heaven." Apoc. xi. 13. See my Vol. ii. p. 484.

Portugal; the Romish superstition being professed nationally, the French infidelity cherished in the heart: and, together therewith, instead of humiliation under God's judgments, a bitter blaspheming rebelliousness of spirit against Him who sent them.—But on this subject I shall not now enlarge; as the notice is renewed, as I said, and will better come before us for consideration after the next Vial.

## CHAPTER V.

### THE FIFTH VIAL; OR JUDGMENT BEGUN AND PROGRESSING ON THE POPEDOM.

“AND the fifth Angel poured out his Vial on the throne of the Beast: and his kingdom was darkened.”<sup>1</sup>—Apoc. xvi. 10.

We have here predicted *the outpouring of a Vial of judgment on the Beast's throne and kingdom*, consecutive on that of the former Vial.

Now as to the *locality* on which this Vial was to be poured out, there cannot, I think, be a doubt. The *throne*, or *seat*, of the Beast was the same as that of the seven-headed Dragon, representing the Roman Pagan power before him: for it is said, “The Dragon gave to him (the Beast) *his throne* and power, &c.”<sup>2</sup> It was the *throne of the seven hills*, the *See of ROME*.<sup>3</sup>—And precisely in accordance with the prediction of the text, thus interpreted, we find that immediately after the battle of Wagram in 1809, and re-subjection of Austria,—the closing historic fact noted in my exposition of the *fourth Vial*,—there were issued by Napoleon the two celebrated Decrees of Schönbrunn and Vienna, (Decrees to which I shall again advert ere concluding this Chapter,) whereby *the Pope's temporal authority over the Roman State was abolished, and ROME itself incorporated with France*, as the second city of its empire.

<sup>1</sup> εγενετο εσκοτωμενη.

<sup>2</sup> Apoc. xiii. 2.

<sup>3</sup> Already in the 4th Century, the *episcopal see*, or *seat*, was called a *throne*. So Eusebius, H. E. vii. 32, θρονοσ αποστολικος, said of the see of Jerusalem; Sozomen, H. E. iv. 23, των εν Αντιοχεια θρονονο; &c.

But this in truth was only the consummation of insults and injuries, heaped by the French on the Papal power from almost the very commencement of their Revolution. I have had occasion to glance at this fact, and cursorily to illustrate it, more than once in the general historical sketches given in my Chapter iii. preceding. But it becomes a necessary part of my duty to set it forth more distinctly and fully in the present Chapter. For the solution of the great question of *the termination of the 1260 years of prophecy* is connected with it. If, as I have supposed in common with many other interpreters, the 1260 predicted year-days of Papal supremacy *began primarily*, though *imperfectly*, with the quaternion of years from 529 to 533, that witnessed the promulgation of the Poppedom-exalting Justinian Code, and commencing adhesion of the ten Romano-Gothic kingdoms and kings to the Pope, as spiritual head of Christendom,<sup>1</sup> then ought the quaternion of years, 1260 years after,—that is, from 1789 to 1793, the opening æra of the Revolution,<sup>2</sup>—to be marked, as a *primary* though *imperfect end* to the 1260 years, by some great blow at the Papal supremacy;—then Daniel's prophecy about the “taking away of dominion from it, to consume and to destroy it unto the end,”<sup>3</sup> to have had coincidentally a commencement of accomplishment.<sup>4</sup>—Let us note then what history reports

<sup>1</sup> See *suprà*, pp. 160—162, 304, 305.

<sup>2</sup> So Alison in his Preface. He notes four epochs in European history as connected with the French Revolution; the 1st of which is from the meeting of the States General in 1789 to the establishment of a Republic, and murder of the King, in 1793.

The 2nd, I may here observe, is from 1793 to 1795; including the strife of the Girondists and Jacobins, and the Reign of Terror, until the suppression of the revolt of the National Guards, and triumph of the Convention, in October 1795:—the 3rd, from 1795 to 1802; a period including the rise of Buonaparte, his Italian and Egyptian campaigns, his elevation to the first Consulship, (the democratic passion having now exhausted itself,) and the peace of Amiens:—the 4th, Buonaparte's zenith of power, and oppression of the continental powers, from 1802 to 1815; including his fall, and the battle of Waterloo. <sup>3</sup> Dan. vii. 26.

<sup>4</sup> I do not here apply the well-known prophecy in Apoc. xvii. 16: “The ten horns are ten kings which . . . receive authority as kings at one and the same time with the Beast. These have one mind, and give their strength and authority to the Beast. . . And the ten horns . . . shall hate the whore, and shall make her desolate and naked, and shall eat her flesh, and burn her with fire. For God hath put it into their hearts to fulfil his will; and to agree, and give their kingdom unto the Beast; until the words of God shall be fulfilled.”

The most generally received view indeed of this prophecy, from the times of Luther and Bullinger down to the time now present, has been to the effect that, though till the time of the 7th Trumpet's sounding, the ten kingdoms might adhere to the Beast, and his affianced Harlot-Church, yet they would then at length revolt from, and begin to tear and desolate her. And so in my three earlier Editions I too ex-

on this point ; and mark the earlier spoiling of *the Pope's Ecclesiastical Civitas, or the Romish Church*, ere we revert to the subsequent subversion of his *throne*.

Now significant symptoms had not been wanting for full half a century before the French Revolution, which showed the attachment of many of the Western kings to have more than grown cold towards the Pope, and a preparation of mind to have risen up within them, if not for the overthrow of his domination, yet for some spoliation of the Church his associate.<sup>1</sup> But as yet there was no *mortal blow* struck by any of them against Papal supremacy. This was reserved to the epoch of the Revolution ; and to that country which under Clovis, 1300 years before, had first of the Western Kingdoms attached itself to Rome, and of which the king thenceforward in consequence had borne the title of Eldest Son of the Church.<sup>2</sup>

plained the prediction ; struck, like my predecessors Bicheno, Bickersteth, and others, with the tearing and torturing of Papal Rome by the French Revolutionists ; as illustrated in this Chapter of my Exposition. But, on reconsideration, I have come to the conviction, as will hereafter be more fully explained, that the real intent of that one particular prophetic statement by the Angel-interpreter in Apoc. xvii. is that the ten horns would, *before becoming diademed horns on the Beast Antichrist's head,\** tear the Woman Rome, in her *prior* or *imperial* state ; so as in fact did the Goths. For I see that, though the vision of Apoc. xvii. exhibits Rome and the Beast in their *last* or *Papal* form distinctively and alone, yet the Angel's *explanation* tells about the Woman's, and the Beast's, and ten horns', *prior history* also. So Apoc. xvii. 10, 12, 13. A further notice on this point will be given in my Part vi. ch. 1 § 2.

<sup>1</sup> "There is something unnatural," said the Venetian Envoy in 1737, "in the sight of all the Catholic governments united in a body, in hostility to the Roman Court . . . Whether it proceed from the spread of more enlightened ideas, as many people maintain, or from a tyrannical disposition to crush the weaker party, thus much is certain,—that the kings of Europe are making rapid progress in stripping the Roman See of all its temporal rights and privileges." Ranke, Vol. iii. p. 192.—After this, Benedict XIV, Pope from 1740 to 1758, by making concessions with much political sagacity, where absolutely requisite, both to Spain, Portugal, Sardinia, Naples, &c., delayed the crisis. As it is said by Ranke ; "In this manner were the Catholic courts again reconciled to their ecclesiastical head." "But," he adds, "the contest between the State and the Church, which seems to originate in an internal necessity of Catholicism, could not be terminated by these slight compromises. . The agitated deep soon began to heave with indications of other and far more tremendous storms." *Ib.* p. 196. Then, after a Section on the suppression of the Jesuits by Pope Ganganelli A.D. 1773, and another on the ecclesiastical reformations of Joseph II of Austria, A. D. 1787, ecclesiastical reformations which, as including the suppression of 1300 out of 2000 religious houses, abolition of Papal supremacy in Austria, and establishment too of the toleration of Protestants, may be considered the precursors of the anti-papalism of the French,) Ranke proceeds to describe the mightier changes of the French Revolution.

<sup>2</sup> See p. 164 *suprà*.

\* At p. 74 *suprà* I have stated that in Apoc. xvii. 16 I read *επι*, not *και, το θηριον* .

The blow was there and then instantaneous. Scarce was the National Assembly constituted in the summer of 1789, when it entered on its course of spoliation. The Clergy, who formed one of the Estates, had so little anticipated this, that, on the conflict between the Nobles and the Tiers Etat, they in large numbers joined the latter; and thus materially helped to turn the scale, and precipitate the Revolution. But, regardless of the help so given it, one of the first measures of the Assembly was to abolish tithes, establishing an insufficient rent-charge on the State in lieu of them; a second at one fell swoop to sever from the Church, and appropriate as national property, all ecclesiastical lands throughout the kingdom:—lands, let it be observed, which had been regarded ever before as not French property only, but that too of the Catholic or Roman Church; and as needing therefore the Pope's sanction to its alienation.<sup>1</sup> Then followed the suppression of all monastic houses in the kingdom, to the number of 4000: and, in regard of the Clergy, already made pensioners of the State, the substitution of popular election for institution after the Papal Concordat; and the requirement from each of them, on pain of forfeiture of the pension, of a solemn abjuration of all allegiance to the Pope. And then in 1793, *the last year of the four*, a Decree was issued for the abolition of the Christian (or rather Romish) religion in France: whereupon the Churches were many of them razed to the ground; others left in partial ruin; and of the rest, now shut against priests and worshippers, the most sacred places defiled, (the visible memorial of which desecration remained long after,)<sup>2</sup> the treasures rifled, and the

<sup>1</sup> So Ranke iii. 221. Elsewhere, p. 227, he speaks of the value of the lands thus alienated as 400 millions of francs.

Alison (Ch. 3) reports the general valuation of ecclesiastical property in France, at the commencement of the Revolution, as follows:

Tithes = 130 millions of francs, of which 42 belonged to the Parochial Clergy.

Church Lands = *one-third* of the whole landed property in France, nearly. i. 236.\*

<sup>2</sup> In Carr's "*Stranger in France*," published in the year 1802, and which was a narrative of a tour in France made during the peace of Amiens, lively notices occur,

---

The point is one that I shall have to revert to when considering the subject more fully in my 4th Volume.

\* So in the earlier Editions of his Work. In the 6th Ed., Vol. i. p. 761, he states their value as "*nearly one-half* of the whole landed property of the kingdom;" but gives no reason, or authority, for that very material difference in the valuation.

bells broken, and cast into cannon.<sup>1</sup>—So was the whole French ecclesiastical establishment then destroyed. As to the French clergy themselves, 24,000 were massacred;<sup>2</sup> and this, as before stated, with every the most horrid atrocity.<sup>3</sup> The rest, for the most part utterly beggared, found refuge from the popular fury only by flight into other and chiefly Protestant lands; bearing about with them everywhere visible evidence that the predicted outpouring of judgment had begun on the mystic Babylon, and darkness gathered over the Papal kingdom.

Begun in France, the spoliation of the harlot-Church, and of its Papal patron and head, spread quickly into the other countries of Christendom. A propagandist spirit, in respect of this as in respect of its other principles, was

illustrative of this, such as follow. “On turning the corner of a street, as we entered Rouen, I suddenly found coach, horses, and all, in the aisle of an ancient Catholic church. . . From the busy buzzing of the streets, we were translated into the silence of shattered tombs, and the gloom of cloisters. . . The church having devolved to the nation as its property, by force of a revolutionary decree, was sold for stables to one of the owners of the Rouen diligences. An old unsaleable cabriolet occupied the place of the altar; and the horses were eating their oats in the sacristy.”—He adds, that “the Cathedral of Rouen was converted during the Revolution into a sulphur and gunpowder manufactory.” In the Church of St. Ouen “the costly railing of brass gilt, which half-surrounded the altar, had been torn up and melted into cannon:” in the Chapel of the English Convent, or Convent of the “Blue Nuns,” the graves were still open, the coffins having been rifled of lead for bullets: &c. pp. 38, 46, 142.

In Dr. Waugh’s Memoranda, who visited Paris about the same time, similar notices are found. “*Dieppe*. Sept. 29, 1802: Visited one of the churches:—found two men winnowing wheat before the floor of the pulpit, which was still remaining: but, in place of the Holy Virgin at its back, as formerly, the rude ruffians of reformation. . . have erected a female figure of the Republic with a spear in hand, surmounted with a cap of liberty.”—“*Rouen*: One splendid church was full of wheat. M. Dupont however told me, he expected the nuisance would be removed on the Archbishop’s arrival.”—“*St. Denis*: Saw the Cathedral. . . The slates were torn off the roof; the jackdaws flying through and through; the ancient cemeteries of the kings of France violated: the lead coffins having been converted into musket-bullets, the bones hurled into a common hole dug in the vicinity, the beard of Henry IV torn from his face, and worn as moustaches by a rude soldier, and not a wreck left behind in all the vaults: . . the place converted into a storehouse for flour, of which it is now almost full.” *Memoirs*, pp. 223—229.\*

<sup>1</sup> Scott’s *Life of Napoleon*, ii. 306.—In a Report given to the Committee of Public Safety, in 1794, it was stated that out of the church-bells there might be cast 15,000 pieces of cannon. *Encyc. Brit. Art. France*. In the *Tresor de Numismatique* by M. Achille Collas, Plates xxxii., xxxvi., and xxxviii., there are copies of rude medals struck at Lyons and elsewhere, representing the ruined church and bell.

<sup>2</sup> Cobbin gives this number in his *Historical View of the Reformed Church in France*.

<sup>3</sup> See pp. 361, 372, *suprà*.

\* Abundant memorials still remain of this desecration, and secular appropriation, of churches in France at the great Revolution. At Tours, when I visited it in 1851, one church continued to be the Halle de Blé. The Church of St. Julien was, I think, a remise for Diligences; and other churches in that beautiful city were also similarly desecrated.



one of the essential characteristics of the Revolution; and the tempests of war gave it wings. Its first translation was into *Belgium* and the *Rhenish provinces of Germany*; the latter "the chief seat," as Ranke terms it, "of the ecclesiastical form of government."<sup>1</sup> Thither it brought with it ecclesiastical changes analogous to those in France.—In the years 1796, 1797, French dominion being established by Buonaparte's victories in *Northern Italy*, it bore with it thither the similar accompaniment, as of French democratism and infidelity, so too of French *anti-papalism*.—And then, *Rome* itself being laid open to Buonaparte, and the French armies urging their march onward to the Papal Capital, the Pope only saved himself and it by the formal cession in the Treaty of Tolentino of the Legations of Ferrara, Bologna, and Romagna, (*Peter's Patrimony*,) together with the city of Ancona; the payment of above £1,500,000 sterling,<sup>2</sup>—a sum multiplied three-fold by exactions and oppression;<sup>3</sup>—and the surrender of military stores, and of a hundred of the finest paintings and statues in the Vatican.<sup>4</sup> The French ambassador wrote from Rome to Buonaparte; "The payment of 30 millions [of francs], stipulated by the Treaty of Tolentino, has totally exhausted this old carcass: we are making it consume by a slow fire."<sup>5</sup>—The aged Pope himself, now left mere nominal master of some few remaining shreds of the Patrimony of Peter, experienced soon after *in person* the bitterness of the prevailing anti-papal spirit. On pretence of an insult to the

<sup>1</sup> Ranke iii. p. 224 :—c. g. that of the Prince-Bishops of Mayence, Cologne, &c.

<sup>2</sup> Sir W. Scott's *Napoleon*; cited by Keith, ii. 239, 240. On their march towards Rome the French entered *Loretto*, and rifled its celebrated Chapel of the treasures that had not been previously packed up and removed to Rome:—that same Chapel which had been the original dwelling-house, according to the Romish Calendar, of the Virgin Mary; and miraculously transported through the air from Nazareth to Loretto.

<sup>3</sup> Pope Pius VII, in his Brief addressed to Napoleon on the 27th March, 1808, speaks of 5,000,000 of Roman crowns as the charge incurred by the Holy See for the support of the French troops from 1807 to the date of the Brief; that is for not much more than one year. See the Brief in De Pradt's *Quatre Concordats*, Tom. ii. p. 328. This, which is official, may serve as an index of the exactions of other years.—Ranke, iii. 224, says that the losses of the Roman State were estimated altogether at 220 millions of livres.—See too Eustace's *Travels*, Vol. iv. pp. 415, 416: where, as the result of French occupation and oppression, we find stated the reduction of the population of Rome from 180,000 to 90,000, and conversion of many villages in the Roman territory into deserts.

<sup>4</sup> Sir W. Scott, ap. Keith ib. 232, 240.

<sup>5</sup> Alison iii. p. 548.

French Ambassador there, a French corps d'armée under Berthier, having in February 1798 crost the Apennines from Ancona, and entered Rome, the tricolour flag was displayed from the Capitol, amidst the shouts of the populace, the Pope's temporal reign declared at an end, and the Roman Republic proclaimed, in strict alliance and fraternization with the French. Then, in the Sistine Chapel of the Vatican, the ante-hall to which<sup>1</sup> has a fresco painted by Papal order commemorative of the Protestant massacre on St. Bartholomew's day, (might not the scene have served as a memento of God's retributive justice?) there, while seated on his throne, and receiving the gratulations of his cardinals on the anniversary of his election to the Popedom,<sup>2</sup> he was arrested by the French military, the ring of his marriage with the Church Catholic torn from his finger,<sup>3</sup> his palace rifled, and himself carried prisoner into France, only to die there in exile shortly after.<sup>4</sup>—The Vial had thus touched the *throne of the Beast*, just in ✓ Apocalyptic order, after the first and earlier sprinkling of each of the four preceding Vials: and the confiscation of all territorial possessions of the Church and monasteries, and the pillage of the Pope's library, museum, furniture, jewels, and even sacerdotal robes, told before the world of its outpouring.<sup>5</sup> Nor, though the temporary success of the allies under Suwarrow made feasible the election of another Pope, and temporarily repaired the ruin of the Papal throne,<sup>6</sup> was it anything more than an intermission from further evils yet to come.

For the hopes of an end to these persecutions of Rome

<sup>1</sup> That is, in the *Sala Regia*, which is the ante-hall to the Sistine and Pauline Chapels.—The Jesuit Bonanni thus refers to the Pope's ordering the painting, in his *Numismata Pontificum*: "Colinii et sociorum eadem in Vaticanâ Aulâ describi coloribus jussit à Georgio Vasaro; religionis vindicatæ monumentum, et de profligatâ hæresi trophæum." See my p. 191 *suprà*.

<sup>2</sup> Feb. 15, 1798. *Encyc. Brit. Art. France*.—See my notice at pp. 176, 185 of the worship given to, and received by, the Pope in *God's temple*, or Churches of divine service.

<sup>3</sup> Ranke iii. 225.—See what has been said of the *ring* at p. 179 *suprà*.

<sup>4</sup> He died Aug. 1799.

<sup>5</sup> "The whole sacerdotal habits of the Pope and Cardinals were burnt, in order to collect from the flames the gold with which they were adorned. The Vatican was stripped to its naked walls: a contribution of 4 millions in money, 2 millions in provisions, was imposed on a city already exhausted," &c. Alison, Ch. xxvi.

<sup>6</sup> Chosen Mar. 13, 1800, at S. Georgio in Venice.

and its harlot-Church, excited by Buonaparte's restoration of the Romish religion in France on his assumption of the first Consulship, (a mere political step, as I have already stated,)<sup>1</sup> quickly proved delusive. The Romish religion was recognised by him only in common, and on an equal footing, with other forms of Christianity.<sup>2</sup> In Rhenish Germany, now a part of the mighty French Empire, temporal Princes, alike Protestant and Catholic, were appointed to the old Romish bishoprics and ecclesiastical principalities; in utter contempt of the ancient canon law, by which heresy involved the actual forfeiture of all power, title, and property:<sup>3</sup> and in the very provisions of the French Concordat, made this year, 1801, with the Pope, there was a total abnegation of all Papal supremacy, and even Papal influence, in the ecclesiastical state of *France*.<sup>4</sup>—In 1803 the Concordat made by Buonaparte with the Pope for the kingdom of *Italy* exhibited no other provisions than those for France.<sup>5</sup>—In the autumn of 1804 the Pope, summoned to Paris as a vassal to crown Napoleon Emperor, or rather to give consecration to his crowning,<sup>6</sup> obeyed, in the rekindled hope of the restoration of the

<sup>1</sup> p. 394 *suprà*.

<sup>2</sup> Of the bitterness of this to Rome, and its Prelates, no one that knows anything of Romish pretensions and laws needs information. It is strongly expressed in a circular of the Cardinal Pacca to the Bishops of the Papal States, dated May 29, 1808, and given by De Pradt, Tom. ii. p. 400. "Un gouvernement," it says, "envahisseur de la puissance spirituelle dans tous les lieux où il s'étend, et protecteur de toutes les sectes et de tous les cultes. La formule de ses sermens, ses constitutions, son code, ses lois, ses actes, respirent en tout au moins l'indifférentisme pour toutes les religions. Et est ce qu'il y a de plus injurieux et de plus opposé à la religion catholique, apostolique, et Romaine?—parcequ'elle est divine, et ne peut faire d'alliance avec aucune autre. . . . En montrant du respect pour toutes les sectes, avec toutes leurs opinions coutumes et superstitious, le gouvernement Français ne respect en effet aucun droit, aucune institution, aucune loi, de la religion catholique. Sous une telle protection pour tous les cultes (protection jurée et si vantée du souverain des Français) se déguise la persecution la plus dangereuse contre l'église de Jesus Christ."

<sup>3</sup> Ranke iii. 229.

<sup>4</sup> See the Concordat in De Pradt, ii. p. 102, with Napoleon's *Articles Organiques* subjoined, p. 106.

<sup>5</sup> "The Pope was forced in this to sanction the sale of ecclesiastical property, and to abandon the nomination to all offices to the temporal power. Indeed so many limitations were appended to this Concordat, that Pius VII felt himself compelled to refuse to publish it." Ranke iii. 229.—It would seem, however, from De Pradt, that the ecclesiastical *lands* were not altogether alienated from the *Italian* Church. For he says that Napoleon made a merit of having spared its *biens* to it. Only they were for Napoleon's own creatures, not those of the Papal appointment. The Pope and mother Church of Rome were almost as much robbed of them for the time, as if they had been altogether alienated and appropriated by the secular power.

<sup>6</sup> The Emperor, as every one knows, put the crown on his head himself.

Papal patrimony: but in vain. Nor was the Emperor's coronation next year at Milan, as King of Italy, more fruitful to the Romish harlot-Church. "The designs of Napoleon," says Ranke,<sup>1</sup> "were now revealed. . . The Constituent [or National] Assembly had endeavoured to emancipate itself entirely from the Pope. The Directory wished to annihilate his authority. Buonaparte's notion was to retain him, but in a state of absolute subjection; to make him a tool of his own boundless ambition."—After a while indeed he was permitted to return to Rome. But, on his resistance to the oppressor's views, there followed within four short years after, i. e. in 1809, the full outpouring of the Vial on his *throne*, or *see*, in those anti-papal Decrees of Napoleon from Schönbrunn and Vienna to which I made allusion at the beginning of this Chapter: Decrees to which,—as both *Naples* had now been formed into a dependant kingdom under Murat,<sup>2</sup> and *Spain* into another dependant kingdom under Joseph Buonaparte, and *Austria*, after the victory of Wagram, forced into a political and matrimonial alliance with the French Emperor,—all the ten kingdoms of Western Christendom (England alone excepted, the tenth of the city, already long since broken off from the Popedom<sup>3</sup>) might have appeared before the world assenting and consenting parties. I say with all these as apparently consenting, if not co-operating parties,—viz. Louis King of Holland, Jerome of Westphalia, the Princes of the confederation of the Rhine, (including Bavaria, Wurtemberg, and the Swiss Cantons,) the Austrian Emperor, the King of Italy, (a kingdom comprehending Savoy, Lombardy, and Tuscany,) the King of Naples too, and King of Spain and Portugal,<sup>4</sup>—Napoleon issued from Schönbrunn and Vienna his Decrees for the final humbling and spoliation of the Romish Church and Pope: <sup>5</sup> Decrees of which the purport was the revocation of Charlemagne's donations

<sup>1</sup> p. 231.

<sup>2</sup> *Joseph Buonaparte* was first made king of Naples, in 1805; but *Murat* substituted, on the translation of the former, in 1808, to the throne of Spain.

<sup>3</sup> See my Vol. ii. p. 473.

<sup>4</sup> Compare the list and the territories of the ten original Romano-Gothic kingdoms drawn out at p. 138 *suprà*.

<sup>5</sup> See Sir W. Scott's *Life of Napoleon*, Vol. vi. p. 366, cited by Keith ii. 288. Also Ranke 232. He claimed the right to revoke Charlemagne's donation, as himself the successor and representative of Charlemagne.

to the Holy See, the annexation of the duchies of Urbino, Ancona, Macerata, and Camarino for ever to the kingdom of Italy, the total and final abolition of the Pope's temporal authority, and incorporation of Rome as its second city with the French Empire: <sup>1</sup>—a committee of administration having been appointed for the Roman civil government; and a salary settled on the Pope, <sup>2</sup> as a mere pensionary of the State, in his spiritual character. The Pope vented the bitterness of his soul in the fulmination of an excommunication of the French Emperor and his adherents, expressed after the old model, and with the old haughty Papal pretensions. <sup>3</sup> But it was only to serve as a memorial, by its *detail of wrongs*, <sup>4</sup> of the fulfilment of the predicted outpouring of judgment on the Papal throne, and darkening of his kingdom: and by its *perfect impotency of effect*, and the *ridicule* it met with, <sup>5</sup> of the fact of the days of Papal supremacy, such as of old, being ended. A little after, as if sensible of the hopelessness of the Papal fall, and in forced resignation to his fate, being carried off prisoner by the French, first to Savona, <sup>6</sup> then to Fontainebleau, he signed a new Concordat, of which the very preliminary condition was *his separation for ever from Rome*. <sup>7</sup> So did he set his own seal to the fact of the outpouring of this Vial on the *Papal throne* having been consummated.—It was Napoleon's policy and intention to fix him and the Papal See in the

<sup>1</sup> On the birth of his son, Napoleon had him proclaimed *King of Rome*.

<sup>2</sup> See Ranke *ibid.* 233.

<sup>3</sup> It is given in full by De Pradt, Vol. ii. p. 330. Its date was Rome, June 10, 1809.—He uses in it the old and characteristic word of *fulmination*. “Ils ont encouru l'excommunication majeure, et les autres peines et censures ecclésiastiques *fulminées* par les canons sacrés, &c.” I cite from De Pradt's French translation, p. 345.—As a specimen of the old Papal haughtiness, the following may serve. “Qu'ils apprennent,” he says, “qu'ils sont soumis par la loi de Jesus Christ à notre *trône*, et à notre commandement: car nous exerçons aussi une souveraineté,” &c. *Ib.* 343. In which observe the Pope's use of the Apocalyptic word *throne*.

<sup>4</sup> Besides the confiscations, exactions, &c., inflicted on the Holy See, he notices also “les injures, sarcasmes, et calomnies contre la puissance et la dignité pontificale,” in the public journals of the day. This was one of the modes of expressing the popular hatred to the Roman Harlot Church. He says elsewhere; “Nous eumes la douleur de voir les malheurs et les desastres de l'église du Jesus Christ s'accroître et s'étendre chaque jour.” *Ib.* 333, 339.

<sup>5</sup> De Pradt, ii. p. 386.

<sup>6</sup> He was detained at *Savona* near two years; then, on the approach of an English fleet, removed in January 1812 to Fontainebleau. While at Savona he conceded the main point required by Napoleon; as stated in a Brief of the date of Aug. 5, 1811, given by De Pradt, Vol. ii. p. 507: afterwards all else. Ranke iii. 234.

<sup>7</sup> Ranke iii. 235.

Archiepiscopal Palace at Paris ;<sup>1</sup>—the spiritual head of the Catholic Church, under his own eye and restraint,<sup>2</sup> in the new capital of Catholicism. And indeed all tended to that result : which however could scarcely be, because inspired prophecy connected the Popedom and Rome essentially together, until Rome's final and terrible destruction, not by man but God.<sup>3</sup> Accordingly the sudden and wonderful overthrow of Napoleon's power occurred to prevent it; an overthrow more sudden than even its rise. But even then, and when so strangely, as De Pradt says, "Catholicity having deserted him, four heretical kings bore the Pope back to Rome,"<sup>4</sup> still he sate not on his throne as once before. His power was crippled ; his seat unstable ; the riches of his Church rifled ; and a mighty precedent and principle of action established against him :—a precedent and principle which could scarce fail of bearing similarly bitter fruit afterwards ; and so of prolonging, or renewing, the *consuming judgment on the Beast* predicted in Daniel, and darkening of his kingdom, predicted in the Apocalypse.

And so in fact it happened. For, as to the subsequent attempted re-establishment of Papal superstition and Papal supremacy by the Bourbons, Ferdinand, Miguel, and the Pope, in France, Spain, Portugal, and Italy, I must remind the reader that the revolutions which occurred in the three

<sup>1</sup> De Pradt notes this several times, as ii. 257, &c. The Archiepiscopal Palace of Paris had been repaired for his reception. "C'est ainsi," says De Pradt, on the Pope's final removal to Fontainebleau, "qu'il l'acheminoit successivement vers le siege de Paris."

<sup>2</sup> "Il (Napoleon) avait devant ses yeux l'exemple de Constantin, et le souvenir des malheurs qu'avait entraîné le trop grand éloignement de ces deux pouvoirs. Il lui paraissait convenable que le chef du culte catholique residât aupres du souverain de la plus grande partie de la catholicité." Ib. p. 257.—This judgment of Napoleon, on the effect of the separation of the chief temporal and chief spiritual power, may be regarded as a fresh unintended comment on St. Paul's prophecy of the necessity of the removal of the Roman Imperial *let*, in order to the development in full power of the Papal Antichrist. See pp. 172, 173, *suprà*.

<sup>3</sup> See Gregory the First's just inference from Scripture to this effect, in my Vol. i. p. 401, Note.

<sup>4</sup> A. D. 1814. So De Pradt, p. 313 ; meaning, I suppose, besides the Princes of Russia, Prussia, and England, the King of Sweden, as the fourth. *Austria*, however, the fourth of the four *great* allied Powers, now devotedly Roman Catholic, had of course her full share.\*

\* In here nearly taking my leave of De Pradt's interesting and authentic work, let me express my surprise that Ranke should have made no reference to it, in his sketch of the Papal history during the Napoleonic period.

former countries weakened not a little the ill-cemented reconstructions:—the result down to the reign of Louis Philippe, 1830—1848, being that in *France* the Romish Church still remained impoverished, and legally only on a footing of equality with other religions, very much, so far, as under Napoleon:<sup>1</sup> that in *Portugal* it remained spoiled of its ecclesiastical domains, by the decrees of the secular power in 1835:<sup>2</sup> and that in *Spain* it suffered a similar confiscation of much of the immense church-property of that “most catholic” of countries; a confiscation completed under the rule of Queen Christina and the Regent Espartero. Which last-mentioned act of spoliation is the subject of a Papal Apostolic Letter, published not long after, “ordaining public prayers on account of the unhappy state of religion in Spain, together with a *plenary indulgence* in the form of a *jubilee* :”<sup>3</sup>—a memorial in these its expressions alike of the continued harlotry of the Romish Church, and of the continued darkening of the splendours of its once dominant and proud kingdom.<sup>4</sup> And though in *Italy* it has hitherto kept the domains

<sup>1</sup> On the expulsion of the Bourbons, and election of Louis Philippe, duke of Orleans, to be king of the French in August 1830, the committee of the Chambers recommended the suppression of the 6th Article in the Charter (of Louis XVIII), which declared “The Catholic Apostolic and Roman religion to be the religion of the State;” as being that which had been “most abused.” Cited by Cuninghame, p. 197. He adds an extract from a letter from Paris of that same date; “The fall of Charles X has dragged along with it the fall of Popery.” A statement too strong, as the event proved.

<sup>2</sup> “The bill for the sale of church property in Portugal has passed into a law. The amount of the national and church property together, which is thus to be disposed of, is calculated at considerably more than twelve millions sterling. Such a dilapidation of the funds of the Romish Church has had already, it is said, a sensible effect on the revenues of the Romish See.” Record of June 1, 1835; quoted by Mr. Bickersteth on the Prophecies, p. 182. (7th Ed.)

<sup>3</sup> It states among the grievances of the Church,—that the ecclesiastical property in Spain has been put up to sale, and the proceeds put into the public treasury; that all communication with the See of Rome is prohibited under severe penalties;—that no Nuncio from Rome is ever to be admitted into the kingdom to grant favours and dispensations;—that the ancient Papal prerogative of confirming or rejecting bishops elected in Spain is altogether abolished;—and the priests who seek confirmation, and metropolitans who solicit the *pallium* from Rome, incur the penalty of exile. Compare Rule’s Mission to Spain, p. 300.

<sup>4</sup> Though, as before observed, not myself now applying that prediction in Apoc. xvii. 16, which speaks of “the tearing, spoiling, and burning by the ten kings of the harlot of Rome,” to the desolations of the Papacy above detailed in this Chapter, (for reasons hereafter to be given,) yet certainly there was so much of coincidence between the two that I do not wonder that many Protestant expositors (myself at first among them) should have so applied it. At p. 400 we have seen how the *French* spoliation of the Papal Church in Italy was spoken of very much in the figurative language of that prophecy.—Let me here add an illustration in reference to the *Spanish* branch of the Church of Rome, from one of the able editorial articles of the Times and Evening

re-assigned to it at the Peace of Paris,<sup>1</sup> yet significant symptoms have not been wanting to show that there too the democratic anti-Papal spirit, infused under the French domination, is not extinct; and that it only awaits its opportunity to take part in the renewal of its assaults on Rome.<sup>2</sup>—At the same time it must ever be remembered, in looking both to present and to future, that the Apocalyptic prophecy in a subsequent notice in this Chapter intimates a revival of energy in the Papal Beast ere the expiration of the æra of the 6th Vial,—a prediction of which we shall

Mail. In the No. for April 16, 1844, the writer's subject being Christina's repentance of her anti-Romish proceedings in former years, and measures taken by her, conjointly with Narvaez, for the partial re-endowment of the Church, he speaks of "the signalization of her former government, by the confiscation of Church property, burning of monasteries, desecration of churches, and massacre of monks, when the infidel party in her name tore up the old ecclesiastical machinery of Spain, and shot down its adherents;" and then thus proceeds. "The corruptions of the Church have been beyond denial or apology. Friend and foe alike confessed and proclaimed them. A fiery ordeal was necessary for it; and a fiery ordeal it has had. It has emerged from the flames shorn of much of its paraphernalia. We may hope that it has been purified as well as punished."

The Pope, in his Allocution of March 2, 1841, on the same subject, given in full by Mr. Rule, pp. 313—322, well illustrates another of the figures in that same Apocalyptic verse. "As for the authors of these acts, who glory in being called children of the Catholic Church, we supplicate them to open their eyes on the wounds they have inflicted on their Mother and Benefactress." p. 320. He also designates his Romish Church (mark again the allusive contrast of the Apocalyptic symbol) as Christ's spotless bride. "We show you the patrimony of the Church almost entirely usurped; as if the irreproachable Spouse of Jesus Christ had not in her primordial right the faculty of acquiring and possessing temporal goods." p. 319.

"If," observes Mr. Rule, p. 301, "the spirit which led to the spoliation of the Spanish Church was infidel,—it was only a development and application of the infidelity which is indigenious to Popery in every age and country. . . Standing aloof from the fray, we may admire the supreme and retributive providence of God; who, not in Spain only, has allowed to the natural offspring of the Babylonish Harlot the work of her gradual destruction."

<sup>1</sup> So written in my first Edition of 1844.\*

<sup>2</sup> An Encyclic Letter of Pope Gregory XVI, dated August 16, 1832, of which Mr. Bickersteth has given an abstract, ib. 402, bears testimony to this; as well as to dangers from a different quarter, and of a more Scriptural origin. It mourns over "a tempest of evils and disasters;" says, "This our Roman Chair of the blessed Peter, in which Christ has placed the main strength of the Church, is most furiously assailed: . . . a horrible and nefarious warfare is openly and avowedly waged against the Catholic faith." And it closes with a prayer to the *Virgin Mary*, "who alone has destroyed all heresies, and is our greatest confidence, even the whole foundation of our hope."—So does the Papacy show itself, even to the end, ever idolatrous, ever antichristian, ever blasphemous.

---

\* Very striking, I added in 1850, in my 4th Edition, is the recent illustration set before the world in the democratic revolt at Rome, and Pope's flight from it, in 1848, 1849! And now in 1861, as I am passing my 5th Edition through the press, we have before us a second spoliation of the Roman See of most of Peter's Patrimony, chiefly again, or at least ultimately, through *French* agency. But I should anticipate too much by here enlarging on it.



have soon to show the remarkable accomplishment.<sup>1</sup> Moreover in Apoc. xviii. there is implied some kindly feeling towards Rome on the part of the Western kings, at the epoch of its great and final destruction.<sup>2</sup> But in all this paragraph I have been anticipating.<sup>3</sup>

Thus have I shown the fulfilment of the Apocalyptic prophecy of *the outpouring of a vial of wrath on the throne of the Papal Beast, and of its kingdom being darkened, as the fifth act in the judgments of the seventh Trumpet.* And hence, as will be obvious, the fitness of the epoch of the French Revolution's outbreak to constitute a *primary, though imperfect, terminating epoch* to the 1260 predicted year-days of Papal domination and supremacy.<sup>4</sup>—Let me, in concluding the present Chapter, add two brief remarks in further illustration of its fitness. The *first* is, that the then establishment by the Revolutionary laws, and afterwards by the Napoleonic Code, of equal toleration to Protestants as to Roman Catholics, (the former a proscribed class up to that epoch in the continental kingdoms on the territory of the old Roman Western Empire,<sup>5</sup>) seems to point it out

<sup>1</sup> Apoc. xvii. 13, 14: "I saw out of the mouth of the Beast and out of the mouth of the False Prophet (as well as out of the mouth of the Dragon) spirits go forth working miracles, &c.," in preparation for the final conflict of truth and error, Christ and Antichrist.

<sup>2</sup> It is said in Apoc. xviii. 9, that on occasion of the ultimate and total destruction of the mystic Babylonish harlot by fire from heaven, "The kings of the earth, *who committed fornication with her*, shall lament over her, when they see the smoke of her burning."

<sup>3</sup> I may have to speak of this again in my Part vi, on the Present and the Future.

<sup>4</sup> Daubuz, p. 800, writing long *before* the French Revolution, observes on Apoc. xvii. 16, 17, (which he applies like so many other expositors to *Papal Rome*), that the hating, and spoiling, and consuming of the whore by the ten kings would probably determine the 1260 years.—And Niebuhr, writing *after* it, in his *Roman History*, Vol. i. p. 189, after observing that Rome soon after Totila's desolation of it "had become the capital of a *spiritual empire*," adds, "which, *after the lapse of 12 centuries*, we have *seen interrupted in our days*." (Hare's Transl.)

<sup>5</sup> Including France, Spain, Portugal, Italy, Savoy, Austria (till 1783), and the Netherlands:—all in short, except some of the Swiss Cantons and the Dutch United Provinces.

In illustration of the state of Protestants in France, from after the revocation of the Edict of Nantes by Louis XIV until the French Revolution, I may cite the following from an interesting abstract of facts given in the *Edinburgh Review*, No. 71, on the authority of De Rulliere and others. "At the close of the American war (on inquiry by the Government) the fact was confessed that a million of Calvinists were concealed in France, without civil privileges or acknowledged existence, without means of establishing by legal evidence their births, marriages, or deaths:—husbands without lawful wives, fathers without legitimate children; unable to quit their country, or to remain in it without profaning its religion or disobeying its laws;—compelled at the

as the time when the two symbolic witnesses may be considered also to have begun *partially* to put off their sackcloth. The *second* is that the continuance in force even until then, in the several countries of Papal Christendom, of the old *Popedom-favouring Code of Justinian*, a Code first promulgated, as we have seen, in the years 529—533, and its then sudden and rapid supersession by *new anti-Papal Codes* that originated from, and expressed the spirit of, the French Revolution of A.D. 1789—1793,<sup>1</sup> are facts that furnish a very notable mark of contrast between the characters, juridically and constitutionally considered, of those epochs of *primary commencement* and *primary ending*,

hour of death either to violate their conscience, or to leave their property liable to confiscation, and their bodies exposed to insult." p. 129.

"The last public execution of Protestants, for no other crime than professing the Reformed religion, took place at Toulouse in 1762. The affecting case of John Calas (one of the four persons who suffered on that occasion) aroused the sympathies of the French people, who now began to look with disgust on those frequent immolations of innocent victims: and a few words from the pen of Voltaire turned the current of public opinion against the satellites of the Holy Inquisition. Persecutions thenceforth became less frequent. The king's troops were ordered to desist from the pursuit of the defenceless Hugonots, and a respite was given to the reformed *Church of the desert*.\* Louis XVI, prompted by his counsellors Lafayette and Malesherbes, caused an inquiry to be made into the social condition of his Protestant subjects: and, on the report of De Rulhiere, an edict was issued in 1787; by favour of which, persons professing the Reformed religion were admitted to the rights of citizenship." So *Presbyter Anglicanus* in the Record, No. 1596:—a summary of what is given to the same effect in Wilks' Book on the Persecutions of French Protestants, Ch. i.; and the Edin. Rev. *ibid*.

In 1788 the Parliament of Paris registered Louis the XVIth's Edict, giving to French Protestants, or "Non-Catholics," a *legal existence*: but it was not till the year following, and commencement of the Revolution, that they were permitted the public exercise of their religion.

In Austria it was just before the French Revolution that the first Edict of Toleration was past; viz. by the Emperor Joseph II, in his Ordinance of Religious Reform, which I have before referred to, of the year 1783.

In Spain, Portugal, and the greater part of Italy, the Inquisition had been too rigorous and searching to leave at this epoch any Protestants.

<sup>1</sup> The following is cited very appositely by Dr. Keith, in his *Signs of the Times*, Vol. ii. p. 163, from Lavalette's Memoirs. "The events that preceded the grand drama of 1789 took me by surprise, in the midst of my books and my love of study. I was then reading *L'Esprit des Lois*; a work that charmed me by its gravity, depth, and sublimity. I wished also to become acquainted with the code of our own laws. But *Dommanget*, to whom I mentioned my desire, laughed, and pointed to the *Justinian Code*, the common law Code of the kingdom. . . I thought I should do well to unite with the meditations of my closet, the observation of those scenes of disorder which were the harbingers of the Revolution."

\* Compare the figure in Apoc. xii. about the *faithful professing Church*, still down to the opening of the 5th century *united and Catholic*, having a place appointed it for the 1260 years in the wilderness; of which Church, the various modern faithfully professing Protestant Churches are but fragmentary sections. Also what I have observed on it, pp. 65—68 *suprà*; and, on the two representative witnesses still retaining their sackcloth, Vol. ii. p. 487, 488.

respectively, (according to my view of the matter,) to the 1260 years.

## CHAPTER VI.

### THE INEFFECTIVENESS OF THE VIALS TO PRODUCE REPENTANCE.

“AND they gnawed their tongues from the pain.<sup>1</sup> And they blasphemed the God of heaven from their pains and sores. And they repented not of their deeds.” Apoc. xvi. 11.

So had one Vial after another, as prefigured, been poured out on them that had the mark of the Beast, and that worshipped his image. And our idea of the severity of the sufferings is necessarily enhanced by the expression, “They bit their tongues for pain:”—the rather perhaps if, as I think, it implies the manner in which all expression of thought and feeling against the oppressor would be repress, as under an iron reign of terror. An aggravation this which, I need hardly say, was in a marked manner the accompaniment of the establishment of French domination, alike under the Republic and the Emperor, in every subjugated country of Western Europe.<sup>2</sup>—But what the moral and religious impression and effect? Alas! just as when, after the 6th Trumpet’s tremendous scourge from the Euphrates, by which “the third of men,” or Eastern division of Roman Christendom, had been nationally destroyed, the report given in respecting “the rest of the men,” so far undestroyed, was, that “they repented not of the works of their hands, so as not to worship dæmons, and idols of gold, and silver, and brass, and stone, and wood, nor repented of their murders, or sorceries, or fornications, or thefts,”<sup>3</sup>—so now

<sup>1</sup> *εμισσωντο τας γλωσσας αυτων εκ του πονου.*

<sup>2</sup> The jealous censorship of the press, and oppressive tyranny of the police, in the countries under French domination, during the Napoleonic dynasty, are well known. Even a book like that of Madame de Staël on Germany, praising the literature of a nation that was not French, was sufficient to cause the suppression of the book in France, and banishment of the authoress by Napoleon. See Quarterly Review, Vol. x. p. 355.

<sup>3</sup> Apoc. ix. 20, 21.

again, both during, and after, the pouring out of five out of the 7th Trumpet's seven Vials of judgment, on the other parts of Anti-Christendom, and on the throne of the Beast itself, the prediction of the revealing Angel was to the effect that the inhabitants of the Apocalyptic world would not be brought to any real repentance of their sins against heaven; and that they would but blaspheme God, as the result of<sup>1</sup> their pains and sores. Surely the judgment had been most significant of God's controversy with the Beast, and them that had worshipped him. But, whatever else the result, true repentance towards God, it was foreshown, would be no part of it. The rod would not be heard, nor He who had appointed it.

It is said, "they *blasphemed* the God of heaven:" and it may be well, before looking to the historical fulfilment, to note the various though cognate senses of that verb in Scripture, in order to our better understanding of its comprehensiveness of intent here. It appears then that, besides its original and simple sense of *speaking injuriously against*,<sup>2</sup>—even, it might be, to the extent of *cursing*,<sup>3</sup>—the word, in case of *God* being the party blasphemed, is applied to those also who *virtually*, though *indirectly*, speak against and deny Him, either by *usurping to themselves* his prerogatives and honours, or by *ascribing them to other gods and idols*. So, on the one hand, the Jews' exclamation against Christ as a blasphemer, when (falsely as they would have it) professing to be the Son of God:<sup>4</sup> and, again, its Scriptural application to the Beast, as exalting himself against God, in the Apocalypse.<sup>5</sup> So, on the other, Ezekiel's and Isaiah's charges against Israel as blasphemers, in respect to their

<sup>1</sup> ἐκ τῶν πόνων αὐτῶν.

<sup>2</sup> So Luke xxii. 65; "And many other things *blasphemously* spake they against him:" Acts xiii. 45; "The Jews were filled with envy, and spake against those things which were spoken by Paul, contradicting and *blaspheming*:" Jude 8; "These despise dominion, and speak evil of (lit. *blaspheme*) dignities."

<sup>3</sup> Levit. xxiv. 11, 15; "And the Israelitish woman's son *blasphemed* the name of the Lord, and *cursed*. . . And the Lord spoke to Moses, saying; Whosoever *curseth* his God shall bear his sin: even he that *blasphemeth* the name of the Lord shall be put to death."

<sup>4</sup> Mark ii. 7; "Why doth this man speak *blasphemies*? Who can *forgive sins* but God only?" John x. 33; "For a good work we stone thee not; but for *blasphemy*; because thou, being a man, *makest thyself God*." Matt. xxvi. 63, 65; "Tell us if thou be the *Christ, the Son of God*? Jesus saith unto him; *Thou hast said*. . . Then the High Priest rent his clothes, saying, He hath spoken *blasphemy*."

<sup>5</sup> Apoc. xiii. 5, 6. See pp. 174, 185 supra.

*idolatry and worship of other gods.* “Yet in this your fathers have *blasphemed* me: . . . when I had brought them into the land for the which I lifted up my hand to give it them, then they saw every high hill, and all the thick trees, and *there they offered their sacrifices, and there they presented the provocation of their offering.*”<sup>1</sup>

This premised, proceed we to compare history with the prophecy. It will be observed, as to the *time* comprehended in the criminatory charge, that it seems to extend from the epoch of the Vials being first poured forth on the Beast’s kingdom, and through all the plagues and sufferings consequent, down to that of the effusion of the 6th Vial-plague on the Euphrates; i. e. from A.D. 1790 to A.D. 1820: indeed yet further, apparently.<sup>2</sup> Also, as to the *subjects or objects* of its crimination, that it was the constituency of “the Beast’s kingdom,” the same that was darkened under it: i. e. the constituency of Anti-Christendom generally, if we explain the phrase of the Pope’s *spiritual* kingdom; that of Rome and the Italian Papal States specially, if we explain it of his *temporal* kingdom.

1. Now of the fulfilment of the prophetic clause during much of *the earlier half of the period* in question, while the Vial was outpouring and the wars raging, I have already spoken briefly and partially in a former Chapter; so briefly however, and partially, that it seems proper, now that the charge is repeated a second time, to revert to it again, and a little further to amplify on and illustrate it.

I then observed with reference to *France*, the chief and mightiest of the nations of Anti-Christendom, that if under Buonaparte’s consulship in 1800 she abandoned her national profession of *atheism*, it was for the profession, not of a pure scriptural faith, but of *Popery*: and this on grounds of political expediency alone, with a view to the tranquilization and control of weaker minds by its superstitions and ceremonial; while all the energy of the nation, whe-

<sup>1</sup> Ezek. xx. 27, 28. So too Isa. lxx. 7; “Your fathers have burned incense on the mountains, and *blasphemed* me on the hills.”

<sup>2</sup> No change is noticed as occurring afterwards.—In my 1st Volume, on the 2nd and 3rd Seals, I have spoken of the manner in which a previous evil might well overrun into the era of a new evil. And the symbol of vials outpouring seems (as before intimated) more especially to give the idea of continuance.

ther in the capital at home or soldiery abroad, was still tainted, I might say saturated, with *the old infidelity*.<sup>1</sup> I now subjoin, in illustration, a sketch of Buonaparte's announcement to the Legislative Body of his re-establishment in France of the Romish religion,<sup>2</sup>—the report by one of his ministers of the Pope's reception in Paris, in the year 1804, soon after,<sup>3</sup>—and that by the Bishop of Amiens in the same year, depicting the general infidel spirit of the nation.<sup>4</sup> And after perusing these, and after further con-

<sup>1</sup> P. 394 *suprà*.

<sup>2</sup> This official account of the presentation to the French Legislative Body of Buonaparte's *Concordat* with the Pope, re-establishing the Romish religion, is very characteristic. M. Portalis, Counsellor of State, on presenting it, made, among others, the following observations.—“A primary question presented itself. Is religion in general necessary to bodies of people? Is it necessary to men? Whatever may be the degree of perfection at which we are arrived, the multitude is more struck by what is imposed upon it by order, than what is proved to it to be right. The idea of an universal legislator is as necessary to the intelligent, as to the physical world. . . Law without morality cannot subsist. . . Some would wish for a religion more conformable to our manners and ideas of liberty. If the strength of *law* consists in its being feared, the strength of *religion* consists in its being believed; and belief is greater in proportion as the origin of the dogma is more remote. Christianity has the sanction of time. . . It has civilized Europe. . . It connects itself with the progress of the arts and sciences. . . It has been said that the Catholic religion has too many rites and ceremonies. These rites are the sanction and preservation of its doctrine. The Catholic religion is reproached with cursing all those that are without its bosom, and of being intolerant. Montesquieu saw in this principle only a motive for being attached to the religion which teaches it: ‘For,’ says he, ‘when a religion gives us the idea of a choice made by the Divinity, that must attach us very strongly to the religion so chosen.’” Ap. Christian Observer for 1802, p. 259.

It is a curious fact that while expressing these feelings about religion generally, and the Romish religion in particular, Buonaparte in 1804 ordered a Romish Missionary establishment to be founded in France, to consist of 500 members; 50 for the East Indies, 100 for China, 100 for Africa and America, 50 for the islands in the Pacific, 20 to Canada; the rest to remain in France.—See the quotation from the Journal de Paris in the Christian Observer for 1804, Vol. iii. p. 442.—So, to the Protestant missions now begun in England, there were already projected by him antagonistic Popish missions.

<sup>3</sup> “Beni soit le Ciel,” said Pope Pius VII to Fouché, on his arrival for the coronation of Napoleon, in 1804, at Fontainebleau; “j’ai traversé la France au milieu d’un peuple à genoux.” So the Abbé de Pradt (*Quatre Concordats* ii. 211); who observes that it was perfectly true that the Pope had been met with those marks of veneration, in his progress through the provinces. But he adds that the danger was in *Paris*; lest *there* the ridiculousness of a Pope's presence should excite the mockery of the populace. But “Fouché avoit pourvu à tout. Cet homme là ne dormait pas toujours: et Paris garda son sérieux.”

<sup>4</sup> On occasion of opening a subscription in his diocese, for the education of Romish priests. “Since our advancement to the episcopacy 60 priests under us have died, and who are to fill their places? . . . The times may soon come when the night of ignorance, superstition, profanation, and all the shocking vices their attendants, will cover the Church of France. Her churches will stand; but no priest be found to officiate at their altars. . . Fathers and mothers, . . if you tremble to think of that fatal hour, that disastrous moment, when religion descends into the tomb with the last of its ministers, remain not insensible to our prayers, refuse not a small donation to our pressing solicitations.”—Again: “Such is the indifference to religion caused by the persecution of our revolutionary philosophers, and our philosophical barba-

sidering the testimony of Christian travellers in France, during the brief delusive peace or armistice of 1802, with report of sabbaths unsabbatized,<sup>1</sup> the Bible unknown and unprocurable,<sup>2</sup> the utter demoralization of manners, and infidelity of the then current literature and conversation,—let my readers judge whether, notwithstanding the mock-show of revival of the old Romish superstition, as if religion, there rose not up still from France throughout this period the voice, not of repentance, but of blasphemy against the God of heaven? Says Alison of the French in 1807, in the very words of the Apocalyptic prophecy, “They repented not of their sins, to give glory to the Lord.”<sup>3</sup>—And, as in *France*, so very much in other countries of Anti-Christendom. From *Germany* the accounts received during the war’s continuance, told of irreligion and infidelity as fearfully and almost universally prevalent, amidst the grievous sufferings from God’s chastisements: while Romanism continued as before the *profest* religion of southern Germany, and scarce a sign appeared of any national repenting of their deeds.<sup>4</sup>—In *Spain*, when the

rians, that of 5000 curacies vacant in the French Republic, not 50 proper subjects are found to fill them up. The faithful are forced to travel 40, 50, 60 miles, to find a church where a priest officiates. What a blessing would not our valorous chief magistrate receive, was he to change some of our military schools, or prytanées, into religious seminaries; and convert some of our military conscripts into religious students. All sort of glory is reserved to him. He will not leave unfinished what he has so devoutly begun. His reign will therefore by the faithful of all future ages be called *the reign of the second resurrection of Christ*.”—*Gazette de France*; ap. *Christian Observer* for 1804, p. 315.

<sup>1</sup> “In Paris the sabbath can only be considered as a day of dissipation to the lovers of gaiety, and a day of unusual profit to the man of trade.” *Carr’s Stranger in France*, published in 1802, p. 119; ap. *Christian Observer* for 1803, p. 729. So too *Dr. Waugh’s Memoirs*, p. 231.

<sup>2</sup> A deputation from the London Missionary Society (*Dr. Waugh* one), which had formed the idea of printing and circulating an Edition of the French Bible in France, and went to Paris with that object, thus report. “In Paris it required a search among the booksellers of four days to find a single Bible. This is also supposed to be the situation of the greater part of France; and of *other countries* also, formerly connected with the See of Rome.” Report of 1802; ap. *Christian Observer* for 1802, p. 744.

<sup>3</sup> Ch. 46.

<sup>4</sup> I may refer to Letters received during this period from various German correspondents of the British benevolent or religious Societies. Professor *Timæus*’ report in 1806 from Luncburg, after depicting the physical misery consequent on the French wars, adds; “More dreadful than all is the moral corruption, and the diseases, that have been brought into our country by the war. Infidelity, illicit intercourse of the sexes with all its dreadful consequences, contempt of the most sacred obligations, are the melancholy bequests left to us. They are spread, and have taken deep root among both higher and lower classes: and they show even now symptoms, which must

Cortes had met in 1810, on Buonaparte's invasion of the country, the religious as well as political state of the country came necessarily under their consideration. But, while abolishing the Inquisition under the influence of the new philosophy, and despoiling the Church of much of its riches, so as illustrated in my preceding Chapter, yet was this laid down by them at the same time, as a fundamental law of the state;—"The religion of the Spanish nation *is*, and *shall be perpetually*, the *catholic apostolic Roman*, only true: the nation protects it by law, and *prohibits the exercise of any other.*"<sup>1</sup> Was there in Spain the spirit of repenting of their deeds? Surely here, as elsewhere, the voice of infidelity among the higher, and of the Papal superstition among the lower, however discordant and at war between themselves, commingled together in blasphemy before the God of heaven.—Then, finally, in *Italy* and in *Rome*,—i. e. in that which was specially the *throne*, as well as *kingdom* of the *Beast*, in Apocalyptic language,—was there a sign of amendment and repenting? Alas! take but up any Volume of Travels to that country by a traveller of intelligence during the period referred to, (for example that of Mr. Forsyth in 1802,) and in his report of the then Romish and Italian morals and religion read the answer! In regard of *morals* mark the universal and even legalized supersession of the marriage vow of fidelity,<sup>2</sup>

blight for many generations the noblest hopes of humanity." Christian Observer, v. 383.

In the Quarterly Review of Madame de Staël's Work on Germany shortly since referred to, there is at pp. 368, 374 (vol. x.) a sad picture of German morality: and at p. 401 the following characteristic sketch of German religion. "If the reader is able to form any opinion as to the religious principles of our Teutonic kindred, it will be, we apprehend, that they have no definite principles of faith or practice whatever: and that for the Confessions of Augsburg and Geneva, or the Decreta of the Council of Trent, they have substituted, as a *mezzo termine*, not those points in which all Christians agree, . . . but the *sentiment of infinity*, the *admiration of ideal beauty*, and that sort of *pantheism* which finds the Divinity in the features of a father, the innocence of a child, the heavenly countenance of Raphael's Virgin, in music, in poetry, in nature." This was written in 1814.

<sup>1</sup> See Rule's Mission to Spain, p. 44; to which I may refer for many interesting details.—See too Blanco White's awful report of the then state of the Spanish clergy.

<sup>2</sup> Take the following awful passage (though Mr. F. does not give it as such) from his sketch of the manners of Florence. "Cœcisbeism, though perhaps as general, is not so formally *legalized* here as at Naples, where the right of keeping a gallant is often secured by the marriage contract: yet here no lady can appear in fashionable company, or *before God*, without such an attendant."



the extent of licentiousness such as to have extinguished multitudes of noble families,<sup>1</sup> (a consequence very principally of the habits and influence of the celibate clergy and the confessional,<sup>2</sup>) and the extension of the habit of swearing even to the female sex in the higher orders,<sup>3</sup> as also of false swearing for hire among the lower!<sup>4</sup> Again, in regard of *religion*, mark the continuance of the old system of saint-worship, images, relics, false miracles, and the pagan-like mockery of Christ's true religion by the Papal ceremonial; not omitting the partial dramatic burlesque of Christ's humiliation in the Easter week, by him who still usurpingly called himself Christ's Vicar and representative! And then judge we, whether in Rome or Italy there appeared a sign, thus far, of *repenting* of their deeds; whether there was not rather continued blasphemy!—On two points, touching the religion of Rome and Italy, let me add yet one word more, ere passing from this earlier period of the vial-outpouring to a later: I mean on the *Mariolatry* with which (like Israel) they blasphemed God in the streets and on the hills; and their *intolerance* of the purer, truer, worship of Protestantism. 1. In evidence of the manner in which the Virgin Mary and her images were by the Papal priesthood set before the people, and by the people resorted to and worshipped, as their grand comfort and hope under the judgments of the Vial, let me make reference to a famous image of the Virgin, still seen at Rome; <sup>5</sup> (a specimen of many similar; <sup>6</sup>) annexed to which

<sup>1</sup> So in his sketch of Sienna. "The general incontinency of the present day is thinning the first ranks of society. Within the last 20 years twenty noble families are extinct. Others hang but by a slender thread, and that a rotten one."

<sup>2</sup> In the same sketch of Sienna he notes the *confessor priest* as one of the usual partners of the sin; and in his sketch of Roman morals notes the *celibacy of the priesthood* as its grand source and authorization. <sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>4</sup> "An assassin might be hired (at Genoa) for 50 livres; and if taken might be defended by hackney swearers at 12 livres each." This class, I believe, was not confined to Genoa.

<sup>5</sup> Sir W. Cockburn, p. 206, states it to be at the corner of the *Via Paganica* in Rome; and that the following is the Latin inscription attached. "Mater Providentiæ, quam venerabilis imago, eum Sept. Id. Jul. 1796, vario oculorum motu, propitio aspectu, supplicem populum refeceret, omnia corda sibi demeruit, et ex corde laudes, hoc amor [?] M. P." \*—An Italian inscription further sets forth: "Col recitare le litanie si acquistano ee. giorni d'indulgenza, concessa per indulto pontificio, emanato sotto il dì 29 Marzo 1797, d'applicarsi ancora per le anime nel purgatorio."

<sup>6</sup> Bombelli, in his *History of the Madonna*, (4 vols. 12mo, printed with approba-

\* I saw it myself while at Rome in 1847, 1848; but omitted to make a correcter copy of the inscription.

an inscription tells how this holy image winked its eyes, and propitiously smiled on the people, as they offered their supplications before it in 1796, the year of the first French invasion of Italy: and also too how the Pope, a few months after, authoritatively confirmed the story, and urged the faithful to continue their supplications, by that which was yet more an aggravation of the blasphemy,—the promise of 200 days of indulgence,<sup>1</sup> applicable alike to the living, and to souls in purgatory. 2. In proof of their *not repenting* of their *intolerance* of a purer Christianity, I must note the Papal instructions of 1803 to the Nuncio at Vienna, on occasion of the proposed assignment of certain German churches and chapters to Protestants. In these Pope Pius VII re-asserted the most intolerant of the old Papal dogmas against Protestant heretics; declaring them still liable, even as of old, to confiscation of property, and (if sovereigns) to deprivation of their sovereignties, as the fit penalty of the crime of heresy: “although,” as he added mournfully, “in these calamitous times it is

tion of the authorities at *Rome*.) gives the history and pictures of 104 Roman images of the Virgin, on which the Chapter of St. Peter has bestowed their yearly golden crowns, on account of their miraculous achievements, or antiquity. It seems that *Mary of Guadalupe*, the Patron-saint of Mexico, and who was in 1746 chosen Mistress of New Spain, (her temple being made a Collegiate Church, and 400,000 dollars devoted to her clergy,) had a part though so distant in these miracles. For in 1754 a *copy* of this image was sent to the Pope; by him given to the nuns of St. Francis de Sales; and placed by them in the Church of the Visitation. And it, in common with others, was asserted to have opened and shut its eyes on occasion of the French invasion in 1796.

It was upon *every* high hill that the blasphemies of *Judah* were committed; but certainly not on so many as the similar blasphemies of the *Italian Papists*.

On entering Loretto, in their march towards Rome in February, 1797, the French soldiers amused themselves with observing the *machinery* by which these tricks of Romish superstition had been carried on. “The priests had here an image of the Virgin Mary, which they exhibited to the people in the act of shedding tears, the more to stimulate them against the impious republicans. . . The Madonna’s tears were a string of glass beads flowing by clock-work, [like the or-molu fountains made a Paris as ornaments for the chimney-piece,] within a shrine which the worshippers were too respectful to approach very nearly.” Sir W. Scott’s *Napoleon*, cited by Keith, ii. 239.—A writer in the *Christian Examiner* of Jan. 1843, says that a painter at Florence stated to a friend of his, how on one occasion he assisted the opening of one Image’s eyes by the application of his pencil. It was the same of old. Bishop Burnet, I think, notices the discovery of machinery for the same purpose at the suppression of the monasteries in England. And Luther in his *Table Talk*, Ch. xxiii. p. 39, tells of one he had seen prepared with screws, to make the image turn to or from the worshipper, according as he was liberal or not to the monastery.—It was just the same with the old *Pagan Images*. So Professor M. Stuart on Apoc. xiii. 15.

<sup>1</sup> Was not the saying in this case really applicable, “This man speaketh blasphemy: who can forgive sins but God only?”

impossible to execute, and inexpedient to recall, the holy maxims."<sup>1</sup>

2. But at length these calamitous times passed away. After twenty-five years of convulsion and distress, the rod of the oppressor was in 1815 broken, *peace re-established*, and both Pope and Princes restored to their several kingdoms in the European world. And was repentance then at last exhibited by them; and that turning to God, which *judgment* had not effected, effected now by the gracious suspension of judgment, and intervention of *mercy*?

As regards the *Pope* it was an ominous prognostic that in his proclamation from Cezena, May 5, 1814, just a little before re-entering Rome, he characterized himself and his office by the ancient Papal title of "*God's Vicar on earth*."<sup>2</sup> For in that one word was wrapped up a re-assertion of all the old Papal impieties and blasphemies.—The acts that followed accorded well with this beginning. A few days after the proclamation he solemnly crowned at Ancona a miraculous *image of the Virgin*, the counterpart of that at Rome, as if the guardian and saviour of Ancona; and fixed its festival, and attached a plenary indulgence to its worship.<sup>3</sup>—Arrived at Rome the old system of the religious

<sup>1</sup> Given by O'Donnoghue in his History of the Church and Court of Rome, Vol. ii. p. 447, from the Essai Historique sur la Puissance Temporelle des Papes, ii. 320. "This penalty, so far as concerns the *property of private individuals*, is decreed, says the Pope, by a Bull of Innocent III, *Cap. Vergentes X. de Hæreticis*: and, as concerns *sovereignties and fiefs*, it is a rule of the Canon Law, *Cap. Absolutus XVI.* that the subjects of a Prince manifestly heretical are released from all moral obligations to him, and dispensed from all allegiance and homage." "To be sure," he adds, "we are fallen into such calamitous times that it is not possible for the Spouse of Christ to practise, or even expedient for her to recall, her holy maxims of just vigour against the enemies of our faith."

Ranke alludes to the same, Vol. iii. p. 229. He speaks of the Instructions to the Nuncio at Vienna as without date, but probably of the year 1803.

<sup>2</sup> O'Donnoghue ii. 449.

<sup>3</sup> This was May 13. He entered Rome May 18. The Abbé Albertini refers to this image of miraculous pretensions at *Ancona*, in his work entitled "An Historical and Moral Picture of the Invasion of Italy in 1796, and of the Miraculous winking at the same epoch of the eyes of the Holy Image of the most Holy Virgin Mary, worshipped in the Cathedral Church of Ancona:"—a work published in 1820, and extracted from, in a letter to Charles Butler, Esq., by the present Bishop of Exeter. I cite a part of the extract. "The author tells us that in the day after the first miracle, when a solemn procession was made in its honour, the Virgin Mary did nothing but open, and close, and turn her eyes on all sides, to the indescribable delight of the people, who absolutely wept for joy. On the 20th of June 1800, and on the 15th of August 1807, similar processions took place. And on the 13th of May

doctrine and ceremonial was left unchanged; and, in his most solemn yearly act of benediction, he referred salvation to the merits of the saints and the Virgin.<sup>1</sup> Quickly after this followed his *re-establishment of the Jesuits*, as “the experienced rowers to whom the bark of St. Peter might be most wisely committed:” though Pope Clement the XIVth’s Bull, dissolving them, had declared that Jesuitism was a public nuisance; and that “he who endeavoured to let it loose on society would be chargeable with high treason against the common interests and happiness of his species.”<sup>2</sup>—A little after he solemnly refused *tolerance*, when applied to for it, to *Protestant worship* in France;<sup>3</sup> and renewed the solemn *anathematization of Protestants* on the Maundy Thursday. And then both he and his immediate successors issued Brief after Brief *against Bible Societies*: declaring them to be tares in the midst of wheat, wolves in guise of lambs: and the Scriptures themselves that they circulated, unaccompanied by Romish explanations, poisonous pastures, and the Gospel rather of the Devil than of God.<sup>4</sup>—Further, in 1825 he published a *Bull of Jubilee*; promising to exhibit Christ’s cradle,<sup>5</sup> as an at-

1814, Pius VII in person crowned the miraculous image; an event commemorated by an inscription.”

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Burton in his work on Rome, ii. 124, gives the formula. “SS. Apostoli Petrus et Paulus, de quorum potestate et auctoritate confidimus, ipsi intercedant pro nobis ad Dominum!—*Precibus et meritis* Beate Mariæ semper Virginis, Beati Michaelis Archangeli, Beati Johannis Baptiste, et SS. apostolorum Petri et Pauli, et omnium sanctorum, miseretur vestri Omnipotens Deus; et, dimissis omnibus peccatis vestris, perducatur vos Jesus Christus ad vitam beatam.” After which followed the pronouncement of a plenary Indulgence in the usual form.

<sup>2</sup> Sir W. Cockburn, p. 290.

<sup>3</sup> A.D. 1818. O’Donnoghue, p. 454.

<sup>4</sup> Given by Mendham, on the Indices Prohibitorii of Rome, pp. 182, 183: also by O’Donnoghue, p. 455, and Sir W. Cockburn, pp. 266, 267, &c.—I give one extract. “It endeavours to translate, or rather to corrupt, the Holy Scriptures into the vulgar tongues of all nations: which gives just reason to fear that we may there find a bad interpretation; and, instead of the Gospel of Christ, the Gospel of men, or (what is worse) the Gospel of the Devil.” So Leo XII in 1824.—What a contrast to the *divine* prefiguration (if I mistake not its meaning) of the same subject; in the vision of the Angel flying through mid heaven, “having the everlasting Gospel to preach to all nations.”

<sup>5</sup> Sir W. Cockburn, p. 178. “They pretend to show the identical cradle in which our Saviour was rocked, and also, I was assured, the very straw on which he lay in the manger. That this is done by the highest possible authority, is proved by the Pope’s Bull of the last Jubilee, which I saw his Holiness proclaim: an authorized copy of which thus refers to that cradle, and to other relics to be adored; ‘*Quis demum à lachrymis temperet, quando vel Christi inculpata cernens, vagientem de præsepi recogitit infantem Jesum, vel sanctissima Domicæ passionis instrumenta adorans, pendentem e ligno meditetur Redemptorem Mundi.*’”

Dr. Burton, ii. 130, mentions that in this Jubilee the number of pilgrims was but in

traction to the pilgrimage: and with authoritative instructions to the pilgrims, afterwards added, to call on the *Virgin Mary*, as the great advocate for sinners, on that day of grace and mercy.<sup>1</sup>—In fine he repeated that crowning act of Papal blasphemy the *canonization of saints*.<sup>2</sup>—Hence it was plain, with regard to the *Pope and his kingdom*, (even though we adduce not other abundant concurring evidence,) that “they repented not of their deeds.”

And what then of the *Princes of the nine kingdoms*, spiritually subordinated under the old regime to Rome? At first, in the glorious moment of the great victory of Leipsic, when the *Austrian Emperor* united with the Emperor of Russia and Prussian King, in publicly offering thanks to the God of heaven for the victory, it seemed as if he at least,—the most eminent of Roman Catholic monarchs,—was turning to the God who had smitten him. But the illusion past away. Both himself in Austria, and the Bourbons in France, and Ferdinand in Spain, and, a little later, Miguel in Portugal, and the Kings too of Bavaria, Sardinia, Naples, did repent indeed. But of what, and how? M. Ranke answers the question. “The restored governments of Southern Europe *repented of their former insubordination to Rome*. They thought they had

all 476! How had the mighty fallen! Compare the accounts in my Vol. ii. p. 19, of the numbers that visited Rome at the middle-age Jubilees.

<sup>1</sup> In a Book of instructions to the Pilgrims visiting Rome, published “con licenza de’ superiori,” the following prayer is directed to be offered up,

All’ altare della Madonna :

“Dove ha da ricorrere un peccatore dolente, se non al seno vostro? O avvocata de’ peccatori, . . . in questo tempo di remissione, questo giorno d’indulgenza, non distenderete il manto del vostro patrocinio sopra di me, per ricoprire con esso le mie brutture; accio in tal modo posso sottrarmi dall’ira del vostro divino figliuolo!” Sir W. C. Ibid. 205.

<sup>2</sup> The Roman Catholic Vicar-General Dr. Milner, in his *End of Religious Controversy*, writes: “You ask me, Do you pretend that your Church possesses the miraculous powers at the present day? I answer that, the Catholic Church being always the beloved spouse of Christ, (Rev. xxi. 9,) and continuing at all times to bring forth children of heroic sanctity, God fails not in this, any more than in ages past, to illustrate her and them by unquestionable miracles. Accordingly, in the processes which are constantly going on at the Apostolic See for the *canonization of new saints*, fresh miracles of a recent date continue to be proved on the highest degree of evidence.” (Ed. 1824.) After which, in exemplification, he refers to the notable case of the *Sœur Nativité*, of a convent in Fougères, near Avranches, in Brittany; whose “*Vie et Revelations*” had been published by the Abbé Genet at Paris in 1817. I cite from the Quarterly Review, No. 72, p. 309; which see. And see also in its No. 66, Art. 5, an account of the said sister; and here of *the Abbé’s*, book of pretended revelations.

thus unchained the tempest by which themselves had been overthrown; and beheld in the *Pope* their natural ally."<sup>1</sup> In *France* (until exiled again from it by a second revolution) the Bourbons dedicated their kingdom most especially to the Virgin Mary as its patroness: introduced the Jesuits, and (so far as circumstances permitted) oppressed the French Protestants; enough to show that the will to persecute, as once before, was not wanting. In *Spain*, similarly, Ferdinand re-established both the Jesuits and the Inquisition; and the blood of heretics flowed at the stake afresh.<sup>2</sup> In *Sardinia* the king, to whom the Waldenses had been made over by the treaty of Vienna, for no reason but that they were Protestants, revoked their privileges, and multiplied vexations and oppressions on them.<sup>3</sup> In *Austria* the Jesuits were as active as ever in propagating Popery, with all its falsehoods.<sup>4</sup> Again in *Naples, Tuscany*, everywhere throughout Roman Catholic Christendom, the miracles,—the lying miracles,—which had ceased during French ascendancy,<sup>5</sup> began again. And then what

<sup>1</sup> Ranke iii. 239.

<sup>2</sup> See the details of one execution for heresy, in 1826, at Valencia, in Rule's Mission, p. 90; also Llorente's Inquisition, last chapter.

<sup>3</sup> See Dr. Gilly's well-known work on the subject of the Waldenses.

<sup>4</sup> An old form of recantation for converts from Protestantism was about this time republished, drawn up under 20 heads by Jesuit missionaries in *Hungary*; which made them say:—"that the Pope cannot err; that he has full power to forgive or retain sins, and to cast men into hell; that all that he has established, whether out of the Bible or not, is true; that he ought to be honoured with similar reverence to that paid to Christ himself; that those who oppose his authority ought to be burned at the stake, and to perish body and soul in hell; that the reading of the Scriptures is the origin of all faction and blasphemy; that each priest is greater than the Virgin Mary, because she was the parent of Christ but once, but the priest creates him anew again and again; \* &c." So the Christian Observer for 1828, p. 467.

The authority is there not given, nor any further information on the subject. But Dr. Wordsworth in his Letters to M. Goudon, published in 1848, has given extracts from the Formula, identical in terms nearly with the above, taken from Streitwolf's "Libri Symbolici Ecclesie," Götting. 1838, Tom. ii. p. 343. On which a Reviewer in the Brit. Magazine, vol. xxxi. p. 389, remarks that all the information in Streitwolf about this document is as follows: "Quarta fidei professio, cujus auctor et etas non satis certo constant, in Hungariâ circa annum 1678 per patres Societatis Jesu composita esse videtur. Sæva hæc formula . . . Evangelicis ad ecclesiam Romanam revertentibus, illie primum præscripta, dein per ipsam Germaniam dilatata est. Textum ejus ex libro Frederici Mohaike, pp. 88 sqq., repetivimus." And the B. M. critic wishes further evidence of its genuineness. The fact of its republication in 1828 is shown by my extract from the Christian Observer, and is significant of the spirit of Popery as then revived.

<sup>5</sup> "I understand that not one miracle happened during the whole reign of the French. It was not until the streets were purified with lustrations of holy water, on

\* Compare my observations on this point, pp. 184, 215, 216 *suprà*.

of the Sabbath? What of Bible devotion? What of morality?—Not a sign appeared thus far (my present historic sketch reaches to about A.D. 1830, but might be extended still onward) of conversion of heart. “They repented not of their deeds.”

And what then remained?—What but that the sentence, the awful sentence, should go forth against them; “Because I have purged thee, and thou wast not purged, thou shalt not be purged from thy filthiness any more?” In effect the prophecy that we have under consideration intimated as much to St. John. Yet a little further respite it foreshowed would be granted to them, while the next Vial was discharged on another and different corrupter and desolator of the Roman earth,—*the Moslem Turk from the Euphrates*. Then speedily would the time arrive for the outpouring on the apostate princes and countries of Papal Rome,—the mystic *Babylon* and *Sodom*, as well as *Egypt*, of the Apocalypse,—of the last and the most terrible of all God’s Vials of wrath.

## CHAPTER VII.

### THE SIXTH VIAL; OR, JUDGMENT BEGUN ON THE MAHOMMEDAN TURK.

“AND the sixth Angel poured out his Vial on the great river Euphrates. And the water thereof was dried up; that the way of the kings from the sun-rising<sup>1</sup> might be prepared.”—Apoc. xvi. 12.

It seems to me manifest that the same Turkish power is here intended that was described under the sixth Trumpet.

the return of the Pontiff, that they began to operate again.” So the Author of “Rome in the sixth century,” quoted by Keith ii. 315. But with the Pontiff’s return miracles revived. “Within this little month (April 1817) three great miracles have happened at Rome. The last took place yesterday (April 30); when all Rome crowded to the Capitol, to see an image of the Virgin opening her eyes.”

<sup>1</sup> *ἵνα ἐτοιμασθῇ ἡ ὁδὸς τῶν βασιλευν τῶν ἀπὸ ἀνατολῆς ἡλίου.* The received text has *ἀνατολῶν* and so Scholz. But *ἀνατολῆς* is the reading of B, C; and of the latest critical Editions of Tregelles and Wordsworth.

as loosed from the Euphrates.<sup>1</sup> Like the Assyrian power of old, when Providentially employed to desolate Judah, it had overflowed from its Euphratean river-banks<sup>2</sup> over Grecian Christendom. And now the Apocalyptic vision represented that its symbolic river-flood was to be dried up:—dried up, as the next great event after the outpouring of the fifth Vial on the seat of the Beast, that is, on Rome.

The precise *time* at which this its drying up was to commence had been, as I believe, marked out long before by the memorable prophetic vision of the *Ram and Goat*, in the viiith Chapter of Daniel. And, having already in an earlier part of my Work explained other prophecies of Daniel which have reference to the *Popedom*,—one great common subject of that prophet and of St. John,<sup>3</sup>—I must beg to detain the reader while explaining and connecting with the Apocalyptic prediction before us, in an introductory Section, this his striking prophecy concerning another great common subject, viz. *Muhammedanism and the Turks*.

§ 1.—DANIEL'S PROPHECY OF THE LITTLE HORN OF  
THE HE-GOAT, AND PROBABLE INDICATION IN IT  
OF THE TIME OF THE SIXTH VIAL.

The vision, as Daniel has recorded it, is subjoined below.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See Part ii. Chap. vi. in my Vol. i. 495—498.

<sup>2</sup> “The Lord bringeth up upon them the waters of the river [i. e. the Euphrates] strong and many, even the King of Assyria and all his glory: and he shall come up over all his channels, and go over all his banks; and he shall pass through Judah: he shall overflow, and go over.” Isa. viii. 7.—Similar to which is Jer. xlvi. 7; “Who is this that cometh up like a flood, whose waters are moved as the river? Egypt riseth up like a flood, &c.” On which says Lowth; “The prophet describes, by way of vision, the march of an Egyptian army, coming on like a flood: . . . which expressions allude to the overflowing of the river Nile.” Compare Apoc. xii. 15, with my Comment on it, pp. 59—64 *suprà*; also Apoc. xvii. 15. <sup>3</sup> See pp. 87—90 *suprà*.

<sup>4</sup> 1. “In the third year of the reign of King Belshazzar, a vision appeared unto me, even unto me Daniel, after that which appeared unto me at the first.\*—2. And I saw in a vision; and it came to pass, when I saw, that I was in Shushan in the palace, which is in the province of Elam; † and I saw in a vision, and I was by the

\* In reference to the previous vision in Dan. vii., seen in the *first* year of Belshazzar's reign.

† Wintle thus renders the clause:—“it happened that *in my seeing* I was in Shushan, the *capital*, which is in the province of Elam.” I italicize the differences of translation which deserve attention. See p. 426 Note <sup>1</sup> *infra*, for an explanation.



—The historical fulfilment of the *first* part of it is clear: the Angel's own explanation being given to point out the powers and the places intended; and history with its record

river of Ulai.—3. Then I lifted up mine eyes and saw: and behold, there stood before the river a ram \* which had two horns: and the two horns were high; but one was higher than the other: and the higher came up † last.—4. I saw the ram pushing ‡ westward, and northward, and southward; so that no beasts might stand before him, neither was there any that could deliver out of his hand; but he did according to his will, and became great.—5. And as I was considering, § behold, an he-goat came from the west on the face of the whole earth, and touched not the ground: and the goat had a notable horn (lit. a horn of vision) between his eyes.—6. And he came to the ram that had two horns, which I had seen standing before the river, and ran unto him in the fury of his power.—7. And I saw him come close unto the ram, and he was moved with choler against him, and smote the ram, and brake his two horns: and there was no power in the ram to stand before him, but he cast him down to the ground, and stamped upon him: and there was none that could deliver the ram out of his hand.—8. Therefore the he-goat waxed very great: and when he was strong, the great horn was broken; and for it || came up four notable ones, toward the four winds of heaven.—9. And from out of one of them came forth a little horn, which waxed exceeding great, towards the south, and towards the east, and towards the pleasant land. ¶—10. And it waxed great, even to the host of heaven; and it cast down some of the host and of the stars to the ground, and stamped upon them.—11. Yea, he \*\* magnified himself even to the prince of the host: †† and by him ‡‡ the daily sacrifice §§ was taken away, ||| and the place of his sanctuary ¶¶ was cast down.—12. And an host was given him \*† against the daily sacrifice by reason of trans-

\* “Hebr. *one* ram: and the Versions rightly retain the word אֶחָד, as it denotes the unity of the empire.” Wintle. † Wintle, “grew up.”

‡ Or, butting. Wintle.

§ Wintle, “contemplating.”

|| i. e. *instead* of it.

¶ אֶל־הַכְּבוֹדִים, Literally, *towards the glory*. The same word occurs Dan. xi. 16, 41; but there in the genitive, after the word *land* expressed: also ib. 45, in conjunction with the added designation *holy*, (lit. of holiness,) “the glorious holy mount.”—The apparently parallel phrase Psalm cvi. 24, in our English translation, “that pleasant land,” is different in the Hebrew, being literally the *land of desire*; and the same again in Zech. vii. 14.—Wintle compares Ezek. xx. 6, 15, calling Judea “the glory of all lands.” Compare too Jer. iii. 19: “How shall I give thee a pleasant land, (lit. a land of desire,) a goodly heritage (lit. an heritage of the glory) of the hosts of nations?” In Isaiah xiii. 10 the word is applied to Babylon.

\*\* The word *horn* in Hebr. is feminine. The change of gender here to the *masculine* should be remarked.

†† אֶחָד מֵאֲנֹכַחֵי הַיָּם, *captain of the host*: the same phrase that is applied to the *divine* Captain of Israel in Jos. v. 15; and which is also used of *men*, as *Abner*, *Joab*, &c. Wintle translates “*against* the Prince of the host.”

‡‡ Wintle renders it “*from* him:” i. e. *as the cause*; or *instrumentally*. He says; “Heb. אֶחָד: Gr. reads εἰς αὐτὸν *by him*; and gives a quite different turn to the whole of this verse, and part of the next. I follow Vulg. and Syr.”

§§ Lit. *the continual (thing)*. In Numb. xxviii. 6, 10, &c., the word is several times united with the noun *burnt-offering*. There is no case, I believe, but here and in Dan. xi. xii. where the word is used *by itself*, and without any defining noun.

||| Compare Lev. iv. 8; “He shall *take off* from it all the fat of the bullock,” where the same verb is used.

¶¶ אֶת־בְּיַת־קֹדֶשׁוֹ, “the *dwelling-place* of his sanctuary:” בְּיַת־קֹדֶשׁ being specially used of the dwelling-place of Jehovah, says Gesenius. So Exod. xv. 17, &c.

\*† Or, “An host (or army) was *placed* against, or *set up*.” The word נָתַן is rendered to *place* in Dan. xi. 31, to *set up* in xii. 11; (“*place* the abomination;” “the abomination *set up*:”) and in Gen. xli. 41, 43, to *set over*, as a ruler: “I have set thee over the land of Egypt;” in Ezek. xxvi. 8, it is used of *placing* or *setting up* bulwarks.

of facts, answering thereto conspicuously. On the banks of the *Ulai*, the river that flowed by what was soon after-

gression: \* and it † cast down (the) truth to the ground; and it practised and prospered.

13. Then I heard one saint speaking: ‡ and another saint said § unto that certain saint that spake; How long || shall be the vision (*concerning*) the daily sacrifice and the transgression of desolation, [or, the desolating transgression,] ¶ to give both the sanctuary and the host to be trodden under foot?—14. And he said unto me, \*\* Unto two thousand and three hundred days: †† then shall the sanctuary be cleansed. ‡‡

15. And it came to pass when I, even I Daniel, had seen the vision, and sought for the meaning, then, behold, there stood before me as the appearance of a man.—16. And I heard a man's voice between [*the banks of*] *Ulai*, §§ which called and said, Gabriel, make this man to understand the vision.—17. So he came near where I stood; and when he came, I was afraid, and fell on my face: but he said unto me, Understand, O son of man; for at (or *to*) the time of the end [*shall be*] the vision. |||| —18. Now as he was speaking to me, I was in a deep sleep ¶¶ on my face toward the ground: but he touched me and set me upright.—19. And he said, Behold, I will make thee know what shall be in the last end \*† of the indignation: for at

\* Wintle translates "*by* a bold transgression." He gives Secker's translation; "The host was placed, on account of the daily sacrifice, in a state of sin."

† The formative prefix of the verb is *feminine*; and both *horn* and *host* are feminine in the Hebrew.

‡ Or *holy one*. This term Wintle explains to mean angels. It is the same that in Dan. iv. 13 is applied to the *Eir*, or *watcher*.

§ Would it not be better to translate the , in the *causal* sense, *for*, and the *said* as a pluperfect, *had said*? "Then I heard a Holy One speaking, (for another Holy One had said to him that spake, How long shall be the vision, &c.)"

¶ Till when? ἐως ποτε; Sept. "*To how long, or to how distant a period, will be the vision?*" Wintle.

¶¶ *Concerning* being a word interpolated, the passage may be thus rendered; "Till when shall be the vision? (till when) the daily sacrifice (taken away)? (till when) the desolating transgression?—Mr. Wintle says that he thinks "the inquiry is *only* into the *duration of the vision*, and that the other words are added by way of explaining what the vision is:" i. e. characterizing the vision as that respecting the daily sacrifice, &c.

\*\* So the Hebrew. But, says Wintle, the Versions have "answered him:" reading probably אָמַר, instead of אָמַר.

†† Literally, "*until evening (and) morning 2300.*" So Wintle. The Greek νυκθήμερον is the equivalent expression.

‡‡ מִצְדָקָא Lit. *justified*. The word is used Exod. xxiii. 7, Deut. xxv. 1, Is. v. 25, liii. 11; in which last passage the word has just the same sense as I think is the sense here, of removal of the penalty for sin. On the force of this I shall have further to remark hereafter.

§§ Or, *over the Ulai*. Wintle.

|||| So Wintle. Greek, εἰς καιρὸν πέρας. The "*shall be*" of the authorized Engl. Version is in *Italics*, not being in the Hebrew. Probably the sentence might better have been completed thus; "*at the time of the end the vision shall have its consummation:*" or, "*to the time of end the vision will last.*"

¶¶ Wintle, *sworn*. So as also Gesenius would here render the clause, we may translate, "I fell in a swoon." The word "*was*" implies continuance.

\*† אַחֲרֵי־כֵן, or, *the latter end*. It is used, for example, in Gen. xlix. 1, "I may tell you what shall befall you in the *last* [or *latter*] *days*;" where Jacob's prophecy had reference to the lot of each of the tribes on Israel's entrance into Canaan: and again in Job xlii. 12, "The Lord blessed the *latter end* of Job more than his beginning:" where "the *latter end*" comprehends all the time after his affliction, even (verse 16) 140 years. Lowth, in accordance with the Latin Translation of the Syriac version, translates, "*to the latter end:*" meaning that the explained vision would reach to the end of God's judgments on his people. The Syriac itself however corresponds precisely with the Hebrew.

wards the Persian capital, *Susa*,<sup>1</sup> a ram appeared to the Prophet pushing westward, northward, and southward, so

the time appointed the end shall be.\*—20. The ram which thou sawest having two horns is the kings of Media and Persia.—21. And the rough goat is the king of Grecia; † and the great horn that is between his eyes is the first king.—22. Now, that being broken, whereas four stood up for it, four kingdoms shall stand up, out of the nation, but not in his power.—23. And in the latter time ‡ of their kingdom, § when the transgressors are come to the full, || a king of fierce countenance, ¶ and understanding \*\* dark sentences, †† shall stand up.—24. And his power shall be mighty, but not by his own power; and he shall destroy wonderfully, and shall prosper, and practise, and shall destroy the mighty ‡‡ and the holy people. §§—25. And through his policy also he shall cause ||| craft ¶¶ to prosper in his hand; and he shall magnify himself in his heart, and by peace \*† shall destroy many: he shall also stand up against the Prince of princes; but he shall be broken without hand.—26. And the vision of the evening and the morning which was told is true: wherefore shut thou up \*‡ the vision; for it shall be for (or to) many days.

27. And I Daniel fainted, and was sick *certain* days: afterward I rose up, and did the king's business; and I was astonished at the vision, but none understood it."

<sup>1</sup> The vision was seen by Daniel in the third year of the Babylonian king Bel-

\* Heb. "At a time appointed an end shall be:" there being in neither case the definite article.

† Lit. of *Javan*, יָוָן. It is well known, as Wintle observes, that *Ιαονες* was an appellative of the Greeks, especially of those north of the Peloponnesus.

‡ אַחֲרָיָהּ as verse 19; where it is rendered *the latter end*. See Note \*† p. 425.

§ כְּלִי־חַרְבָּה, *their kingdom*, in the singular.

|| Wintle, with a slightly different punctuation, "When [*transgressions* or] *iniquities* shall be full."

¶ Compare Deut. xxviii. 50; "a nation of fierce countenance;" where the Hebrew is the same as here.

\*\* מַבִּין: perhaps *causing to understand, teaching*. So the verb is rendered *cause to understand* verse 16 *supra*. So again in Nehemiah viii. 9 it is translated "*taught the people*." Wintle renders the clause, "*penetrating in mysterious craft*." In Prov. i. 6, it is rendered "*to understand*," but might perhaps be better rendered "*cause to understand*."

†† Compare Prov. i. 6, "their dark sayings," same Hebrew.

‡‡ צַדִּיקִים, *strong ones*.

§§ עַם קְדוֹשִׁים, *people of (the) holy ones*. So the margin more literally renders it.

And Mr. J. E. Clarke (*Dragon and Beast*, p. 368) observes on this expression as discriminative. Those, he says, against whom the horn succeeds, having filled up the measure of their iniquities, could not be called עַם קְדוֹשִׁים, *the people of the holiness, or the holy people*, (so as it is in Isa. lxii. 12, "They shall call them *the holy people, the redeemed of the Lord*,") but only *the people of* [qu. as *containing?*] *holy ones*; "those to whom God has in his Providence committed his oracles." I conceive however that this is a critical refinement, which the analogy of Scripture will hardly bear out. For in Dan. vii. 27, the similar phrase in the Chaldee קְדוֹשֵׁי מַלְכָּא is used in as strict a sense as that in Isaiah; "The greatness of the kingdom shall be given to the *people of the holy ones of the Most High*."—Compare Dan. xi. 15; where the literal Hebrew is, "*the people of his chosen ones*," in the sense of *his chosen people*: also 1 Kings x. 15, אַנְשֵׁי הַמֶּרְכָּא, *the men of the merchants, for the merchantmen*: &c.

||| Wintle translates; "*the yoke of his policy shall cause even fraud to prosper*." He observes: "The Greek interpreter has *καὶ ὁ ζυγος του κλοιου αυτου*, with which Irenæus agrees: *שַׁכְּב* in Arabic signifies a fetter or shackle."


¶¶ מַרְכָּדָה. The same word is used Gen. xxvii. 35; "Thy brother came with *subtlety*:" also Gen. xxxiv. 13.

\*† Or, *in peace*. Wintle; "in (times of) tranquillity."

\*‡ Compare Dan. xii. 4, 9, "*Shut up the words*;" "The words are *closed up*," where the same Hebrew verb is used. Wintle, "*seal up*."





THE PERSIAN RAM.



---

THE MACEDONIAN GOAT.



as that no beast might stand before it. By the *ram* was meetly figured the *Persian power*:<sup>1</sup> by its *two horns*, the Median and Persian kingdoms united in it:<sup>2</sup> by its butting, so as that no beast might stand before it, its conquests and supremacy over other powers: (a characteristic this of the Persians for some fifty or sixty years, from the time of Cyrus's accession to that of the Greek expedition of Xerxes: ) and, once more, by the directions of its butting, specified at the opening of the vision, "*westward, and northward, and southward,*" either the general directions of Persian aggrandizement during these fifty years, towards Lydia, and Thrace, and Egypt, and India,<sup>3</sup> or the particular directions of the very remarkable, and up to a certain point triumphant, expedition of Xerxes,<sup>4</sup> at their close.—Again, by the *goat* was figured as meetly the *Macedonian power*:<sup>5</sup> by the *great horn* between its eyes, the dynasty of *Alexander the Great*, or rather of Alexander and his brother and son:<sup>6</sup> under the former of whom the symbolic goat rushed with irresistible swiftness and fury on the Persian

shazzar; and therefore when *Shushan*, or *Susa*, was only a provincial capital. A question has been raised how Daniel, who (verse 27) was in the employ of the king of Babylon, came to be in Susa. Of course he might have been there on some mission. But, as Wintle observes, this supposition is not needed. For both the language of the original, and also of the Greek copies agreeing therewith, seems rather to intimate that Daniel was there only in vision. The Prophet "saw in a vision, and in his seeing, or in his visionary idea, he was at Shushan:" and again, "when he was in the vision" he was on the Ulai.

<sup>1</sup> See the appended engraving copied from one in Taylor's *Calmet*, vol. v., of the Persian emblem of a *ram* on a Persian coin; together with the observations in my Vol. i. p. 426, Note <sup>1</sup>.

<sup>2</sup> On the *later rise* of the *higher* or *Persian* horn Mr. Cuninghame remarks, p. 231, that in Dan. v. 31 and vi. 1, it is said that Darius *the Mede* took the kingdom; but that afterwards *Persia* is introduced as the first and chief name of the united kingdom. So in Esther i. 3, 14, 18, 19, "*Persia and Media,*" &c.

<sup>3</sup> *Lydia* conquered by Cyrus, *Egypt* by Cambyzes, *India* in one direction, and *Thrace* in another, by Darius Hystaspes. Theodoret, on Dan. viii., makes Arabia one of the subjected regions. And so it is said in Esther i. 1; "Ahasuerus, who reigned from India even to *Ethiopia*, over 127 provinces." Herodotus, iv. 14, mentions Darius' Indian conquests.

<sup>4</sup> Through *Asia Minor* westward, *Thrace* and *Macedonia* northward, *Thessaly* southward.—Theodoret (ii. 1215) speaks of Xerxes' expedition as the epoch of the highest Persian greatness.

<sup>5</sup> See the emblem of a *one-horned goat* on the appended Macedonian coin; and also what is said on it in the same Note <sup>1</sup>, p. 426 of my first Volume, just before referred to. Eckhel, ii. 84, thus notices the coin as one of King Archelaus:

{ *Eques pileatus binas hastas tenens.*  
 { APXEAAO. *Caper dimidius intrâ quadratum.*

Plutarch, in his *Life* of the later Macedonian Prince Pyrrhus, mentions his being known in battle by "his lottly plume, and *crest of goat's horns.*"

<sup>6</sup> See Note <sup>4</sup> p. 428.

ram ; and, having destroyed its kingdom,<sup>1</sup> waxed very great by adding this latter kingdom in all its amplitude to his own, and uniting the two as one mighty empire. By the *great horn's breaking* when it was strong was figured Alexander's death in the plenitude of his power,<sup>2</sup> and consequent speedy breaking up of his kingdom ; by the *four notable horns* that stood up in its place, and out of the nation,<sup>3</sup> towards the four winds of heaven, the *four Macedonian kingdoms* apportioned by treaty after the death of Alexander's brother and son, and the great battle of Ipsus, to four of his chief generals, on the same great platform of the joint territory of the goat and ram :—viz. that of *Greece* to Cassander, of *Thrace with Bithynia and the adjacent Euxine provinces* to Lysimachus, of *Egypt and Palestine* to Ptolemy, and the *rest of Asia* to Seleucus.<sup>4</sup>—Thus much, I say, seems plain.

The explanation of the latter part of the vision, and of the *little horn* to which it relates, is more difficult : the interpreting Angel not having described with absolute distinctness either *the place where*, or *the time when*, of the rise of this Little Horn ; nor, again, the particular *power*

<sup>1</sup> By the victories of the *Granium*, *Issus*, and *Arbela*, in the years 334, 333, 331 B.C. respectively. The united ram's head and one-horned goat's head, copied in Taylor's Calmet, Vol. v., from a Florentine gem, is supposed to figure the united kingdoms of Persia and Macedon under Alexander the Great. See the preliminary explanations in that Volume of Calmet.

Let the reader in passing mark the ascription to Alexander of sovereignty over *the whole earth*, though of course only the civilized world. I note this with reference to Dr. Maitland's objection against our construing the Apocalyptic earth, or world, as that of the Roman empire. See p. 290 *suprà*.

<sup>2</sup> B.C. 323.

<sup>3</sup> So verse 22.

<sup>4</sup> On Alexander's death, B.C. 323, *Philip Aridæus*, his half-brother, was proclaimed King at a meeting of the chief generals ; and, in conjunction with him, so soon as born, a son of Alexander of whom Roxana was then pregnant, called afterwards *Alexander Ægus*. And during their lives the generals forbore from assuming the royal title ; professing themselves simply *governors* under Alexander's son and brother. But in 317 Philip Aridæus was murdered ; and about 310 Alexander Ægus, then fourteen years old, and his mother Roxana. Whereupon followed what is said in 1 Macc. i. 7 ; " Alexander reigned 12 years and then died ; and his servants bare rule every one in his place ; and after his death *they all put crowns upon themselves*." —The ambition of *Antigonus*, governor in the first instance of Phrygia, and his attempt at subjugating the other princes, having caused a general war between them, and Antigonus having fallen in the decisive battle of *Ipsus*, a Phrygian town, in the year 301,—the celebrated quadri-partition of the provinces was made between Cassander, Lysimachus, Seleucus, and Ptolemy, which I have noticed in the text. See Rollin ad Ann. 301, or the Universal History, Vol. ix. c. 2, § 6, 7.

Arnold, Rom. Hist. ii. 400, cites Dan. viii. 8, in application to this quadri-partition of Alexander the Great's empire.

and people that it was to desolate. The following indications, however, are given respecting it; which, when considered with the additional light of subsequent history reflected on the subject, will, if I mistake not, direct us with sufficient clearness to the power intended.

Ist, it was to *originate* out of one of the four above-mentioned Macedonico-Greek empires; whether out of one of the Greek dynasties ruling, or simply out of one of the constituent territorial domains, and perhaps the same capital city as of old. For the latter as well as former relation to the originating horn, — the territorial identity, as well as the dynastic continuity, — will, if I mistake not, satisfy the prefigurative emblem: a point this to which I must beg attention, as one essential to my argument; and of which, as too long for the text, I subjoin my proof in a Note below.<sup>1</sup>—2. As to *time*, it was to rise

<sup>1</sup> In case of a family or people being perpetuated before the world, unmixed in the main from generation to generation, then in the largest and most sudden chronological transitions of prophecy, a princely scion even at a very distant age, rising from it, might evidently be figured as a *later horn springing out of an earlier horn*, typical of the nation or family; and this in the strictest construction of the 'figure. Hence the peculiar propriety of Ezekiel's language, with reference to Israel's restoration at the latter day, "I will cause the *horn of the house of Israel to bud*" (Ezek. xxix. 21); though by a contemporary prophet it had been said, "He hath *cut off in his fierce anger all the horn of Israel.*" (Lam. ii. 3.)

But what when the successive fortunes of a country, or of its ruling dynasty, are glanced at in prophecy, with the same rapid transition from an earlier to a later age, in cases where invasions and revolutions, many and great perhaps, intervening, have more than once revolutionized the country; and so intermixed other races as to constitute the inhabitants in respect of blood, and perhaps too of language and religion, very much a different population? In strict *genealogical* truth unity could not be then represented as existing between the earlier inhabitants, or earlier dynasty, and the later; nor the figure of a later horn, springing out of one earlier, correctly used to designate them. Yet in fact, even in these cases, the community of local site, and of a certain measure of the same stock in the population, is sometimes so regarded as a sufficient identification, that a *continuity of political existence* is ascribed to the earlier and later people, or dynasty, and the common designation given them of one and the same impersonating appellation. So in common parlance of *modern Greece, modern Italy*, as now representative of *old Greece, old Italy*. Accordingly in prophetic Scripture we find the symbol of a *horn out of the old head* so applied. For example, in Baalam's prophecy, Numb. xxiv. 22, 24, we read, "The Kenite shall be wasted until *Ashur* carry thee away captive; . . . and ships shall come from the coast of Chittim, and shall afflict *Ashur*:"—where the continuity of the impersonation is kept up, though it was Assyria under a *pure Assyrian*, and then *Babylonian dynasty*, that carried away the Kenite; but Assyria *half Macedonized*, and under the Macedonian dynasty of the *Seleucidæ*, against which came the conquering ships from Chittim, that is Rome and Italy.—Again in Dan. xi. we have the sketch in continuity of the history of the *King of the North* and *King of the South*; the impersonation being kept up in either case throughout, as of a connected dynasty: though at the beginning of the chapter the Ptolemies of Egypt and Seleucidæ of Syria be manifestly meant, who succeeded to empire on Alexander the Great's demise; and, at the end of the Chap-



“at the latter time of their kingdom,” i. e. of the kingdom of these Greek dynasties: in which phrase the use of the singular noun *kingdom*, not *kingdoms*, is to be remarked as deserving notice.<sup>1</sup>—3. The *character* of the Little Horn is described as that of “a king of fierce countenance, understanding, or causing to understand, (that is, teaching,)”<sup>2</sup> dark sentences;” whether enigmas generally, or specially dark religious oracular sayings as from heaven.<sup>3</sup>—4. His *success* was to be such that he would wax (or *be*) exceeding great; in directions “toward the south, and toward the east, and toward the glory:”—in regard of which specified points of the compass, it becomes a question whether the *South* and *East* are to be estimated from Susa, where the prophet saw the vision, or from the place where the Little Horn might first rise and fix itself: also, as to *the glory*, whether it might indicate the locality of Jerusalem, where Jehovah’s glory rested of old literally and visibly;<sup>4</sup> or that country which, at the time of the Little Horn’s rising, (if after Jerusalem’s destruction,) might have, in place of God’s ancient city, the light of his revelation committed to it, and be then professedly and outwardly the country of God’s covenanted people.<sup>5</sup>—5. The *result* of this its success is

ter, dynasties of the latter day (perhaps those of the Saracens and the Turks)\* then holding rule in the same countries.—Once more, in the prophetic vision of the four wild beasts in Daniel vii., the Goths and Vandals having invaded and revolutionized France, Spain, and other countries of the Roman Western empire, but connected themselves afterwards, in respect of religion, with Rome,—i. e. Christian or Papal Rome,—as their common head, they are symbolized in the vision as *horns* growing out of the head of the Beast which signified in the first instance the old Roman Pagan Empire.

<sup>1</sup> See Note § p. 426 above. Mr. Clarke has remarked on this point in his Treatise on the Dragon and Beast, p. 355.

<sup>2</sup> See Note \*\* p. 426 *suprà* on the Hebrew word.

<sup>3</sup> The Hebrew word הַיְדָבָרָה is the same that is used Numb. xii. 8; “With him will I speak mouth to mouth, . . . and not in *dark speeches*;” also Psalm xlix. 4; “I will open my *dark saying* upon the harp;” and the same nearly Psalm lxxviii. 2. It is also used Judg. xiv. 12, of an *enigma*, and Prov. i. 6, of a *proverb*; “the words of the wise, and their *dark sayings*.”

<sup>4</sup> So St. Paul in his Epistle to the Romans ix. 4; “Israelites to whom pertaineth the adoption, and *the glory*, and the covenants, &c.”

<sup>5</sup> If by the specified *sanctuary* there be meant figuratively *the Christian Church*, then it seems to me that *the glory* must in consistency be explained figuratively of a *Christian country*, and *the people of the holy ones* of the *professed Christian people*, not Jewish:—the latter just as in Dan. vii. 21, 25; where the Papal power is typified as a Little Horn out of the Roman Beast, making war on *the saints*; i. e. on the *really holy Christians* in *professedly* holy Christendom. Whether the *Jewish* or the *Christian* solution should be adopted, is a question for after consideration.

\* See my inquiry into Dan. xi., xii., in the 4th Volume.

propheesied of as two-fold, and in either case as that of destruction: first against *religion*, as it was “to cast the truth to the ground, and cause *craft* to prosper in its stead, taking away the daily sacrifice, and casting down the place of Jehovah’s sanctuary;” secondly, against the *secular religious powers*, or rulers at the time of God’s professed people: for the host and stars of the symbolic heaven, which the Little Horn was seen to cast to the ground, and stamp on, are explained by the Angel as at once *the mighty ones and people of the holy ones*; and the Prince of the *host* is called also the Prince of the *sanctuary*.<sup>1</sup>—In regard of which *people of the holy ones* it is observable, 6thly, that as the reason of their being thus abandoned to destruction, their religious state at the time of the Little Horn’s rising is described as one of *matured transgression and apostasy*; <sup>2</sup> and the judgment wrought by it upon them as a judgment inflicted not until “*the latter end of the indignation*.”<sup>3</sup>—7. As a further characteristic of the Little Horn, in its course of destruction of these mighty and holy ones, it is added that it would *magnify itself even to the Prince of the host*; or, as the Angel expresses it, stand up against the Prince of princes, the Lord Jehovah; and also that it would *in peace* destroy many.—8. The *term* to its profanation of the sanctuary, and oppression of the people of the holy ones, is thus chronologically announced: “It shall be unto 2300 days; then shall the sanctuary be cleansed;” or (as the Hebrew is) justified, and treated as just:<sup>4</sup>—in regard of which announcement the question remains, whether the commencement of this long period (for the *days* must of course, as usual in such symbolic prophecy, be understood as *years*<sup>5</sup>) is to be reckoned from the commencing act of the vision, or from the rise and profanation of the Little Horn:—the declaration being made in answer to a

<sup>1</sup> “It (the Little Horn) magnified itself even to the Prince of the host; and by it the place of his sanctuary (i. e. of the sanctuary of the Prince of the host) was cast down.” Verse 11.

<sup>2</sup> “An host was given it against the daily sacrifice *by reason of transgression*.” Verse 12. “When the transgressors are come to the full.” Verse 23.

<sup>3</sup> Verse 19.

<sup>4</sup> See Note †† p. 425 *suprà*. I mean *treated as just* in the sense of having the national judgment awarded against the nation for sin removed. So from a Christian, when *justified*, the sentence and condemnation of the law is averted.

<sup>5</sup> See the discussion of the *year-day* question in my Part iv. Chap. ix. § 1 *suprà*.

double question, involving both these points.<sup>1</sup> Then at length his end would be brought about; and without any adequate earthly power or agency. "He shall be broken without hand."<sup>2</sup>

And now then we set out on our historic inquiry, to seek some destroying desolator of God's professed people, answering to these several notable characteristics of the Little Horn of the vision. And, as the people of the Covenant thus desolated may be either (*so far as we have yet seen*) the *Jews* with their literal sanctuary and sacrifice, or *Christendom* with its later figurative sanctuary and church-worship, the *chronological* range of our inquiry becomes (in the first instance) a very large one, extending from soon after Daniel's time even to the present: and the *geographical* range also a very large one; since it embraces the territory of both goat and ram, as comprehended in Alexander's empire and the four kingdoms of his successors, from the Greek Morea in the west to the Indus, and from the Oxus to the Nile. Within these limits of time and place we are to look for a power rising up, and rapidly increasing, from comparatively small dimensions to a greatness of dominion comparable even with that of Alexander himself:<sup>3</sup> using it pre-eminently against the contemporarily professing but apostatized people of God; to the destruction of the people themselves politically, and the oppression of their religion, called "the truth," or true religion, though corrupted: and using it also to the inculcation and propagation of some counter-religious scheme of craft and falsehood; and this as well in *peace* as in *war*.

Now, on the hypothesis of *the ancient Jews* being the transgressing people of the covenant intended, I think I may say that no admissible solution of the Little Horn has

<sup>1</sup> Verse 13. See Note ¶ p. 425.

<sup>2</sup> Verse 25.

<sup>3</sup> The scale is thus given, in verse 8; "Therefore the he-goat waxed *very great*:" said of Alexander's empire: "And for it stood up four *notable horns*;" said of Alexander's four successors; who, as the Angel adds afterwards, were "to stand up out of the nation, but *not in his power*." After this it is added in verse 9, "The little horn waxed *exceeding great*;" וַתִּשְׁבַּח הַקֶּרֶן; which expression appears to imply comparison with, and superiority to, the power or powers mentioned before.—The word קֶרֶן is used adjectively, Gen. xlix. 3, in the sense of *first*; "the first in dignity, the first in strength." So Gesenius.

been, or can be, offered. Within the interval of time from Daniel to the final overthrow and dispersion of the Jewish people there were but two powers that desolated their sanctuary, and caused the daily sacrifice to cease:—the one, the Syro-Macedonian king *Antiochus Epiphanes*; the other, the *Romans*. And, accordingly, they who suppose the ancient Jews intended have sought to explain the little horn of the he-goat, some in reference to the *one* of these two, some in reference to the *other*.—But with regard to *Antiochus*,—while it consists with the prophetic description that he was a Prince of the Syro-Macedonian line, and that he desolated the sanctuary, the following insurmountable objections occur:—1. that he was but an *individual king* of the dynasty, and therefore not a *horn*, in the sense in which the word horn is used both in this and other prophecies of Daniel:<sup>1</sup>—2. that his kingdom, instead of being exceeding great on the scale of Alexander's given in the prophecy, was at the greatest scarce a third of that of the first Syro-Macedonian king, Seleucus: the Romans having previously reduced it within Mount Taurus westward,<sup>2</sup> the Parthians within the limits of Media and Persia proper eastward;<sup>3</sup> and it being in fact little better than a Roman dependency:<sup>4</sup>—3. that the *Jewish transgressors* could not be said to have then *come to the full*: there being at that time many zealous for the law, some of whom constituted, soon after, the noble army of the Maccabees;<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> "Now, that being broken (the goat's first horn), whereas four (*horns*) stood up for it, *four kingdoms* shall stand up." Thus the Angel expressly makes the *four horns* to be *four kingdoms*. Similarly the *first horn* was Alexander's *kingdom*, or *dynasty*; the *two horns of the ram*, the Median and Persian *dynasties*; and the *ten horns* of Daniel's fourth wild Beast, the ten Romano-Gothic *dynasties* of Western Christendom: the *beast's body* being in each case associated with the ruling *horn*, and included.

<sup>2</sup> This was the first article in his father Antiochus the Great's Treaty with the Romans, after the great battle of Magnesia, B.C. 190.

<sup>3</sup> The Parthians had effected their independence of the Syro-Macedonian kingdom about 250 or 245 B.C.: (see Clinton ad ann. 250 :) and from that date began the famous dynasty of the *Arsacidæ*; which before the times of Pompey and Crassus had absorbed the whole Eastern territory of the Syro-Macedonian kingdom, and extended over all Persia to the Euphrates.

<sup>4</sup> Witness the celebrated act of the Roman ambassador Popilius, in drawing a circle around Antiochus Epiphanes, when inclined to push his conquests in Egypt; and requiring him, ere he stepped out of it, to obey the Republic, and quit the Egyptian territory. He was indeed at this time an actual *tributary* to the Romans.

<sup>5</sup> It is said of these times, in 2 Macc. iii. 1; "The Holy City was inhabited with

and Christ himself having fixed the epoch of the maturity of Jewish transgression much later:<sup>1</sup>—*i.* that, whereas the fall of the little horn, the terminating act of the vision, was (on the *year-day* system) to be 2300 *years* distant from that which marked its beginning, probably the successful pushing of the Persian ram,—Antiochus' death happened only between 300 *and* 400 *years* after it; and that, even on the *day-day* system, no satisfactory explanation is to be offered, by reference to his profanation of the temple and its cleansing, of the period of the 2300 *days*.<sup>2</sup>—Next, as to *the Roman power*,—though it answered to the little horn of our prophecy both in becoming exceeding great, and in most remarkably desolating the Jewish sanctuary, and destroying the Jewish people, after that the transgressors therein had come to the full,—and though moreover, *if the continuity of its empire be considered to extend to Rome Papal*, its commencement of falling may very possibly be made to coincide with the expiration of 2300 years from some possible commencing date of the vision,<sup>3</sup>—yet (not to speak of other lesser objections)<sup>4</sup> there meet us on the very face of

all peace, and the laws were kept very well; because of the godliness of Onias, the High Priest, and his hatred of wickedness.”<sup>1</sup> Matt. xxiii. 32.

<sup>2</sup> The profanation of the Jewish altar under Antiochus lasted but 3 years complete, according to 1 Macc. i. 54 compared with iv. 52; (the profanation having begun, it is said, on the 15th of the month Cisleu in the year 145 of the Seleucidæan æra,\* and the altar been purified on the 25th of Cisleu in the year 148;) not 2300 days, or 6½ years: and the desolation of the temple, and taking away of the daily sacrifice by Apollonius, continued but 3½ years, according to Josephus.—See Bishop Newton.

<sup>3</sup> Mr. Cuninghame in his three first editions had made B.C. 508 the *commencing* date of the 2300 days, as being the epoch of Darius Hystaspes' conquests in *Thrace*, according to the chronologer *Dufresnoy*,—in *India*, according to *Rollin*. In his 4th (p. 232) he prefers B.C. 509. And thus 1792 becomes his *terminating* epoch to the period; that is, the epoch (as he fixes it) of the French Revolution.

But, with regard to the conquests of Darius Hystaspes in *India*, the data seem to me quite wanting on which to determine it at all accurately. Herodotus, iv. 44, gives no date. And, accordingly, the best modern chronologists, as Larcher, Hales, and Clinton (*Fasti Hell. App. on Kings of Persia*), give none. Clinton's date of Darius's Scythian expedition and Thracian conquests is B.C. 508—506.

<sup>4</sup> E. g. if the little horn were the Roman power, how could its increase of greatness *westward*, where Spain and Gaul became permanently and peculiarly Roman provinces, previously to the Romans' desolation of Jerusalem, be omitted in the notice of its waxing great? “The little horn waxed great,” it is only said, “towards the east, and toward the south, and toward the glory:” (or Holy Land:) which is in fact *east* again.—Again, how did the Roman power in its progress cause *craft to prosper*? Pagan idolatry was just as prevalent before its conquests, in the countries conquered, as after them.—On one *chronological* objection the Note preceding speaks. A much greater one is noticed in the Text.

---

\* This æra began B.C. 312, from Seleucus' capture of Babylon.

the question two objections most palpable, and which no ingenuity can ever overcome. The 1st is, that the old Roman power can never be considered as a little horn of the Greek he-goat. For the local origin of its horn was from *Latium in Italy*, not any spot in Greece or Persia: and before ever it moved eastward, to intermeddle with the territories of the Greek he-goat, it was (on the scale in Daniel's vision) a *great horn*, not a *little one*; Sicily and Spain and Carthaginian North Africa, besides all Italy, being comprehended in its dominions. Moreover it never rooted itself in the Grecian soil, under a separate and independent government, until, at the very soonest, the division of the empire by Diocletian; or, accurately speaking, not till the final division of the Roman empire into Eastern and Western under Theodosius' two sons, a century later: i. e. above two or rather three centuries after the destruction of Jerusalem and the Jewish nation, by its armies under Vespasian. 2. Even if the symbol of the Macedonian he-goat's little horn might by any possibility be allowed to represent the *old Roman Pagan power*, the idea of its representing also, while all unmodified and the same, the extremely different power of *Rome Papal*,—an idea forced on the expositors spoken of by the fact of the little horn's having an assigned duration to the end of 2300 years,—I say this idea is one quite contrary both to the reason of the thing, and to the analogy of the three other admitted and notable prefigurations of Rome Pagan and Papal in Daniel and the Apocalypse.<sup>1</sup>

In short, high as is the authority of both Sir I. Newton and Bishop Newton as interpreters of prophecy, it seems to me scarce possible not to see the futility of their attempts at applying the prophecy to the Romans: and certainly

<sup>1</sup> 1. In the *image of Nebuchadnezzar* (Dan. ii.) *Rome Pagan* is represented by the *iron legs* of the image, *Rome Papal* by the *feet divided into ten toes*, part of iron and part of clay. 2. In the vision of the *four Beasts*, (Dan. vii.) it is the *ten-horned state* of the fourth Beast, with its *little horn, that had eyes*, rising among them, in the latter time of the Beast's existence, which represented *Rome Papal*; its state previous to the ten horns rising, *Rome Pagan*. 3. In the Apocalypse it is the *seven-headed Dragon* that represents the *Roman Imperial Pagan Empire*; the *seven-headed ten-horned Beast* (to which the Dragon resigns the kingdom) the subsequent *Roman Papal Empire*.

later expositors, as Mr. Cuninghame,<sup>1</sup> with all their zeal to uphold the interpretation, have altogether failed of their object. The attempted defence has only exposed in clearer light what Mr. J. E. Clarke, in somewhat uncourteous though not untrue phrase, calls the high absurdity of the solution.<sup>2</sup>

Thus then, as no other power but these two desolated the *Jewish* sanctuary, or oppressed *its* people, from Daniel's time of seeing the vision to the final Jewish dispersion, we seem forced on giving the prophetic phrases a mystic meaning; and on interpreting the holy but transgressing people, to be desolated, of *professing Christendom*. And indeed, on a careful scrutiny of the language used of them, it appears to me that there is one characteristic which of itself excludes the Jews, and can only apply to some *great Christian power*;—I mean the Angel's designation of the host cast down by the little horn as not *the holy ones* only, but *the mighty ones*.<sup>3</sup> For, from the time of the Babylonish captivity to the capture of Jerusalem by the Romans, *the Jews were never a mighty people*; being thenceforth a mere dependency on the Persians, Macedonians, Ptolemies, Se-

<sup>1</sup> See his Treatise on the Apocalypse, p. 236, &c., and Letter in the Investigator, Vol. iii. p. 277.

In the *latter*, which exhibits his fullest defence of the interpretation, I will notice two points in addition to what has been said already. 1. In order to justify the supposed symbolization of the Roman power as a little horn of the Macedonian he-goat, he endeavours to fix the reader's eye on "*the Roman power in the East*," as if a distinct power or horn; justly observing, that "from the time when Constantinople became the seat of empire, that power became essentially Greek." But most unfortunately, on considering the two grand actions of this Romano-Greek little horn, which he dwells on as figured in the present prophecy, it appears that the first, viz. the desolation of the *literal sanctuary of Jerusalem*, was (as already hinted) effected by the Roman power above two centuries before this its inrooting in the Greek soil: and that the *second*, viz. the desolation of the *spiritual or Christian sanctuary*,—i. e. according to Mr. C. (p. 236) "the pure worship of God," by Rome Papal, which Mr. C. judges to be the desolation intended,—was effected not by the Greek branch, but the *Latian* stock; and this after the notable separation of the latter from its short-lived eastern or Greek connexion.—2. He observes that, "in order to a power becoming the *horn of a beast* previously existing, it needs that there should be either an *identity of origin*, (as in the four kingdoms that sprang up out of the empire of Alexander,) . . . or a *unity of adoption*: in which last way the *ten Gothic kingdoms* became horns of the fourth Beast; viz. by receiving its religion, its laws, the spiritual supremacy of Rome, and the Latin tongue." Now he allows that it was not by *identity of origin* that the Roman power became a horn of the Greek he-goat. Had it then the *unity of adoption*? Did the Italian Romans before Christ adopt the Greek religion, laws, and language; or those after Christ acknowledge the spiritual supremacy of Constantinople, or adopt the Greek tongue?

<sup>2</sup> On the Dragon and Beast, p. 354.

<sup>3</sup> צְבָאוֹת.

leucidæ, and Romans, in succession: and consequently from that time never really *mighty ones*, or so represented in Scripture, but the contrary.<sup>1</sup>—Yet again, there is a phrase which, as Mr. Clarke has already observed,<sup>2</sup> looks very much like a marking out of some *Greek people* of the latter day as the one to be desolated. For it says, “In *the latter time of their kingdom*,”<sup>3</sup> in the singular: as if the state of things contemplated was one in which, at some latter time, a single kingdom or empire would be the representative in a manner of the several earlier post-Alexandrine Macedonian dynasties.—Once more it is to be observed that *the transgressors* spoken of, as those against whom the little horn would act, are pretty clearly identified with the people of this latter-day Greek empire. For it is said, “In the latter time of *their* kingdom, when the transgressors [in it, apparently,] are come to the full,”<sup>4</sup> that then the little horn, having had power given him *by reason of the transgression*, would destroy “both the *mighty* and the *holy* people:” implying that these *mighty ones* of the latter day Greek empire would be *by profession* holy ones, but *in effect* transgressors; and so the object of God’s punishment by the little horn.

Which premised, is it possible but that, in our inquiry after a power answering to the little horn of the he-goat, the thought of the *Saracens* and of the *Turks* should flash upon the mind:—each a power of sudden rise into mighty

<sup>1</sup> It was said to Abraham, (Gen. xii. 2,) “I will make of thee a great nation,” with reference to Israel in its national populousness and prosperity; a prophecy partially fulfilled under Joshua, and David, and Solomon, and to be fulfilled abundantly more fully at the time of Israel’s restoration. But, after returning from the Babylonish captivity, their day was but “the day of small things” (Zech. iv. 10), as the prophets of that time express it; and in Christ’s time their cry, “We have no king but Caesar,” was a public confession that they were no more *mighty ones*, but a *subject people*. Moreover we know from prophecy that they are to continue a poor and oppressed people even up to the time of the restoration.—So Prof. Lee, in his Preface to Eusebius’s Theophania:—“The Jews could not be called after the Christian æra the mighty or the holy people: their power was gone: and God’s people were now called by a new name; as in Isa. lxii. 2.” p. 355.

<sup>2</sup> *Ἡς βασιλείας αὐτῶν* not *τῶν βασιλείων*. So the Sept. like the Hebrew. Compare Apoc. xvii. 17; “The ten horns shall agree, and give their kingdom (*τῆν βασιλείαν αὐτῶν*) to the Beast:”—the Pope being their common father and head, and so a unity effected of their otherwise separate kingdoms.

<sup>3</sup> The Septuagint translation almost expressly identifies *the transgressors* to be desolated, and *the members of some latter-day Greek kingdom*: *Ἐπ’ ἰσχυρῶν τῆς βασιλείας αὐτῶν, πληρουμένων τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν αὐτῶν*. In the Hebrew, as in the English, the identity seems also half implied.



empire; each a tremendous desolator of apostatizing Greek Christendom; each the propagator of the false religion of Mahomet?—There is however this *primâ facie* objection against the *former*, that, although rising on the very border of *Ptolemy's Egypto-Macedonian kingdom*,<sup>1</sup> and soon settled within the *Syrian* border, yet being distinctly *Arabian* in its first origin, and springing from *Mecca and Medina*, it could scarcely be called a *little horn out of one of the four post-Alexandrine horns*. Nor again, in the *full* sense of the word, could it be said to have *destroyed the mighty and holy Greek people*; as it merely destroyed their armies, and did but mutilate and abridge their empire. In fact the Apocalyptic prophecy of the Saracens, as we have seen earlier, distinctly marks this limit to their desolating commission.<sup>2</sup>

And thus we turn to the TURKISH POWER; and in it, if I mistake not, and its Seljukian and Othmanic ruling dynasties, we shall find all we want. It originated in Chorassan, (the ancient Parthia,) south of the Oxus; and thus out of the territory of the *Seleucian* or *Syro-Macedonian* horn. There a Turkman shepherd-tribe in 1038 raised the standard of revolt (I have already elsewhere sketched the history)<sup>3</sup> against Massoud, son of Mahmoud, Sultan of Ghizni; defeated him, became independent, elected Thogrul Beg their chieftain, and appeared as a *horn* (as yet a *little horn*<sup>4</sup>) before the Asiatic world. His first conquests were over the *Eastern* provinces of Persia towards the Indus.<sup>5</sup> Thereby the horn became more notable. The

<sup>1</sup> In the quadripartite division of Alexander's empire Ptolemy is recorded to have had Egypt, Libya, *part of Arabia*, &c. (Arrian apud Photium): that is, probably, those districts of the Arab territory that border on *Egypt*. And of Ptolemy Euergetes, who died B.C. 222, we read that he made himself master of all the coasts of the Red Sea, both on the *Arabian* and *Æthiopic* sides, down to the Straits of Babelmandel; and consequently of the districts adjacent to, though not including, Mecca and Medina. (So Leo Allatius, as referred to in the Univ. Hist. ix. 394.)—Justinian too, it may be added, in the sixth century had a custom-house on the coast near Medina: but still not in the territory of Mecca.

<sup>2</sup> Apoc. ix. 5; "To them it was given that they *should not kill them*," &c. See Vol. i. pp. 454—456.

<sup>3</sup> For the history see Gibbon x. 342, &c.; or my Part ii. Chap. vii. *suprà*.

<sup>4</sup> Just before the battle Massoud had been thus warned about them by one of his Omrahs:—"They were in their origin a swarm of ants; they are now *little snakes*; and, unless instantly crushed, they will acquire the venom and magnitude of serpents." Gibbon x. 343.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* 346.

report reached the Caliph at Bagdad: and, oppressed at that time by the factions of the Bowides, lords of Western Persia, he called Thogrul to his aid. The Turkman descended *southward* at the call. They fell before him; and so central Persia was added to his dominions.—And then came a crisis in his history which opened the way to far higher greatness. He was made by the Caliph *Emir al Omra*, or Chief General of Islam;<sup>1</sup> an office, the ceremonial of investiture on which is the theme of Eastern eloquence.<sup>2</sup> And bound up both by this office, and by his alliance with the Caliph's daughter, (who had however at first disdained to mingle his blood with that of "a Scythian shepherd,")<sup>3</sup> —I say identified in this manner with the religion of Mahomet, and inoculated, alike himself and the military population subject to his rule, with all the early Saracen fanaticism, he became thenceforward its armed apostle and propagator, specially against Greek Christendom; and from *Bagdad*, as his new religious capital, (a locality of which more presently,) set forth on a long uninterrupted career of success and conquest. Both *Judea*, the ancient glorious and holy land, and *Asiatic Christendom*, holy and glorious as the land of God's then professing people, (with which latter alone we are now specially concerned,) were soon embraced in the conquests. Under *Malek Shah*, "Commander of the Faithful,"<sup>4</sup> the third of the three first Sultans of the Turks, the extent of the Turkish dominion is thus described by the historian; "From the Chinese frontier [in the far *East*] he stretched his immediate jurisdiction or feudatory sway to the *West* and *South*, as far as the neighbourhood of *Constantinople*, the *Holy City of Jerusalem*, and the spicy groves of *Arabia Felix*:" an extent of dominion which surpassed the Asiatic reign of Cyrus and the Caliphs.<sup>5</sup> "It grew *exceeding great* toward the *East*, and toward the *South*, and toward *the glory*," or (professedly) holy and Christian land. The Turkman's "fierceness of countenance," as he conquered, has passed into a proverb.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> It had been substituted for that of *Vizier* by a preceding Caliph. Gib. x. 84.

<sup>2</sup> See my Vol. i. pp. 525, 526.

<sup>3</sup> Gibbon x. 350.

<sup>4</sup> A sacred title, says Gibbon, x. 364, given to Malek Shah, first of barbarians.

<sup>5</sup> Gibbon x. 365.

<sup>6</sup> "Fierce as a Turk."—Gibbon applies the epithet more than once; e. g. "The

In proof how, "having waxed great, even to the host of heaven, it cast of the host and of the stars to the ground, and stamped on them,"—how "by it the daily sacrifice was taken away, and the place of the Lord's sanctuary cast down," how "it magnified itself against the Prince of the host,"<sup>1</sup> "cast down the truth to the ground, as it practised and prospered," and "caused craft to prosper in its hand,"—I say, in proof of the exact applicability of all this to the Turkman Sultans, it needs but that we read the account given by Gibbon (for it was an exact specimen of all the rest) of the conquests of Soliman (one of Malek Shah's generals) in Asia Minor. "By the choice of the Sultan, Nice was preferred for his palace and fortress; . . . and the Divinity of Christ was denied and derided in the same temple in which it had been pronounced by the first general synod of the Catholics. The unity of God, and the mission of Mahomet, were preached in the mosques; and the Cadhis judged according to the law of the Koran. . . . On the hard conditions of tribute and servitude, the Greek Christians might enjoy the exercise of their religion: but their most holy churches were profaned, and their priests and bishops insulted: they were compelled to suffer the triumph of the *Pagans*, and the apostasy of their brethren: many thousand children were marked by the knife of circumcision, and many thousand captives devoted to the service or the pleasures of their masters."<sup>2</sup>—As to the manner in which, after a temporary disruption of the Turkish power, and then its

body of the Turkish nation still breathed the *fierceness of the desert.*" x. 384. So again p. 352, &c.

<sup>1</sup> "Emperor of emperors and Prince of princes" was the Turkish Sultan's self-applied title; as we have seen from the citation given in my Vol. ii. p. 32. But he viewed himself, and was regarded by his subjects, in a character yet higher and more sacred. "The Koran and its interpreters inculcated on him that the Sultan was the descendant of the prophet, and the *Vicergerent of Heaven.*" So Gibbon i. 130. The Sultans answered thus to the title of *αυριθιος*, as did the Popes to that of *αυριχριστος*.

Compare on this expression what is said of Sennacherib, Isa. xxxvii. 23: "Against whom hast thou exalted thy voice, and lifted up thine eyes on high? even against the Holy One of Israel."

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. x. 373. With facts like these before him, what can Mr. Cuninghame mean by saying, p. 237; "Neither the Saracens nor the Turks have interfered with the worship . . . of the Greek Church. It is impossible therefore to show that they have in any sense whatever taken away the daily sacrifice of the Church." Has he forgotten, besides the Turks' frequent supplanting the cross by the crescent in lesser instances, (e. g. as above stated, at Nice,) their converting Justinian's far-famed metropolitan Church of Greek Christendom into the mosque of Santa Sophia?

revival under a new dynasty, the *Othmanic*, it not only conquered other of the Greek provinces, but at length destroyed the Greek empire itself,—“the mighty ones and the holy people,”—the history has been given already.<sup>1</sup> Suffice it therefore to add that the *Apocalyptic* pre-intimation of the cause of the *Euphratean horsemen* being thus let loose on Greek Christendom to destroy it, viz. that of its sanctuary being polluted with transgressions, and pertinaciously unpurified and unatoned for,<sup>2</sup> agrees precisely with *Daniel's* intimation of the cause of the *he-goat's little horn* being commissioned, and receiving power, against the then mighty and holy people;—viz. the fact of the transgressors (now their designative) having come to the full. Therefore it was that the Turk became great, like Sennacherib,<sup>3</sup> and “not by his own power:”—therefore that he became, according to his own self-assumed appellative, *Hunkiar, the Destroyer*.<sup>4</sup>

Yet once more, and most particularly, let me direct attention to the Turkman's early political connexion with BAGDAD, as a fact equally illustrative of Daniel's and the Apocalyptic prediction. For that famous capital of Mahomedism, whence the Seljukian Turk first issued on his mission against Christendom, and which in their very titles has been ever since remembered by the Turkish Sultans,<sup>5</sup> was not only notable for its *Euphratean site*, agreeably with the *Apocalyptic* prophecy, but also for certain remarkable *local associations with earlier history*, agreeably with *Daniel's*. When the Caliph Almanzor, little thinking what he did, chose it for his new capital,<sup>6</sup> it bore the humble name of *Bagh-Dad*, or *Dad's Garden*; a name derived from a hermit so called, its then only inhabitant. But ruined heaps betokened that it had once been populous. And, as the monk turned from those ruins to contemplate the buildings

<sup>1</sup> Viz. in my Vol. i. p. 501, &c.

<sup>2</sup> See my Vol. i. pp. 481—486. I rather beg my reader's reference to the above, because it was written without any thought of Daniel's prophecy.

<sup>3</sup> Isa. xxxvii. 24, &c. “Thou hast said, By the multitude of my chariots am I come up to the height of the mountains, &c. . . Hast thou not heard long ago how I have done it? . . . Now have I brought it to pass that thou shouldst be to lay waste defenced cities into ruinous heaps. Therefore their inhabitants were of small power: they were dismayed and confounded:” &c.

<sup>4</sup> See Vol. i. p. 504.

<sup>5</sup> See Vol. i. pp. 504, 505.

<sup>6</sup> See Vol. i. pp. 461, 462.

of the new-rising city, like one standing in the void between two distant ages, he might have told the Caliph that his chosen site was that of the capital of a once mighty kingdom of earlier conquerors of Asia :—that there, nearly 1100 years before, SELEUCIA had been founded; and there for some 500 years had flourished, with all the pomp and pride of its half million and more of inhabitants;—the *Eastern capital* of the greatest of Alexander's four successors, *Seleucus Nicator*.<sup>1</sup>—Thus, with regard not merely to the more distant Parthian provinces of Seleucus' ancient kingdom, where the Seljuks first formed into a *little* power, but also to the Selucian capital (thenceforward the Seljuks' religious metropolis) where they received, and whence they issued on, their predicted commission against Christendom, it was *out of the chief of the four horns* into which the first great horn of the Macedonian he-goat broke, that (“in the latter time of the Greek empire”) the *little horn of the Turk* might be said to have sprung.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> “Seleucus now undertook the building of a new city, which he called from his own name *Seleucia*, and made the metropolis of all the provinces of his empire beyond the Euphrates. It was placed on the western side of the Tigris, about forty miles from Babylon, over against the place where at present the city of *Bagdad* stands. . . Seleucia (especially through the emigration of the inhabitants of Babylon to it) became so populous that in Pliny's time it had 600,000 inhabitants, and far excelled all the other cities of the East.” *Universal History*, ix. 181. Again: “As Babylon was drained of its inhabitants by Seleucia, so was Seleucia in process of time by Ctesiphon and Almadayan, and these two again by *Bagdad*. This last city was first built in the same place where *Seleucia* stood. . . In the year A.D. 754 Seleucia was reduced to such a state of desolation as to have nothing on the spot where it stood but the cell of a monk called *Dad*, and a garden adjoining to it; whence it was called *Bagh-Dad*, that is *the garden of Dad*. In this place Almansur, Caliph of the Saracens, . . . built a new city; which has ever since been called from the place *Bagdad*.” *Ibid.* p. 184.

On the foundation and greatness of *Seleucia*, and its effect in draining Babylon of its population, Strabo thus writes. *Και κατηριψαν της πολεις (Βαβυλωνος) τα μεν οι Περσαι, τα δ' ο χρονος, και η των Μακεδωνων ολιγωρια περι τα τοιαυτα' και μαλιστα επειδη την Σελευκειαν επι τη Τιγρητι πλησιον της Βαβυλωνος, εν τριακοσις πω σταδιοις, ετειχισε Σελευκος ο Νικατωρ. Και γαρ εκεινος, και οι μετ' αυτον απαντες, περι ταυτην εσπουδασαν την πολιν, και το βασιλειον ενταυθα μετηνεγκαν. Και εη και νυν η μεν γεγονε Βαβυλωνος μειζων.* Lib. xvi. p. 1073. (Ed. Casaub. 1707.)

I observe that the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, on the word *Seleucia*, notes its situation as at the *confluence of the Euphrates and Tigris*, as well as its identity with the site of the modern *Bagdad*. It was however only by a *canal*, except at *flood-time*, that the *Euphrates* washed the walls of the city; the proper confluence of the two rivers being somewhat lower. See Vol. i. p. 494, Note <sup>3</sup>.

<sup>2</sup> Mr. J. E. Clarke (pp. 361, 362) explains the *Goat's little horn* of the *Ottoman Turks* distinctively, as having risen up in Bithynia, a part of the territory of *Lysimachus* :—an explanation not inadmissible, had we none better to rest in. But the superior fitness of that which I have given must, I think, be evident; as it traces the

Such is my view of the *little horn* of the *He-Goat* in Daniel's 8th chapter; and it is a satisfaction to me to learn, as I am now revising it, that it was also the view taken of the prophecy by the learned Bishop Horsley.<sup>1</sup>

It only remains, in conclusion, that I show the bearing of the celebrated *chronological statement* in this prophecy of Daniel upon the time of the sixth Apocalyptic Vial; i. e. on the destined time for that drying up of the 'Turkman power which the Vial prefigures. "Then I heard one saint speaking; and another saint said unto that certain saint which spake; Till when<sup>2</sup> shall be the vision concerning the daily sacrifice, and the desolating transgression, to give both the sanctuary and the host to be trodden under foot? And he said unto me, *Unto 2300 days: then shall the sanctuary be cleansed.*" Now it is to be understood that the received reading 2300 is, as various commentators have observed, of authority not to be doubted:<sup>3</sup>

*primary* origin of the Turkish nation out of both the territory and the capital of one of the Greek he-goat's four horns; and this by reference to the precise local origin assigned to the Turkman desolator by the Apocalypse.—Moreover, supposing the *King of the North* at the beginning of Dan. xi. to be the *Syro-Macedonian* or *Seleucian* dynasty, and the *King of the North* at the end to be the *Turk*, which is not improbably the case, (see my Part vi. Ch. 2,) this will of course greatly tend to confirm the view taken of the *Turkman* as a little horn out of the particular *Seleucian* or *Syro-Macedonian* horn of the goat.

Considering the obscurity that rests on the origin of the name and ancestry of *Seljuk*, (see Gibb. x. 345, Note 17,) might not the possibility of a *Seleucian* origin be suggested; seeing that Macedonian cities and colonies were founded under Alexander and Seleucus in Chorasán, and beyond it, and that there is so much of resemblance between the appellatives *Seluk* and *Seljuk*?

<sup>1</sup> In the first of Bishop Horsley's Letters to the Author of "Antichrist in the French Convention," lately published in the British Magazine, Bishop Horsley says; "The little horn which rises out of one of the four horns of the he-goat (Dan. viii.), I am persuaded, is the Ottoman Porte:" and again, in his next Letter; "The little horn of the he-goat (Dan. viii.) respects the Mahometan power." These Letters were written in April and July, 1797. They are cited by Dr. Todd on Antichrist, p. 130.

<sup>2</sup> I prefer this "*Till when*" to the "*How long*" of the authorized translation, as a more exact rendering of the Hebrew; and with the not unimportant difference of marking the little horn's *terminating epoch*, not *duration*. So the Septuagint. *Ἔως ποτε ἡ ὄρασις στήσεται;* and so too the Vulgate; "Usquequo visio?" &c. See Wintle's remark on it, p. 425 Note || *suprà*.

<sup>3</sup> Mr. Clarke thus writes, p. 390, with reference to the two various readings of 2400 and 2200 in certain copies of the Septuagint. "Several copies of the Septuagint read 2400 days (*ἡμέραι δισχίλιαι καὶ τετρακοσῖαι*): but this reading is evidently spurious; as several of the best and oldest manuscripts of the Septuagint have *τριακοσῖαι*, instead of *τετρακοσῖαι*. One of the manuscripts alluded to is the Codex Alexandrinus, supposed to have been written as early as the 4th or 5th century. In the Complutensian Polyglott printed at Alcalá in 1517, and the Antwerp Polyglott printed in 1570, it is *τριακοσῖαι*. Theodoret, who flourished in the 4th century, reads so in his copy of the Septuagint.—The various reading of 2200 days, which Jerome says existed in some manuscripts in his time, merits no attention; as only

and the *days*, or *evening-mornings*,<sup>1</sup> which it is the numeral prefixed to, are of course, if the *year-day* theory have been proved correct, to be interpreted as *years*. Thus, in order to the application of the prophetic period, so enunciated, to history, and calculation when the cleansing of Greek Christendom from the Turk and his religion of deceit was to begin to take place, we have only one further preliminary to settle, viz. from what commencing epoch to date the 2300 years. As the Angel's statement is made in answer to an apparently double question,—“Till when the vision? Till when the daily sacrifice (taken away), and both the sanctuary and the host trodden under foot?”—it might *à priori* be referred to either; and designate either the length of what the whole vision prefigured, or the length of the little horn's desolations. I interpret it of the former, as alone consistent with other chronological prophecies.<sup>2</sup> Thus the date of the commencing act seen

two of these manuscripts have come down to us.—There is no various reading of this passage in the *Hebrew* text; which appears to me decisive in favour of the common reading.”

The Editor of the Investigator, Vol. i. p. 441, says on the authority of Mr. Cunningham, in his examination of Irving's and Frere's systems, that “not a single *manuscript* known to be extant, whether Hebrew or Greek, sanctions the reading of 2400 days; and that it rests entirely on a manifest *typographical error* of the Vatican [*printed*] edition, taken [generally] from the Vatican *manuscript*: which error the Chisian edition of Daniel notices, and says that the Vatican *manuscript* reads 2300.”

As regards the *Hebrew*, however, the above statements are made too absolutely. The reading 2400 was found by Dr. Wolff in *one* Hebrew manuscript at Ispahan, and *one* at Bokhara; the one, he says, *esteemed* to be of the 5th century, the other of the 3rd. See his letter in the Investigator, Vol. iv. p. 315.

The *estimation* and *belief* however of these Eastern Jews, as to the antiquity of the manuscripts, is to be received with great caution: it being the estimation of unlearned persons; and the point not as yet critically examined by competent judges. Moreover, as Dr. Wolff seems to imply, the greater number of the manuscripts that he found in the East, as well as *all* those in Europe, had the number 2300. So that, I conceive, little doubt can be felt on the subject.

<sup>1</sup> The word is in the singular in Hebrew, “2300 evening-morning;” עֶרְבַּי וּבֹקֵרַי. Hebrew numerals of plurality being sometimes joined with nouns in the singular number: a conjunction not unknown in vulgar English.—I conceive, with Dr. Maitland, that the phrase *evening-morning* is used, instead of *day*, because of the *sanctuary* being the subject, and its services *double*, in the evening and in the morning.

<sup>2</sup> And so, it is evident, Mr. Wintle. See the Note || p. 425 just before referred to.

It seems to me that the *incipient cleansing* (or, literally, *justifying*) of the *sanctuary*, that is, *canceling the punishment consequent on its condemnation*, (see p. 425, Note ††) at the end of the 2300 years, must probably not very long precede the blessings predicted at the end of the 1335 days, Dan. xii. 12. Now, were we to date the 2300 years from the time of the Turks first desolating Christendom, its end would not fall out till about A.D. 3350; and consequently not till long after that which we have seen reason to regard as the terminating epoch of that first-mentioned prophetic period.

in the vision,—that is of the Persian two-horned ram pushing in its power westward and northward and southward,—must be regarded as the commencing date of the 2300 years. And, within the narrow limits of some fifty or sixty years, earlier or later, it seems hardly possible to mistake in the determination of *this* epoch in history. It cannot surely be placed *before* Cyrus' establishment of the supremacy of the united Persian and Median kingdom, B.C. 538 or 536. It cannot be placed *after* Xerxes' defeats by the Greeks, at Artemisium, Salamis, and Plataea, in 480 and 479; after which time the supremacy departed from Persia. It was in the interval that the ram fulfilled its career of conquest.—Now, both as regards the *commencement* and the *termination* of this, just as of other prophetic periods, we may infer from abundant Scripture analogy (not to say from common sense also) that each one ought to be a *marked and well-determined epoch* in history.<sup>1</sup> And what then the most marked epochs of Persian greatness, such as might be reasonably supposed commencing epochs to the prophecy, within the interval of that sixty years? I think the two most marked must be considered to be that of Cyrus' accession and conquest of Babylon, B.C. 536, and that of Xerxes' splendid progress against Greece, B.C. 481, 480, just before his great catastrophe. I prefer the latter;—first, because it is an epoch of the exhibition of Persian greatness distinctively set forth in another of Daniel's prophecies;<sup>2</sup> secondly, because, whereas there is *no termin-*

<sup>1</sup> It is so in the case of both the commencement and end of the 1260 years period of Antichrist's reign,—of "the hour, day, month, and year" of the Turks' progress towards the destruction of the Greek empire,—of the 150 years of the intensity of the Saracen woe,—and of the  $3\frac{1}{2}$  years of the two witnesses lying dead.

<sup>2</sup> Dan. xi. 2: "And now I will show thee the truth. Behold there shall stand up yet three kings in Persia: and the fourth shall be far richer than they all: and by his strength, through his riches, he shall stir up all against the realm of Grecia." Theodoret notes the epoch; as already observed p. 427 Note <sup>4</sup>, supra.

Herodotus (vii. 1) uses the word *εδορευετο* of the three years' stir of preparation in Asia on this occasion: *ἡ Ἀσιη εδορευετο επι τρια ετα.* And Bishop Thirlwall, in his History of Greece, taking up the word, writes, in reference to these three last years of Darius, "For three years all Asia was kept in a constant stir:" and, again, with reference to the four first of Xerxes following, "For four years more Asia was still kept in restless turmoil:" so illustrating unconsciously, in both the one clause and the other, Daniel's prophecy.—On the extraordinary exhibition of Persian greatness in the expedition Herodotus' account should be consulted. In the Council held on his accession, Herodotus mentions (vii. 8) that Xerxes avowed it as his object in the Greek expedition, to march through Europe, and reduce the whole earth under his empire. "The Deity," he added, "impels me to it."



ating epoch of historic note to suit the *commencing* epoch of *Cyrus'* conquest of Babylon,<sup>1</sup> there is, as we shall presently see, a *very marked terminating epoch* to suit the *commencing* epoch of *Xerxes'* triumphant progress into Thrace, Macedonia, and Greece.—The circumstance of the final catastrophe of his armament and expedition is no more an objection to our selecting it as a most notable epoch of Persian greatness and supremacy, than the final catastrophe of Napoleon's Russian expedition in the snows of Moscow, to our selecting the year of the assemblage of that mighty anti-Russian armament, and homage done to him by the princes of Christendom at Dresden, when he passed onwards to conduct it, as the culminating and most notable epoch of Napoleon's greatness.<sup>2</sup>—That it is not a mere selection made *ex post facto*, simply to answer that which later history has suggested to my mind as the terminating epoch of the 2300 years, will appear from this,—that Mr. Bicheno, writing in 1797, selected the same commencing epoch to the prophecy; and prognosticated accordingly that we might expect to see the cleansing of the sanctuary begun in the year 1819.<sup>3</sup> In this he calculated from Xerxes' starting from *Susa*, B.C. 481.<sup>4</sup> But it is evidently as fit to calculate from his starting from *Sardis*, and passage through Thrace and Macedonia, B.C. 480, the year following. In which case not 1819, but 1820, would be the terminating year of the 2300 years.—Thus then in one of these two years (supposing our Turkish view of the prophecy correct) we might *à priori* with Bicheno have inferred from the prophecy that the withdrawal of the Mahomedan abomination from the sanctuary and host of Greek Christendom would probably commence, and the

<sup>1</sup> Counting from B.C. 538-6 the 2300 years would expire in 1762-4 A.D.; a period marked by no event of importance, as regards either the breaking up of the Turkman power, or the cleansing of Greek Christendom from Mahomedism.

<sup>2</sup> "Earthly state has never reached a prouder pinnacle than when Napoleon, in June 1812, gathered his army at Dresden,—that mighty host unequalled in all time, —and there received the homage of subject kings." Arnold, Lect. on Mod. Hist. p. 177.

<sup>3</sup> Signs of the Times, Third Part, p. 268. At pp. 183, 252, 1797 is noted as the date of first publication. His view of the prophecy generally is that of Bishop Newton.

<sup>4</sup> The date is determined to 481 by a famous eclipse of the sun. See Dr. Hales' Chronology, Vol. iv. p. 140, 2nd Edition.—So too Mr. Clinton, in his Fasti Hellen., makes Xerxes to arrive in the autumn of B.C. 481 at Sardis, and there winter.

breaking up begin very notably of the Turkman Moslem power: in other words, and to use another and different prophetic metaphor, that then there would be a commencement of *the drying up of its flood from the Euphrates*:—that same event that is the subject of the 6th Vial.

§ 2.—COMMENCEMENT AND PROGRESS OF THE DRYING UP OF THE TURKISH FLOOD FROM THE EUPHRATES.

So the year 1820 drew on, which seemed marked out in Daniel's ancient prophecy, as the destined epoch for the breaking up of the Turkman power, and drying up of its flood from the Euphrates.<sup>1</sup>—During the progress of the revolutionary wars in Europe, which we have been lately reviewing, though not without an early sprinkling of the Vial, it had yet remained comparatively uninjured. For the French expedition of 1798, which conquered Egypt,<sup>2</sup> was soon expelled by the English under Abercrombie;<sup>3</sup> and the political state of the Turkish empire became as before. Insomuch that in 1802 a Christian commentator, musing on this prophecy, expressed his marvel as to the means by which the Vial was to take effect; and an empire, still so populous and mighty, to be wasted and dried up.<sup>4</sup>—So things continued in the main till the very beginning of

<sup>1</sup> Compare on the figure here used Ezek. xxx. 12, "I will make the *rivers dry*," said of Nebuchadnezzar's conquest of Egypt: also Isa. xlv. 27, "That saith to the deep, Be dry, and I will dry thy rivers:"—the figure being taken from the overflowing Nile in the one case, the overflowing Euphrates in the other.

Tillinghast, a commentator who wrote 200 years ago, thus expounded the symbol in this Vial of the *Turks*. "By the river Euphrates we are to understand the Ottoman or Turkish empire. It is called *the great river* because of the multitude of people and nations therein. The people who at this present time are of all others accounted the greatest are the *Turks*; who therefore, and no other, are here to be understood; especially as the Euphrates in Apoc. ix., under the sounding of the 6th Trumpet, by general consent of expositors has reference to the Turkish power." (ap. Bickersteth's *Divine Warning*, p. 13.)

<sup>2</sup> The dates were as follows. In May, 1798, the French expedition sailed: in July it took Alexandria: then, in the same month, followed the battle of the Pyramids, and capture of Cairo. <sup>3</sup> A.D. 1801.

<sup>4</sup> "By what means the Turkish empire shall be reduced to this helpless state (an empire formerly distinguished for its enthusiastic loyalty, ferocity, and valour, . . . and which is even at this day as populous as any other upon the earth, the Chinese excepted), is not intimated in this verse; and will perhaps remain concealed until the events themselves shall remove the veil. . . However this is certain, from the evident purport of the text, that a very extraordinary indifference or disaffection in the people to the government must take place to fulfil this part of the prophecy" (i. e. of the 6th Vial). Galloway on the Revelation, p. 258.

1820. "That year the Ottoman empire, by unwonted good fortune," it has been said, "found itself freed at once from foreign war and domestic rebellion."<sup>1</sup> But before the year ended how was the scene changed; and what causes introduced of exhaustion and distress that have since then never ceased to operate!—I proceed to sketch them in brief: abstracting almost entirely from Dr. Keith, who has himself abstracted from the Annual Register.

The first cause that so operated was *internal revolt and insurrection*. In the summer of 1820 Ali Pasha of Yanina asserted his independence: and by his revolt precipitated the *Greek insurrection*, which had been for some time silently preparing. In October the Greek islanders called in their merchant-ships. In November the Suliot Greeks returned to their country from the Ionian islands, and raised the standard of revolt against the Sultan, in alliance with Ali Pasha their former oppressor. In February, 1821, Chourshid Pasha, of Tripolizza, having marched from thence against Yanina, leaving the Morea almost destitute of Turkish soldiers, the Moreote Greeks broke out into insurrection. This was early in April. The insurrection quickly extended to the Ægean isles, and districts of Northern Greece, Epirus, and Thessaly; while at the same time the standard of revolt was raised also in the trans-Danubian provinces of Wallachia and Moldavia.—Does the reader think me too particular in the dates? I have given them that he may more minutely compare what then occurred on this Greek rising against the *Turkman* domination, with what occurred just 2300 years before on the Greek rising against the *Persians*.<sup>2</sup> There is a striking

<sup>1</sup> Keith ii. 337.

2 B.C. 480.	A.D. 1820.
<p><i>Spring and Summer</i>.—Persians march through Thrace and Macedonia against Greece.</p> <p><i>Summer</i>.—Battles of Thermopylæ and Artemisium.</p> <p><i>Sept. or Oct.</i>—Battle of Salamis.</p>	<p>Ali Pasha revolts against the Sultan, and invites the Greeks to join him.</p> <p><i>Summer</i>.—Turkish troops advance against him by Thermopylæ.</p> <p><i>Sept.</i>—Siege of Yanina.</p> <p><i>Oct.</i>—Greek islanders call in their ships.</p> <p><i>Nov.</i>—Suliot Greeks raise the standard of insurrection.</p>

parallel between the two; which to myself at least appears quite to deserve observation.

The progress and successful issue of the Greek insurrection is well known. An irruption of the Persian Prince Royal into the Asiatic provinces of Turkey in 1821,<sup>1</sup> and then in 1822, favoured it. Moldavia and Wallachia were indeed reduced. But in the Morea the Greeks held the country, the Turks being shut up in the fortresses; and a Turkman army of near 30,000, that entered to re-conquer it, having been destroyed in 1822 in detail, the freedom of the peninsula was nearly completed by the insurgents. By sea the islander Greeks emulated their ancestors of Salamis and Mycale; and, attended with almost uniform success, encountered and vanquished the superior Turkish and Egyptian fleets, especially in the battles of September 1824.<sup>2</sup>—Meanwhile the sympathies of Western Christendom were awakened in behalf of their brother Christians struggling for independence; above all after the dreadful massacres made by the Turkish admiral in the conquest of Scio.<sup>3</sup> And, just when at length the tide of success had been turned by the Egyptian armament of Ibrahim Pasha against them,<sup>4</sup> and the Morea was again all but subjected by him, the united fleets of England, France, and Russia, in contravention of all their usual principles of policy, interposed in the Greek favour; attacked and destroyed the Turco-Egyptian fleets in the battle of Navarino, Sept. 1827; and so both saved Greece, and, by destroying the Turkish

B.C. 479.	A.D. 1821.
<i>Spring.</i> —Revolt in Thrace against the Persians.	<i>Spring.</i> —General revolt of the Greeks in the Morea, Wallachia, Moldavia, and the islands.
<i>Sept. or Oct.</i> —Battle of Plataea, and deliverance of Greece.	<i>Oct. 5.</i> —Capture of Tripolizza, and liberation of the Peloponnesus.

<sup>1</sup> It was at the close of the summer of 1821 that the Prince Royal first advanced into Turkey, by way of Van on the Euphrates, as far as Bayazid; and the next summer again, nearly as far as Erzeroum, having defeated an opposing army of 50,000 Turks. In either case his further progress was stopped by the cholera breaking out fearfully in his army.

<sup>2</sup> “In the engagements of the 16th, 18th, 26th, and 30th September the Turks are said to have lost twelve frigates, twenty brigs, and more than eighty transports.”—Annual Register for 1825.

<sup>3</sup> In 1822.

<sup>4</sup> Ibrahim first landed in Greece, on the Sultan's requisition, in 1825.

fleet, prepared the way for other disasters quickly to follow on that devoted empire.

For,—not to dwell on the awful scene of the massacre of the Janizaries at Constantinople, whereby, in the vain hope of reforming and so resuscitating the Turkish military power, the Sultan swept away some 30,000 of those troops whose ancestors had been to the Porte its chief arm of victory,<sup>1</sup>—I say, not to dwell on this, the scourge of the most disastrous *foreign war* was added by its own infatuation to all its other woes. “Quem Deus vult perdere prius dementat.” The Sultan appealed to the fanaticism of the Moslem population against Russia: and in 1828 insulted Russia declared war.<sup>2</sup> From the Caucasian frontier of the Russian dominion in the *East* Prince Paskewitch pressed on his victorious career to Erzeroum. From the *North* Count Diebitch, after a primary less successful campaign, in a second in 1829 took the entrenched camp of Schumla on the Danube; crossed the Balkan; entered Adrianople; and, in spite of the unfurling of the Prophet’s banner against him, threatened the immediate investment of the Turkish capital. The prophetic saying was in many a mouth, (whether correctly, or incorrectly, as an application of the prophecy,<sup>3</sup>) “And tidings out of the North and out of the East shall trouble him.” The ambassadors however interposed, and peace was made.—But it was a peace by the articles of which the drying up of the Euphratean Turkman flood greatly progressed. Freedom was secured by it from the Turkish yoke to the Christian principalities of Wallachia and Moldavia, under Russian Protectorate; the independence of *Servia* also assured, and not a Turk permitted to reside North of the Danube. This was in October, 1829.—Moreover, that same year, a French army of

<sup>1</sup> July 15, 1826.—The Janizaries had revolted on the Sultan’s attempting to force on them the Nizam Djedid, or new system of military discipline: on which they were surrounded in the square of the Etmeidan, massacred by discharges of grape-shot; and, on their retiring to their barracks, the barracks set on fire, and cannon-ading continued against them through the whole night following, until there remained no more victims or fuel for the one and the other. “The next morning,” says Mr. Walsh, “presented a frightful scene of burning ruins slaked in blood;—a huge mass of mangled flesh and smoking ashes.” Walsh’s Narrative quoted by Keith ii. 344.

<sup>2</sup> April, 1828.

<sup>3</sup> Dan. xi. 44.—I shall in the next Part of my Work, “On things future,” not omit to give my exposition of this prophecy.

40,000, having landed on the African coast, and defeated an equal force of Turks and Arabs, took Algiers; converted the Turkish province into a colony of France; and so, in that distant quarter also, dried up another of the sources of the Turkish power.<sup>1</sup>

And then followed *the rebellion of the great Egyptian Pasha, Mehemet Ali*. The French invasion of Egypt first prepared him for it; as having taught him the superiority of European discipline, and led him to the formation of a regular army. Again, his co-operation in the re-subjugation of Greece, to which the Sultan had commissioned him, helped forward the issue. For, though unsuccessful in its primary object, through the intervention of the great Christian powers, the war served both to exercise and discipline his army, and also to show its superiority to the less regular troops of the Sultan. Thus, very soon after the Russian war had ended, the Pasha asserted his independence; attacked and conquered Syria; and defeated the Sultan's armies sent against him in three great battles, of Hems, of Nezib, and of Iconium.<sup>2</sup>—The interference of the ambassadors of Christendom was again successful in warding off the danger, and preventing the victorious army from marching on Constantinople:—in which case resistance seemed hopeless, and the Turkish empire in all probability must have fallen. And at length, as we have lately seen, England, Russia, Prussia, and Austria,—weary of the state of suspense and peril to the European balance of power, arising from the war between the Sultan and his revolted vassal,—interposed with their own armaments in the Sultan's favour; drove the Egyptians out of Syria, took Acre, and forced back the Pasha within his proper Pashalic.<sup>3</sup>—Yet Egypt, though now again nominally dependent on the Turkish Sultan, remains conscious as before of the strength of independence, and yields him but a divided allegiance. The

<sup>1</sup> So Keith, ii. 346—349.

<sup>2</sup> The dates stand thus:—A.D. 1832, May, Ibrahim Pasha takes Acre: June 7, war declared by Sultan Mahmud against Mehemet Ali: June 25, defeat of Turks in the battle of Hazib, or Hems, near Aleppo: 1833, January, defeat of Turks at Iconium.

<sup>3</sup> In the autumn of 1840.

Euphratean flood, which three centuries ago overflowed Egypt,<sup>1</sup> has there too been drying up.

Once more, there were manifested from time to time very strikingly, during this period, the *depopulating judgments of God himself*. Depopulation had indeed been long silently going on in the empire, from the Turkish anti-social habits of vice and polygamy, and their political oppression and misrule. But I speak now of other and additional causes; of *earthquake, famine, and pestilence*.—In 1822 happened the great Syrian *earthquake*, in which the walls of Aleppo the Syrian capital were thrown down, and 14,000 buried in the ruins: and at Antioch, and other towns and villages in the province, the sufferings and loss of life were in proportion.<sup>2</sup>—Near about the same time (A.D. 1821) the *cholera* broke out at Bussora, and carried off some 16,000 persons,—near a fourth of its population: then, ascending the Tigris to Bagdad, swept away, it is said, one-third of *its* inhabitants: and then in 1822 advanced into Asia Minor, Syria, and Egypt, with a similarly fearful mortality everywhere attending it.<sup>3</sup>—The *plague* at the same time was taking its usual part in the wasting of the Turkish population; and, besides it, other extraordinary and mysterious epidemics. From the cities of Mecca and Bagdad, more especially, the cry was heard of desolation. In the Bombay Gazette of August, 1831, the report is given that *Mecca and Medina* had been completely depopulated by a dreadful disease, of which the nature was unknown; that it broke out in the May preceding, when the Mahommedan pilgrims were collected at Mecca; that 50,000 had been carried off by it, and among them the Governor of that Holy City of the Mussulmans.<sup>4</sup>—Yet again, in *Bagdad*, the city of Seleucus and of the Caliphs,—there where the Turk received his commission, and whence he issued on his course of destruction against apostatized Christendom,—the commission of the destroying angel had been as awfully severe: 50,000 of the inhabitants having perished by the *plague*. To the horrors of disease there were

<sup>1</sup> Dan. xi. 40, 42: "He shall enter into the countries, and shall overflow and pass over; . . . and the land of Egypt shall not escape."

<sup>2</sup> Keith 341.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid. 367.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid. 369.

here added the desolation of the *flood* and of the *sword*. The missionaries Groves, Parnell, and Kitto, then resident in Bagdad on their self-denying mission of love, thus wrote the sad and affecting story. "The plague prevailing to a fearful extent among the inhabitants, part of them attempted to escape into the country: but they were arrested by a sudden inundation of the Tigris, by which numbers perished; and the rest were driven back into the city. . . . When at length it pleased God to stay the hand of the destroying angel, it was found that out of 80,000 human beings not more than 25,000 survived." Then followed God's judgment of the sword. "The plague had scarce ceased, and the waters subsided, when troops arrived in the name of the Sultan to depose the Pasha; and *fierce and bloody contests* succeeded." So again another Letter, bearing date Bagdad, April 23, 1831. "Surely every principle of desolation is operating in the midst of the Ottoman . . . empire;—*plagues, earthquakes, and civil wars*. The Pasha's palace is left open, without a soul to take care of anything. His stud of beautiful Arab horses are running about the streets." "May 5. Inquire where you will, the answer is, The city is desolate."<sup>1</sup>—With regard even to *Constantinople*, the glorious capital of the Ottoman Empire, Mr. Walsh, the Chaplain of the British Embassy, resident there during the period referred to from 1821 to 1831, thus writes. "Within the last twenty years Constantinople has lost more than half its population. Two conflagrations happened while I was in Constantinople, and destroyed 15,000 houses. The Russian and Greek wars were a constant drain on the Janizaries of the capital. The silent operation of the plague is continually active, though not always alarming. It will be no exaggeration to say that, within the period mentioned, from 300,000 to 400,000 have been prematurely swept away in this one city in Europe, by causes which were not operating in any other,—*conflagration, pestilence, and civil commotion*."<sup>2</sup>

On the whole, it must strike even the most careless observer, that from the epoch of the year 1820, the exhaustion of the Turkish power, and drying up of the flood with which

<sup>1</sup> Keith 368.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. 362.



for near 400 years it had inundated half Christendom, has been going on with a rapidity beyond what any sober mind could à priori have anticipated:—Moldavia, Wallachia, Greece, Algiers, all having now emerged from it as Christian principalities or provinces, and the Christian (professedly Christian) population in them become again dominant.—Nor has the drying up yet ceased. East and West, North and South, rebellions of pashas and insurrections of people are rife or threatening; and everywhere the process of internal decay and depopulation goes on.<sup>1</sup> The Persian and Curd from the East, and, yet more observantly, the Russian and French, look on, and watch the process. It is evident that nothing supports what remains of the once mighty power of Turkey, but the policy of the Princes of Christendom.<sup>2</sup> And how much longer will even that be able to effect its object?<sup>3</sup> How much longer the Russians from the North, and French from the West and South, exercise forbearance? Most truly, said the “Times” in 1853 on this subject, “The power of the Turks over their European territories is ebbing as steadily as the tide.”<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The Mahomedan power has also been manifestly drying up in other countries, as in Persia, Bokhara, and Afghanistan.

<sup>2</sup> In 1843 so near seemed the end of the Turkish empire that more than one prophetic expositor, e. g. Habershon, speculated on a calculation and dating of “*the hour month day and year*,” of the Apocalyptic prophecy, from the taking of Constantinople; as if intended to mark not so much the period of the Turkman’s earlier course of conquest, but rather the appointed time for the Turks retaining their capital and empire: and, agreeably with this calculation, numbering 391 or 396 years (the equivalent of the Apocalyptic period, according as the year might be reckoned as of 360, or of 365 days) from 1453, the date of the fall of Constantinople, looked to 1844, or else 1849, as the year of their fall.

In my earlier Editions, while expressing my conviction of the correctness of the historic solution given by me, Vol. i. pp. 524—532, of the prophetic period, as terminating with the Turk’s capture of Constantinople,\* I observed that it was possible that the other might possibly be also additionally intended: and that, if so, time would soon show. But 1844, and then 1849, past successively before the publication of my 4th Edition, without the expected destruction of the Turkish empire.

<sup>3</sup> As I revise this for my 5th Edition in 1861, how frequent and anxious continues to be the asking of this question about “the sick man!”

<sup>4</sup> No. for Mar. 7, 1853.

\* *ἡτοιμασμένοι εἰς τὴν ὥραν καὶ ἡμέραν καὶ μῆνα καὶ ἐνιαυτὸν, ἵνα ἀποκτείνωσι τὸ τρίτον τῶν ἀνθρώπων.* The *killings*, being a momentary act, cannot *properly*, I conceive, have subjoined to it a period of duration, expressive of the time *during* which the killing is to have effect. If exceptions here and there seem to occur to the rule in sentences not very dissimilar from the present,—e. g. in Luke xiii. 16, *ἦν ἐδῆσεν ὁ Σατανας ἰδοὺ δεκά καὶ ὀκτὼ ἐτη*, “Satan hath bound, or kept bound, these eighteen years;” and again, Apoc. xx. 2, *καὶ ἐδῆσεν αὐτὸν χίλια ἐτη*, “He bound him for (i. e. to continue bound for) one thousand years;”—it should be observed that the *εἰς* is not in these passages.

## § 3. THE KINGS FROM THE SUN-RISING.

But who the KINGS FROM THE SUN-RISING,<sup>1</sup> whose way is to be prepared by this drying up of the symbolic overflow of the Euphrates? And what the character and result of their movement of advance, on the way thus prepared for them?—This is a question which, as having reference to events as yet unfulfilled and future, might seem rather to belong to the vith and last Part of my Work, than to that which we are now unfolding. Connected however as it is, and in but one brief clause, with the prediction of the sixth Vial, it may perhaps be as well not to pass it by: especially considering that it will not long detain us.

The reader is doubtless familiar with the predictive clause as one most generally explained of *the restoration of the Jews to their own land*, following on the decay and fall of the Turkish empire:<sup>2</sup> an explanation to which the recent political changes, and present troubled aspect of things, in Syria and Palestine,<sup>3</sup> must be allowed to have lent not only a new interest, but perhaps also an increased probability. Yet I must confess that, though à priori inclined to the same view of the prophecy, and still almost wishing it to be the true one, I cannot on investigation find clear Scripture warrant to support it. For, first, the Jews are nowhere represented by inspired prophecy to be so concentrated in eastern countries at the close of their dispersion, as to be a people gathered therefore emphatically from the *East*. Each point of the compass is depicted as alike at that time a locality of Jewish movement and emigration.

<sup>1</sup> *απο ανατολης ηλιου*. The reader must remember that the preposition *απο*, *from*, here precedes the genitive; so that the authorized translation is evidently incorrect, "Kings of the East." It is also to be observed that the word *ηλιου* is added, perhaps emphatically, to the *ανατολης*; which latter word is often used by itself to signify the East.

<sup>2</sup> This is the explanation of *Mede* and *Brightman*. *Bishop Newton* gives it as an alternative; "Whether by the Kings of the East be meant the *Jews* in particular, or any Eastern potentates in general." *Mr. Cuninghame*, the representative of one class of modern interpreters, inclines to the same explanation; *Mr. Burgh*, the representative of another, fully embraces it.

<sup>3</sup> This was written originally in 1843; and certainly now, in 1861, as I am passing my 5th Edition through the press, the *interest* of the prophecy on this account has not diminished.

“The Lord,” it is said, “shall set his hand again the second time, to recover the remnant of his people which shall be left, from Assyria, and from Egypt, and from Pathros, and from Cush, and from Elim, and from Shinar, and from Hamath, and from the islands of the sea. And he shall set up an ensign for the nations, and shall assemble the outcasts of Israel, and gather together the dispersed of Judah, *from the four corners of the earth.*” And again: “I will bring thy seed from the *East*, and gather thee from the *West*: I will say to the *North*, Give up, and to the *South*, Keep not back: bring my sons from far, and my daughters from the ends of the earth.” So wrote Isaiah;<sup>1</sup> and other prophets too similarly describe the matter.<sup>2</sup> Besides that the now existing state of things agrees well, and only, with this view of the case:—I refer to the wonderful fact of the universal dispersion of the Jewish people still continuing, as before, in every quarter and country of the globe.<sup>3</sup>—Again the Jews, at the time of their final restoration, and on their way to, and first re-establishment in, their own land, are not spoken of in prophecy as *kings*. Rather the contrary. “Go,” says the prefigurative voice in Isaiah, “Go, ye swift messengers, to a *nation scattered and peeled, a nation meted out and trodden down:*”<sup>4</sup> and Zephaniah,

<sup>1</sup> Isa. xi. 11, 12; xliii. 5, 6. And so elsewhere, xlix. 12: “Behold, these shall come from far; and, lo, these from the North and from the West, and these from the land of Sinim.”

<sup>2</sup> E. g. l’salm cvii. 3; “And gathered them out of the lands, from the East and from the West, from the North and from the South:” Zech. viii. 7; “Behold, I will save my people from the East country, and from the West country; and I will bring them, and they shall dwell in the midst of Jerusalem:” also Deut. xxx. 3; &c. &c.

On one of the above quoted prophecies of Isaiah, viz. xi. 11, Jerome thus comments: “Ac, ne solum *orientales* populos significare videatur (Esaias), jungit et reliqua, ‘*et ab insulis maris.*’ Insulis autem maris *occidentalem* plagam significat, quæ oceani ambitu clauditur.” And Bishop Horsley, on the same passage, after citing Jerome, observes that Jerome does thus by anticipation confute “the senseless criticism of Mr. White,” to the effect that “the prophet mentions no return of the Jews from England, Holland, and Germany.”

<sup>3</sup> The only possible way that I can see of overcoming this objection to the Jewish application of the prophetic clause before us, is by reference to their original calling from the East in the person of Abraham the father of the Jewish people. In Isaiah xli. 2 we read; “Who raised up the righteous man *from the East*, (lit. *the sunrise*, as here,) called him to his foot, gave the nations before him, and made him ruler over kings?” where *the righteous man* is explained by some expositors indeed as designating Cyrus, but by others as designating *Abraham*. So A. Clarke, &c. If so the exaltation predicted of him would be explicable by reference to the triumph and elevation of his descendants, Moses, Joshua, David, Solomon.

<sup>4</sup> Isa. xviii. 2. The prophecy is obscure; but it is, I believe, now very commonly

“ I will leave in the midst of thee *an afflicted and poor people*; and they shall trust in the name of the Lord.”<sup>1</sup> Nor does the circumstance of their *subsequent* superiority and religious eminence, under the millennial dispensation, (if such they are to enjoy,—a question for subsequent discussion,) seem to justify their being called kings, on this presumed mention of them, with reference to a time before the restoration has begun. It is their Gentile gatherers and nursing-fathers that have the appellation of kings distinctively given them in prophecy, up to the time of the completion of the restoration of the Jewish people.<sup>2</sup>

Of other explanations of the clause, ancient or modern, there does not seem to me to be any one so probable *primâ facie* as to call for particular inquiry and discussion.<sup>3</sup> I

explained as above, with reference to *the outcasts of Israel*, on the eve of their re-gathering. See especially Bishop Horsley's full and learned Dissertation on it.

<sup>1</sup> Zeph. iii. 12.

<sup>2</sup> “ Thus saith the Lord God; I will lift up my hand to the Gentiles, . . . and they shall bring thy sons in their arms, and thy daughters shall be carried on their shoulders: and *kings* shall be thy nursing-fathers, and *their queens* thy nursing-mothers.” Isa. xlix. 22, 23.

Mr. Faber (S. C. iii. 288—290), admitting the force of the objection against the *Jews* being the parties meant, from the fact of their universal dispersion, would explain the Apocalyptic prediction of the *ten* tribes distinctively, whom he supposes to be still, as of old, in Central Asia, beyond the Euphrates. But are the two *tribes of Judah* then to be excluded from the restoration? or those of them only to participate in it who, as Faber says, “ may have wandered far into central Asia?”

<sup>3</sup> Of the ancient fathers *Primasius* takes the clause as if written in the singular, *King from the East*, and explains it of Christ; “ Ut præpararetur via venienti Regi ab oriente sole; id est Christo, (de quo legimus, ‘ Ecce vir; oriens nomen ejus,’\*) cui venturo ad judicandum via præparatur:” the Euphrates (I suppose as the river of the mystic Babylon) signifying “ homines immundos,” its drying up the exhaustion of all good out of it, and so its preparation for judgment.” B. P. M. x. 324. Similarly *Ambrose Ansbert*, expressly understanding the *Euphrates* mystically as the river of the antichristian Babylon, † explains its *drying up* of the diminution of that Babylon's power for opposition to the truth; and that the *Kings from the East* signify *Christian preachers*, commissioned from Christ the Sun of Righteousness, for whom an opening is thus made; and who are called *kings*, from their zeal in ruling both themselves and the Church. B. P. M. xiii. 580. *Andreas* interprets it of kings coming from the East to take part, as actors and sufferers, in the slaughters of the great day of slaughter:—perhaps, he says, Gog and Magog from Scythia; perhaps Antichrist out of Dan's tribe from Eastern Persia. B. P. M. v. 618. And so too *Aretas*.

Of the later Protestant expositors *Vitringa*, (pp. 968—973,) (somewhat like Ans-

\* Zech. iii. 8. “ Behold my servant *the Branch*,” is in the Septuagint, Ἰδὲ ἔγω εἶμι τὸν ἄκρον μου Ἀνατολήν.

† Mr. Jukes published a Pamphlet in advocacy of the same solution, just as I was revising this passage for my 2nd Edition. But most strangely he takes no notice of the usual explanation of the *Euphratean Horsemen* of the 6th Trumpet as meant of the *Turks*; which is the very foundation for the *Turkish* application of the *Euphratean flood* in this 6th Vial.—He seems too to have forgotten that Papal Rome is in the Apocalypse figured not only as the mystic *Babylon*, but as the mystic *Sodom*, and mystic *Egypt*, also: in which last view indeed it is chiefly regarded during the five first *Vial-plagues*; these being like the plagues of *Egypt*.

shall therefore at once proceed to state what I incline to think may be inferred from the context as its simple meaning. We have already seen, and shall soon have to recur to the fact, that *the opening of the temple-gate*, on the Apocalyptic scene,<sup>1</sup> was one of the notable concomitants of the sounding of the seventh Trumpet; and explained it of the opening of the Church, (the *Reformed Church*, it is to be observed,<sup>2</sup>) and discovery to the world of the holy mysteries, and divine tutelary presence, which its *ark* symbolized. Further, in a passage which will constitute one of the subjects of my next following Chapter, we read of a song of certain of God's faithful servants, some way chronologically connected with the æra and events of the Vials, one clause of which thus anticipates the coming future: "For *all nations shall come and worship Thee*; for thy judgments have been made manifest." With which their anticipations as to the conversion of the heathens at this time of the end to Christianity, and the confluence of its princes and people to worship in the Christian temple, all prophecy agrees. "The kings of Tarshish and of the isles shall bring presents; the kings of Sheba and Seba shall offer gifts: yea, all kings shall fall down before Him; all nations shall serve Him."<sup>3</sup> Who does not recall a hundred predications of similar import?—Now it is almost needless to say that *Mahomedism*, reigning and supreme, has been the most formidable obstruction to the Christianization of the *Eastern world*; that is, in the symbolic phraseology of the

bertus,) preferring to understand the Euphrates, which was the Eastern frontier defence of the old Roman empire, *mystically*, applies it to *France*, as the greatest bulwark and defence of the New Testament Babylon, or Popedom; by whose drying up, he thinks, a way would be made for the advance of kings illuminated by the light of the Gospel.—*Daubuz*, (pp. 710—712,) in whose system this Vial strangely precedes the 6th Trumpet, explains the drying up of the Euphrates of the exhaustion of the power of the Byzantine or Greek empire, especially on its Eastern frontier, by intestine wars, famine, pestilence, &c.; so as to prepare a way for the Othman Turks getting entrance within the precincts of the corrupted Church, and pulling down the Greek monarchy.—And, just of late, one work has been published which explains the kings to mean the *East India Company*, as the greatest present power in the East: and another which explains them of *Nestorian Christians* in Kurdistan; the descendants, Dr. Asahel Grant thinks, of the ten tribes.

<sup>1</sup> See p. 336 Note <sup>4</sup> *suprà*, and p. 463 Note <sup>4</sup> *infrà*.

<sup>2</sup> The temple (*ναός*) was spoken of previously (xi. 2) as solemnly reformed: and its Paganized outer court, being then cast out by St. John under Divine direction, seems thenceforth no more to have been recognised in the Apocalyptic visions as a part of the *ναός*.

<sup>3</sup> Psalm lxxii. 10, 11.

Apocalypse, to its entering within the opened gates of the Temple, and worshipping:—or, again, that the *Turkish power* has been the greatest bulwark to the Mahomedan religion. By its law, till quite of late, it was death to a Mussulman to apostatize from his faith, and become Christian; and examples not a few, even in recent times, have occurred to illustrate it.<sup>1</sup> Besides that the furious popular bigotry against such conversions, in all but a few of the more Europeanized parts of the Empire, still continues. What then so signal a removal of obstructions to the Christianization of a great part of the East as the drying up of the flood of the Turkman host and power? What so notable a preparation of the way for princes and peoples from the East, like the Magi from the sunrising of old,<sup>2</sup> to come to the Christian temple, and enter, and worship?<sup>3</sup>

Such seems to me a sufficient and not improbable explanation of the clause. Whether the *Jew* may not have part in the movement and conversion to Christianity, so facilitated, and (if so) what and when, will be a question for subsequent discussion.<sup>4</sup> There are other prophecies that strongly point to such an issue.—And indeed if the phrase, “kings from the East,” be meant in the simply *figurative* sense of

<sup>1</sup> A case was brought under the author's own observation, while in Greece before the Greek Revolution, of a Mussulman (once a Christian), on conviction of the truth of Christianity, preparing to make a public confession of his faith, and to suffer martyrdom. A little after, as a friend and fellow-traveller was passing by the great square of Smyrna, the head of one who had made the confession, and could not be induced by the Cadhi to retract it, was rolled, all bleeding from the block of execution, before the feet of his horse.—Doubtless many of the readers of this Work will remember the similar case of the Arabian *Abdallah*, so touchingly and beautifully related in Dr. Buchanan's “Star in the East:” when, as *Sabat*, his former friend but betrayer, described it, “All Bokhara seemed to say, What new thing is this?” (So written in 1843.)

The Sultan's repeal of the law referred to, March 1844, in favour of *Christian apostates*, the result of conscious weakness in his relation to the Christian powers, has furnished a striking illustration of my remarks, since my first Edition. See on this the diplomatic Papers, and some interesting illustrations of the subject, in the Appendix, No. ii., to Bickersteth on the Prophecies; 7th Ed.

<sup>2</sup> Matt. ii. 1, *μαγοι απο ανατολων.*

<sup>3</sup> Since the above was sketched out I have seen a somewhat similar explanation both of the opening of the *symbolic temple* in the Apocalyptic scene, and of the *preparing of the way of the kings from the East*, in the Critici Sacri, Vol. ix. On the first, Zegerus writes:—“Per hoc significatur quod verum et spirituale templum Dei, apertis mysteriis, toto mundo cuperit reserari et ostendi; ut Dominus à cunctis possit gentibus adorari.” On the second; “Significatur apertam esse viam omnibus liberè eurrendi ad Christum.” The *occasion*, however, supposed by Zeger to be represented, is that of the opening of the Gospel to Gentiles, as well as Jews, in the *apostolic times*.

<sup>4</sup> In my with Part.

*light-bearing*, (as very possibly it may,) then the prophetic clause so explained may have reference to them also. But, in that case, should other predicted *light-bearing kings*,<sup>1</sup>—I mean of course those noted in Apoc. xx. 4,—be past over?

## CHAPTER VIII.

THE OPENING TO VIEW OF THE REFORMED CHURCH, AND  
MISSIONARY ACTS AND ANTICIPATIONS OF THE FAITHFUL  
IN IT, DURING THE VIALS' OUTPOURING.

BUT what as regards *Christ's evangelic Church* throughout all this period of the Vial judgments; a Church which, of course, with God's own assured safeguard around it, could no more fail or be destroyed, during their progress, than during the Beast's 1260 years of supremacy and tyrannic oppression, before them? On this point, including alike the fact of its continuance, its state, and its actings, intimations were given to the Evangelist alike in the pre-figurations of the *Part within written* of the Apocalyptic, and those supplemental to the former in the *Part without written*. It will be well, I think, to place these side by side in their chronological parallelism:—a parallelism of which the proof was already drawn out at the commencement of this Part V. of my Commentary;<sup>2</sup> and concerning which it may suffice here to remind the reader that the epoch of the 7th Trumpet in the one (of which the Vials were the unfolding) was stated to be that of the hour of God's wrath and judgment against the corrupters of the earth; and the same of the epoch of the two successive Angels' flying forth in the other to preach the everlasting gospel, and to raise the anticipative cry of triumph and warning against the corrupting Papal Babylon, as foredoomed and falling.<sup>3</sup> It is this latter vision of the *Part without* that I shall primarily discuss, as being the more

<sup>1</sup> Compare Apoc. vii. 2; where however, being said of an angel rising from the eastern *sky*, the phrase might more naturally be so taken.

<sup>2</sup> See pp. 328—333 *suprà*.

<sup>3</sup> The chronologic parallelism of the vision of the gospel-bearing Angel with the æra of the 7th Trumpet appears from its very position in the prophecy: placed as it is between the general figuration of Christ's true Church of the 144,000 during the

simple; then that which was first express more plainly, at the sounding of the 7th Trumpet, and afterwards at the out-pouring of the Vials more fully, but also more enigmatically, in the *Part within*.

PART WITHIN WRITTEN.

“And there were great voices in heaven [i. e. on the seventh Angel sounding], saying, ‘The sovereignty<sup>1</sup> of the world hath become our Lord’s, and his Christ’s, and he shall reign for ever and ever.’<sup>2</sup> . . . And the temple of God was opened in heaven; and there was seen the ark of his covenant in the temple.” Apoc. xi. 15, 19.

“And I saw another sign in heaven great and marvellous; seven angels having the last plagues; for in them is filled up the wrath of God.—And I saw as it were a glassy sea,<sup>3</sup> mingled with fire; and those that were victors over the Beast,<sup>4</sup> and over his image, and over the number of his name, standing on (or *by*)<sup>5</sup> the glassy sea, having harps of God. And they sing the song of Moses the servant of God, and the song of the Lamb: saying, ‘Great and wonderful are thy works, O Lord God Almighty: true and just are thy ways, thou King of nations (or of ages):<sup>6</sup> who shall not fear, O Lord, and glorify thy name? For thou only art holy: for all the nations shall come, and shall worship before thee: for thy judgments<sup>7</sup> have been made manifest.’—And after these things I beheld, and the temple of the tabernacle of the testimony was opened in heaven. And the seven angels went forth that had the seven plagues. . . And the temple was filled with smoke from the glory of the Lord. And no one was able to enter into the temple till the seven plagues of the seven angels were fulfilled.” Apoc. xv. 1—8.

PART WITHOUT WRITTEN.

“And I saw another Angel flying in mid-heaven; having the everlasting gospel to preach to them that dwell on the earth,<sup>8</sup> and unto every nation and kindred and tongue and people: saying with a loud voice, Fear God, and give glory to Him; for the hour of his judgment<sup>9</sup> is come: and worship Him that made heaven, and earth, and sea, and the fountains of waters.

“And another Angel followed, saying, Babylon the great is fallen, which made all the nations to drink of the wine of the spirit<sup>10</sup> of her fornication.”<sup>11</sup> Apoc. xiv. 6—8.

1260 years of the Papal Beast’s reign in triumph, (a state, we saw, of insulation, even after the loud symphonizing of princes and people in the new song of the Reformation,) and the vision of the third flying Angel (Apoc. xiv. 9), announcing the near impending judgment of fire on the Beast and his votaries.

<sup>1</sup> Ἡ βασιλεια. So, we have seen, the best critical editions.

<sup>2</sup> There here intervenes the eucharistic song of the 24 elders, about God’s taking to himself his great power, and reigning, and judging the nations, and the time having come for the judging of the dead, and rewarding of God’s servants.

<sup>3</sup> ὡς θαλασσαν ὑαλινην not ὑαλου, of glass.

<sup>4</sup> τους νικωντας εκ του θηριου a phrase observed on afterwards.

<sup>5</sup> επι την θαλασσαν observed on afterwards.

<sup>6</sup> εθνων so, as before observed, A, C:—αιωνων so C:—not ἀγιωτα.

<sup>7</sup> τα δικαιωματα σου.

<sup>8</sup> This is alike the meaning of the τους κατοικουντας in the received text, and τους καθημενους, as read in the critical Editions. <sup>9</sup> κρισεως. <sup>10</sup> θυμον.

<sup>11</sup> The critical Editions omit ἡ πολις after *Babylon*; and also the second επεσε.



I. Turning then to the passage in Apoc. xiv., what, we ask, was its primary symbol? It was that of an Angel flying through mid-heaven, having the everlasting gospel to preach both to them that dwelt on the Apocalyptic earth, and to every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people; a symbolic vision of which the intent seems abundantly too plain to be mistaken. It figured surely some remarkable æra of wide-spread evangelic missions, and gospel-preaching. Not an æra, let it be first observed, of mere missions and preaching of *so-called* Christian doctrine, but of "*the everlasting gospel*:"—a phrase in which the absence of the Greek article before the word rendered *gospel* might indicate perhaps that it was an actual *Book of the Gospel*,<sup>1</sup> or *New Testament*, that the Angel appeared bearing in hand to preach; and the epithet *everlasting*, its having been ever marvellously preserved by Divine Providence, through all the darkness, irreligion, and hostility of past ages. Not an æra, observe again, of gospel-preaching so limited as was the commission before given to St. John, when figuring the leaders of the Reformation in his symbolic character, "Thou must prophesy before *many* kings and nations;"<sup>2</sup> but one absolutely *universal*, to "*every* nation and kindred and tongue and people under heaven:"—the Angel's *flying* on the commission being further an indication probably of its rapid accomplishment.—As to the tenor of the visionary Angel's address, it signified a mixture in the prefigured preaching of solemn warning and appeal, with the persuasions and invitations of the gospel; by reference not only to the fact of God's judgments being on the earth, (the second Angel calling special notice to those on Babylon,) but to that also of the time of heathen ignorance that God

<sup>1</sup> Bishop Middleton ad loc. remarks that our translators, in saying, "*the everlasting Gospel*," have said more than the original; which is simply *εχοντα ευαγγελιον αιωνιον*. Compare the inarthrous use of *βιβλιον*, when signifying a volume, Luke iv. 17; *επειδουθη αυτη βιβλιον Ησαιου του προφητου*: also 2 Kings xxii. 8; *βιβλιων του νομου ευρον εν οικη Κυριου*. And so *του βιβλιαριδιου*, Apoc. x. 2.

<sup>2</sup> Apoc. x. 11. See my Vol. ii. p. 179.

winked at having passed away, and of his now at length entering into communication and controversy with the before unapproached heathen nations.<sup>1</sup>—So was this vision of the two out-flying Angels in harmony with, and indeed illustrative of, the emblematic vision of the opened temple in the other prophetic vision next to be considered: for it was a voice telling that God's gospel-church was open to men; and both by hope and fear urging all to enter.

II. In Apoc. xi. 15, &c., we read that, on the seventh Trumpet's sounding, voices loud and joyful were heard by St. John in heaven, (the firmamental political heaven probably,)<sup>2</sup> anticipating the establishment of Christ's kingdom on earth, as even then near its accomplishment: also that thereupon the very significant figuration was exhibited before him of the temple (the same out of which St. John himself, in his representative character, had a little before ejected the outer-court worshippers as heathens) opening wide its entrance-gates, just as if in invitation of, and preparation for, the entrance of worshippers: the ark of the covenant within becoming at the same time an object generally recognizable from without<sup>3</sup> on the Apocalyptic scene. A symbol this which (as before said)<sup>4</sup> seems only explicable as figuring the Reformed Protestant Church's opening wide

<sup>1</sup> So Acts xvii. 30; "The times of that ignorance God winked at: but now God commandeth every man everywhere to repent; for He hath appointed a day in which He will judge the world in righteousness:" said on the first preaching of the Gospel to the Gentiles.

<sup>2</sup> See p. 334, Note <sup>3</sup> *supra*.

<sup>3</sup> To St. John himself the ark seems always to have been in sight.

<sup>4</sup> *Ἡνοίγη ὁ ναὸς τῆς σκηνῆς τοῦ μαρτυρίου*. The word *ναὸς*, or *temple*, is sometimes used more largely of the *whole* temple, including the altar-court; as xi. 1, 2, "Measure the temple and the altar, and them that worship in it, but the court that is without the temple (i. e. the Gentile court), cast out:"—sometimes more strictly of the Holy Place, or Holy of Holies. It is, I conceive, in the *larger* sense that the word is here used: and so the opening of the temple intended to designate the opening of its doors in the wall of the altar-court, according to the well-known Jewish custom.—See the illustrative quotations from Scripture, Note <sup>4</sup> p. 336; and add to those cited, on the *literal* opening of the Jewish temple-doors, 1 Sam. iii. 15, "Samuel lay till morning, and opened the doors of the house of the Lord." Which door, I conceive, was the *door of the court*; as Samuel was a Levite only, and might not enter the Holy Place. It is elsewhere called frequently the *door of the tabernacle* of the congregation; as Lev. viii. 31, 33, &c. Exod. xxvii. 16. In which latter passage we read that for "the gate of the court" of the tabernacle there was "an hanging of twenty cubits, of blue and purple, &c., with four pillars."—The hanging for the *inner* door of the tabernacle, mentioned Exod. xxvi. 36, that which separated between the court and the Holy Place, was distinct.

its gates, so as never before, in invitation to the multitudes without its pale; and with signs concomitant very striking and manifest of God's truth and presence resting within it, at once its characteristic and its defence.<sup>1</sup> Perhaps too the notice twice made of the temple being so opened *in heaven*, alike in Apoc. xi. 19, on the sounding of the 7th Trumpet, and in Apoc. xv. 5, on the preparation for the outpouring of the Vials in which that Trumpet was developed, (there and there only I believe,) might indicate that it now appeared associated in vision with the heaven of political exaltation.

III. There remains to be considered the figuration of Apoc. xv. 1—8:—a figuration with which the Apocalyptic series *within written*, on resuming its interrupted subject of the seventh Trumpet's primary symbolization of the temple's appearing opened, recommences; and which, both on account of its importance, and on account too of the considerable difficulties that attend it, needs to be examined into with more than usual care.<sup>2</sup>

“And I saw another sign in heaven, seven Angels having the seven last plagues. And I saw as it were a glassy sea mingled with fire, and those that were come off victors<sup>3</sup> over the Beast, and over his image, and over the number of his name, standing on (or *by*) the glassy sea, having harps of God. And they sing the song of Moses, the servant of God, and the song of the Lamb: saying, Great and marvellous are thy works,” &c.—Such is the passage. And in it the particulars to be considered are *the harpers themselves*;—*the glassy sea* (or that which appeared like one) *mingled with*

<sup>1</sup> See p. 336 Note <sup>4</sup> and p. 337 Note <sup>2</sup>. I have observed in the latter Note referred to, that the manifestation of God's glory covering the tabernacle was in defence of his servants Moses and Aaron, as well as in judgment against their enemies.—Compare Isa. iv. 5: “The Lord will create on every dwelling-place of Mount Zion, and upon her assemblies, a cloud and smoke by day, and the shining of a flaming fire by night: for upon all the glory shall be a defence.”

<sup>2</sup> The rather because many commentators, as it seems to me, have very much frittered away its prophetic meaning and value. So the interpreters alluded to p. 465; alike those who explain the harpers in the vision as *the separate spirits of the faithful in Paradise*, and those who explain them as *the living saints translated at Christ's coming*:—interpreted in either of which ways the vision has no force as a prefiguration and portraiture of the true servants of God, living at the particular time referred to, on the scene of Christendom.

<sup>3</sup> νικῶτας ἐκ.

fire ;—and *the song sung by them on (or by) it*, viz. “*the song of Moses, and the song of the Lamb.*”

1. With regard then to *the harpers*, the first thing to be observed is their being distinctively, and alone, those of God’s servants that were *victors over the Beast*; none other of God’s faithful servants being mentioned as united in the scene and the song with them. A consideration this which seems of itself to be almost decisive against all idea of their symbolizing either the separate spirits of the just in Paradise, so as some expositors would have it; <sup>1</sup> or the living saints translated at Christ’s coming, so as others.<sup>2</sup> For alike the saints in their separate Paradisiacal state, and the saints translated, become forthwith part of the great company of the redeemed, including saints of former times, as well as those of the Beast’s time; and their song part and parcel of that of the universal chorus.<sup>3</sup> The harpers, I say, must hence naturally be construed as servants of God living at the time of the vials’ outpouring, and spectators of the judgments contained in them. Such, I am glad to see, is also Vitringa’s view.<sup>4</sup>

And it is a view confirmed by the next point which I would suggest for the reader’s notice; viz. the use of the *present participle νικωντες*, not the *past νικησαντες*, or *νενικηκοτες*, in designation of these harping conquerors. For where *ὁ νικων* is used to designate a conqueror, not *prospectively* or *hypothetically*, so as is not infrequently done in both Holy Scripture<sup>5</sup> and the classics,<sup>6</sup> but after the

<sup>1</sup> E. g. Daubuz, Cuninghame, &c.

<sup>2</sup> E. g. Burgh.

<sup>3</sup> Mr. Cuninghame speaks of “this part of the Church triumphant . . . leading the chorus of the triumphant anthem.” But we read not of others following in it.

<sup>4</sup> Surviving witnesses for the truth he calls them, “qui viderent tandem . . . ultimas vialas divinæ iræ in imperium Antichristi effusas:” adding that there had already been many examples of such witnesses, engaged successfully in conflict with the Beast in England, Scotland, Gaul, Belgium. Vitringa, p. 913.

<sup>5</sup> So, for example, by Christ in speaking of the rewards laid up for saints that continued faithful unto death; *Τῷ νικῶντι δώσω αὐτῷ φαγεῖν ἐκ τοῦ ξύλου τῆς ζωῆς*. Apoc. ii. 7: and again Apoc. xxi. 7. *Ὁ νικῶν κληρονομήσει πάντα*: where the word, being used of a victory only partially begun in life, and to be perfected in death, has evidently very much of a *hypothetical* or *future* signification.

<sup>6</sup> So, e. g. the phrase is used by Pindar, Olymp. i. 157, &c.

Ὁ νικῶν δὲ λοιπὸν ἀμφὶ βίωτον  
ἔχει μελιτοεῖσαν εὐδίαν.

Also in Euripides’ Alcestis 1122, *Νικῶντι συννικᾶς ἐμοί, &c.*

actual gaining of the victory,—I say in such case the present participle will be found applied, if I mistake not, to those only who have but just recently gained it, and especially while still on the field of conflict.<sup>1</sup> The *past* tense is preferred when speaking retrospectively of the victors of other days, who may have in a past, perhaps far distant age, fought and conquered; especially when seen on ground altogether removed from the scene of warfare.<sup>2</sup>—Besides that it hardly accords with Apocalyptic usage, in these prophetic visions, to speak of God's servants as victorious over an earthly enemy, except where victorious over him on the earthly scene, and before the world's eyes :<sup>3</sup>—a case the direct reverse to that of the *earlier* of Christ's saints under the Beast's reign, *in their day and generation*. For of them it is stated, *not* that they then conquered the Beast, *but* that the Beast conquered them :<sup>4</sup> and their *ultimate* predicted victory over the Beast upon this earthly scene, by the Beast's kingdom giving place to their Lord's kingdom, is declared in the very song of the harpers to be an event, at the time symbolized in the vision, still future.<sup>5</sup>

Yet once more there is to be observed in the description of the harpers the use of the preposition *εκ*, after the word

<sup>1</sup> Somewhat as when the reporter in Euripides' *Electra* says, verse 762,

Νικωντ' Ὀρεστην πασιν ἀγγελλω φίλις.

Though here we have not the article prefix, but a noun. And in the *Supplices*, 718 ;

Οὐ γὰρ τὸ νικῶν τοῦτ' ἐκερδαίνειν μόνον'

said of one part of an army which was victorious ; while the still unconcluded battle, in another part of the field, was against it. Similarly Xenoph. *Anab.* i. 10. 4 ; *Ἐνταῦθα εἰσέχον ἀλλήλων βασιλεὺς τε καὶ οἱ Ἕλληες ὡς τριακοντα σταδία· οἱ μὲν διωκόντες τῶς καθ' ἑαυτοῦς, ὡς παντὰς νικῶντες· οἱ δὲ ἀρπαζόντες, ὡς ἤδη παντὰ νικῶντες.* And so *ib.* ii. 1, repeatedly.

In passages like 1 John v. 5, *Τίς ἐστὶν ὁ νικῶν τὸν κόσμον*, "Who is he that *overcometh* the world," said in the *present tense* of *living* Christians, and their actual, though as yet imperfect victory, a *continuous* and *progressive* course of victory is indicated ; very much, I conceive, as in the text.

<sup>2</sup> Compare Apoc. xii. 11, *Αὐτοὶ ἐνίκησαν αὐτὸν διὰ τὸν λόγον τῆς μαρτυρίας αὐτῶν*, said *retrospectively* of the victory of faithful saints departed, in the *arist* ; and Apoc. iii. 21, *Ὡς καγὼ ἐνίκησα*, said by Christ *retrospectively* of his victory in the earthly scene of conflict, also in the *arist*.

<sup>3</sup> So in the song of Apoc. xii. 11, &c., "They *conquered* him by the blood of the Lamb, and by the word of their testimony ;" said of the Christian martyrs killed under Rome Pagan, not till after Christianity had established its supremacy in place of Paganism, through their instrumentality (it was supposed), in the Roman Empire. See p. 32 et seq. *suprà*.

<sup>4</sup> Apoc. xiii. 7, xi. 7.

<sup>5</sup> "For all nations *shall come* and worship before thee."—It is in Apoc. xix. 19, 20, some time after the outpouring of the last Vial, that the victory of the Lamb and his saints over the Beast is represented as taking place.

νικωντας spoken of them, and with the genitive following it; τους νικωντας εκ του θηριου, και εκ της εικονος αυτου, κ.τ.λ. This is a phraseological form which Heinrichs calls a *constructio prægnaus*; and it implies not only *conquest over*, but *separation from*, the party conquered.<sup>1</sup>

So that on the whole it must have appeared, as I conceive, to St. John, that the party figured by the *harpers* were the living representatives, for the time being, of those protesters against the Beast that had been previously depicted as victoriously raised to life and power, in the face and to the terror of the Beast and his adherents: perhaps too in association with the tenth part of the city declared coincidentally to have fallen; that is, in its character of a constituent of the Beast's great city Babylon.<sup>2</sup> For these were the only ones to whom victory over the Beast had been hitherto ascribed in the prophecy: and moreover it was the faithful ones of the body of these self-same politically ascended witnesses that seemed elsewhere described, in contra-distinction to the Beast's followers, as both *followers of the Lamb*, and with *harps* of sacred song in use among them; songs which, however others might fail of it, they at least sang, it was intimated, not with the voice only, but the understanding also.<sup>3</sup>—Thus explained, the reader will not omit to remark the exact contrast in the Apocalyptic designation between the parties subjected to the infliction of the vial-plagues, and these the exempted or saved ones:—the one, living men that had the mark of the Beast, and worshipped his image, τους εχοντας το χαραγμα του θηριου, και τους τη εικονι αυτου προσκυνουντας, in the *present participle*; <sup>4</sup> the other, living men that were victorious separatists from the Beast and his image, τους νικωντας εκ του θηριου και εκ της εικονος αυτου, in the *present participle* also.

<sup>1</sup> “Νικωντας εκ του θηριου” constructio alia inaudita, quæ hoc loco prægnaus videtur, et ita resolvable; νικωντας pro νενικηκotas το θηριου, και σωθεντας εξ αυτου.” So Heinrichs. Of course I do not agree with his explanation of the word νικωντας, as simply tantamount to νενικηκotas; nor indeed does he offer any reasons to justify it.—Similarly writes M. Stuart. “Our English idiom comes very near the sense, *Come off conquerors from the Beast, &c.*” adding that the idiom is very common.

Compare the expression, ου μετενοησαν εκ των εργαων των χειρων αυτων, Apoc. ix. 20 and xvi. 11, where there is the same idea of separation implied: also the similar use of the preposition απο in passages like Luke vii. 21; εθεραπευσε πολλους απο νοσων.

<sup>2</sup> Apoc. xi. 11—13.

<sup>3</sup> Apoc. xiv. 1—5.

<sup>4</sup> Apoc. xvi. 2.

2. We have to consider the *scene* on, or by, which the harping took place; viz. what seemed in vision “*as it were a glassy sea mingled with fire.*”—And here thus much seems clear;—that it was *not* the *glassy sea-like expanse before the throne*, described on the first opening of the Apocalyptic scene before St. John: <sup>1</sup> seeing that, had this been the case, the *definite article* ought, according to the analogy of Apocalyptic usage, to have been prefixed to the word, on this present re-mention of it. For if the reader look to the cases where any one particular, originally specified as an object seen by St. John in the inner temple of the fore-ground of vision, is re-mentioned, whether *the throne* itself, *the four living creatures* its supporters, or *twenty-four elders* attendant, (not to speak now of the more common temple-appurtenances,) <sup>2</sup> he will find in every instance, I believe, that the definite article is thenceforward prefixed. <sup>3</sup> Besides which that very striking characteristic of the sea-like expanse now seen, that it was *mingled with fire*, was not predicated, nor anything like it, of the sea-like expanse before the throne. Nor moreover do I see how the place of the harpers could be either *on* or *by* the crystal sea before the throne, when the place of the Cherubim, the beings nearest of all to the throne, was *under* that crystal firmament; not upon, or at its brink. <sup>4</sup>—Another thing equally evident is that the sea meant is not (so as some have supposed it) the *brazen sea*, or *laver*, of the old Jewish temple. In the Apocalyptic temple of vision there is not a hint of any such laver appearing represented. Moreover how

<sup>1</sup> Καὶ ἐνωπίον τοῦ θρόνου ὡς θάλασσα ὑάλινη ὁμοία κρυστάλλῳ. Apoc. iv. 6. See on this my Vol. i. p. 84.

<sup>2</sup> On these I have to remark in my next page.

<sup>3</sup> The first mention of *θρονος* occurs iv. 2, *Ὁρονος ἐκεῖτο ἐν τῷ ουρανῷ* without the article; after which it occurs above twenty times, and uniformly with the article.—The first mention of the four *ζωα* occurs iv. 6, without the article; *Καὶ ἐν μεσῷ τοῦ θρόνου τεσσαρα ζωα*: after which the expression occurs thirteen times, always with the article.\*—The first mention of the twenty-four *πρεσβυτεροι* occurs iv. 4, without the article; *εἰκοσι τεσσαρας πρεσβυτερος καθημενους*:† after which the expression occurs eleven times, and always with the article.

<sup>4</sup> So Milton, cited Vol. i. p. 84;

*Over their heads* a crystal firmament, &c.

\* In the second mention of *ζωα*, which occurs in verse 8 of the same chapter, some copies indeed read *ζωα* without the article. But the critical Editions insert it: and I conceive there can be no question of this being the true reading.

† The textus receptus reads this passage *τους εικοσι τεσσαρας πρεσβυτερους*, with the article prefix, on this their *first* mention. But the critical Editions reject the article.

could that which was *brazen* be called *glassy*?<sup>1</sup> Or wherefore changed into something *glass-like* in the Apocalyptic temple imagery? Indeed the fact is, that even on the *first* mention of the more common and notorious *appurtenances of the old temple* in the Apocalyptic temple-scene, the article is prefixed, according to another well-known rule of grammar,<sup>2</sup> because of the notoriety of the thing to a Jewish observer: e. g. in regard of *the brazen* and *the golden altar, the outer court, and the ark of the covenant*.<sup>3</sup> So that the absence of the article prefix in the case before us, furnishes here too a further corroborative proof, (notwithstanding the contrary views of various modern expositors,<sup>4</sup>) that the *laver, or sea, of the old Jewish temple* could not be intended.<sup>5</sup>—Thus the *glassy sea* in the passage before us would seem to have been nothing described elsewhere in Scripture as in the old Jewish temple; and nothing elsewhere as in the Apocalyptic temple of vision.<sup>6</sup> It must rather be considered as something that appeared to

<sup>1</sup> Even Mede, p. 439, on Apoc. iv. 6, refers to what is said Exod. xxxviii. 8 of the *laver of the old tabernacle* being made "of the women's *looking-glasses*," as perhaps explanatory of the Apocalyptic *sea of glass*: though, notoriously, these mirrors were of brass, not ὕαλος, or *glass*; and so the *laver* a *brazen* laver.

<sup>2</sup> See respecting these points Middleton on the Greek Article.

<sup>3</sup> The first mention of the *brazen altar* occurs in Apoc. vi. 9; "I saw souls ὑποκατω του θυσιαστηριου," with the article prefixed: just as in Matt. v. 23 also, and in other Books of the New Testament.—The first mention of the *golden altar* occurs Apoc. viii. 3, ἐπι το θυσιαστηριον το χρυσουν το ενωπιου του θρονου, with the article.—And so, on the first mention of the *outer court* in Apoc. xi. 2, την αυλην την εξωθεν του ναου εκβαλε εξω; and of the *ark, ἡ κιβωτος της διαθηκης*, Apoc. xi. 19.

<sup>4</sup> E. g. Mede, p. 592, Cuninghame, Burgh, &c.

Perhaps, of the *ancients, Victorinus* and *Primasius* so understood it. For the *former*, in explanation of the *sea* in Apoc. iv., writes; "Ante solium . . . mare vitreum . . . donum baptismi;" and on that in Apoc. xv.; "Super mare vitreum; id est super baptismum suum." &c. And *Primasius*, on Apoc. xv.; "Aquam baptismi, igne Sancti Spiritus consecratam, vel etiam . . . martyrio rubricatam." B. P. M. iii. 416, 420, x. 322. They do not, however, either the one or the other, actually refer to the *brazen sea of Solomon*.

<sup>5</sup> On the *first* mention of *Solomon's making the brazen sea* for his temple, (1 Kings vii. 23,) it is spoken of with the article prefix, either as being the representative of the old *brazen laver of the tabernacle*, or because of its notoriety as an appendage of the temple: Καὶ ἐποίησε τὴν θαλασσαν. Sept.

<sup>6</sup> Vitringa indeed, though too well aware of the force of the omission of the article prefix to identify the *glassy sea* here mentioned with that described in Apoc. iv. as before the throne,—the which latter he had explained, in common with myself, of the firmamental cerulean expanse forming the basement of the divine throne,—yet interprets the one we are now considering as a *pavimentum* similar to the former, ("pavimentum, seu stratum, pellucidum, igneo transcussum colore,") and with the added suggestion of its having been the *beautiful pavement*, with mystical significance attached to it, of the *Apocalyptic temple-court*, p. 913. But in this supposition he seems to me to borrow too much from imagination: not pretending to any historical authority for the existence of any such Jewish temple-pavement, in support of it.



St. John detached from, and unassociated with, the temple-scene in the fore-ground of vision. What we may most reasonably suppose it to have been, is now the question.

The apparent allusion to Israel's passage of the Red Sea, in the mention of the song of Moses as that sung by the harpers, led me at first to think that the characteristic here ascribed to the Apocalyptic sea, of its appearing *mingled with fire*, might perhaps have had reference to the fiery appearance sometimes ascribed to the Red Sea itself:<sup>1</sup> and so that sea have furnished the visible symbol; though with accommodation to the case of certain servants of God, the members of his true Israel, escaped triumphantly from the Beast, or Papal oppression, as Israel of old out of Egypt.<sup>2</sup> But the descriptive epithet *mingled with fire* is more than mere *fiery looking*; and the further epithet, "*as it were glassy*," seems on this view quite unmeaning.—Besides that, had it been the Red Sea, it ought to have had its proper *geographical* position in the Apocalyptic landscape; just as the Euphrates, and other geographical or topographical features, described before: in which case how could it geographically figure to the Evangelist's eye quite another territory on the Apocalyptic earth, to which the prophetic symbol had reference? An objection this very weighty in my opinion.—After fully reconsidering the subject, I have come in fine to a strong impression that the symbol must be one borrowed from *volcanic phenomena*:—the "glassy sea as it were mingled with

<sup>1</sup> So Agatharcides, an author who flourished under Ptolemy Philopator, about two centuries before the Christian æra, and wrote on the *Red Sea*: and of whose works fragments have been preserved by Photius. The following is an extract from him, cited by Fuller in the *Criticæ Sacri*, Vol. ix. p. 1059.

"Nonnullos narrare montes quidem ad occasum Sinûs Arabici, feriente eos acri igneque solis radio, carbonis candentis (h. e. igne rubentis) imaginem exhibere: arenæ vero cumulos subrubentes per litora, ortum versûs, ad multa stadia passim exstare. Igitur relucentem atque emicantem ex utrisque splendorem (αγγη), cùm in fretum incidit, simili continentis colore mare inficere videri. Alios autem perhibere solem ibi non, quemadmodum apud nos, claris et fulgentibus radiis maris aquas impetere, sed sanguinis speciem habentibus; quibus efficitur ut ipsum quoque mare sanguinei propemodum coloris similitudinem referat."

Besides which, the thought was on my mind of the Red Sea's reflection of the rays of the pillar of fire, on that night much to be remembered, when Israel safely crossed the sea in escaping from Pharaoh; and the Lord shot forth his lightnings from the pillar, and troubled the host of the Egyptians.

<sup>2</sup> Apoc. xi. 8; "Which [i. e. the great City or State of the Beast] is spiritually called Sodom and *Egypt*."

The resemblance of many of the vial-plagues to the plagues on ancient Egypt has been before noticed by me; following in this remark many previous expositors.

fire," which was presented to John's eye in vision, being a flood of vitrified rock and lava, spreading in destructive inundation over the territory of the antichristian Beast, i. e. the mystic Egypt, as well as Babylon, of the Apocalyptic earth;<sup>1</sup> and with the fire that fused it breaking forth continually from the mass, as from the glowing lava from Vesuvius:<sup>2</sup> while the harpers, escaped triumphantly from out of his Egyptian domination, stood, with their harps, unharmed upon its edge.<sup>3</sup>

The figure is not unused in Scripture elsewhere, in designation of God's fiery judgments.<sup>4</sup> And in the present case (if only *historically* suitable) it might seem the rather

<sup>1</sup> Geologists, in their narratives of observations on volcanic mountains and eruptions, use language very similar. So Sir W. Hamilton, in his description of *Vesuvius*, speaks of "the *red-hot transparent liquid fire*, and its splendid brightness." So Capt. Lord Byron, describing *Hawaii*, notes "how the *molten lava* came boiling up, and flowed down the sides of the cone in two beautiful streams, *glittering with indescribable brilliancy*; at the same time that a *lake of fire* opened in a distant part which had *all the agitation of an ocean*, &c." Another writer describes, how "a *vitreous stratum* of ancient lava looked as if it had been suddenly petrified into *glassy stone*; the which might have been once a *fiery sea of burning rocks*, &c."\* And another, with reference to the "vitrified walls of lava" round Hecla, tells how "the lava, when passing from its liquid state, and cooling, sometimes retains a shining vitreous coat, not unlike . . . the refuse from glass-works."

<sup>2</sup> So Mr. Conder.

<sup>3</sup> επι. See Note<sup>2</sup> p. 472, overleaf.

<sup>4</sup> So Deut. xxxii. 22, of God's judgments against the apostatizing Jews. "For a fire is kindled in mine anger, and shall burn unto the lowest hell, and shall consume the earth [land] with her increase, and set on fire the foundations of the mountains." Among which judgments there are noted in the verses following those of being "burnt with hunger, and devoured with burning heat, (perhaps burning fevers,) and with bitter destruction; . . . the sword without, and terror within." So again Nahum i. 5, 6; "The mountains quake at him, and the hills melt; the earth is burnt at his presence: his fury is poured out like fire, and the rocks are thrown down by him," &c. Though here the actual agency of *fire* is probably included.

Yet again we may compare Isa. lxiv. 1-3; "Oh that thou wouldest rend the heavens; that thou wouldest come down; that the mountains might flow down at thy presence, as when the melting fire burneth, and the fire causeth the waters to boil; to make thy name known to thine adversaries, and that the nations may tremble at thy presence." Here not only is there the volcanic *figure* of God's judgments; but prayer is made for them in anticipation of just such a result following as is here anticipated from the vial-judgments, anticipatively made a subject of praise.

In the vision of the 2nd Trumpet, let me add, the symbol was that of a volcanic mountain burning with fire, cast, as if by the force of the earthquake, into a particular marine locality, and thence dealing out its destructive fires.—Here the symbol seems rather that of a wide-spreading deluge of igneous lava, glass-like as it cools.

\* See Wonders of the World, p. 10: also Ferber the mineralogist's description of the lava-glasses of Vesuvius; and Gilbert's Wonders of Nature, p. 24.

It is related by Pliny, in his Nat. Hist. xxxvi. 65, 66, (some Edd. 26,) how the formation of artificial *glass* was discovered from the accidental *fiery fusion* of some nitre and sand, by some sailors, on landing near Ptolemais, on the ancient confines of Asher and Zabulon.

This was supposed by the Rabbins to be one of the "treasures hid in the sand," meant by Moses, Deut. xxxiii. 19, in the promise to Zabulon.

apt, because of the predicted fact of Babylon, and its subject empire, being finally destroyed under the last Vial apparently by this self-same volcanic agency.<sup>1</sup> So that, as the time of the harpers harping would seem to extend through the whole range of the seven Vials, the figure may be deemed one *drawn from the life*.—Its suitability to the 7th Trumpet's original symbol of an *earthquake* is evident. Its *historical* suitability to the æra and events to which I refer it, will be shown in my next Section.

3. As to the *song sung by the harpers*, as they stood on, or rather *by*,<sup>2</sup> “the glassy sea as it were mingled with fire,” it is first designated as the *song of Moses* the servant of God, and the *song of the Lamb*; and then a brief abstract is given of its chief topics.

Now with regard to its designation as “the song of Moses,” it is to be remarked that there are two songs that specially bear the title of *songs of Moses* in Scripture: the one recorded in Exod. xv.,<sup>3</sup> sung at Israel's entrance on the wilderness, after the overthrow of Pharaoh; the other in Deut. xxxii., sung at the end of Israel's journey through it, and on the eve of their entrance into Canaan.<sup>4</sup> At first sight, as a little while since observed, we may be inclined to think that the former accords best and alone with the associated *scene* and *persons* in the text:—its *scene* having been that of the margin of the Red Sea in which Pharaoh perished, so as here the margin of the fiery flood in which the Beast was ultimately to be overwhelmed; and the *persons* that sang it Israelitish harpers, with harps devoted to God's praise, so as here the members of the New Testament Israel. Besides that the brief sketch given of the *subject-matter* of the song in Exodus agrees sufficiently, though on one important

<sup>1</sup> See my Part VI. Chap. i. § 2.

<sup>2</sup> Such is often the sense of *επι* with an accusative. So Apoc. iii. 20; *ιδου ιστηκα επι την θυραν* “at, or by, the door:” viii. 3; *εσταθη επι το θυσιαστηριον* “at, or beside, the altar:” Numb. xxi. 4; *Απαραντες εξ 'Ωρ οδον επι θαλασσαν ερυθραν* “(by way of or along) the Red Sea:” &c.

<sup>3</sup> “Then sang Moses and the children of Israel this song unto the Lord,” &c. Exod. xv. 1. The concluding verse of the preceding Chapter designates Moses by the same title of *servant of the Lord* as here; “The people believed the Lord, and his servant Moses.”

<sup>4</sup> Deut. xxxi. 30; “And Moses spake in the ears of all Israel the words of this song; ‘Give ear, O heavens,’” &c.:—the subject of the song being God's gracious choice of Israel to be his peculiar people, and a prophecy of Israel's subsequent departure from him, and the plagues that they would so bring on themselves.

point imperfectly, with the song now before us. For *here* the topics of the saints' song are God's great and wonderful works, especially it would seem in the final destruction of enemies, even as by "the Almighty One;"—the truth and righteousness of His ways, or Providential dealings, even as "the King of ages" (if we read *αιωνων*<sup>1</sup>), on the lapse of which ages that truth and righteousness was to be shown;—and also the assured anticipation of "all the nations" being now at last brought to fear, glorify, and worship before Him, as "*their* king" (*βασιλευς εθνων*);<sup>2</sup> his "righteous judgments" (alike as written in his revealed word, and as exhibited in his acts of Providence)<sup>3</sup> having been manifested to the world. While in *Moses' song in Exodus* there is the recognition of God as the strength and salvation of Israel;—his glorification in the destruction of Pharaoh, Israel's enemy and persecutor, even as "a God glorious in holiness, fearful in praises, doing wonders:" and assured anticipation of the Canaanitish heathen being struck with fear, on hearing of the catastrophe, and of God triumphantly establishing his redeemed people Israel in that land of Canaan, "the mountain of his inheritance:"—the closing distich of the song being this, "For God shall reign for ever and ever;" or as the Septuagint renders it, "The Lord reigning for an age, and for an age, and still onward."—So that the only main point wanted in the song of Exodus, to complete

<sup>1</sup> The MS. C, as we have seen, (p. 461.) reads *αιωνων*, A and B *εθνων*. Of these the reading *αιωνων* is not unsuitable to the context as expounded above: and it well corresponds with the expression in the closing verse of Moses' song in Exodus remarked on a little later, *Κυριος βασιλεων τον αιωνα, και επ' αιωνα, και ετι*. Sept.

If we take the reading of best authority *εθνων*, it must be understood not of the apostatized heathen on whom his judgments fell; but only of the *εθνη*, or heathen, noted in the next clause, as those who would in fine come and worship before him.

<sup>2</sup> Reading *εθνων* we may compare Jer. x. 7; "Who would not fear thee, O king of nations, for to thee doth it appertain:" that is, fear and honour.

<sup>3</sup> *Τα γαρ δικαιωματα σου εφανερωθησαν*. The word *δικαιωματα* is properly used either in the *forensic* sense of *justification*, as Rom. v. 16, (where however it is in the singular,) and probably Apoc. xix. 8; or, yet more frequently, of God's *ordinances* and *statutes*: scarcely, I think, of his *judicial inflictions*. So Luke i. 6, *Πορευομενοι εν πασαις ταις εντολαις και δικαιωμασι του Κυριου*. Rom. ii. 26, *Εαν η ακροβυστια τα δικαιωματα του νομου φυλασση*. Heb. ix. 1, *Ειχε μεν ουν η πρωτη σκηνη δικαιωματα λατρειας* &c. In the *Septuagint* innumerable examples of the same kind occur; for which see Trommius.—I doubt there being either in the New Testament, or in the Septuagint, any instance in which *δικαιωματα* is used (so as *κρισις*, Apoc. xvi. 7) in the *simple* and *direct* sense of *judicial inflictions* and *punishments*. See Schleusner in Voc.—Heinrichs makes its sense the same as of the *δικαιαι και αληθιναι οδοι σου* of the preceding verse. I include this sense with the former in my explanation.

the parallelism, is an announcement similar to that remarkable anticipative declaration in the Apocalyptic song, of “*all the nations* being brought to fear and glorify God, and to *worship before him*:” a declaration tantamount to that of the imminent conversion of the world.—But this is supplied in Moses’ *other* song; which we may view perhaps as a supplement to the song in Exodus; and so as also included in the Apocalyptic appellative of reference, “the song of Moses.” For in his Deuteronomic song Moses carries forward his view of the fortunes of Israel yet further apparently, or at least more fully in detail, than in that of Exodus. He foretells Israel’s apostasy to idols, after establishment through the divine goodness in the land of Canaan; speaks of the resulting judgments on Israel, and its long rejection by God; then predicts God’s gracious relenting towards Israel, when by consequence in a state of utter powerlessness, misery, and prostration;<sup>1</sup> and thereupon, and on God’s final destruction of its enemies, of *the heathen’s participation in Israel’s joy and blessing*: the song thus concluding; “*Rejoice, O ye nations* (or *heathens*, εθνῶν), *with his people*: for God will avenge the blood of his servants, and will render vengeance to his adversaries, and will be merciful unto his land and to his people.”<sup>2</sup>

Now it will be remembered that, although in his Epistle to the Romans St. Paul quotes that prophetic clause, “*Rejoice, ye nations, with his people*,”<sup>3</sup> as even then *beginning* to have fulfilment in the early conversion of the Gentiles, yet he evidently looked to the time of Israel’s *final* reconciliation to God, as that of its *plenary* accomplishment. “For if the fall of them be the riches of the world, and the diminishing of them the riches of the Gentiles, how much more their fulness? . . . And if the casting away of them be the reconciling of the world, what shall the receiving of them be but as life from the dead?”<sup>4</sup>—A fact this which tends strongly to confirm us in the impression that it is to the epoch of the natural Israel’s *ultimate* triumphant re-establishment in Canaan that we must refer the Jubilaic anticipations in Moses’ song respecting the

<sup>1</sup> Deut. xxxii. 36.<sup>2</sup> Ib. verse 43.<sup>3</sup> Rom. xv. 10.<sup>4</sup> Rom. xi. 12, 15.

general conversion, and sympathetic rejoicing with God's people, of the Gentile world. And since, both in the Gospels and Epistles of the New Testament, the same blessed result of the general conversion of the Gentile world is set forth as also immediately consequent on the ultimate triumph of the Lamb, with such as have been his faithful saints and servants during the present dispensation of trial,<sup>1</sup> and this, similarly, after God's final judgments on the enemies of his Church and people, therefore in this respect the close agreement between the Jubilaic anticipations for the Gentile world under the one Testament and under the other becomes evident; and thus, and in this way, the song of the harpers by the glassy sea, with what are called their "harps of God," as being both given by Him and devoted to his service,<sup>2</sup> might not unfitly be called alike the song of *Moses* and the song of the *Lamb*.

Besides which, forasmuch as of this æra of the seventh Trumpet, and its seven Vials, one most marked characteristic was the opening wide to all of the temple of Christ's reformed Church, and preaching of his gospel to every nation under heaven, *Jews* inclusive, not of course without the ingathering of some first-fruits from among *them*, as well as from each other people so preached to during the progress of the Vial-judgments, therefore we must suppose the voices of some of these converts from out of the natural Israel to mingle with those of Gentile saints in the song of the harpers by the glassy sea; and thus, and in this way, also the blending to be more manifest of the song of *Moses* and the song of the *Lamb*.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See my Millennial Chapter on this point, in Vol. iv.

<sup>2</sup> Daubuz explains the expression "having harps of God," as an expression indicative of the heavenly or paradisiacal state of them that sang it. But the phrase is a well-known Hebraism: in signification either of the *excellence* of a thing, as Psalm lxxx. 10, *cedars of God*, עֲרָבֹת יְהוָה, Psalm lxxviii. 16, *mountains of God*, &c.; or of the thing *being devoted to God's service*, as in 1 Chron. xvi. 42, and 2 Chron. vii. 6, "*musical instruments of God*."

It seems to me probable that a *special* and *real* devotion may be *here* intended by the phrase: as if in contrast with the harps of the vast multitude of mere formal harpers alluded to in Apoc. xiv. 2; representing (as has been shown) the earthly-minded multitudes of professing Protestantism. See p. 316 *suprà*.

<sup>3</sup> *Και* has sometimes simply an *exegetic* or *explanatory* meaning. So among other examples are those following: Matt. xiii. 41, Συλλέξουσιν εκ της βασιλειας παντα τα σκανδαλα, και τους ποιουντας την ανομιαν; John x. 33; Αλλα περι βλασφημιας, και οτι συ ανθρωπος ων ποιεις σεαυτον Θεον. In the Apocalypse we have, xiii. 12, Ποιει την γην, και τους κατοικουντας εν αυτη; and xii. 12, Ουρανοσ, και οι σκηρουντες εν αυτοις. And Vitringa would incline to explain it so here.

## § 2.—THE HISTORICAL FULFILMENT.

It remains to trace the FULFILMENT OF THE THREE VISIONS, in the history of Christ's true Church and servants during the æra of the French Revolution.

1. And 1st, a word as to the fitness of the symbol of a *fiery volcanic flood* figuring them.

Though where indeed the need of this on a point so notorious? Its fitness to symbolize the *overflow of French revolutionary fury* in desolating France and Europe, is such, and so obvious, that it has been, and is still, applied continually. Already, some 12 years before its outbreak, the French Parliament foresaw and predicted this its volcanic character.<sup>1</sup>—On its great outbreak in 1790, when it was said by some one, "I see a chasm in the place of France," it is recorded, I think, as Mr. Burke's answer, "It is the chasm of a volcano."—After the second great outbreak in 1830 the *Journal Des Debats* exclaimed; "It seems that the volcano which closed in 1815 is beginning to emit flames again:" and the *Quarterly Review* spoke of "*the outpouring of its burning lava.*"<sup>2</sup>—Yet again, after its third and latest great outbreak in 1848, the "*Tines*," in England, thus repeated the same language of symbol: "The debate . . . reminds us how near the surface lie those *volcanic fires* which have broken out with intermittent fury *during a period of sixty years*; and which all the strength and policy of half a dozen forms of government have failed to quench."<sup>3</sup> And in France M. Montalembert, in his address to the French Academy, Feb. 5, 1852: "The French Revolution still exists: . . . History can tell with what sincere affection

But I prefer the sense I have offered, as one that gives more force and more distinctness to both the one appellative and the other; "the *song of Moses*, and the *song of the Lamb*."

<sup>1</sup> "One is tempted to believe," said they in a protest in 1775, "that there exists in the state a secret party . . . who by internal throes seek to overturn its foundations: like those volcanoes which, preceded by subterraneous sounds and earthquakes, subsequently cover all that surrounds with a burning torrent of ruins, cinders, and lava, vomited forth from the entrails of the earth." *Alison*, Vol. i. p. 344.\* <sup>2</sup> No. 134.

<sup>3</sup> In the *Evening Mail* of Jan. 28, 1850; in allusion to a Debate in the French National Assembly, just before.

If, to answer the Apocalyptic figuration's epithet *glassy*, lava in its cooled and vitrified state might seem rather required, we must remember, after the torrent of war had passed over a land, what was the state of desolation that remained on it. But indeed the "mingled with fire" may imply a state of fiery liquefaction, sufficiently answering to the epithet vitreous.

\* Ed. 6. It is not in the earlier Edd. of Alison.

France loved liberty ; till *a new explosion of the revolutionary lava burst forth*, and covered Europe again, dismaying the boldest among us." <sup>1</sup>

2ndly, as to those who answered, during this time of judgment, to the Apocalyptic *harpers*, standing unhurt by the desolating sea of volcanic fire in vision ; and through whose agency, in the main, the symbolized acts of evangelic effort and progress were to be carried out.

It was *England*, we saw,—*insular England*,—to which living Protestantism, and the 144,000 that alone understood its *new song*, seemed almost confined just before the time of that tremendous political outbreak. <sup>2</sup> And we also saw how lamentably low religion had fallen even there too, as the result of a long century of declension ; <sup>3</sup> though not indeed without some recent signs of improvement. What a *religious revival* then was needed in the nation, in order (according to God's usual rule of judicial dispensation) to its escaping from the judgments directed against apostate Christendom ! What a new *missionary spirit*, in connection with such religious revival, and leavening in some measure of the popular mind with it, and perhaps too of the

<sup>1</sup> In the same Address M. Montalembert, with regard to the internal revolutionary principles in France, uses a different figure, very similar to that in the 1st Apocalyptic Vial of a noisome sore. "It is the same disease which has endured for 60 years, and for which we still seek the remedy."

<sup>2</sup> See p. 325 *suprà*, and the Chapter which it concludes.

<sup>3</sup> In 1713 Bishop Burnet, in his Pastoral Charge, stated "that the much greater proportion of those who came to be ordained were ignorant to a degree not to be apprehended by those who were not obliged to know it." In 1728 Bishop Gibson, in his Pastoral Letters, complained "that profaneness and impiety were grown bold and open." And Archbishop Secker's Charges, from 1738 to 1766, present a similarly melancholy picture of the spiritual condition of the kingdom during the whole of that period.\* To which add Bishop Horsley's declaration (already given before p. 320, Note <sup>2</sup>) to the effect that during the larger half of the eighteenth century, the preaching of the great majority of the *clergy* of the English Church had been "little better than a system of *heathen ethics*."

Bishops Porteus and Barrington, in Charges delivered during the first ten years of the French Revolutionary war, speak in similarly sad terms of the then *general* decay of religion in England. So Bishop Wilson has remarked, in his Preface to Wilberforce's View, pp. xxxvii., xxxviii. : and so too Mr. W.'s biographers, Life i. 129, speaking of the year 1787. Mr. Wilberforce himself often mournfully laments over it ; declaring it at one time (I think in 1792) to be "practical atheism." In fact, like Cowper, Mr. Wilberforce had prognosticated coming evil on England, in consequence of its prevalent ungodliness, before the French Revolutionary outbreak. Writing in 1785 he says : "I fancy I see storms arising, which . . . will by and by overspread and blacken the whole face of heaven. It is not the confusion of parties, and their quarrelling in the House of Commons, which makes me despair of the Republic ; . . . but the universal corruption and profligacy of the times." *Ibid.* i. 84.

\* These three authorities are aptly cited by a Reviewer of Dean Milner's Life in the Evening Mail of Dec. 28, 1842.



government; in order to the accomplishment of missionary work on the scale figured, or implied, alike in the figure of the opening wide of the Apocalyptic temple-gate, the vision of the Angel with the everlasting Gospel, and song of the harpers by the fiery sea! What a concurrence, moreover, of other favouring circumstances:—as of the supply of fit instrumentalities, moral and intellectual; the accomplishment of religious combination; and, nationally, not the mere political safety of England, but its colonial and maritime supremacy and aggrandizement!

It was all needed, and we know was all supplied. The revival of religion in England at the time of the French Revolution,—its preservation and successful progress in maritime and colonial power, amidst dangers unprecedentedly great, which threatened its very existence,—and, coincidentally, the outburst in it of missionary feeling, missionary action, and missionary anticipations and song,—are now among the best known, as well as most memorable, historic facts, of the era spoken of. It was when the continental nations were agitated with the fiery volcanic earthquake of the Revolution, (to borrow again the Apocalyptic figurative phraseology,<sup>1</sup>) agitated, as a living observer expressed it, “like poor Calabria,”<sup>2</sup>—when the infection moreover of French democratic and infidel principles, having spread plague-like across the Channel, threatened the outbreak (had not the virus met its counteracting antidote) of *ulcers noisome and sore* in the English body politic, just as in the French,<sup>3</sup>—when both the *sea*, with its European Papal

<sup>1</sup> Apoc. xi. 19, xv. 2.

<sup>2</sup> “What a world we live in! The nations are agitated like poor Calabria. See p. 316 *suprà*. When they will rest in quietness, He only knows, who knows all things.” So *Mr. Hey* of Leeds; writing to Mr. Wilberforce about (as I infer) the year 1792. *Life of Wilberforce*, ii. 80.

<sup>3</sup> It well deserves the notice of a prophetic student, how naturally and frequently this Apocalyptic symbol of the first Vial was applied by writers of the day to any such working in a political or social body of infidel and democratic principles, as that in revolutionary France. So Mr. Wilberforce, in earlier life; “A universal corruption and profligacy has spread its destructive poison through the whole body of the people: the mass of blood is corrupt.” Again, speaking, though at a later era (A.D. 1812), of a temporary and limited outbreak of the kind among the operatives of the manufacturing body in Yorkshire, he thus writes. “The state of the lower orders in the manufacturing districts is such as I can illustrate only by the figure of the *confluent small-pox* on the human body. It is breaking out all over.” *Life*, iv. 36.—Col. Creveke (*Wilb. Correspondence*, ii. 63), and Bishop Wilson (*Preface to Wilberforce's View*, p. xxvii.) liken the same to a *plague*, or *evil disease*. Compare my observations pp. 358, 359, 372—375, *suprà*.

colonies, and the *rivers* and kingdoms of the European continent, were dyed with blood, its most ancient *thrones* subverted, and chiefest *lights* in its political heavens eclipsed or darkened,<sup>1</sup>—when the apparently irresistible power of France under Napoleon, having been the scourge and plague of the mystical Egypt, i. e. Papal Christendom,<sup>2</sup> seemed ready to concentrate its efforts in all the bitterness of enmity against that chief nation which, like Israel at Pihabiroth, had escaped out of it,<sup>3</sup>—it was during this awful period of the outpouring of God's vials of judgment, and when so imminent was the danger to England, that the cry of one of the most eminent prelates of the day, “Nothing but the interposition of Heaven can save us,”<sup>4</sup> was but the echo of the thoughts of them who knew the most,<sup>5</sup>—and Pitt himself at one time confessed the commonwealth to be in extremity,<sup>6</sup> and at length died of a broken heart, in disappointment and almost despair for his country,<sup>7</sup>—it was even then that this religious revival, this wonderful outburst of missionary spirit and action, broke forth in our favoured land:—our land insulated by nature, and in its ecclesiastical constitution long before triumphantly separated, from the name, dominion, and connexion of the Beast and his Image; i. e. the Popedom and its apostate Councils.<sup>8</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Apoc. xvi. 3, 4, 8, 10.

<sup>2</sup> About *Egypt* see Vol. ii. pp. 437, 438, 444.

<sup>3</sup> Luther in his Table Talk, ch. iv., Vol. i. 140, spoke very naturally of the reforming leaders, as having through God's assistance brought the Protestants out of the bondage of the Roman Antichrist, even as Moses led Israel out of Egypt. And so elsewhere.

<sup>4</sup> Bishop Porteus, writing A.D. 1793. *Life of H. More*, ii. 366. So again in 1795. *Ibid.* 456, &c.

<sup>5</sup> So Wilberforce (*Correspondence* i. 273), writing in 1803 at the time of the threatened invasion: “Busy preparations, but too tardy, I fear, for the reception of our inveterate enemy. All who know anything of the matter are alarmed, I find, in proportion to their knowledge.”—A curious and interesting letter from Lord Stanhope, given in the same Volume, p. 109, and bearing date Dec. 1794, expresses alarm at the exceeding increase of the danger; from the possibility (of which even at that early time he was fully persuaded) of the French making and using *steam-boats* for an invading force.

<sup>6</sup> This was at the time of the mutiny at the Nore. Mr. Wilberforce writes, May 28, 1797, “Pitt and the others now convinced that things *in extremis*.” *Life* ii. 220.

<sup>7</sup> “Poor Pitt, I almost believe, died of a broken heart. . . . The love of his country burnt in him with as ardent a flame as ever warmed the human bosom; and the accounts from the armies [after the battle of Austerlitz] struck a death's blow within.” *Life* iii. 251.—I quote continually from these memorials of the day, to bring the fearfulfulness of the epoch of the French Revolutionary wars, now almost forgotten, more vividly before the reader.

<sup>8</sup> τὰς νικωντάς ἐκ τοῦ θηρίου, &c.

There was one individual who was ordained by God above all others, in his distinguishing mercy to England, to be the instrument of this religious revival in it; and so both its preserver, (for is not righteousness the preservative of a nation?) and its preparer also for the fulfilment of its high missionary destinies. It is interesting to contemplate the manner in which God fits his instruments for the work appointed them. We have marked this in the cases of AUGUSTINE and LUTHER.<sup>1</sup> We may be permitted to mark it in the case of him we are now alluding to,—the late WILLIAM WILBERFORCE: for he too, though less exclusively indeed, was, in a *religious* point of view, *the man of the age*.<sup>2</sup>—But how so? His quick and varied powers of wit, memory, and intellect, his native eloquence,<sup>3</sup> conversational charms, affectionate heart, and winning manners,<sup>4</sup> as well as his parliamentary station, reputation as a patriot, and friendship with England's honoured Prime Minister of the day, though concurring to mark him out as one fitted to exercise more than common influence, at that fearful crisis of the Revolution which broke out soon after his entrance into public life, were *by themselves alone* vain to the end I speak of. How inadequate all this, had he not experienced real *conversion of heart*, such as to lead him to consecrate the whole to God:—that conversion of heart and inward regeneration,<sup>5</sup> (the realization of the change symbolized and conditionally promised him, on entrance into the outwardly regenerate and spiritually privileged state of baptism,) to which he was himself wont to refer most solemnly ever after, as that which had been

<sup>1</sup> See the 4th Section of my Chapter on the Sealing, and Part iii. ch. iv. § 1.

<sup>2</sup> So Lord Erskine; "Wilberforce urged on the lingering progress of the human mind:" and his Biographers; "Wilberforce was the centre of a great moral system, and . . . gave an impulse to the age." Life v. 154, 232.

<sup>3</sup> Pitt said repeatedly, "Of all the men I ever knew, Wilberforce has the greatest natural eloquence." Life v. 241.

<sup>4</sup> "Mr. W.," was M<sup>de</sup>. de Stael's declaration to Sir James Mackintosh, "is the best converser I have met with in this country. I have always heard he was the most religious; I now find he is the wittiest man in England." Life iv. 167.—At p. 158, her testimony is quoted from her work on the French Revolution, to his being "J'homme le plus aimé et le plus considéré de toute l'Angleterre."

<sup>5</sup> I here use the term *regeneration*, or being *born again*, in the sense in which St. Peter and St. John use the figure. "Being *born again* not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, *by the word of God*, which liveth and abideth for ever." So 1 Peter i. 23; "Whatsoever is *born of God* overcometh the world; and this is the victory that overcometh the world, even *our faith*." Also 1 John v. 4.

the turning-point of his life;<sup>1</sup> and whereby he was *notably* marked out, agreeably with the Apocalyptic figuration, (it is therefore that I call attention to it,) as one of its mystical 144,000, illumined, quickened, and sealed by God's own Spirit, the followers of the Lamb whithersoever he goeth, and harpers with harps of God's own attuning to chant his praise:<sup>2</sup>—those whom alike prophecy and history prove that He has ever chosen, as his chief instruments for the revival of religion among men.

So prepared, on considering the high gospel-standard of Christian life and practice, and surveying on the one hand the prevailing ungodliness, immorality, and latitudinarian and infidel philosophy, especially among the higher ranks, of his professedly Christian countrymen, and on the other his own position and capabilities for improving them, he recognised his vocation of God: "God has set before me, as my object, *the reformation of my country's manners.*"<sup>3</sup>—Most justly do his biographers add, "Having accepted the commission, he devoted all his powers to its fulfilment." Who so fully, so habitually, in private life and public, the very exemplification of his own favourite motto,<sup>4</sup> in opposition to the false philosophy and irreligion of the age;

How charming is divine philosophy!

<sup>1</sup> The account of this memorable change is given at pp. 76, 82, 87, 98—103, 380—382 of the 1st Volume of his Life. The reading of Doddridge's *Rise and Progress of Religion* seems to have been the primary means of its commencement; the examination of the New Testament, with the light of God's Spirit opening its meaning to him, to have completed it. This was in his 26th year. His subsequent reference to it in his Diary and Letters is frequent.—In a most interesting letter to Dr. Frewen, written in later life (Dec. 1822), he speaks of it in the language used of the returning prodigal, as the time when he "*came to himself*;" noting the years 1785-6 as those in which it was effected. Ibid. v. 147. In Vol. iv. p. 310, writing to one of his sons, he expresses his anxiety, above all things to see in him "decisive marks of that great change:" and to a young friend recommended in 1823 Doddridge and Witherspoon on Regeneration, as calculated to impress the reader with "a just sense of the greatness of the change to be effected;" even "as a work to be wrought on the human heart by the power of God, and Him alone." Corresp. ii. 475.

At the same time he was careful to avoid a controverted term, of double and therefore of dubious meaning. In a Preface to Witherspoon's *Treatise on Regeneration*, he purposely abstained, we are told, from using the term *regeneration*, or expressing an opinion on the correctness of its application. It is not the *name*, but the *thing*, that is important.—I need scarcely add that he was persuaded that it *might* begin, as well as that it *might not*, with baptism and in childhood.

<sup>2</sup> Compare Apoc. vii. 3, 4, xiv. 1—5; and my comments on the two passages in the Chapter on the Sealing, Vol. i. pp. 274—282, and at pp. 306, 321—324 *suprà*.

<sup>3</sup> Life, i. 130.

<sup>4</sup> Prefixed on the title-page to his *Practical View*, from Milton's *Comus*.

Not harsh and rugged, as dull fools suppose ;  
But musical as is Apollo's lute.

And, humanly speaking, less than this could not have been effectual to the purpose.—Of his winning example and unceasing labours in the cause of truth, benevolence, and evangelic Christianity, his often uplifted voice in the senate and more enduring word of exhortation and instruction contained in his published *Work on Christianity*,<sup>1</sup>—all accompanied and followed as they were by intercessory prayers for his country,—prayer as full of humiliation, and as devout, continuous, and earnest, we may almost say, even as those of Daniel,<sup>2</sup>—who can over-estimate the influence? The faithful ones of Christ, especially in the Church of England, a little body scattered here and there at the time, for the most part little known, and in general society misunderstood and perhaps despised, (can we well err in so characterizing a Newton, Scott, Milner, Cecil, Robinson, Simeon, though indeed the æra is almost too recent to allow of particularization,) I say these members of Christ's mystical body of the 144,000, "the called and chosen and faithful," who were all in their several spheres of duty busily taking part in the promotion of the same blessed work, hailed with delight the interposition and gift from God.<sup>3</sup> Gradually, yet not slowly nor feebly for a world so dull to receive divine impressions, the heaven worked in the middle and higher classes; as it

<sup>1</sup> *Practical View of Christianity*; first published in the year 1797. Within half a year from its publication, five editions of 7500 copies had been called for. See the *Life*, ii. 199, &c.—The effect of this work is largely and strikingly described in Bishop Wilson's Preface, p. vii. &c.

<sup>2</sup> Of these intercessions for his country his *Diary* furnishes various most touching examples. See, for example, in the *Life*, Vol. ii. 56, iii. 122, &c.—My reference to *Daniel*, in the way of comparison, is taken from the author of the *Pursuits of Literature*; a Book published in the same year as Mr. W.'s on Christianity. "I will own that from a careful scrutiny into the public and private character of Mr. Wilberforce, I am inclined to think that his enemies would be forced into an acknowledgment, that (as it is recorded in the words of a prophet) they can find no occasion against this man, except they find it against him concerning the law of his God." Cited, *Life*, i. 375, and also in Bishop Wilson's Preface, p. xx. Mr. Newton had made the same comparison before. See his Letter in the "Correspondence," i. 133.

<sup>3</sup> See, for example, the beautiful Letters of John Newton, given in the *Life and Correspondence*; e. g. on the publication of the *Practical View*. In the *Life of the Rev. P. Roe of Kilkenny* lately published, p. 52, we see exemplified its influence on the revival in the Anglo-Irish Church.

had done before in a measure among the lower, under various influences.<sup>1</sup> The power and blessing of God's almighty Spirit was manifest in it. Religion revived in England. The number of its adherents, and its means too and resources, were multiplied. Higher views opened before them of Christian usefulness. A desire and spirit was shed forth, and made effectual, for religious union and co-operation. Associations Christian and philanthropic arose :<sup>2</sup> and at length too MISSIONARY SOCIETIES,—the *Baptist*, the *London*, the *Wesleyan*, the *Church Missionary* ;<sup>3</sup> one after another, in quick succession, like the Swiss Alpine peaks at day-dawn, catching and reflecting on a benighted world the rays of heavenly light :—while at the same time other older Associations revived, or brightened the holy flame : especially the *Moravian*, that pattern, though with smallest resources, of a missionary body ;<sup>4</sup> and also the *Christian Knowledge and Gospel Propagation Societies* ; Societies ill supported too, and which had very much lost their first zeal and love ; though still illustrious at home by having just kept alive the missionary cause in the English Church through the 18th century,<sup>5</sup> and in India by the labours,

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Wilberforce's biographers ascribe this to Wesley. "Against this universal apathy *John Wesley* had recently arisen with a giant's strength. His mission was chiefly to the poor."—*Life*, i. 130. They might surely have associated with him, not only certain others out of the pale of the Established Church, but not a few within it also, as God's joint instruments for effecting the work.

<sup>2</sup> The earliest was that instituted in 1787, through Mr. Wilberforce's instrumentality, and with the Archbishop of Canterbury and other bishops at its head, for enforcing the *King's Proclamation against Vice and Immorality*. "This was the first example of those various associations which soon succeeded to the apathy of former years."—*Life*, i. 138. Then followed the *Slave Trade Abolition Committee*, and *African Association*.

<sup>3</sup> The *Baptist Society* A.D. 1792, the *London* 1795, the *Wesleyan*, a little later, the *Church Missionary Society* 1800. With regard to the formation of the last mentioned, proceedings had begun as early as 1797. See Wilberforce's *Life*, ii. 251. Also the Sketch of the history of its formation, published by the Society on its "Jubilee" in 1848.—On the general subject of Missions I may refer to Huie's *History of Church Missions* ; an interesting volume lately published.

<sup>4</sup> Founded by Count Zinzendorf in 1727 ; the whole Moravian body being, much like the early Christian body, altogether of a Missionary character. See Crantz's interesting *History of the Missions*, or Huie's brief Chapter on the subject. The first mission to the West Indies was in 1731, to Greenland, 1733.

<sup>5</sup> The formation of these Societies in William and Anne's time was noted by me, Vol. ii. 485, as an omen of England's future Christian missionary eminence. In 1742, on employing Fabricius in the Madras Mission, it was found that the means of the Christian Knowledge Society were scarcely adequate to support it ; but the directors declared that "they trusted the same good Providence of God, which had hitherto blessed them in their undertakings to spread the pure Gospel of his Son Jesus Christ in all parts of the world, would raise up benefactors to contribute what might be

under their auspices, of the apostolic Swartz.<sup>1</sup> Yet once more, last, but perhaps greatest of all, there arose the *British and Foreign Bible Society*:<sup>2</sup>—a Society by which (conjunctively with the Mission Societies) the word of life has in every quarter of the world been diffused and preached in the several native languages;<sup>3</sup> and the vision of the Apocalyptic Angel seen by St. John flying through mid-heaven, with the book of the everlasting Gospel to preach to every nation, kindred, and tongue, literally fulfilled, and *just in the exact order of time* there laid down.—It is not for an *Apocalyptic Expositor* of the English Church, persuaded that the prophetic vision was thus fulfilled, to withhold his admiration from the work of the Bible Society, because *Protestant Dissenters* had a part in it;<sup>4</sup> or from

wanted towards it.” Huie, 89.—At the time of the revolutionary war, however, as it is said by Wilberforce’s biographers, “the zealous spirit, which had begun to spread during the reign of Anne, had been benumbed by the evil influence of latitudinarianism.” (e. g. such as Hoadley’s.) *Life*, i. 129.—The declared inability of the same Society, from its limited funds, to supply the Bibles wanted and asked for in the Welch Principality in 1803, was the originating occasion, as is well known, of the formation of the British and Foreign Bible Society.

Let me not omit to observe further that *Bishop Berkeley*, before the middle of the eighteenth century, having made a noble effort at establishing a Missionary College and Mission at Bermuda, for the West Indies and North America, was obliged to abandon it from want of adequate support.

<sup>1</sup> He was the pupil of *Franke* at Halle University, in 1742; where he imbibed the principles of his instructor; and was thus their propagator in another age and hemisphere.—By means of the missionaries that they have supplied to us, Protestant Germany and Protestant Switzerland have well united themselves in the missionary work with Protestant England.

<sup>2</sup> Let me quote on this point Mr. W.’s biographers: themselves certainly not over-favourable judges. “It was at this time, amidst the din of warlike preparation, that the foundation-stone was laid of an Institution (the *British and Foreign Bible Society*) which was to leaven all nations with the principles of peace. . . This is not the place to scrutinize its constitution. The good that it has effected has been great, beyond the utmost expectation of its founders; both in the circulation of the Word of God, and in awakening the zeal of a careless generation. The evil which has waited on this good has been incidental in its character; and confined, perhaps almost entirely, to the public meetings.” *Life*, iii. 90.—Of course, besides this suggested incidental evil, its translations were imperfect. This has been made by some a matter of charge against it; and sometimes with as much bitterness as unreasonableness. The same might have been made even to our admirable English translation, in a measure; and indeed to the Septuagint Greek Version, quite as much, but which yet was used by the apostles. For in both of these the existence of mistakes is notorious.

<sup>3</sup> In the Report for 1845 I find the total number of *copies* of the Scriptures issued by the Society, up to that year, is stated to have been 17 millions; the number of *languages* in which the Scriptures have been circulated by it 138. In the Report for 1850 the total number of *copies* is stated at 23 millions; the number of *languages* 144 (4th Ed.): in that for 1860 the number of *copies* above 39 millions; of *languages* 160 (5th Ed.)

<sup>4</sup> Mr. Owen, in his *History of the Bible Society*, i. 79, has noted the prominence of members of the Church of England at its formation. And I believe by far the larger number of its home members, and especially of the most influential, have been mem-

that of some of the other English Protestant Missionary Societies, because constituted of such, very principally, as their members.<sup>1</sup> On the great field of conflict between Christ and Satan, such as the Apocalypse contemplates, ecclesiastical distinctions, far from unimportant in themselves, appear *comparatively* indifferent. And surely we must suppose the judgment of heaven to have favourably rested on their work; whether we consider the spirit animating, or the results effected by, not a few of their missionaries and missions! How did the House of Commons itself bow before the greatness and true evangelic spirit of one of these missionary Dissenters, when Wilberforce described his noble disinterestedness, after rising by force of uncommon literary acquirements, and moral worth, to a highly lucrative post in the Fort William College, under Lord Wellesley!<sup>2</sup> And, as to *effects produced*, he certainly is not to be envied whose heart does not glow on looking at what they have done towards the great work of Christianizing the heathen; whether in India, in Burmah, in China, in South Africa, in Madagascar, or in the islands of the South Sea.

It was coincidently, or nearly coincidently, with the first rise of these missions, that the missionary battle was fought by Mr. W. in the House of Commons; and a *legislatorial sanction* obtained for the work of evangelization in India, and so *opening the Christian temple-doors* to the Eastern world, imperfect at first, afterwards more complete:<sup>3</sup> for

bers also of the Established Church.—Mr Wilberforce's biographers observe with truth, that in the earlier years of this Society the dissenting body had not manifested that hostility to the English Church, which since, alas, has been such a stumbling-block to the Church members of the Society. As a specimen of their *then* catholic and friendly spirit, see Mr. Hinton's declaration made in 1813, at Oxford. Owen ii. 505—507.

<sup>1</sup> In the *London Missionary Society*, and some others, many Church members for years united. Indeed it was founded very much through their agency: and Bishop Porteus gave them in 1798 "his good wishes and prayers." Difficulties have occurred subsequently in the way of their active co-operation.

<sup>2</sup> Devoting his whole salary (between £1000 and £1500 a year) to the mission at Serampore. *Life*, Vol. iv. p. 123.—"Well," say Mr. Wilberforce's biographers, "had the noble conduct of the band at Serampore deserved his vindication. 'I do not know,' Mr. W. often said, 'a finer instance of the moral sublime, than that a poor cobbler, working in his stall, should conceive the idea of converting the Hindoos to Christianity: yet such was Dr. Carey. Why, Milton's planning his *Paradise Lost* in his old age and blindness, was nothing to it!'" *Ibid*.

<sup>3</sup> "With our times certainly agrees the *open door* for proclaiming the news of mercy, which none has been able to shut." So Mr. Govett, on Apoc. iii. 8; whose testimony I cite, in illustration, as being a decided disciple of the Futurist School of Apoc-



never, notwithstanding the bitter opposition of enemies, did its parliamentary champion urgird himself till its complete accomplishment.<sup>1</sup>—And, meanwhile, the ever-advancing maritime and colonial ascendancy of Great Britain, whereby every sea and clime was opened to its ships, and in the East the consolidation moreover of its East Indian Empire under Lord Wellesley's administration, (an empire founded just before by Clive and Hastings, almost as by miracle,) prepared widest fields for the missionary enterprise of British Christians; and unfurled its "heaven-blest banner," as it has been called, for the protection of the converts:<sup>2</sup> while the unprecedented increase of British commercial wealth, as well as progress of science,<sup>3</sup> concurred to facilitate its execution.—Never, altogether, had there been such a work of Christian *evangelic* missions since the Apostolic æra. The famous *Romish* missions of the 16th and 17th centuries, in the eastern and western hemispheres, notwithstanding all their exemplifications of devotedness and self-denial, had been scarcely better than the propagation of Popery, not the Gospel;—the advocacy of Romish doctrines, not those of the Bible;—of Anti-christ, not Christ.<sup>4</sup> And, as to the earlier English mis-

alyptic interpretation. The open door for gospel proclamation implies, of course, the open door for admission of converts.

<sup>1</sup> In 1793, on the renewal of the East India Company's charter, certain Resolutions were agreed to in committee by the House of Commons, on Mr. Wilberforce's motion, and entered on its journals; which pledged the House in general terms to "the peculiar and bounden duty of promoting, by all just and prudent means, the religious improvement" of the native Indians. Which assertion of the duty of attempting to evangelize the East, though barren for twenty years, still remained on the journals of the House, and was made the vantage-ground from which to carry *practical resolutions* through the House, twenty years after. Ibid. ii. 24, 28; iv. 124—126.—Accounts of the controversy in 1812 and 1813 may be found in the Christian Observer, Owen's History of the Bible Society, and Wilberforce's Life. It is stated that many Christian people, in their deep anxiety on the subject, passed the night of the debate in prayer. Mr. W. writes; "I place the cause even before the abolition: . *that*, I mean, of laying a ground for the communication to our Indian fellow-subjects of Christian light and moral improvement." Ib. iv. 126.

<sup>2</sup> So the excellent Hewitson, in his account of the settlement of the Portuguese converts from Madeira at Trinidad. "There, under Britain's heaven-blest banner, they found themselves for the first time on ground where they were at liberty to hear God speaking in his word, and to speak to God in prayer." Life, p. 269. This was in 1847.

<sup>3</sup> E. g. in the discovery of *stereotype* and other improvements in printing; also, a little later, of *steam navigation*.

<sup>4</sup> "It is recorded," says Huic, p. 17, of *Xavier*, that when at Lisbon, prior to sailing on his missionary enterprise, "having obtained a *part of the New Testament*, he resolved to take it with him, imagining that it might *possibly* be of use;" also that what he translated for the use of his converts on the Comorin coast, was "the words to

sonary Associations for the propagation of Christian Knowledge and of the Gospel, though still operating in India at the epoch of the French Revolution, their feebleness and limited fields of operation have been already noted. But now, in every quarter of the world,<sup>1</sup>—in the East Indies and the West Indies, in South Africa and West Africa, (Africa enfranchised with temporal freedom as preparatory to the liberty of the Gospel,<sup>2</sup>) in New South Wales and New Zealand, in the South Sea Islands and Madagascar, in Tartary and Persia, in Burmah and incipiently in China, in the polar regions too of Greenland and Labrador,—everywhere the gospel was preached, the Scriptures circulated, evangelic schools instituted, Christian churches opened to the heathen, and Christian life too offered in sacrifice. Can we forget *David Brown, Martyn, Heber, Corrie, Williams, Judson*, and other noble names not a few?—The Almighty Spirit that prompted the missions, excited among the heathen the desire for them.

“ From Greenland’s icy mountains,  
From India’s coral strand,  
Where Afric’s sunny fountains  
Roll down their golden sand,”

be used on making the sign of the cross, the Apostles’ Creed, the ten Commandments the Lord’s Prayer, the Salutation of the Angel, the *Confiteor*, the *Salve Regina*, and the whole of the *Catechism*” (some one, I suppose, that was authorized prior to the later Catechism of Trent); “a strange mixture of truth and error:” also that, after a petition to the Lord Jesus Christ, he added at each clause of the Creed, “Holy Mary, mother of our Lord Jesus Christ, obtain for us from thy beloved Son to believe this article.”—The perusal of a little volume that I have seen, published long since, of Xavier’s own Letters, would I think tend to disabuse the Protestant admirers and panegyrist of Xavier of many a fondly-cherished idea of his Christian greatness. No doubt, viewed as a *man*, for intrepidity, self-denial, perseverance, and greatness of design, he may well deserve admiration. But, viewed as a *Christian Missionary*, how can we rightly avoid the consideration of what he taught; whether Antichristian superstition, or Christian truth?—If such considerations are to be set aside, might not Xavier’s eulogists fitly take *Siméon Stylites* as a subject of panegyric? For *passive* virtues are not inferior to *active*; and his self-denial, devotion, and perseverance were equal even to Xavier’s. Moreover with his figure, his pillar, and his desert, the *picturesque* in description would not be wanting.

Of the manner in which other of the Romish missionaries, alike in South India, North India, Japan, China, and South America, propagated superstition as Christianity, and even adopted direct heathen idolatrous customs into their own ritual, the story is too well known. The Abbé Dubois, himself a Romish missionary, has proclaimed this to the world. See his work on Indian Missions, or Huic, chaps. i. ii. iii; also Gutzlaff’s Catalogue of the works translated by the Jesuits, for support of the Chinese Romish missions. Nowhere do we find them translating, circulating, or preaching “*the everlasting Gospel*.”

<sup>1</sup> I here include the noble *American*, as well as other *foreign Protestant* missions.

<sup>2</sup> “I am occupied, I trust, in preparing an entrance into Africa for the Gospel of Christ.”—Wilb. Life, iv. 182, 206. So of the *Anti-slavery* scheme, v. 168.

from these, from every country, where a mission was attempted, the cry was heard, "Come and help us."—The Jews, God's ancient people, were not forgotten;<sup>1</sup> nor the benighted professing churches of Greek or Roman Christendom.<sup>2</sup> And, after a while, the secular and ecclesiastical heads of our English Church deemed the time to have come for extending it, with all its regular ecclesiastical organization, under sanction of the State, and not without *missionary* views in the matter, to India, Australia, and other of the colonies:—preliminarily (if I may a little anticipate) to its yet larger and more recent extension to many other spheres of previous Anglican missionary labour; beginning at JERUSALEM.

Now from early times, during the terrible wars of the Revolution, while the few, very few, faithful ones of Christ's true Church elsewhere, though not without fearful awe at the divine judgments poured out, comforted themselves with the assurance that Christ's cause could not fail, and that even these judgments would hasten on the time when (to use the language of the harpers by the glassy sea mixt with fire) all nations should come and worship before him,<sup>3</sup> so more especially those that were in England cherished hopes of the preservation of their country, as being that which, with all its sins, had still the *ark* of Christ's true evangelic Church within it.<sup>4</sup> And, as sign after sign appear-

<sup>1</sup> The Jews' Society was founded in 1809. *Franke* had founded a somewhat similar institution in 1728 at Halle. But Israel's time was not yet come.

<sup>2</sup> In the vision of the gospel-bearing Angel, his declared office was to bear the gospel to them that dwell on the *Apocalyptic* (or Roman) earth, as well as to every nation and tongue under heaven. Compare with this the fact of the early communication opened by the British and Foreign Bible Society with Germany and most other parts of the Continent, even during the war; and the formation there of local Bible Societies. The coincidence seems to me remarkable.

<sup>3</sup> So the *Pere Lambert*, A.D. 1806, (the same that I have cited already, p. 373 *suprà*.) "Predictions et Promesses," i. 13: "Le Seigneur veut que dès aujourd'hui nous applaudissions aux victoires que Jésus Christ remportera un jour sur tous ses ennemis; que nous nous livrions aux transports d'une joie pure, en voyant des yeux de la foi toutes les nations accourir à Jésus Christ, l'adorer et le servir; et, dès ce moment, mêlant nos voix à celles des heureux habitans de la nouvelle Jérusalem, nous chantions avec eux le cantique que l'Esprit Saint leur a préparé depuis tant de siècles (Apoc. xv. 4); 'Vos œuvres sont grandes et admirables, Seigneur Dieu Tout-puissant: vos voies sont justes et véritables, O Roi des saints! Qui ne vous craindra, et ne glorifiera votre nom? Car vous seul êtes saint, et plein de bonté; et toutes les nations viendront à vous, et se prosterneront en votre présence; car vos jugemens ont éclaté.'" A remarkable illustration this from a Christian observer at Paris; one too who, though not of Rome, was yet apparently *in* Rome.

<sup>4</sup> I here refer to the 7th Trumpet's figures (Apoc. xi. 19, xv. 5) of the mystic

ed of the revival of religion,<sup>1</sup> and especially as the Bible and Missionary Societies progressed in the fulfilment of their high commission,<sup>2</sup> whereby that ark-bearing temple, with the Gospel its sacred deposit, was more and more "opened" to the world, they still with stronger hope rested on the thought of the Sovereign Almighty One being for and among them. So during the progress of the earlier vial-plagues on the mystic Egypt: so when afterwards, with all his tremendous power, and threats of invasion and destruction, Napoleon Buonaparte, like another Pharaoh, menaced them.<sup>3</sup> And when still, in spite of all his efforts, they stood secure, looking unhurt from their peaceful shore on the desolating lava-like flood, mingled with fire, as it spread its ravages over continental Europe, and at length (like as when Israel from the other side of the Red Sea beheld the destruction of Pharaoh and the Egyptians) saw the enemy that would have ruined them overwhelmed and destroyed, and, coincidentally with that event, saw also the still continued progress of the manifestation of God's gospel-truth committed to them,—when by foreign emperors

*temple appearing opened, and its ark being seen.*—In a letter from a German Clergyman, I think to the Bible Society, in the year 1805 or 1806, he speaks of God preserving England, God's ark being with it. (I have mislaid the reference.) Again: "I am jealous," wrote the venerable John Newton to Mrs. H. More in 1797, on occasion of a Fast Day for the country, "for the Lord of hosts and his ark among us."—Life of H. More, iii. 10.

<sup>1</sup> E. g. Mr. Wilberforce in 1803. After speaking of the infatuation of the public counsels, and fatal torpor of the political body of the British State, he adds; "Yet I think the greatly increased proportion of truly religious young men who are coming forward are a token for good; and sign that, though we may be scourged, we shall not be finally abandoned to the fury of our enemies." Correspondence, i. 274. So again, in 1809, Life, iii. 420, &c.

<sup>2</sup> Life, iii. 303: "God will bless this country," said Mr. W. after the abolition of the Slave Trade in 1807: and again, iv. 125, &c.

<sup>3</sup> Let me quote, in illustration of the subject, from a letter of John Newton to H. More, written in the year 1801, and given in her Memoirs, iii. 153. "The new year is likely to prove very eventful. The eye of sense starts at the prospect. But faith sees a hand guiding in the darkest cloud, and reports that the Lord reigns, let the earth be never so unquiet. He is carrying on his great designs in a way worthy of Himself, and with a special regard to his Church. To manifest his glory in the salvation of all who believe in the Son of his love, and that his character, in the combination of his infinity, wisdom, power, holiness, justice, sovereignty, mercy, grace, and truth, might be fully exhibited to the universe, was, I believe, the great purpose for which the earth was formed. . . What the Lord said to *Pharaoh*, will apply to all who are like-minded; [alluding to *Buonaparte* then threatening England;] 'For this very cause have I raised thee up, that I might show forth my power in thee, and that my name might be made known in all the earth.' Pharaoh's oppression of Israel prepared the way for their deliverance, and issued in his final overthrow. He permits his people to be brought low, that his interposition in their behalf may become the more signal and the more glorious."

and princes, on their visit soon afterwards to this island, (as on Jethro's to the Israelites,<sup>1</sup> after the deliverance of the Red Sea,) there was homage done to the holy cause itself, and to the individuals most prominent in promoting it, chiefly for its sake,<sup>2</sup>—when moreover from the outcasts of Israel one and another and another, converted to the faith of Jesus, had become associated in spirit and object with them,—how did they join, even as with “harps of God,” in notes of adoration and praise: how recognize God's faithfulness and truth, and greatness and holiness, so different from all the gods of Popery or Heathenism: how, with glowing heart and tongue, (and who can forget him to whom we have just been alluding, that has heard him touch the sweet harp of prophecy on the topic?<sup>3</sup>) anticipate the time as not very far off, when the promises of the latter day should be accomplished, the everlasting gospel fulfil its commission, and all nations come and worship before God and the Lamb!<sup>4</sup>

Fly abroad, thou mighty gospel!  
Win and conquer; never cease!  
All the promises do travail  
With a glorious day of grace.  
Blessed Jubilee!  
See the morning breaks apace.

Such were then the fond anticipations. The door had

<sup>1</sup> Exod. xviii. 1—11.

<sup>2</sup> See the account of Deputations to the Emperor Alexander in Owen's B. S. History, and some of the Missionary Reports of that memorable epoch.

<sup>3</sup> “Sweet is the harp of prophecy,” &c.: the commencement of a passage in Cowper, that was among Mr. Wilberforce's most cherished and favourite passages.—“There is in such a scene,” said he in 1819, after the May Bible and Missionary meetings, “a moral sublimity which, if duly estimated, would be worthy of the tongues of angels. Indeed I doubt not they do participate in the joy.” *Life*, v. 17. On occasion of the opening prospect in 1817 of Christianizing St. Domingo, he wrote thus to Mr. Randolph in America:—“It produces quite a youthful glow through my whole frame to witness before I die, in this and so many other instances, the streaks of religious and moral light illuminating the horizon; and, though now but the dawning of the day, cheering us with the hope of their meridian glories.” iv. 355.

So too in Lord Glenelg's eloquent speech at the Bible Society Anniversary, 1814. “It seems to announce the near approach of a period, when, instead of welcoming the inhabitants of a few countries only, we may hail the union of natives of every quarter of the globe; when, even from distant realms, the delegates of a thousand sister Societies may hasten to pay homage to the Parent Society, and announce the progressive triumphs of this holy cause.” Owen, ii. 578.

<sup>4</sup> “And they sing the song of Moses the servant of God, and the song of the Lamb: saying, Great and marvellous are thy acts, Lord God Almighty! Just and true are thy ways, O King of nations! Who shall not fear, O Lord, and glorify thy name? For thou art holy. For all nations shall come and worship before thee: for thy righteousness hath been made manifest.”

been wide opened everywhere for the gospel; and its onward progress was apparently likely to be uninterrupted and free. The great antagonistic power that had so long opposed itself to the gospel-cause seemed almost to have lost the power, if not the inclination,<sup>1</sup> to continue effective opposition to it. And the anticipative cry had already been raised, "Babylon is fallen, is fallen."<sup>2</sup>—But was the Dragon to be ejected from his empire over the heathen world, or the Beast from the throne of Anti-Christendom, without a fresh putting forth of Satanic subtilty and power to uphold them? Had Babylon really fallen by human agency, to rise no more in power? Again, was the gospel's triumph to be achieved, and the morning of the world's jubilee to be brought in, by the mere agency of Mission Societies; or without Christ's own more direct intervention, and judgments of wrath against his enemies, burning like fire?—To these questions we shall in the *prophetic*, and also indeed partially in the *historic* sequel, soon see the answer.—It was in 1823, just when the judgment of the 6th Vial was beginning to be poured out on the mystic Euphrates, that Mr. Wilberforce retired from parliament, the scene of his chief public labours in the cause of Christian benevolence. In 1833, when the judgment was lulling, he fell asleep, full of years and full of honours: though not till the news of the abolition of Negro slavery in the British Empire had reached him, by God's gracious ordering, to irradiate his peaceful death-bed. But already ere that consummation had occurred to his glorious career of Christian benevolence, and ere both King and Country, and Church and State, had sought to do honour to his memory in a public funeral, a new æra was opening: and spirits of delusion appeared to the discerning eye issuing forth, not elsewhere only but especially in England, which might seem well to answer to the three spirits prefigured as going forth over the earth, after the drying up had begun of the waters of the mystic Euphrates. It was said in his

<sup>1</sup> See the Letter of Mr. A. Knox to Mr. Wilberforce, on the (by him supposed) approaching "new reformation" of the Roman Catholics, dated Feb. 1813. Correspond. ii. 241.

<sup>2</sup> Dr. Waugh was but one of a thousand, in judging in 1802 that "Catholicism was giving up the ghost." Life, p. 232

old age by Luther, on review of the times preceding him, that "seldom had the true doctrine of the word flourished in any one place above *forty* years." And now, after just about forty years from the opening of the æra of evangelic missions, that saying was to have a new and remarkable fulfilment, by the fresh issuing forth in power over the prophetic scene of those three several spirits of evil that had been already the chief antagonists to pure Christianity in the progress of the 18 preceding centuries; "spirits from out of the mouth of the Dragon, and mouth of the Beast, and mouth of the False Prophet." How, in truth, supposing this not to have occurred ere the great catastrophe, could the world be prepared intelligently to observe it? How but so to understand the reason of the Lord's controversy with Roman Anti-Christendom?

## CHAPTER IX.

### THE THREE FROGS.

"AND I saw [*come*] out of the mouth of the Dragon, and out of the mouth of the Beast, and out of the mouth of the False Prophet, three unclean spirits like frogs.<sup>1</sup> For they are the spirits of dæmons working signs,<sup>2</sup> which go forth to the kings of the whole world,<sup>3</sup> to gather them together to the war<sup>4</sup> of that great day of God Almighty." Apoc. xvi. 13, 14.

By this novel and very remarkable symbol, which followed next after that of the drying up of the waters of the Euphrates, but ranged still evidently under the same 6th Vial, there seemed signified some extraordinarily rapid, wide-spread, and influential diffusion, throughout the whole *Roman*, or perhaps the whole *habitable* world,<sup>5</sup> of three several unclean or unholy principles, characteristic respect-

<sup>1</sup> ὡς βατραχοί. So A, B, and most of the critical Editions. Others read ὁμοία βατραχοίς.

<sup>2</sup> σημεία.

<sup>3</sup> τοὺς βασιλεῖς τῆς οἰκουμένης ὅλης. So A, B, and the critical Editions, omitting the τῆς γῆς καὶ of the received text. The βασιλεῖς include the βασιλείαι.

<sup>4</sup> εἰς τὸν πόλεμον. The idea of a certain *continuance* and *duration* may attach to this word πόλεμος, or to its literal English rendering *war*; such as does not attach to the word *battle*, given in our authorized translation.

<sup>5</sup> From after the opening of the prefigurative visions in chapter vi. of the Apoca-

ively of the Apocalyptic Dragon, Beast, and False Prophet, from whom they appeared to emanate: all being alike directed and speeded on their course by spirits of hell;<sup>1</sup> and all alike, in respect of the earthly agencies employed to propagate them, resembling *frogs*, the well-known type of vain loquacious talkers and agitators, deluding and seducing the minds of men.<sup>2</sup>—Now by the *Dragon* we know to have been meant (for the Evangelist tells us so) that old Serpent *the Devil*, as in earlier days animating and acting in the Paganism of ancient Rome: the covering skin in which he had been primarily depicted, in a vision figurative of the final war of Heathenism against Christianity, at the opening of the fourth century, being that of a seven-headed Dragon, and the seven heads said to figure Rome's seven hills.<sup>3</sup> Again, by the *Beast*, or rather (according to the Angel's definition of the thing intended in his description<sup>4</sup>) the Beast's *eighth ruling head*, we saw, on I think irrefragable evidence, that the *Popes of Rome* were meant, from and after the time of their occupying the

lyptic Book, the word constantly, if not exclusively, used for the *Roman* earth is *γη*. The word *οικουμενη* is only used here, and in xii. 9, where the Dragon is described as deceiving *την οικουμενην ὅλην* the world in perhaps a larger sense.—It was also used in chap. iii. 10, of a trial which was to fall *επι της οικουμενης ὅλης*. But this, whatever the meaning, was before the opening of the *prophetic* part of the Book.

<sup>1</sup> This point is well illustrated by what St. John says in his 1st Epistle, iv. 1, &c., of *lying spirits* that had gone forth in his day; his reference being to certain anti-christian and false theological doctrines and principles of the time, whereof earthly teachers were the visible propagators, but evil spirits the real ones:—also by what St. Paul says, 1 Tim. iv. 1, of the *πνευματα πλανης*, *seducing spirits*, and *ειδασκαλῖαι δαιμονιων*, *doctrines of demons*, supposing the demons here spoken of to be the *actors out*, not the *subjects*, of the teaching (a point dubious, as we have seen\*); said in reference to human teachers of error then future. Compare too the very parallel vision of Micaiah; in which it appeared that a lying spirit had gone forth, and had spoken by the mouth of the false prophets of King Ahab, to draw him to the battle of Ramoth Gilead. See 1 Kings xxii. 22, 23.

<sup>2</sup> Daubuz cites the two following references to the symbol from ancient writers in illustration:—1st, Cicero ad Attic. xv. 15, saying *Rome ῥητορευουσι*, of certain vain prating demagogues of the day: 2. Artemidorus ii. 15, who expounds the figure thus; *Βατραχοι δε ανδρας γοητας και βωμολοχους προσημαινουσι*. “Frogs signify impostors and flatterers.” Professor Stuart says; “Perhaps the *noise and bluster* which frogs make were in the mind of the writer; as an object of comparison with the boasting and noisy pretences of the heathen hierophants:” the Professor's view referring the prophecy to *Neronian* times.—To understand the force of the emblem, a person should have heard the frogs of *southern Europe*.

<sup>3</sup> Of this covering however, from after the time when he delivered up his seven-hilled throne and power to the Beast, we may perhaps suppose him to have appeared divested. Compare Apoc. xii. 17, xiii. 2. So, when again spoken of as seized and bound by the Angel, Apoc. xx. 2, we may perhaps suppose that he did not appear with his old covering of the *seven-headed dragon-skin*.

<sup>4</sup> Apoc. xvii. 11. See my p. 110, Note <sup>2</sup>, *suprà*.

\* See my Vol. ii. p. 508, Note <sup>2</sup>.



Dragon's throne and empire in Western Christendom. Once more, by the *False Prophet*, at least when with the further characteristic attached to it, so as in Apoc. xix. 20, of acting out its functions "before," or in subordination to, the Beast, (a characteristic which completely identifies it with the *two-horned lambskin-covered Beast* of Apoc. xiii.) there is meant, we have seen, the *apostate Priesthood* of the Patriarchate of Western Europe, from and after the time of its subjection and official attachment to the Romish Popedom.<sup>1</sup>

And what then, if this be correct, the *three spirits*, or *principles*, that may be considered most fitly characteristic of these three several actors on the scene:—of the Devil, in that character specially in which he had agitated and spoken against Christ's Church in the times of Pagan Rome; <sup>2</sup> of the Roman Papal Antichrist, and of the Priesthood of the apostate Romish Church? To myself, with reference to the *two first*, the answer seems sufficiently obvious:—viz. that the one from the *Dragon's* mouth is the principle of *heathen-like infidelity*, with its proper accompaniment of *blasphemy*, and perhaps too of *rebelliousness against rightful authority*, when opposed to it, alike divine and human: ("by which sin fell the angels:")<sup>3</sup>—and the one from the *Beast* the pure direct principle of *Popery*, based on its fundamental antichristian dogma of the Roman Pope being Christ's divinely appointed Vicegerent on earth. But, on the question as to the *third* spirit intended, there is difficulty. For, as just defined, it seems hard to assign to the *False Prophet's* spirit a sufficiently distinct character from the *Beast's* spirit; seeing that the *two-horned Beast* is described as the chief organ, agent, and mouth-piece, as well as supporter, of the *Papal Beast*, its principal. Yet, on closer examination, the difficulty will I think vanish. The name here given to this agent of evil is simply that of "*the False Prophet*;" without any further adjunct,

<sup>1</sup> It may be worth the reader's while again to consider, and satisfy himself on the exposition given to this effect, Part iv. Chap. vi.

<sup>2</sup> The symbol of the *frog* seems to indicate opposition by *speaking* and *agitation*, at this particular epoch, rather than by active violence and persecution; prior to the last war itself.

<sup>3</sup> Compare 1 Tim. iii. 6, "Lest, being lifted up by *pride*, he fall into the condemnation of the devil;" and the notices of the fall of the lost spirits from their once high estate, given 2 Peter ii. 4, Jude 6.—So too our Homily against Rebellion.

expressive of its subjection to the Beast, so as in Apoc. xix. This seems not obscurely to suggest the solution. For "*the False Prophet*" is, by itself, the *generic* appellation of an *apostate Priesthood* in the professing Church :<sup>1</sup> and of an apostate Priesthood what the most characteristic spirit but that of *priestcraft*? A spirit this of which the essence in profest Christianity, just as in heathenism, is to arrogate to its own peculiar order the distinction of being the appointed and necessary earthly mediator between men and God, the one effective deprecator of His wrath, and channel of his grace and salvation ; and which is thus seen to be distinct from, and independent of, that of direct Popery ; though naturally, and almost necessarily, its ally. In fact it acted thus independently ere the close of the 4th and through the 5th century, long before its *organization* under the particular form of the two-horned lambskin-covered Beast of Apoc. xiii., just as the *preparer of the way* for a heading sacerdotal earthly Antichrist ;<sup>2</sup> though afterwards, under the particular organization just spoken of, devoting itself to him as his most effective instrument and supporter : still, however, with the full retention of its own essentiality of the spirit of *Priestcraft*.<sup>3</sup>

Such, I say,—if the Dragon, Beast, and False Prophet mean what I think it proved they mean,<sup>4</sup>—appear to me clearly to be the three principles, or spirits, intended :—spirits in regard of which the prophecy intimates that they would act with unity of effect, if not of purpose, so as to gather the powers of the world, (very much as Ahab was seduced by a lying spirit to Ramoth Gilead,<sup>5</sup>) in antagon-

<sup>1</sup> I say *in the Church* ; for Christ speaks of *the disciples* as those among whom the false prophets would arise ; " who come to you in sheep's clothing," &c.

So *Vitringa*, p. 1117 ; " Per *pseudo-prophetam* doctores illi falsi qui, in ipsâ Evangelii clarissimâ luce, non destiterant suâ eruditione, eloquentiâ, et auctoritate falsæ doctrinæ religionis patrocinari, et plebes credulas detinere in perniciosis erroribus."

<sup>2</sup> See Vol. i. pp. 408—410.

<sup>3</sup> See pp. 197—205, *suprà*.

<sup>4</sup> A different view of the Dragon, Beast, or False Prophet, will of course involve a different view of the spirits that proceed from them. As, however, I conceive my proof to have been complete of these three Apocalyptic symbols, I shall not trouble the reader with any notice or refutation of other English Protestant views. The German Præterist expositors, consistently with their view, refer to the vain but high pretences of the *heathen* priesthood, as the thing intended by the spirit from out of the mouth of the False Prophet.

My readers will not have forgotten that the very symbol of a *lambskin* covering pretty much excludes the idea of any but a *pseudo-Christian* priesthood. See p. 209, Note<sup>1</sup>, *suprà*.

<sup>5</sup> 1 Kings xxii.

ism against Christ's truth and people,<sup>1</sup> introductorily to the great coming day of final conflict. And, if these be the spirits intended,—spirits to go forth, let it be remembered, after a certain progress made in the drying up under the sixth Vial of the Turkman flood from the Euphrates,—it is only too obvious that within the last twenty or thirty years, the precise period marked out in the prophecy, (for I will carry down my sketch, now on revising for my 5th Edition, to the time present, A.D. 1861,) there has been an outgoing of principles and spirits of error, both in England and over the world, which have most strikingly answered to each and every one of them.

I proceed to show this : but must just suggest preliminarily, ere doing so, how, in his early warfare against Christianity, the Dragon of Pagan Rome carried it on primarily for above two centuries by means of appeal, through the mouth of heathen priests, to the superstition of the populace, and the infidel arguments and sneers of heathen philosophers, ere the decisive wars by physical force on the battle-field of nations.<sup>3</sup> Very similar, it will be seen, is the mode of warfare here described as carried out against Christian gospel-truth, under the two last Vials, by the Dragon and his confederates. First go forth vauntingly against it the spirits of superstition and infidelity ; then finally comes the appeal to physical force in the war of the great day of God Almighty !

In my retrospective historic sketch I shall begin from about A.D. 1830 ; at which time, it may be remembered, the predicted drying up of the mystic Euphrates had had fulfilment alike in Greece, in the trans-Danubian Turkish provinces, and in Algiers. I commence from that epoch, though already some few years before it the two first mentioned spirits had made themselves very noticeable on the scene, because about that time there occurred certain momentous political changes in France and England, the two

<sup>1</sup> The kings gathered by the three spirits were to be the kings of the whole *οικουμένη* ; those engaged in conflict with the Lamb, the kings of the *γη*. If therefore the first term be considered to have a larger meaning than the other, (see Note<sup>3</sup>, p. 492, supra,) there may perhaps be meant a distinction of the kings of the *γη* only as *actors* in the conflict, of the others as *spectators*.

<sup>2</sup> See my Vol. i. 212—222; and Vol. iii. 19—22.

most influential powers of Western Christendom, — in France that of its second democratic Revolution,<sup>1</sup> in England those of the Roman Catholic Emancipation Act<sup>2</sup> and the Reform Bill,<sup>3</sup>—whereby (though little intended by the chief authors of those changes in England) the issuing forth of the three unclean spirits spoken of, in that virtual alliance with each other, in regard at least of their one common principle of enmity to evangelic religion, of which I may have to speak as perhaps indicated by the Apocalyptic prophecy, was eminently accelerated and helped forward.—And in our sketch let us more especially mark their actings in *our own country*:—not merely because it is that about which we must ever nationally feel the greatest interest; but yet more because, from its being during the Revolutionary æra the chief asylum of true religion, and central point whence the actings for the evangelization of the world had for some time previous been proceeding, it was here that their effective working would of course be the most extensively injurious; and here consequently, above all other countries in European Christendom, that the Author of evil might be expected to urge their going forth in power, with his deepest subtlety and mightiest energies.

I. Thus then, as to the *first* spirit specified,—that from the mouth of the *Dragon*, (the early antagonist of Christianity in the days of Roman Paganism,) or unclean spirit of *heathenlike infidelity*, in all its proud rebelliousness against the truth, as opposed to it, whether in religion, morals, government, or even science itself,—can any who then were living, and capable of observation, forget its sudden furious outbreak in England, after the overthrow of the Bourbon dynasty in France, about the time of the mootings and the progress of the Reform Bill? I refer not to the political measure itself, and consequent change in our national constitution; whether wisely planned, or less wisely; and whether, in the result, injurious in the main, or in God's Providence overruled for good to our country. But I refer to the extraordinary anti-religious as well as revo-

<sup>1</sup> A.D. 1830.  
VOL. III.

<sup>2</sup> A.D. 1829.  
32

<sup>3</sup> A.D. 1832.

lutionary agitation of the public mind in England attendant on it; such almost as of the herd which the legion of evil spirits impelled into the Lake of Gennesareth. For it is not to be forgotten how rank and property, church and state, were at the epoch alluded to alike endangered by it; till the Premier himself, the ostensible author of the Reform Bill, quailed and fell before the tempest:—how a conjunction of the avowed infidel in religion and revolutionary democrat in politics was both within Parliament and without it often marked prominently; <sup>1</sup> and their incessant cry, like that of the frogs from the Stygian pool of the great Greek dramatist, <sup>2</sup> heard addressing itself to the masses, “Agitate, Agitate:”—how legislators, and even peers, as men infatuated, stood in their places in Parliament advising passive resistance to the law; and others, with yet clearer token of the spirit speaking in them, suggested recourse to physical force, and even murder:—how our Church, which (whatever its imperfections) must be deemed surely, by reason of its scriptural Articles and Liturgy, to be a pillar and ground of the faith, was marked as the special object of enmity and attack; its property saved with difficulty, its prelates insulted, and even within the House of Lords itself admonished to set their house in order:—how the dissenting body more especially was infected with the spirit; <sup>3</sup> and many dissenting ministers, (not of the Socinians only, but even of the more orthodox sects,) instead of confining themselves, like the most illustrious of their predecessors, to the work of evangelists at home, and the promotion of evangelic missions abroad, became strangely known as political agitators: latitudinarianized in their religious associations, if not their religious profession, to an extent such as to make them seem partizans of infidelity. By many, we cannot doubt, what was then said and done, was said and done under a temporary infatuation. But this only the more strikingly illustrates the influence on them of a mighty spirit of delusion. Nothing, I think, but an hypothesis like what the text

<sup>1</sup> Of course I do not speak of the mere advisers of a more democratic basis of the Constitution. I am fully aware that decided democratic principles may be united with sincere reverence for religion.

<sup>2</sup> So in the *Barraçoi* of Aristophanes.

<sup>3</sup> The Wesleyans, at least their leaders, were an honourable exception; and many too of other dissenters. I speak of the generality.

suggests, of the outgoing of such a spirit over the land, can at all adequately account for the phænomenon. "I never said that the *vox populi* was of course the *vox Dei*," are the reported words of Coleridge. "It may be. But it may with equal probability be the *vox Diaboli*. That the voice of ten millions of men calling for the same thing is a *spirit*, I believe. But whether that be a *spirit of heaven*, or *of hell*, I can only know by trying the thing called for by the prescript of reason and God's will." However free from anything like a spirit from hell were those whose minds were bent simply on what they viewed as a constitutional improvement by the broader and more democratic basis of the representation, yet, as regards the godless, irreligious spirit which burst out with such singular vehemence at the political crisis, there could be no two opinions with the wise and good as to whence its origin.

Nor, though that fearful crisis after a while passed away, and a marked re-action gradually took place, especially amongst the English middle classes, in favour not only of order and the constitution, but also of the Church, (whether altogether in favour of *true religion* is a different question, partially to be considered under another head in this Chapter,) was the unclean infidel spirit from the Dragon's mouth so soon silenced. It continued still alive and active long after among the lower orders. All through the time of this Work being originally written Socialism, Chartism, and Infidelity still kept up in England their machinery of agitation; with inflammatory haranguings from which, after the old radical-papist models, there was sometimes not excluded a more than half prompting even to *assassination* and *murder*.<sup>1</sup>—It was the age of *Journalism*; and the Draconic Spirit must have its journals and newspaper organs, as well as its mob orators.<sup>2</sup> In the period under review

<sup>1</sup> In illustration of the spirit's practical working I might refer to the outbreak of the manufacturing population in 1842, to the Chartist Bowker's case, convicted in 1849 for blasphemy, sedition, and advocacy of bloodshedding for popular rights, as if *after Jesus Christ's example*, and to the subsequent assassination of Mr. Drummond, by mistake for Sir R. Peel! The Manchester Courier, commenting on this last-mentioned catastrophe, observed, not without reason, that the stories of murderous plots against the Queen's ministers, told *approvingly* to their inflamed hearers by the agents and partizans of certain political Associations of a more or less revolutionary character, may most probably have been that which first suggested the idea to the assassin.

<sup>2</sup> I abstract, in what follows, very much from Mr. Bickersteth's Sermons before the Protestant Association; and the "Divine Warning" condensing them.

the publication of the *New Moral World* was early the exponent and infamous organ of the polluted sect of Socialists. There was another Journal that called itself *The Atheist and Republican*,<sup>1</sup> which spoke of having thirty able contributors, and boasted of all Continental Christendom, and a large part of England as its own: and yet another (a Sunday paper) called the *Weekly Dispatch*, of much the same irreligious revolutionary character, and of which the circulation was immense. Then came the *Northern Star*, and other such-like organs of the Chartists; and again the *Oracle of Reason*, and other similar weekly penny publications: of which the character was such, that Mr. Bickersteth expressed his astonishment how Satan could have so dropped the veil, and openly manifested his spirit of lying and blasphemy.<sup>2</sup> Not long after Lord Ashley told, in his place in Parliament, of halls opened for factory operatives, including *children*, in which infidelity and sedition were, as a system, sedulously inculcated.—Nor was the more elaborate appeal to human reason against the truths of Christianity wanting. The infidel metaphysics and infidel anti-Scriptural criticisms of German sceptics were infused first in spirit, then in translations, into England. Altogether, both in respect of its more virulent blasphemies against Bible doctrines, its elaborated arguments against the Bible's divine supernatural inspiration, and the Pantheistic philosophy that it would substitute for the Gospel,<sup>3</sup> a person familiar with the history of the attacks on Christianity made by the philosophers of old Pagan Rome, about the time of the last contest between Christianity and Paganism depicted in the vision of the Dragon and the Woman, (Apoc. xii.,) might very naturally have had suggested to his mind the identity of the spirit in the one case and the

<sup>1</sup> The following awful placard, taken from the shop of a miserable incendiary of this character, and exhibited before the magistrate in Bow-street, will well illustrate my sketch of the spirit spoken of, as acting among the lower orders.

"What is God? The Tyrant-Idea personified.—What is the God-Idea promulgated for? To subjugate the many for the benefit of the few.—How is this contrived? The God-Idea conveys the notion of superior and inferior; produces worship, prostration of intellect, and subjugation."

<sup>2</sup> *Ib.* p. 10. He observes that our Lord's *incarnation*, that highest act of God's love, is the constant subject of denial and ridicule, mockery and blasphemy.

<sup>3</sup> See Sedgwick's *Studies of the University*, Pref. to 5th Ed. § 9. "Pantheism is but Atheism tricked out in the semblance of religion." p. clxxvii.

other; though at the interval of above 1500 years.<sup>1</sup> Mr. F. Newman's "Phases of Faith," Mr. Greg's "Creed of Christendom," John Stirling's affecting history, from 1835 to his entering into eternity's "deep darkness"<sup>2</sup> in 1844, and the Westminster Review as the able periodical of the School, all told, ere the publication of my 4th Edition in 1851, of the outgoing and influential progress of the spirit of infidel speculation. And now in 1861, as my 5th Edition is passing through the press, (let me advance a little beyond the more proper chronological limit of this Chapter, as the three spirits were evidently to extend their voice into the times of the 7th and last Vial,) the "Oxford Essays" has startled the whole English people by showing that the Infidel Spirit has invaded, and sought to establish itself in, the very sanctuary of the English Church; and to mock its Christian Articles and Creeds by the theory of an admissible infidel interpretation.

So in regard of *England*. And the same, but with even yet more effect, in *the continental countries* whence the Draconic spirit came to us, more especially in *France* and *Germany*, during the 20 years, or so, that we are passing in review.—How *France* was affected by it was evident from the spirit of its journals, and character, alike infidel and impure, of its popular literature, whether romances, poetry, or even science:<sup>3</sup> till, on the overthrow of King Louis Philippe in that country, the *unclean infidel* spirit yet more openly spoke out; and showed how it animated, though not un-mixed with another spirit of which more presently,<sup>4</sup> the then dominant Socialists.—The same in *Spain*, *Portugal*, and *Italy*; while in *Russia*, *Germany*, *Denmark* there now rose up Associations of "Illuminati," bent on the propagandism of infidelity.<sup>5</sup>—As regards *Germany* the names of *Strauss* and *Baur* of Tübingen will suggest at once the impieties, and the wide-spread influence, of its sceptical schools.<sup>6</sup> And

<sup>1</sup> See this illustrated in a Paper in the Appendix.

<sup>2</sup> His own words in his last letter to Carlyle. *Life*, p. 334. Just like poor Shelley, the poet, before him.

<sup>3</sup> e. g. the materialism of Geoffroy St. Hilaire. *Sedgw. ib. xi.* <sup>4</sup> See p. 512, &c.

<sup>5</sup> So a faithful missionary at Leipsic, ap. *Div. Warning*, p. 34. "You have no idea," says he, "how *the old Dragon* puts his artillery into battle-array against the Church of Christ."

<sup>6</sup> "Let us drink to Jesus Christ, Couthon, St. Just, Robespierre." So one Socialist speaker, in France, in 1848. "To the living Christ, the French people." So



*Switzerland* too was agitated, and soon in part revolutionized, by the same infidel socialist spirit within it.<sup>1</sup> In fact it was thus that the mine was prepared, charged, and at length fired, by which the whole political and social fabric in continental Europe was, as by an earthquake, shaken in 1848 to its very foundation.

Nor was *Europe* to be the only sphere affected. The unclean spirit from out of the mouth of the Dragon, as well as those from his two companions, was to have a wider range than the old Roman earth; even that of *the whole world*. And such was the fact. Take e. g. the case of *India*. On the renewal of the East Indian Charter in 1833, and when restrictions on the trade previously existing were removed, the opportunity was seized to send out thither bales of the works of Tom Paine, and other such-like infidel revolutionary publications. And with these Calcutta was inundated, as Dr. Duff proclaimed in 1837 with burning eloquence, to seduce and poison the youthful mind of India:<sup>2</sup> just when intellectually awakened to see the falsehood and absurdity of Hindooism; and called by the concordant voices of the Christian missionary, and of the Book of the everlasting Gospel, to turn from vain idols to serve the living God. Indeed from each of the three Indian Presidencies the same report has been brought. In all of them, —and in other of our colonies also,—the same spirit has been, and is still, active from out of the mouth of the *Dragon*.<sup>3</sup>

And everywhere more and more, as it has been advancing, who knows not of the frog-like swelling words of vanity that ever marked its utterances, not least in England?—Has it not had even its *στυμνία* of science to boast of; as in the pretended creations and transmutations of Crosse, Dar-

another. I cite from Hislop's "Red Republic," pp. 141, 143; who gives sundry illustrative quotations from the Journals of that era. As regards *Germany* he notices, pp. 130—132, how avowed atheists and blasphemers were chosen by great towns, e. g. Hamburgh, to represent them in the Frankfort Parliament.

<sup>1</sup> In 1846 my attention was drawn by our Envoy, Mr. Morier, to a Pamphlet then recently published at Lausanne, or Vevay, called *Le Communisme*; of which the principles were just the same that I have described as rife in France and Germany; and which in Switzerland so prevailed at that time as to characterize the strongest and dominant political party.

<sup>2</sup> So too Bishop Corrie in 1833. *Life*, p. 524.

<sup>3</sup> In 1855 a private friend, writing from Benares, speaks of the Moulva, Mr. French's Mahomedan antagonist at Agra, having published a Book which was a compilation of all that English and German infidels had written against our Bible Canon.

For further evidence on this head I may refer to Lord Ashley's speech of Feb. 28, 1843: also to the various reports of the chief Protestant Missionary Societies.

win, &c.; and its spiritualistic communications too with the unseen world?<sup>1</sup> It has boasted itself as if all that used to be thought wisdom in the writings of the old champions of Christianity was the mere childishness of an inferior by-gone æra; and it alone were the possessor and enunciator of science and the highest philosophy.

II. Nor, *secondly*, has the spirit of *Popery*,—the spirit from the mouth of the *Beast*,—been within the last 20 or 30 years (for here, as before, I must continue my sketch down to the present year 1861) less active and stirring.

What the Popes did immediately after their restoration to the Romish See, before the outpouring of the sixth Vial, so as already before noticed, must be considered, I conceive, as but preparatory to the fulfilment of the figuration in the prophetic clause of our text. I refer to their issuing, forthwith on their resettlement at Rome, of those official *bulls*, *allocutions*, and *indulgences*, which asserted or implied all the Pope's old pretensions in the character of *Christ's Vicar*; <sup>2</sup> (was it not rather that of *Antichrist*?) and their re-institution of the *Inquisition* and of the *Jesuits*: these latter such reckless agitators for the advancement of Popery, that Vitringa thought the three frog-like spirits might one and all be even in his time discerned in them.<sup>3</sup> I say I conceive that this is to be viewed as but the preparatory step to their fulfilment of what concerns them in the prophecy of the text. For the authority they then sought to exercise was very much after the old model; without any influential associated outgoing of the direct spirit from the Dragon, in ostensible alliance. So it was in France under the Bourbons, in Spain under Ferdinand, and in Portugal under Don Miguel; as well as in Bavaria, Austria, Sardinia, Naples.<sup>4</sup> In each and all there was a marked revival of Popery; and in some cases even the Inquisition was again brought into active operation.<sup>5</sup> But, after a while, this being contrary to the spirit

<sup>1</sup> "Experiments impudently exhibited in our Capital have far outdone the ancient tricks of magic." "We breed mites by the fecundating touch of a galvanic wire." "What was the old second-sight to the mesmeric visions of one seated on the tripod of clair-voyance?" Sedgwick, *ib.* clxiii., clxvii.; &c.

<sup>2</sup> See p. 418, &c., *suprà*.

<sup>3</sup> In Apocal. p. 975.

<sup>4</sup> See p. 421, &c., *suprà*.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* Mr. Wilberforce notes in the year 1819 hearing from a gentleman from Spain, that the Inquisition had then begun to fulminate in that country against the damnable errors of Luther. *Life*, v. 17.

of the age, a popular re-action ensued in the three first-named countries; and the legitimists, its friends of the *old* regime, were driven from their kingdoms.

But then, however, appeared the power and aptness of Popery for alliance with whatever new political forms of government might arise out of the political spirit most closely associated with the Draconic, or infidel.—Already in 1829, 1830, the unclean spirit from the mouth of the *Beast* had been essaying its strength, conjunctively with that from the *Dragon*, in two countries under Protestant government, viz. Ireland and Belgium; and the essay had been in either case crowned with success. After the agitation of Ireland to its very centre for years, chiefly by united Romish priests and revolutionary demagogues, of every degree of laxity in the gospel-faith, the Roman Catholic Emancipation Bill was past in 1829, as a preferable alternative to civil war.<sup>1</sup> Again, the next year, through the united action there of spirits kindred to those in Ireland, the Dutch Protestant King was expelled from Belgium. Whereupon,—notwithstanding the almost contemporary expulsion from France of its friends the Bourbons by a similar but sole dominant democracy,—the Papal Court, after hesitating for a while what course to pursue in the new conjuncture, being brought to a conviction that democracy was in the ascendant in Western Europe, and finding that the French people, all democratic as they were, professed Catholicism as the religion of the great majority of the nation, and that its King of the Barricades himself every way courted the Papal Church and Hierarchy,—I say under these circumstances the resolution seemed taken by it, though not without hesitation, to shape its policy conformably.<sup>2</sup> It appeared as if the *Dragon* had learnt from the

<sup>1</sup> So (if I remember right) the Duke of Wellington, in a speech in the House of Lords.

<sup>2</sup> The following extract is taken from the Quarterly Review for June, 1844, p. 165, on the point referred to. “There is an increasing disunion in the Papal Councils. The doctrines of La Mennais have made great progress; and Padre Ventura, who was silenced because of the countenance he gave the French Abbé, when at Rome, is again in favour, and preached the Quadragesimal sermons this year. Hence the O’Connellite faction in Rome, which has always been opposed by Father Routham, General of the Jesuits, as being against all government in Church and State, while assuming the mask of attacking only the supremacy of an *heretical* Church, has gained much support. That O’Connellite faction has, we grieve to say, been taken up by all the English Roman Catholics: and the admirers of La Mennais are talking more

results of the first and great French Revolution that he could not let loose on Christendom the demoralizing atheistic spirit, all unmodified and alone, without the danger of a re-action following in favour of order, and perhaps even of true religion, (for religion, in some form or other, the human soul craves after,<sup>1</sup>) and thus that an alliance might be desirable with his creature the Beast: while, on the other hand, the *Beast* perceived also its advantage in the alliance, and accepted it when offered. It was clear however that it was one intended by the Master manager to be open or more covert, according to circumstances; and not indeed to continue without open temporary quarrels, (how could it be but that such would arise between two such different spirits each aspiring to dominancy?) but so however as the better to mask the combination:<sup>2</sup> there being thus presented a double seduction from the truth and gospel of Jesus; according as either infidelity, or a corrupt anti-christian Christianity, might best suit the character of the country, the times, or the individual.—Such, I say, began and continued to be the state of things in most countries of Western Europe for the next 16 or 18 years following after the second French Revolution in 1830.

In *England*, (where, as before, I wish particularly to trace its movement,) the Reform Bill having been past in 1832, through the conjunction of Romanists (now admitted into Parliament) and the several sections of real or self-styled Liberals, results succeeded such as, in a manner and measure little anticipated, to strengthen the cause of Popery, alike in this country and in the English Colonial possessions everywhere abroad.—*At home*, through the near balance of parties, the turning of the scale of political power was found to be in the hands of the Irish Papal party: and thereby, substantially, very much of the power of the Government itself devolved on it. Hence in the

composedly of the possibility of their throwing off all connection with government everywhere, and placing themselves at the head of the revolutionists throughout Europe.”

It is observable that in Pope Gregory's encyclical Letter of 1825, they who preached against the union of *Church and State* were represented as the authors of all mischief. But the tone was changed in 1830.

<sup>1</sup> So Homer, one of Nature's truest poets: *Θεων χαιρεουσ' ανθρωποι.*

<sup>2</sup> It is essential, I conceive, to the right understanding and application of the prophecy to remember this.

House of Commons the deference paid to Romish principles, discouragement of all upholding of the distinctive principles of Evangelical Protestantism, and not infrequent assertion (amidst the applause alike of the Romish and the semi-sceptical delegates) of the obscurity of the Bible, the equal probability of truth in the most contrary views of its essential dogmas, Popish as much as Protestant, and propriety therefore of a man's following the way of his fathers:<sup>1</sup>—assertions directly insulting, surely, to Him who gave the Bible;<sup>2</sup> and fitted to suggest to weak minds a wish for some *professedly* surer guide to the interpretation of Scripture than Protestantism could offer; that is, if the Bible were indeed the word of God. So alike in the Houses of Parliament, and throughout the country, while *Infidelity* was encouraged on the one hand, *Popery*, with its sure rule of faith, was encouraged and strengthened on the other. And now Romish chapels and convents and colleges sprang up with increased rapidity over England.<sup>3</sup> Conversions became frequent. The press gave its powerful aid to the cause. Roman Catholic reviews, magazines, and newspapers,—many characterised by great subtlety of argument, and not a little display of learning,<sup>4</sup>—as well as cheap re-

<sup>1</sup> As a notable example take the following from Lord Howick, (now Earl Grey,) in the Debate on the Irish Question, Feb. 19, 1844. "The Right Hon. gentleman (Mr. Shaw) said, 'We take our stand on the broad ground of *religious truth*.' If there were wanting one thing more than another to make the maintenance of an Established Church offensive to the Irish people, it would be the employment of this argument. It was as much as to say that the Catholics were wrong, and the Protestants right. What right had he to assume that the Catholic faith was false? More than half the world adhered to it." So it was once sneeringly asked by Pilate, "What is truth?"

<sup>2</sup> In the case of a letter, or document, address by a parent to his child on a matter avowedly most deeply affecting the child's well-being, would not that parent think it insulting, were a person to assert that he had deliberately so written the letter as that the child might take it as well the wrong way as the right one; and that, even on occasion of the child's application to himself for explanation, he had still, notwithstanding his direct promise to the contrary, left the child in doubt?

<sup>3</sup> The Reformation Society has published maps from time to time, in the course of the last twenty years, illustrative of this their rapid and continued increase.—The *Catholic Directory* for 1843, in a list corrected up to that time, enumerates 571 Roman Catholic churches or chapels, 9 colleges, 22 convents and monasteries; and states the number of the Romish missionary priests in *Great Britain* at 733. The splendour of some of the churches is made a matter of boast in it; especially of the new Metropolitan Popish Cathedral in St. George's Fields. To attract subscribers to the church-building, it promises in various cases that *monthly masses*, or an annual solemn *requiem*, shall be celebrated for the souls of the donors.

In the *Catholic Directory* for 1850 the enumeration for *Great Britain* stands thus:—Churches 680; Colleges 11; Convents 51; Missionary Priests 929. Its *colonial* list is *similarly enlarged*.

<sup>4</sup> Mr. Bickersteth, in a Sermon, preached I think in 1843, enumerates the *Dublin*

ligious controversial works,<sup>1</sup> and tracts fitted for the multitude, obtained, and have ever since continued to obtain, wide circulation among Protestants: and romances, and novels, and works on poetry, history, music, architecture,<sup>2</sup> all of the same character, helped forward the movement.—Meanwhile in *Ireland*, Popery was rampant. And as the unclean spirit, speaking from the altars of the Popish chapels, swayed and infuriated the blind multitude that worshipped before them, the Protestant clergy, (most especially if active in the work of evangelists,) in respect of their property, and sometimes even of their lives, were almost treated as without the pale of the law: their institutions for educating the poor in gospel-truth forced too often to give place to the unclean teaching of Popery;<sup>3</sup> and the

*Review*, the *Roman Magazine*, the *True Tablet*, the *Catholic* newspaper, *Lucas's Penny Reader*, the *Tracts* of the Catholic Institute, (a notice of which I see in the Catholic Directory for 1843, p. 184,) and many others. He adds that the "*Catholic*" is published every week, having twelve quarto pages of close print, and containing reviews of modern books, Protestant journals, and Bishops' charges, &c., written with much subtle cunning and sarcasm; and that it is sent gratuitously to every Romish priest in Great Britain and Ireland, and to the heads of every Popish college and Institute for education in the United Kingdom.

In another place (p. 35) Mr. B. gives an extract from the *Phoenix* of April 10, 1840, an Edinburgh Romanist paper, characteristic of the ready union of Popery with all, and any, against our venerable Church. "Is this the tenth year of emancipation, and do we yet endure tithes and church rates? But the system is to be extended: 16,000 churches of error and falsehood, supported by insolent robbery and oppression, are not enough. Hundreds, nay, thousands more wrung from the sufferings of the poor Catholic and Dissenter, for the dispensation of doctrines which he abhors! . . . It must not, shall not be. Above all iniquity is the Established Church of England, founded in fraud, cemented with blood, and prolonged by ignorance; existing through more than Carthaginian perfidy and cruelty. *Delenda est Carthago.*"

<sup>1</sup> E. g. the *Derby cheap Reprint of Standard Roman Catholic Works*: in which works like *Milner's End of Controversy* are priced at but a shilling.

<sup>2</sup> E. g. *The Broad Stone of Honour*, *Geraldine*, *Pugin's Ancient Cathedrals*, &c.

<sup>3</sup> How unclean the fountain at Maynooth, and in the Irish Church, the name of *Dens* may suffice to show. And if such the fountain, what the streams?—The Bishop of London, in a late Charge, speaks of the *Jesuits* as "directing the education of a great part of the people of *Ireland*, as well as of many of the sons of the Roman Catholic nobility and gentry of *England*;" and adds a quotation from the Arrêt of the Parliament of Paris in 1762, characterizing them as a sect "*d'impies, fanaïques, corrupteurs.*" p. 75.\*

\* In Feuerbach's Narrative of remarkable crimes, compiled from the official records of the Courts of Bavaria, and published in 1839, we are told that Father Sattler's *Ethica Christiana*, a large work, "containing almost a caricature of the sort of morals and casuistry usually called *Jesuitical*, was a favourite text-book in many places of ecclesiastical education in the South of Germany." I quote this from the Edinburgh Review for October 1845, p. 343: where it occurs in an abstract from Feuerbach of the very remarkable case of Priest Reimbauer, accused of and condemned for murder. So that the Romanist priesthood in Southern Germany have their counterpart to the Dens and Delahogue of the Irish priesthood.—Let those who would see the natural working of such a system in the Priesthood, its searing of the conscience, and training it to strong delusion, read that awful but most instructive narrative.

death's head and cross-bones held out *in terrorem* against all who might attempt to withstand its political projects.— Yet again to the vast *English foreign colonies* the same spirit had now the opportunity of speeding forth in power; to India, Australia, New Zealand, the Cape, Canada, Newfoundland: <sup>1</sup>—everywhere Romish bishops and priests, salaried by Government, though with instructions from the Pope, <sup>2</sup> on their settlement organizing the Romish interests: seizing if possible on the education, influencing newspapers, and, in case of popular institutions, agitating for political power; in conjunction (witness the late histories of Canada and of Newfoundland) with the revolutionary and infidel, perhaps too the *anti-English*, <sup>3</sup> element.

So, I say, in England and its Colonies for some 18 or 20 years after the Roman Catholic emancipation, and passing of the Reform Bill in 1829 and 1832: until at length in 1850 our whole island was astounded by the Bull of Pius IX, ignoring our Protestant Church, and parcelling out England, as if now prepared for it, into Romish Episcopates: a Bull followed by the Pastoral of his Legate Cardinal Wiseman, which announced that he was come to *govern* the counties of his Archbishopric; obviously in defiance of the allegiance due to the Queen of England.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> In the *Catholic Directory* for 1843 I see a startling list of "*Catholic Bishops and Vicars Apostolic*," in the British colonies and possessions. The *sees or locations* enumerated are, Australia and Van Diemen's Land, Calcutta, Madras, Bombay, North India, the Western Oceania and Cape of Good Hope, the two Canadas, Hudson's Bay, Nova Scotia, Newfoundland, Jamaica, Trinidad, Guiana, Gibraltar, Malta, Zante.

<sup>2</sup> In a late paper, for example, I see a notice from the *Univers*, French journal, of M. Polding, *Archbishop of Sydney*, in Australia, visiting the Pope before departure from Rome, and receiving his final instructions. It is added that four Italian missionaries go with M. Polding, to be followed by several others of the same order *of the passion*.

<sup>3</sup> In Governor Fitzroy's despatch from New Zealand, printed by order of the House of Commons, and dated Sept. 16, 1844, there occurs the following notice respecting certain disturbances there, broken however by asterisks. "The late disturbances at the Bay of Islands were caused chiefly by \* \* \* exciting the natives to resist British authority. I should be sorry indeed to find that any of the *Roman Catholic missionaries* have contributed to excite such a feeling. \* \* \* They have circulated small books in the native language, printed at their own press, the contents of which are considered to be very objectionable: and though confined, it may be said, to religious questions, there are passages which in my opinion have a direct tendency to cause a bad feeling to the *English* generally."

<sup>4</sup> The Pope's Letter Apostolical, dated Rome, Sept. 29, 1850, and issued "*under the Seal of the Fisherman*," begins with asserting "the power of ruling the universal Church, committed by our Lord Jesus Christ to the Roman Pontiff in the person of St. Peter," states how, "having taken into consideration the very large and everywhere increasing number of Catholics there, and that the impediments which principally stood in the way of the spread of Catholicity were daily being removed,"

Nor did *France* during that same period less prominently in her sphere help forward the unclean spirit from the Papal Antichrist. At home the Hierarchy and Priesthood gradually more and more set aside the old liberties of the Gallican Church, and, in accordance with the precepts of Count Joseph De Maistre,<sup>1</sup> became more purely Popish.<sup>2</sup> And,

he "judged the time to have come when the form of ecclesiastical government in England might be brought back to that model on which it exists among other nations:" and accordingly, after "imploping the aid of Almighty God, and also invoking the assistance of Mary the Virgin Mother of God, and of those saints who have illustrated England by their virtues," had decreed, "in the plenitude of his apostolic power," that in the kingdom of England "there should be restored the Hierarchy of ordinary Bishops," to be named from sees which he constituted in these Letters: viz. in the London district the sees of Westminster (which was constituted Archiepiscopal and Metropolitan) and Southwark; that of Westminster including the counties of Middlesex, Essex, Hertford, north of the Thames; that of Southwark the counties of Berks, Southampton, Surrey, Sussex, Kent, with the isles of Wight, Jersey, Guernsey, and others adjacent: in the northern district the see of Hexham: and so on:—"so that in the most flourishing kingdom of England there will be established one ecclesiastical Province, consisting of one Archbishop or Metropolitan Head, and 12 Bishops, his Suffragans: by whose exertions and pastoral cares we trust God will grant to Catholicity in that country a fruitful and daily increasing extension." He adds that his principal object in thus decreeing the restoration of the ordinary hierarchy of Bishops, and the observance of the Church's common law [i.e. the *Canon Law*], has been to pay regard to the well-being and growth of the Catholic religion throughout the realm of England."

In Cardinal Wiseman's Pastoral, thereon following, and dated from "the Flaminian Gate of Rome, Oct. 7, 1850," he notes these Letters Apostolic of the Pope; and how by a Brief, dated the same day, His Holiness was pleased to appoint him to the Archiepiscopal See of Westminster, and also to raise him to the rank of Cardinal Priest of the Holy Roman Church; giving him in public Consistory, as the insignia of the one dignity, the *Cardinalian hat*; and, in token of the other, the *Archiepiscopal pallium*: (on which see my p. 204 *suprà*;) and that accordingly, "at present, and till such time as the Holy See shall think fit otherwise to provide, we govern, and shall continue to govern, the Counties of Middlesex, Hertford, and Essex as Ordinary thereof, and those of Surrey, Sussex, Kent, Berkshire, and Hampshire, with the islands annexed, as Administrator with ordinary jurisdiction:" and he congratulates his fellow-Catholics on "the great work being thus complete; and on Catholic England having been restored to its orbit in the ecclesiastical firmament, from which its light had long vanished, and beginning now anew its course of regularly adjusted action round the centre of unity, and source of jurisdiction, light, and vigour. "And how," he adds, "must the saints of our country, whether Roman or British, Saxon or Norman, look down from their seats of bliss with beaming glance upon this new evidence of the faith and Church which led them to glory; . . . how take part in our joy as they see the lamp of the temple again enkindled and rebrightening."

On which last figurative phrase compare my notice of the two lamps of the Apocalyptic temple, Vol. ii. p. 208: also, on the Reformation of the Church in England, (as well as elsewhere,) *ib.* pp. 183—199; and on the falling of England, in its old character of a tenth of the Papal city, *ib.* pp. 472—475.

<sup>1</sup> De Maistre was a Savoyard nobleman, some time Ambassador from the Court of Turin to Saint Petersburg. His book, entitled "The Pope, considered in his relations with the Church, Temporal Sovereignities, Separated Churches, and the Cause of Civilization," was first published in 1817, and addressed by him very specially to the *French* people. After, I believe, many subsequent republications, it was translated into English by the Romish Priest Dawson.

<sup>2</sup> In the Catholic Directory for 1843, p. 2, there is given a *Formula* to be subscribed by all clergymen of the *Gallican* Church, before permission being given them by the London Vicar Apostolic to officiate in the Papal churches in England.



though the State admitted into its home-government not a little of a more liberal element, in opposition to Papal Jesuitism,<sup>1</sup> yet abroad it helped the Papal cause onward even more than England: the English Government under the Reform Bill having only forwarded its interests in conjunction, and on the same footing, with those of the Protestant Church and Protestant Sects of this kingdom; but France furthering them distinctively and alone. I refer not so much to what throughout the period under review it did (and indeed now in 1861 still does) in more distant parts of the world; <sup>2</sup> as, for example, in its Indian factories, in China,<sup>3</sup> in the Sandwich Isles of the Pacific, and more southerly group of the Marquesas; <sup>4</sup> sending out Romish missionaries,

It is a Formula of recognition of the *Pope* as the alone *Head of the Church*. "Ego profiteor et declaro me summo Pontifici Gregorio XVI, utpote Ecclesiæ capiti, subesse; et communicare illis omnibus, tanquam Ecclesiæ membris, qui jam cum Pio VII, quem quamdiu post suam ad Pontificatum assumptionem vixit fuisse Ecclesiæ caput confiteor, communionem usque ad ipsius mortem servarunt, et nunc Gregorio Papâ XVI communionem conjunguntur." This arose out of the partially anti-Papistic character of the French Romanist Church under Napoleon's Concordat. See p. 402 *suprà*.—It has become since then more and more purely Popish in spirit:—a fact this noticed as notorious in a discussion in the House of Commons, Feb. 1851. So in the Directory for 1850 the Formula, as unneeded, appears not.

<sup>1</sup> Michelet, in his late work "*Des Jesuites*," thus applies the Apocalyptic figure of the first Vial to the corrupt workings of the revived *Jesuit* system in France. "If God mean to strike us again, I pray that it may be with the sword. The wounds of the sword are frank and clean, which bleed but heal. But what can a nation do with disgraceful concealed sores, which grow old, and gain upon the system daily? From such corruption the worst to fear is the spirit of police in religion, of pious intrigue, the spirit of the Jesuits. Rather may God lay upon us ten times all forms of tyranny political and military, than suffer such a tyranny to pollute beloved France. A tyranny has this at least of good in it, that it often rouses the national sentiment: and they break it, or it breaks itself. But, if this sentiment be extinguished, if the gangrene gets into our flesh and bones, how then will you get rid of it? Now an outward tyranny contents itself with the outward man, the actions. But the religious police attacks the thoughts. The habits of thought become gradually changed under it, and the soul is injured in its depths."

The following had been a little previously the different application of the same symbol of the first Vial by the Procureur-General, on the trial of Quenisset before the French Chamber of Peers in December 1841, for shooting at the Duc D'Aumale: "France has in her bosom two corrosive and torturing sores; and, as long as they exist, we can never rely on a continuance of tranquillity: first, the secret revolutionary societies; next, the inflammatory publications, which incessantly incite antisocial passions, hatred against all that exists, and the wish to destroy."

Might not both be connected, and both true; the one naturally arising out of the other? See pp. 363, 373, *suprà*.

<sup>2</sup> On which compare Buonaparte's Institution for Romish Missions under French protection, observed on in my Note <sup>2</sup> p. 413, *suprà*.

<sup>3</sup> E. g. in the Evening Mail, Jan. 9. 1843, it was stated that eight clergy from the Seminary of Foreign Missions (the Parisian Seminary, I presume, of which more in the Note p. 515) had arrived at Bourdeaux, to sail by a French merchantman to India, en route to China.

<sup>4</sup> In the French King Louis Philippe's Speech in 1843, it was stated that the Marquesas islands were to be fully garrisoned by the French; and, the Journals add,

and establishing and forcibly protecting Romish missions:<sup>1</sup>—but more especially to the manner in which it has supported the Papal interest, and professed itself its protectress, *in the countries nearer home bordering on the Mediterranean*. Alike in Algeria, now a new Papal Episcopate,<sup>2</sup> and in Abyssinia, in Syria and in Egypt, indeed throughout the territories of the Turkish empire generally, the unclean spirit from the mouth of the Beast has, under these auspices, made its voice to be heard with long unwonted power.<sup>3</sup> Throughout the reign of the king of the Barricades the French flag was made to wave over the Roman Catholic churches and convents of Syria; *democratic France* still boasting to be the protectress of *Catholicism*.<sup>4</sup>—Nor, when there broke out in 1848 that third extraordinary revolution which involved the overthrow of royalty in France, expulsion of the House of Orleans, and establishment of the French democratic Republic, as a transition step to Louis

with a sufficient number of Romish *priests* accompanying, for the conversion of those groups of islands.

<sup>1</sup> The Appendix to the Report of the American Board of Missions for 1841 gives account of the Sandwich Islands' affair. Some Roman Catholic priests had been banished from them. In July 1839 Captain Laplace arrived in a French frigate, to demand satisfaction on the part of his Government; threatening hostilities unless the king consented to a treaty, guaranteeing the freedom of Catholic worship to natives as well as foreigners, and assigning a piece of land at Honolulu for the erection of a chapel. The king was compelled to make the treaty; and to give Captain Laplace a deposit of 25,000 dollars, to be retained until the satisfactory fulfilment of the treaty.

After this was first written the history of *Tahiti*, and of the French Protectorate forced on it, and the oppression of its Roman Catholic missionaries, became too notorious.

<sup>2</sup> Official accounts of the day related the journey of the French Bishop of Algiers to Paria for a bone of St. Augustine; the verification of the precious relic in the presence of a Papal envoy; its reception on his return to Toulon by the troops under arms; and its conveyance with the Bishop to Algeria; there to be deposited in a church then building, or to be built, at Hippo.

<sup>3</sup> "During the last two years," writes Dr. Crawford, "the Church of Rome has been continually sending missionaries of both sexes, and adapted to all classes of society, into Syria, Egypt, Persia, Abyssinia, and every accessible district of Asia. A society of *Jesuits from France* purchased a few years ago a house and premises near Beyrout, to found a college for the general education of the natives of Syria; and it was lately announced that they had already above 120 pupils, and that their college was daily increasing. The *Univers* of 1842 contained the following announcement. 'Alexandria, as well as Constantinople and Smyrna, is about to possess establishments of Lazarists and Sisters of St. Vincent de Paul, from France. The French Government has purchased from Mehemet Ali an extensive piece of ground, for the purpose of erecting a building in which the Lazarists and Sisters of Charity may give instruction to the youth of both sexes.'"

<sup>4</sup> It was avowed as the duty and policy of France to be the Patroness of Catholicism throughout Turkey and Heathendom, as well by the professedly *Protestant* prime minister Guizot, and professedly *infidel* Thiers, as by the *ultramontanist Count Montalembert*. And this notwithstanding the almost universal infidelity at the time among the educated in Paris and in France; and its avowed hostility to Popery.

Napoleon's dominancy in the revived empire, did France change on this head its policy. The world saw with amazement that when, under fear of the democratic faction at Rome, (a faction bent on appropriating to themselves the Pope's *temporal* power, without infringing on his *spiritual*,<sup>1</sup>) the Pope had fled from Rome, it was an army of democratic France; under direction of its then President, that fought against their brother Democrats at Rome, and restored the Pope to his capital and kingdom. At home, very remarkably, the Revolution having occurred just when the quarrelling of the spirit from the Dragon's mouth was beginning to be too sharp with that from the Beast's,<sup>2</sup> its result, when perfected in Louis Napoleon's Presidency, and then Emperorship, was to coerce the former, and re-establish the latter in high authority and favour. So that, during the earlier years of Louis Napoleon's reign, even yet more than during the reign of Louis Philippe, France carried out the Papacy-favouring policy; as a nation priding itself on being "the eldest son" of the Roman Church.<sup>3</sup>

It does not need that I say much of the activity and progress of Popery in *other* countries, during this same period. Suffice it to observe that the other *European* Roman Catholic States concurred in now giving their support and aid to the spirit from the Beast. So *Spain*; so *Portugal*:<sup>4</sup> so also, generally, the Southern states of *Ger-*

<sup>1</sup> "What," said one of its democrats in the spring of 1848, "would Rome be without the Pope? A mere third-rate city. In his purely spiritual character the Pope is a good thing." They wished to have the Pope in Rome, under their power; and thus as an instrument for their own aggrandizement. Such, before them, was the policy of the 1st Napoleon. See p. 403 *suprà*. Is Louis Napoleon's policy different?

<sup>2</sup> See, for example, Michelet's *Priests, Women, and Families*; and Quinct's *Lectures on Ultramontaniam*; works published and largely circulated in 1844, 1845.

<sup>3</sup> In the *Evening Mail* of Nov. 1, 1852, just after Louis Napoleon's election to the Emperorship, a correspondent wrote thus,—I think from Paris. "The Jesuits and Ultramontanes are drunk with exultation. The sacerdotal heel is on the neck of France. The Holy Roman Church dreams once more of universal empire:" &c.

<sup>4</sup> In 1845 there was resolved on in this spirit the restoration of the unsold property of the Romish Church, under Narvaez and the Queen Mother, in *Spain*. Again the case of Dr. Kalley, as considered and decided on in the Portuguese Courts at Madeira and Lisbon, showed that intolerance of Protestantism, if preaching or speaking openly, was still regarded and acted on as a law of *Portugal*.

Of *Portugal* Hewitson thus speaks, Dec. 1844.—"In Lisbon Popery is making mighty efforts to establish itself in exclusive domination over the minds of men. It is the seat and centre of Propagandism (i. e. throughout Portugal and its dependencies): . . . the source of all the evil influence that has been brought to bear against the good work going on at Madeira." So *Life*, p. 122: and, at p. 127, thus, "There is much infidelity abroad among all classes of the Portuguese under the guise of a

*many*; in which last-mentioned country moreover influential works, as of Görres and Möhler, in favour of the Papacy, were now published with large effect; <sup>1</sup> notwithstanding the simultaneous progress of the spirit of infidelity and irreligion. More especially, after the revolutionary events of 1848, *Austria* determined to throw itself into the arms of the Papacy; and by the Concordat gave it a power within its dominions such as it had never enjoyed since the time of the Emperor Joseph.<sup>2</sup>—Even in republican *Switzerland* the voice from the *Beast* was found not incapable of blending with that from the *Dragon*.<sup>3</sup> And so too, beyond the Atlantic, in the *American United States*. Albeit a Democracy, they were very notably one of this spirit's chief *foreign* scenes of successful progress.<sup>4</sup>

dozent outward observance of the rites of Popery. . . But all, whether they be bigots or infidels, are one in the determination to maintain the unity of the Church, and to promote its interests; (i. e. as an engine of political despotism.) Nor is the Church of Rome unwilling to be supported by alliance with infidelity. . . I think that at the present time there are at work together for the purpose of promoting the ascendancy of Rome the two distinct but closely-allied forces of superstition and infidelity. If we try to account for the appearance of a growing influence which Popery presents everywhere through the nations by exclusively regarding the operation of one of the two powers, we shall soon be convinced of the inadequacy of the cause to the effect."

<sup>1</sup> Especially Möhler on Symbolism. Of this the first edition was published in 1832, the fifth in 1838. In Part i. is his attack on Protestant Doctrine; in Part ii., "The Church" (the R. Catholic Church) is set forth and exalted "as *human and divine*."

Very remarkably it was not, we read, the prevalence or progress of German *infidel rationalism* that led Möhler to write his antagonistic book; but a German movement, headed by the late Prussian king, towards the resuscitation of the *evangelic Church principles of the Reformation!* So Memoir, p. cvi.

<sup>2</sup> An extract from the Gazette des Tribunaux, given in the Record of April 25, 1844, announced that the Emperor of Austria had published an ordinance interdicting, under the severest penalties of fine and imprisonment, any Austrian Catholic subject from embracing Protestantism, without having previously obtained express permission from the Government; which permission will not be granted, it said, except in serious circumstances, and until the competent authorities shall have admitted the necessity for such a change. The banishment of the Zillerthal Protestants dates a little earlier.

<sup>3</sup> So during the revolutionary movement in 1846. While the cry, "*A bas les Jesuites*," suggested the ostensible pretext to these movements, the result of the revolutions both at Lausanne and Geneva was that the governments in either Canton, and the Roman Catholics there residing, associated and acted together on terms of friendship: a full toleration being given to the Roman Catholic worship, and the erection of new Roman Catholic Chapels permitted. Whereas the Helvetic Confession was abolished by the popular Government of the Pays de Vaud; the mass of faithful ministers driven to the necessity of quitting the National Church; and not only no Chapels allowed them, but no toleration even to their reunions in private houses.

<sup>4</sup> Bishop Macilvaine, when in this country some few years ago, gave some interesting information on this point; mentioning, among other illustrative facts, and as from personal knowledge, the circumstance of 30,000 dollars having been lodged in one of the States' banks, (a sum furnished, he believed, principally by the *Austrian Propaganda*,) for the purpose of assisting the building of Romish Churches there, and otherwise promoting the Papal interests.—Since then the political influence of Popery in the States has greatly increased.

Mr. Bickersteth, in a Note to one of his Protestant Association Sermons, illus-

Let me not omit to add, further, that to mar the work of evangelic Protestant missions, and stop the progress of the everlasting Gospel, has proved in every case to be one primary object of this spirit from the Beast's mouth issuing forth.<sup>1</sup> And such has been the support of *its* missions, (funds to the amount of near £1,000,000 sterling a-year constituting in 1841, it has been said,<sup>2</sup> the Papal revenue

trated the same fact from an account which the Rev. H. Caswall gave him of the Jesuit Establishment at *St. Louis*, the capital of Missouri, on the Mississippi in the far West. The Cathedral, which cost 80,000 dollars, was crowded to excess, Mr. C. stated, every Sunday six times during the day; both Matins and Vespers being performed to three different congregations, German, French, and English. The *University* there was greatly in advance of the Protestant College; one of the Jesuits attached almost constantly traversing Papal Europe to obtain donations for its support. And he added that, out of 30,000 inhabitants in *St. Louis*, 14,000 were Papists.

<sup>1</sup> There is scarce a Protestant evangelic Mission, I believe, which has not felt this. The Sandwich Mission is but one example among many. Australia, New Zealand, India, North America, Newfoundland, have all experienced it. In Abyssinia the Jesuits succeeded in expelling for a while the Church Missionary Society's missionaries. In Alexandria and Syria they have, as already hinted, sought to supersede the Protestant missionary's work. Further, once more, with reference to the Anglo-Prussian bishopric at Jerusalem, the French and Russians jointly,—the one as protectress to the Romish religion, the other to the Greek,—for some time prevented the Porte from agreeing to its establishment, except on condition of the Bishop confining himself to the care of those over whom the other churches of the East cannot rightly claim jurisdiction: (see the Letter of *Viator*, Record, No. 1579 :) though at last the British Ambassador at Constantinople obtained the Firman required.

<sup>2</sup> So *Viator* *ibid.* "Provided with *one million sterling* annually for the propagation of the Romish faith, and assisted with the political influence of all the Roman Catholic countries of Europe, especially of France," &c. In this, as *Viator* subsequently stated, (see Record, No. 1585,) he included the surplus revenue derived to the Pope from both the taxes and the ecclesiastical lands of the Papal States, funds applicable, and in great measure applied, to Propaganda objects, as well as the proceeds of the *Propaganda* Societies, now immensely increased through the efforts of the Jesuits. In his statement of £1,000,000 being the annual sum so applied he was guided, he said, by the opinion of a person who, during a long residence at Rome, had the best possible opportunity of obtaining accurate information on such subjects: adding, however, that there are no well-authenticated *documents* from which to learn the income; those published by the Papal Government being notoriously untrustworthy.

Mr. Bickersteth thus estimated the revenue of the Romish Propaganda Institution from subscriptions in 1841, and spoke of the object of its formation: "In 1822 the Society for the Propagation of the Faith was formed to counteract the Protestant missions. It has adopted our plans. It raised in 1841 £110,000; and has stated its expectation of raising its income to £600,000." *Ibid.* p. 12.

Mr. B. means that of Paris and Lyons; which was in 1822 established, or rather I presume *re-established*, after temporary suspension during the French revolutionary wars: (see my Note p. 413 *suprà*; a Note already a little while since referred to :) and to which an English branch was added in 1838. The great *Roman* Association, or rather Congregation, *De Propaganda Fide*, dates its formation about two centuries back. It was founded in 1622, and richly endowed by Gregory XV: its *Committee* (or *Congregation*) of *management* being thirteen cardinals, two priests, one monk, and a secretary; its object the propagation and maintenance of the Romish religion in all parts of the world. Its riches and possessions were prodigiously augmented by the munificence of Urban VIII. a little after, and the liberality of an incredible number of donors: "so that its funds," says Mosheim, speaking of its state a little before the French Revolution, (*Cent. xvii.* § 1 *ad init.*) "are now adequate to the most expensive and magnificent undertakings." A *College*, or *Seminary* for the Propagation of the

in aid of Propaganda objects,) and such in different foreign countries its progress and success,<sup>1</sup>—that both at Rome and elsewhere the expectation continued to be avowed even till 1848, and yet later, and with almost the sanguine hopes of the olden and palmy days of Popery, that the prophecies of the latter day were about being fulfilled in its favour; when all nations should submit to the *Pope*, all people do him homage, from the river even to the world's end.<sup>2</sup>—And, during the progress of things favourably to Rome in the course of this period, who knows not of the Beast's vaunted miracles,<sup>3</sup> and boastful utterances: still exalting “Rome as the spotless bride of Christ;” and the Papal empire as that which, according to prophecy, while other thrones crumble into dust, *stabit in eternum*, shall be for ever.<sup>4</sup>

*Faith*, was attached, and subordinated to the Congregation, in 1627 and 1641 by Pope Urban VIII; its object being the instruction and education of those who are designed for the foreign Catholic missions.—Moreover in the same century institutions of the same nature and object were founded in *France*: viz., by royal authority, the *Congregation of Priests of Foreign Missions*, and by an association of bishops and other foreign ecclesiastics, the *Parisian Seminary for Foreign Missions*; the latter, like that at Rome, designed for the education of intended missionaries. “From hence,” says Mosheim, *ibid.* “apostolical vicars are still sent to Siam, Tonquin, Cochin China, Persia,” &c.: adding, that altogether the congregations and colleges of Rome and France conjointly sent forth *legions* of missionaries in the 17th century, so as “to cover almost the face of the globe.”

*Naples* appears as an assistant in the Romish Propagandist proceedings. A letter from Naples, of the date of Jan. 12, 1843, states that there had just set out thence ten priests of the Foreign Missionary Society: two to be Directors of the General Missionary College at Penang, two to Cochin China, one to Siam, one to Macao to join the Portuguese Mission.

In Jan. 1848, on the Feast of the Epiphany, I had the opportunity of being present at Rome at the recitations usual on that Festival by the missionary students of the Propaganda. There were recitations in between 40 and 50 languages, by as many pupils;—English of course included.

<sup>1</sup> In regard even of China, the advance of Roman Catholic interests during the period under review was notable. The *Univers* stated in Feb. 7, 1843, that news had come to Rome (“*the Eternal City*”) from its missionaries in China, to the effect that the Emperor had accorded them full toleration and liberty, and had expressed a wish for more Romish missionaries: whereupon, forty religious had been selected for the mission; besides others previously sent, and an Apostolic Vicar:—it being regarded at Rome as a probable indication of the Emperor, and so his empire, soon embracing the Catholic faith.

Not long after this news arrived (I think in 1845) that the Chinese Emperor had formally repealed the law against Christianity. And in 1860, when I began reprinting this work, a part of the news from China was that, by an article in the French Treaty with the Chinese Emperor, it was stipulated that the old Roman Catholic Churches should be everywhere restored; and how *Te Deums* were sung on the occasion in the Roman Catholic Cathedrals at Pekin and Canton.

<sup>2</sup> During my sojourn at Rome in 1848 the celebrated Padre Ventura eloquently and ardently expressed to me his own undoubting expectations to this effect.

<sup>3</sup> E. g. the famous La Salette case. See pp. 213—216, 416, 417, *suprà*.

<sup>4</sup> Dan. vii. 14. So the little horn was, even to the end, “to think to change times and laws:” appropriating to himself, and his antichristian kingdom, the prophecies respecting Messiah's own glorious kingdom, which is to supervene, and

Among ourselves more especially have not the boastings of M'Hale, Cullen, Wiseman become proverbial? Not soon will there be forgotten in England the vain swelling notes of triumph in Pio Nono's and his Cardinal's missives from the Vatican and the Flaminian gate, on *England's* "restoration by them in 1851 to the Catholic firmament." Just so was it characterized in the Apocalyptic symbol. The spirit that went forth from the mouth of the Beast was voiced like a frog.<sup>1</sup>

III. I was next to speak of *the unclean spirit like a frog* from the mouth of the *False Prophet*:—the spirit this, we saw, of *Priestcraft*: (Priestcraft pure and simple, unassociated with, and independent of, the Papacy:) of which the essential characteristic is still, as it ever has been, to arrogate to its own order the exclusive dignity of being the earthly mediator between God and man; and necessary for the effective averting of his wrath, and communication of his favour and salvation.

And, if this be a just and well-warranted description of the essentials of a spirit from the mouth of the *False Prophet*, in a professing Christian Church, can any intelligent and unprejudiced man hesitate at recognising its English anti-type in the spirit of the *Oxford Tractarianism*, which in 1833, all so suddenly and influentially, sent forth its voice from the banks of the Isis?

No doubt, if at the first there was much in it that to a discerning ear and eye seemed suspicious,<sup>2</sup> there were indications also apparently of a more favourable character. When *the infidel revolutionary spirit* swept like a flood across our land, and *the Popish spirit*, combining and fra-

assume the sovereignty of the world, on the usurper's everlasting destruction. (See my p. 177, *suprà*.)

The then recently-appointed Roman Catholic Bishops in England, in their proud vauntings that the see of Canterbury should pass away, that of Westminster never pass away, &c., forgot evidently yet another prophetic intimation:—viz. that the Apocalyptic Babylon on the seven hills is prophetically represented as uttering the exulting cry, "I sit a queen, and shall be no widow, nor see sorrow," just before the moment of her final tremendous destruction!

<sup>1</sup> "The *frog of Rome* must burst itself with its *vainglorious swellings*, before, &c." So the "Times" of March 28, 1851, with reference to Dr. Wiseman's Pastoral.

<sup>2</sup> I do not except from this charge of suspiciousness, as to the character of its doctrine, even Keble's *Christian Year*; beautiful as is much of its sentiment, as well as poetry: a book which was about the first, as well as most influential pioneer, to the Oxford movement.

ternizing therewith, swelled the torrent, the Oxford primary movement was avowedly in antagonism against both the one and the other. And hence in fact much of its early strength. It was looked on by the friends of order, religion, and the Church, in times of fearful peril and agitation, as an ally of *conservatism*. And, as is well known, of its early authors or abettors there were not a few who at the time so intended it, and foresaw not whither it would lead them.<sup>1</sup> When a spirit of delusion goes abroad, its plans are not at once fully developed; and thus its agents and instruments are often at the first led blindfold. Satan may come in, we know from Scripture, even as an Angel of light. But the development subsequently became sufficiently clear and unequivocal. Nor, as I now in 1861 review the subject, does there seem to me a single token wanting, whereby to recognise the acts and spirit of the Oxford Tractarian school, as the fulfilment in England of that which appeared to issue from the mouth of the False Prophet, so as described in our text. Let us trace the parallel, *first*, in respect of its *theological character and doctrine*; *secondly*, in respect of the *time, manner, circumstances, and associations*, that have marked its movement and promulgation.

1. As to its *theological character and doctrine*, the 1st thing which strikes us (and it is indeed a most striking one) is this, that it notoriously takes for its model, in respect of doctrine and practice, not the really *primitive* age,<sup>2</sup> so as is often most strangely and untruly asserted by its teachers, but that of the *fourth and fifth centuries*; an æra when the Church was greatly corrupted,<sup>3</sup> and which the Apocalyptic visions hint at as that of the *first marked development of the predicted priestly apostasy*:<sup>4</sup>—nor this alone, but that it has selected for the primary and fundamental doctrines of

<sup>1</sup> See especially Mr. Perceval's account of the first origin and originators of the Oxford movement, in his Letter to the Editor of the Irish Ecclesiastical Journal.

<sup>2</sup> The appeal to "*primitive*," practice, &c., occurs perpetually, as any one at all acquainted with the Tractarian School must be well aware: although in nine cases out of ten, perhaps ninety-nine out of a hundred, where this word is used, the reference is not to the *first* century, and comparatively seldom to the *second* century; but rather to the *fourth, fifth*, and perhaps *sixth* centuries.

<sup>3</sup> So Bishop Blomfield, in a Charge delivered, I think, about the year 1842: "Not the *primitive* Church, but the Church of the *fourth or fifth century*; infected as it was with the remains of Gnostic superstition, and the inventions of enthusiastic or ambitious men." p. 60.

<sup>4</sup> See my second Section on the Sealing Vision, Vol. i. pp. 264, &c.



its movement, that very dogma about the *Church sacraments* as the only means of communicating divine life to man,—connectedly with that respecting the *priesthood* of their fancied apostolic succession (in the *sacerdotal* sense of *priest*) as its only and its *ex opere operato* conveyancers,<sup>1</sup>—which in the same figurative visions of Patmos were allusively noted, with the silent reprobation of the divine inditing Spirit, as the primary and fundamental doctrines of the then incipient apostasy; and as resulting in the supersession of the Spirit of Christ, Himself directly and alone the illuminator and quickener of each dead soul.<sup>2</sup>—2. It appears that one of its next advances, still in close imitation of the Church's early *false teachers*, which was allusively noted both in the same and in another Apocalyptic prefigurative picture of that primary age of apostasy,<sup>3</sup> has been to doctrines of *reserve* on the *atonement*,<sup>4</sup> and doctrines concerning *justification*,<sup>5</sup> through which Christ was, and is, virtually superseded in his character of our propitiatory atonement: as also to doctrines concerning the *mediation of living priests*<sup>6</sup> and *departed saints*, through which He is superseded also in

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Perceval states that, at the commencement of the labours of the Tractators, the leading principle selected to be put forward by them was the doctrine of *the apostolic succession*, as a rule of practice:—that is, 1st, that the participation of the body and blood of Christ is *essential* to the maintenance of Christian life and hope in each individual; 2, that it is conveyed to individual Christians *only* by the hands of the successors of the apostles and their delegates; 3, that the successors of the apostles are those who are derived in a direct line from them by the imposition of hands, and that the delegates of these are the respective presbyters whom each has commissioned."

So again Mr. Keble, in his Preface to Hooker, p. 77, speaks of "the necessity of the apostolic commission to the derivation of sacramental grace, and to our mystical communion with Christ." Goode, "Case as it is," p. 16. Dr. Pusey's well-known Tracts on *Baptism* show how early and prominently the doctrines of the fourth and fifth centuries concerning *that* sacrament were urged by the Tractarian School. And the same in other of the Tracts on the *Lord's Supper*.

<sup>2</sup> See my Vol. i. pp. 282—287.

<sup>3</sup> See the incense vision of Apoc. viii. 2.

<sup>4</sup> So in the famous Tracts 80 and 87. The doctrine is one which has been condemned by the Bishops generally. See especially the late Bishop of London's most just and strong reprobation of it, at pp. 27—29 of the Charge already referred to.

<sup>5</sup> See Mr. Newman's *Treatise on Justification*, and the first of the Sermons for the Times, entitled *Nchushtan*.—Compare my Vol. i. pp. 293, 294.

<sup>6</sup> The following is a quotation on the point referred to, from Tract No. 10, p. 4. "This is *faith*, to look at things not as seen, but as unseen; to be as sure that the bishop is Christ's appointed representative as if we actually saw him work miracles as St. Peter and St. Paul did." And then; "The *ministering priest* is by the same *faith* to be looked on by the congregation as the bishop's representative:"—irrespective of course of doctrine.—Let me again refer the reader to the weighty and important observations of Bishop Blomfield in his Charge, pp. 9—12, on the dangerous and unscripural character of Levitical views of the Christian ministry.

his character of our mediator.<sup>1</sup>—3. It insists very specially, like the false teachers of the apostatizing Church of the 5th century, on the duty of *auricular confession to the priest*,<sup>2</sup> and necessity of his *priestly absolution*, conjoined with the *penances* appointed by him, in order to God's forgiveness of sin.—4. It teaches a mysterious *change in the sacramental bread and wine*, upon the *priest's* consecrating them on the *altar*, just as did the doctors of the earlier apostatizing Church;<sup>3</sup> and the mysterious presence thereupon of Christ in the elements, which, if not the *transubstantiation* doctrine of Rome, is a most near resemblance to it.—5. The offering of this it speaks of, like them, as an offering for the *dead*, as well as for the *living*; the doctrine of *purgatory* being received and adopted by it from the Apostasy.<sup>4</sup>—6. It lays claim, just like the False Prophet, to the power of *working miracles* on the souls of men:<sup>5</sup> in such manner indeed as

<sup>1</sup> The following is Mr. Newman's remark in the famous Tract No. 90, on our Anglican Article against the Invocation of Saints. "Not every doctrine on this matter is a 'fond' thing, but the *Romish* doctrine. Accordingly the *primitive* doctrine is not condemned in it. Now there was a primitive doctrine on these points." He adds elsewhere (Letter to the Bishop of Oxford, p. 18) that "the *Ora pro nobis* (or Prayer to the Virgin Mary) was not necessarily included in the invocation of saints which the Article condemns."—It is also said in Tract 71, p. 17: "The Tridentine Decrees declared that it is good and useful suppliantly to invoke the saints; and that the images of Christ, and the blessed Virgin, and the other saints, should receive *due honour and veneration*; words which themselves go to the very verge of what could be received by the cautious Christian, *though possibly admitting of an honest interpretation.*" See other quotations in Goode's "Case as it is," p. 29.—Compare with this, and with the statements in my Note preceding, my Vol. i. pp. 330—341, 405—408.

Bishop Blomfield (Charge, p. 57) speaks of it as a subject of deep concern that any of the English clergy should recommend or justify, under any qualification, prayers or addresses to saints; a practice, he says, "which ended in *idolatry*:" and at p. 49 he reprobates the practice adopted by a few of the clergy [of this Oxford School] of decorating the communion-table with flowers on saints' days, as "worse than frivolous, and approaching very nearly to the honours paid by the Church of Rome to deified sinners."

<sup>2</sup> See my Vol. i. p. 409.

As I remember, Mr. Dodsworth, before his formal apostasy to the Church of Rome, declared boastingly that in the confessional the questioning of the penitent by the priest, under the Tractarian system, was to extend to all the details taught in Dens and other Romish manuals of instruction to the priest confessor. A boasting this of a system of the most deadly corrupting tendency!

"So in the porches of the ear they pour  
The leperous distilment; whose effect  
Holds such an eumity with blood of woman,  
That, swift as quicksilver, it courses through  
The natural gates and alleys of the body;  
And with a sudden vigour it doth posset  
And curd, like eager droppings into milk,  
The thin and wholesome blood."

<sup>3</sup> See my Vol. i. pp. 294, 405.

<sup>4</sup> See Vol. i. pp. 406—408.

<sup>5</sup> "If *baptism* be the cleansing and quickening of the dead soul, to say nothing of

actually to furnish a comment, not only on the text now before us,<sup>1</sup> but on a previous Apocalyptic statement also about the False Prophet's working miracles; in that case "before," or under authority from, the Papal Beast his principal.<sup>2</sup>—7. It refuses to receive as *the one rule of faith and practice* the written word and commandments of God; a firm adherence to which is one constant mark of the *true* prophets, and witnesses for Christ, in the Apocalyptic prophecy:<sup>3</sup> making them void, so as did both the Pharisees of old, and the apostatizing teachers (or *germinating False Prophet*) of the fourth and fifth centuries,<sup>4</sup> by the addition of another rule of faith and conduct; viz. that of its own traditions and the commandments of men.<sup>5</sup>—8. It praises up, if not inculcates, as marking a high attainment of grace, the state of self-imposed celibacy, especially with the clergy, and monastic institutions too for either sex; just as was done ere the close of the 4th century, and throughout the 5th, by the teachers of the apostatizing Church.<sup>6</sup>—9. It supports in no equivocal manner the *Papal pretensions and authority*; just as the Papalized Apocalyptic False Prophet did those of the Beast, from soon after the rise of the

*the Lord's Supper*, they, Christ's ministers, *do work miracles.*" Tract 85, p. 95: quoted by Goode, p. 23.

<sup>1</sup> "These are the spirits of demons *working miracles.*"

<sup>2</sup> Apoc. xiii. 14. See pp. 214, 215 *suprà*.—It is really curiously confirmatory of the explanation there given of the prophetic verse: given, I need not say, without any thought of the passage in the Tract above quoted. Add the *Promethean creative* view of *fire from heaven* to that in the comment referred to; and it will give a complete notion of the Tractator's priestly miracles.

<sup>3</sup> So of the children of Christ's true Church, Apoc. xii. 17, "them that keep the *commandments of God*, and preserve the testimony of Jesus Christ;" and of the Church's faithful martyrs, vi. 9, "those that were slain for *the word of God*;" &c.; and xv. 4, "them that had been beheaded for *the word of God*, and the testimony of Jesus." Where that "the word and commandments of God" mean only *the written words and written commandments*, appears sufficiently from Christ's saying that the Pharisees had made God's words and commandments void by their traditions. Matt. xv. 6.

<sup>4</sup> See my Vol. i. p. 293.

<sup>5</sup> "Scripture" is not the only ground of the faith." "Catholic tradition is a divine informant in religious matters." "We agree with the Romanist in appealing to antiquity as our great teacher." "These two [the Bible and Catholic Tradition] together make up a joint rule of faith." "When the sense of Scripture, as interpreted by reason, is contrary to the sense given of it by Catholic antiquity, we ought to side with the latter." "Such tradition is infallible." Such are some of the quotations given on this head by Goode, in his *Case as it is*, p. 9; taken from Newman's Lectures on Romanism, pp. 369, 329, 355, 47, 327, 160, and Keble's Sermons, 146;—with many others to the same effect. Add their famous adopted rule, *Quod semper, quod ubique, &c.*

The equal authority of catholic Tradition and the written Scripture, was the first point determined on at *Trent*: and in this, says Ranke, i. 204, half the business was justly regarded as accomplished.

<sup>6</sup> See my Vol. i. p. 410; and Vol. ii. pp. 13, 14, 27, 28.

Beast's empire in the West :<sup>1</sup>—inculcating the reverence due to the Pope of Rome ; admitting his universal primacy ;<sup>2</sup> deploring the schism from him made at the Reformation ;<sup>3</sup> longing for reconciliation with him, even though it might have to be effected in the garb of penitents ;<sup>4</sup> speaking of his See as the Saviour's Holy Home ;<sup>5</sup> lauding its ritual and its missal, in contrast with the formularies and rites of the English Church, as the very spirit of devotion ;<sup>6</sup> and warding off from it and him, with the

<sup>1</sup> See, on the earlier history of the apostate priesthood of professing Christendom, pp. 196 et seq. ; and, on its causing the world, after the Beast's rise, to worship it in Western Europe, p. 218.

<sup>2</sup> "Among the Catholic verities impressed on the surface of Scripture are the following ;—baptismal regeneration, the sacred presence in the Eucharist, the oneness of the visible Church, the *primacy of St. Peter*." "The supremacy of the Pope is an event in Providence. We find ourselves as a Church under the King now, and we obey him. We were under the Pope formerly, and we obeyed him. Of course the union of the whole Church under one visible Government is abstractedly the most perfect state." So the British Critic for July 1841, and Tract No. 90, quoted by Mr. Goode, *ibid.* p. 33. He adds from the British Critic another quotation, to the effect of their "having no sympathy with the *Gallican* party, so far it is at issue with the *ultramontane* :— regarding national theories as involving a subtle Erastianism, and betokening an *inadequate estimate of the fulness and freeness of the Gospel privileges*." i. e. as derived from the Pope.

<sup>3</sup> "That deplorable schism." Brit. Crit. for July 1841, p. 2. So Mr. Newman in his Preface to the *Hymni Ecclesie*, 2nd vol., speaking of the *Reformation* and Reformers, says, "*Cecce quodam reformationis (quam vocant) æstu in ecclesiâ passim fervente*."—Again, in his last volume of Sermons : "We cannot hope for the recovery of Dissenting bodies, whilst we are ourselves alienated from the great body of Christendom. We cannot hope for unity of faith, if we of our own private wills make a faith for ourselves in this our small corner of the earth. We cannot have the success among the heathen of St. Boniface or St. Augustine, unless like them we go forth with the *apostolical benediction* : " i. e. the *Pope's blessing*."

<sup>4</sup> So Palmer's Aids to Reflection :—"I should like to see the Patriarch of Constantinople and our Archbishop of Canterbury go barefooted to Rome, and fall upon the Pope's neck, and kiss him ; and never let him go till they had persuaded him to be reasonable." Quoted by Goode, p. 33.

<sup>5</sup> So in the poetry of the Tractators.—And the prose rivals the poetry. "Rome is your mother," says Dr. Pusey, "through whom you were born to Christ." "We trust that active and visible union with the See of Rome is not of the *essence* of a Church : at the same time we are deeply conscious that in lacking it, far from asserting a right, we forego a great privilege. Rome has imperishable claims on our gratitude ; and, were it so ordered, on our deference.—We are estranged from him in presence, not in heart." Contrast Bishop Blomfield's statements respecting the Romish Church in his Charge, pp. 19, 59 :—"that idolatrous Church, in a state of schism, if not apostasy ; defiled with superstition and idolatry ; and which has framed a system that deserves to be described as having embodied the very mystery of iniquity."

<sup>6</sup> "The Church of Rome alone has given free scope to the feelings of awe, mystery, tenderness, reverence, devotedness, and other feelings which may especially be called Catholic." Newman's Letter to Jelî ; quoted by Goode, 38. Again ; "Our Reformers in not adopting the *Canon of the Mass*, which is a sacred and most precious monument of the apostles, [sic !] mutilated the tradition of 1500 years." "I can see no claim which the Prayer Book has on a layman's deference, as the teaching of the Church, which the Breviary and the Missal have not in a far greater degree." Froude ap. Goode, 35, 36.—See Bishop Blomfield's observations on this point, Charge, p. 50.

earnest and blind partiality of filial devotedness, all application to them of those too applicable prophecies of the Beast Antichrist, and his Harlot Church on the seven hills.<sup>1</sup>—10. It avows its allegiance to *Æcumenic General Councils*, (not exclusively of that of *Trent*),<sup>2</sup> even as to that which speaks the voice of God's Spirit, and possesses the Spirit's infallibility; wresting the words of the Article of our Church which was drawn up expressly against it, in order to force on them a sense not necessarily unaccordant with this doctrine:<sup>3</sup> just as the False Prophet was the prime and firm adherent to the *Image of the Beast*:—<sup>4</sup> nay, and both excusing, and expressing desire for the re-enactment of, those *penalties of excommunication and death*, with a view to the enforcement of the Church's decrees,<sup>5</sup> which the False Prophet in Apoc. xiii. inspired

<sup>1</sup> See my Analysis of the Oxford Tracts on Antichrist, in a Paper on the Futurist System of Apocalyptic interpretation given in the Appendix to my Vol. iv.

<sup>2</sup> At the least not *now*. Originally Mr. N. made this Council to mark the time of the Popes becoming Antichrist. See p. 524, Note <sup>2</sup> infra.

<sup>3</sup> The 21st Article of our Church says; "Forasmuch as they (General Councils) be an assembly of men, whereof all be not governed with the Spirit and word of God, they may err, and sometimes have erred, in things pertaining to God." Against this Mr. Newman says; "The words only mean that General Councils may err *as such*; may err, unless in any case it is promised, as a matter of express supernatural privilege, they may not err. And such a promise *does* exist, where General Councils are not only gathered together according to the commandment and will of princes, but in the *name of Christ*, according to our Lord's promise." When they are a thing of *heaven*, their deliberations are overruled, and their decrees authoritative; and, he adds also, infallible. "In such cases they are *Catholic Councils*. Thus Catholic, or Æcumenical Councils, are General Councils, and something more."—Tract No. 90, p. 21.

<sup>4</sup> See my Part iv. Chap. vii.; pp. 221, &c. supra.

<sup>5</sup> So Mr. Faber (not the *Rev. G. S. Faber*, but one who less worthily bears the name) in his "Sights and Thoughts" advocates "the most dire weapon of the Church, *excommunication*; whereby she cuts off the offender from the fountains of life in this world, and makes him over from her own judgment to that of heaven in the world to come. Surely it is the duty of Christian States to deprive such an excommunicate person of every social right and privilege; to lay on him such pains and penalties as may seem good to the wisdom of the law; or even, if they so judge, to sweep him from the earth; in other words, to put him to death." In a similar spirit, Gregory VII, Innocent III, and Becket, are extolled as the lights of the Church in the middle ages, and ranked in the same class with Elijah and St. John the Baptist:—Innocent (not to speak of the others) being the bloody ruthless persecutor and murderer of the excommunicate Waldenses.—Bickersteth, *Ib.* p. 27. See my Vol. ii. p. 20, &c.; also Bishop Blomfield's indignant notice of this point in his Charge, p. 57.—Mr. Marks, in his animated Pamphlet, or Protest, lately published, says, not without reason, p. 21, that the *Star-Chamber*, with its old deeds of cruelty, is what the Tractarians would fain call again into existence, had they the power: and he refers to Milford Malvoisin, declaring that the reign of *Queen Mary* was a great and positive advantage to the Church of England, p. 8. Has not even Archdeacon Robert Wilberforce referred to her as not the bloody, but the blessed, Queen Mary? \*

\* Both Mr. Faber and alas too Mr. Wilberforce, some time after the above was written, joined the Romish Church.

the Beast's Image to enact against all persons recusant or disobedient, in enforcement of *its* dogmas.<sup>1</sup>—11. It professes its bitter enmity against the anti-Papal witnessing of Protestantism, and the Reformation of the 16th century;<sup>2</sup>—that act which, in a manner too clear to be mistaken, the Apocalyptic vision notes as done with Christ's direction and blessing, to the dismay of the Beast's adherents, specially of his False Prophet:<sup>3</sup> avows "the *unprotestantizing* of the national Church to be its object, and one worthy of all hazards, as a matter of life and death:<sup>4</sup> unchurches the foreign Protestant Churches: and, as to the *new song* of the Reformation,—the holy and glorious doctrine of *justification by faith alone*,—shows that it not only does not understand,<sup>5</sup> but above all things abhors and rejects it; counting it (awful to say) as a Neluştan,—an idol of the evangelic doctrinists, worthy only of being broken to pieces.<sup>6</sup>

In all these points the character and theological doctrine

<sup>1</sup> Apoc. xiii. 14, 15. See pp. 229, 238.

<sup>2</sup> See quotations on the point in Mr. Goode, p. 37. For example Mr. Froude; "I hate the Reformation and the Reformers more and more." And the British Critic for July 1841; "Protestantism in its essence, and in all its bearings, is characteristically the religion of corrupt human nature:" and again; "The Protestant tone of doctrine and thought is essentially *Antichrist*."

<sup>3</sup> Apoc. xi. 1, 2, 11. See my Vol. ii. pp. 183, &c., and 461.

<sup>4</sup> So the British Critic for July 1841, p. 44, quoted by Goode, p. 38.

<sup>5</sup> "And no man could understand that new song but the 144,000 that were redeemed from the earth." Apoc. xiv. 3.

<sup>6</sup> I have already, p. 518, referred to the first of the Tractarian Sermons for the Times, bearing that title. In the same spirit the British Critic of April 1842, p. 446, (quoted by Goode, p. 24,) writes: "To speak as if this latter scheme of doctrine (viz. the Lutheran doctrine of justification) were in itself otherwise than radically and fundamentally monstrous, immoral, heretical, and antichristian, shows but an inadequate grasp of its antagonist truth." Mr. Goode adds, in proof how the Tractators identify the Lutheran doctrine and that of *our Reformers* on this point, that the author of the Tract No. 86 says, It was "the object" of the latter "to *Lutheranize our Church*, to introduce *justification without works*, &c."

The hatred of the Tractarian body to this great doctrine of the Reformation, to the Protestant Reformation itself, and the great earthly instrument raised up by God to effect it, has ever continued to be one marked characteristic of the Tractarian spirit. So first, and as expressed more decorously, in Mr. Newman's Lectures on Justification; so, less measuredly, in Froude's Letters, Ward's Papers in the British Critic, and the same Writer's "Ideal of a Christian Church."

In one way we have profited by these bitter attacks; because of their having stirred up the late Archdeacon Hare to write his noble Vindication of Luther, and crushing demolition of Luther's assailants, published as Note W. in the Appendix to his Volume on the "Mission of the Comforter." It was not till after the publication of the 4th Edition of my *Home Apoc.* that I became acquainted with this work of Archdeacon Hare. And I cannot but express my gratification at finding the marked correspondence that exists between the view which he gives of Luther's noble character and work, and that given of it by myself; as also on sundry other points of much importance, more or less closely connected with the former.

of the Tractarian School agrees, we see, as at present developed, very completely with that of the False Prophet of the Apocalypse.<sup>1</sup> In truth the remarkable history of its ten years of progress to its doctrinal position in 1843, when the above parallel was first drawn up,<sup>2</sup> was on main points very much a recapitulation in brief of that of the False Prophet of the Apostasy; from its early youth in the 4th century, to its preparedness in the West, ere the end of the 6th century, for spiritual subjection to Rome.<sup>3</sup>

2. Nor, if we compare certain *other notable characteristics* of this spirit, as regards the *time* and *mode* of its *issuing forth*, with those of the issuing forth of the *spirit from the mouth of the False Prophet*, as prophesied of in my text, will the correspondence between the two be less apparent.

<sup>1</sup> Let me add Mr. (now Dean) Goode's brief summary of the doctrine of the Oxford Tractarians in the Abstract called "Case as it is," already often cited by me, from his great work on the *Divine Rule of Faith*, first published in 1842.

"It is their avowed desire and object," says that accurate investigator of the subject, "to *re-appropriate* from Popery the doctrines which our Reformers rejected, —to set up a Popish *rule of faith*, a Popish doctrine of *apostolical succession*, a Popish view of the *Church and Sacraments*, a Popish doctrine of *sacrifice in the Eucharist*, available for the quick and dead for remission of sins; and in regard of *transubstantiation*, *purgatory*, *invocation of saints*, and even on the *Papal supremacy*, a doctrine which, if not Popish, is at least so near it, that it is like splitting hairs to draw a distinction between them: nay, which is admitted to be in most of these instances consistent with the *Tridentine statements*; and only not Popish, because it does not reach all the extravagances *practised* in the Romish communion."

Still to the same effect, but in terse brevity, was the reported judgment of the then reigning Roman Pontiff, that what the Oxford Tractarians wished for, was "*Popery without the Pope.*"

<sup>2</sup> Compare Mr. Perceval's account of the beginning of the movement, with the progress indicated in the Tractarian extracts given by me in the series of Notes on the five or six pages preceding.

With regard to one point, the *movement towards Rome*, there was this difference between the early apostatizing Church and the Oxford School,—that the latter, as professed members of the Anglican Church, had to deal with (which the former had not) a notorious hostility of their Church to Rome and the Papacy. So for some time this hostility was expressed by its writers. And it did the movement good service; as evidence open to all against the charge urged against them of Popish predilections. Mr. Newman especially, its then chief head, in Tracts 15, 20, 38, &c., and other writings, published from 1833 to 1838, called the Romish Church lost, heretical, blasphemous, apostate, at least from the time of the Trent Council, &c. In 1834, a friend remonstrated against statements like these as grossly uncharitable: saying, "How mistaken may we be ourselves on many points that are only gradually opening on us!" And on this monition he withdrew, he tells us, some statements; but still spoke of the Church of Rome, or at least Rome itself, as a demoniac possessed with an evil spirit,—the same that had previously animated Rome Pagan. Subsequently, however, in a very remarkable Letter, published in the Oxford Herald of Feb. 18, 1843, he retracted these reprobatory statements: saying that he had followed but the *consensus* of Anglican divines in so writing; (how anti-Anglican does he thereby confess his present views!) and published the same as *deeming it requisite to the Tractarians' then position*, and to repel the charge of Romanism!!

<sup>3</sup> See my Vol. i. pp. 408—411.

And 1st, the correspondence in respect of *time* is on the face of the thing most exact. For, as it was when the drying up of the mystic Euphrates had made a certain progress that the spirit from the False Prophet was in the Apocalyptic figurations seen to issue forth, so it was in the year 1833, after the Turkman power had dried up in Greece, Moldavia, Wallachia, Algiers, and other countries for years overflowed by it, that the first of the Oxford Tracts issued from the press.—2. The correspondence in respect of a *certain concurrent outgoing of other evil spirits* is also obvious. As the emission of the False Prophet's spirit in the Apocalypse synchronized with that of spirits from the mouths of the Dragon and of the Beast,—so that of Oxford Tractarianism has been accompanied, as we have seen, with a most remarkable and almost simultaneous outbreak from the spirit of *godless infidelity*, and the revived spirit of *direct avowed Popery*.—3. Its mode of speech and action has well answered to the symbol of a *frog*, under which the spirit of the False Prophet appeared to go forth in the prefiguration before us. While, on the one hand, its unceasing emission of voice in conversational or more formal discussions—from the pulpit and from the press—in tracts, sermons, essays, reviews, romances, novels, poems, children's books, newspapers,—in music too, and paintings, and church decoration and architecture,<sup>1</sup>—with what is unsound in doctrine for the most part skilfully mystified, the false mixed up with the true, and burlesques and false picturings of evangelical religion intermingled with as false but fair-drawn picturings of the religion of the apostasy, if not that of Rome,—while I say, on the one hand, these incessant but delusive appeals made alike to the better and the worse feelings of our nature, to our taste, imagination, affections, ignorance, prejudices, and even right feelings and desires,<sup>2</sup> whereby it has been carry-

<sup>1</sup> E. g. the Camden Architectural Society at Cambridge.—Kilndown church has become famous as a specimen of the architecture: in the west window of which one prominent figure is *Pope Gregory the First*, in Papal robes, with the triple crown on his head, the Patriarehal staff or triple cross on the left hand, and his right raised to bless the people.

<sup>2</sup> Especially the desire for *order*, and yet more for *unity*, in the Church. Which *unity* however is not to be, and will not be, till *He* has come that shall come; and, in respect of the members of *his true Church*, has fulfilled his own prayer "that they all may be one."



ing on its avowed plan of *ecclesiastical agitation*,<sup>1</sup> exhibit no inexact counterpart to the incessant and resounding *coaxatio* of the prophetic symbol,—the “high swelling words of vanity” that ever and anon break out from it, in unscriptural exaltation of the writers’ supposed *sacerdotal* office and apostolic descent and powers,<sup>2</sup> may also well recall to the calm and Christian observer (fully as much as in the case of the other two spirits associated) a thought of the *vain inflation* of the Apocalyptic prototype.—4. The *rapidity and extent of its diffusion* suggests—indeed forces on us—the idea of some *supernatural influence or spirit* having been at work in promoting it:—the rather as it is a diffusion as well among the laity as the clergy in England, in the country as in the town; and not in England only, but in England’s wide-spread colonial possessions;<sup>3</sup> in Canada, Newfoundland, Australia, India.<sup>3</sup> Dr. Pusey (sad that such a man should be identified with such a system) has himself strikingly sketched this its rapidity of diffusion, the wonder of its human originators at the fact, and their conviction of some higher power assisting it:<sup>4</sup>—

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Goode (p. 6), quoting the words of the influential Review of the Tractarian party, says, They avow themselves “conspirators,” “ecclesiastical agitators,” ready “to set the father against son, and the mother against the daughter,” to accomplish their purposes.

<sup>2</sup> By their doctrine of the apostolic succession, says the late lamented Dr. Arnold, “they preach not Christ, but *the Church*; not the Church, but *themselves*.” Sermons on the Christian Life, Introd. p. xxvi.—See too what I have said on the *miracles* wrought by them in a previous Note<sup>5</sup> p. 519.

<sup>3</sup> In Calcutta Bishop Wilson has stated and lamented over this, in one of his Charges, in the strongest terms. The spirit had penetrated, it seems, even into *Bishop’s College*, and among the Professors sent out by the *Society for Propagating the Gospel*.

With reference to another quarter I may mention the case of Mr. Badger, sent out to the Nestorians in Coordistan, and then, I believe, to Syria, in the missionary character, under the Christian Knowledge Society: but who, on the way to his mission, when at Malta, preached such palpably Romish doctrines, as to be actually animadverted on by the Malta public press.

<sup>4</sup> “From the very first these views spread with a rapidity that startled us. The light seemed to spread like watch-fire from mountain-top to top; each who received it carrying it on to another, so that they who struck the first faint spark knew not how, or to whom it was borne onward.—And now it has been reflected from hill-top to valley; has penetrated into recesses; abroad, at home, within, without, in palace,\* in cottage. It has past from continent to continent: we see it spread daily: everywhere opposed, yet finding the more entrance.—One may reverently say, firmly believing whose work it is, ‘It bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound, but canst not tell whence it cometh,’” &c.

So too Mr. Gresley on the same subject. “In spite of all opposition, appearances plainly indicate that *a spirit* has spread through the land which no force or

\* So *this* frog too has entered into king’s palaces.

not however reflecting whether this might not be a bad spirit, rather than a good; <sup>1</sup> and so only illustrate the fulfilment of our text.—A rapid diffusion this, let me add, the more remarkable, from the palpable and exceeding questionableness of those two doctrinal lemmata on which the Tractators have actually based their system: viz. 1st, that of the *apostolic succession* of the *priesthood*, as *essential to the efficacy of the sacraments*, and so, they say, to the life and salvation of men's souls;—a doctrine in regard to which, had but the public with common caution called for the Tractators' own *credentials*, I will venture to say these would *on their own principles* never have been forthcoming: <sup>2</sup>

power can curb." He adds:—"Evangelicalism has had its sway for the last half century; and see what its accompaniments. Schism at such a height as was never known in the Church; such that infidelity is scarce less formidable!" Bernard Leslie, p. 353.

Let me add the following too from the English Churchman, Nov. 8, 1844, in illustration of the *independent* acting of this spirit. "Not only is the Catholic movement simultaneously going on amongst Anglicans in Great Britain, Ireland, the United States, North American Colonies, West Indies, East Indies, Australia, and elsewhere, *self-originated*, so to speak, but its progress hereafter must be kept free from foreign influence. Our *independent* testimony to Catholic truth, after our partial aberration, would not so visibly appear before the world, if either Romanists or Byzantines were thus early to stretch out a helping hand."

<sup>1</sup> "Did not *Arianism* spread as rapidly," says Mr. Bickersteth most justly, after quoting the above, "and *Mahomedanism* too?" Homily Sermon, p. 4. Compare my citation from Coleridge p. 499 *suprà*.

<sup>2</sup> Says Dr. Hook, in one of his Sermons on the Church and the Establishment, "There is not a bishop, priest, or deacon among us, who cannot, if he please, trace his own *spiritual descent* from St. Peter or St. Paul." With all respect I will beg to express my doubt whether Dr. Hook himself can do so. Says Dr. Arnold, in his Introduction to Sermons on a Christian Life; "It is a doctrine destitute alike of all internal and external evidence:" and Archbishop Whately; "There is not a minister in all Christendom who is able to trace up, with any approach to certainty, his own spiritual pedigree." Kingdom of Christ, p. 176.

The Archbishop refers to many irregularities of consecration, which, especially in the dark ages, could not have been wholly excluded, except by a perpetual miracle. I will venture to narrow the question, and make it more definite. And I will here ask, not Dr. Hook only, but the whole clerical section of the Tractarian body, to show that there is not, 1st, the *chorepiscopal flaw* in their own succession: a flaw fatal to it *on their principles*; seeing that they require, in order to its perpetuation, a line unbroken even from primitive times of bishops consecrated according to the canons of General Councils; (these being as much, they say, the voice of God, as Scripture itself;) i. e. by the imposition of the hands of *three previously and duly consecrated bishops*: the intervention of which flaw, or, to vary the metaphor, of this *nonconductor*, wherever it has intervened, must needs have stopped the transmission of the ethereal fluid. And then again, 2ndly, the flaw of the *doctrine of intention*: which has necessarily, from the time that it became a doctrine, involved the failure of any apostolic succession of bishops subsequently, alike in the Romish and the English Church, on Romish or Tractarian principles.—See my Vol. ii. p. 174, and p. 177, Notes<sup>2</sup>. The reader may see more on the subject of the *Chorepiscopi*, all confirmatory of what I have there written, in the Councils, Hard. i. 471, 597, 768, iii. 339, iv. 1314, vi. 412.—Mr. Perceval has indeed, if I remember right, somewhere written, as if *one* bishop's hands only were necessary. But, if so, it must have been

—2nd, that principle put forth by them as the test of *true religious doctrine*, “*Quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus* :” a rule which, to any man of common sense, and fair knowledge of ecclesiastical history, must appear on the face of it to involve impossibility and self-contradiction ;<sup>1</sup> and which, construed *practically*, can only mean *the doctrine which has the sanction of the Tractarians* : to the supersession of all private judgment, individual conscience, and personal responsibility; and the surrender of conscience and heart into the hands of the priesthood.—Can the rapid and wide-spread reception and popularity of doctrines so startling, so dangerous, so unwarranted, be accounted for on any principle but that of an assistant spirit of infatuation? The hypothesis of some such supernatural agency helping it on seems positively requisite;<sup>2</sup> and that this must be a spirit of *error*, not of *truth*, will seem little questionable to him whosoever takes God’s written Scriptures as the one supreme standard of truth and right; or him whose heart and reason are fully in accord with the doctrine of the reformed Church of England, as exprest authoritatively in its

by oversight. For this is to deny the authority of the *Apostolical Canons*, and early *Œcumenic Councils*; and therewith to do nothing less than renounce the whole Tractarian system itself.

<sup>1</sup> “*Quod semper, quod ubique,*” &c. Was there ever any important Christian truth about which heresies and heretics did not exist even in the first six centuries? So all *heresies* must first be put aside.—Then, as regards the members of the orthodox Church, where is he who knows all they ever wrote on theological subjects? and whence then the knowledge of what was believed *ab omnibus*? For this the *Œcumenic Councils* are referred to. But did these, though so called, really represent all Christendom? Not so; but only Roman Christendom. So we narrow the voice again. Then, as regards these Councils, who is to decide, in the many controverted cases, which are *Œcumenic*, which not? Hence another important difficulty. And what if the Councils have sometimes contradicted each other?—So questions arise which where is the clergyman, not to say layman, that can solve? He must ultimately, if he take this rule of faith, leave it to some human authority to decide what the rule enjoins; i. e. to *Oxford*, if not to *Rome*. But will Mr. Newman take on him the responsibility of the salvation of the souls that receive his dictum, as Gregory I. did? Or will men trust them with him!

<sup>2</sup> There are, it is to be remembered, two characteristic principles of our fallen nature, on which the spirit of evil knows that he may reckon in such temptations. The one, affecting the *priesthood* in particular, is *man’s natural pride* and *vanity*, which readily drinks in such priest-exalting notions. The other, affecting man generally, is *man’s apostasy from God*: which makes anything welcome, such as, while satisfying the fears of conscience, may enable him to shun close direct personal intimacy with God. As the bushes of the garden to Adam, in which he sought to hide himself from God, and as Egypt or Assyria to Israel, so the priest, the confessional, the Church (in its anti-Christian character), are all welcome to fallen man, if sensible of the need of some religion, as a hiding-place of refuge from God.

articles and liturgy ;<sup>1</sup> however willing to admit the zeal and moral worth of many advocates of it who know not what spirit they are of :<sup>2</sup> still less to him who has at all discerningly entered into the nature, as laid down in Scripture prophecy, of the great apostasy that was to corrupt the Christian Church ; and so to be the preparer for, and precursor of, its at length heading Man of Sin.

Very strange it seemed to reflective men, in the earlier years of this spirit's outgoing, when they considered the affinity of the spirit with that of Romanism, that its ardent advocates should not join the Church of Rome : while the Romanists, on their side, looked with more and more hope continually for their secession ; and even hailed the movement as the not improbable precursor of the reconversion of England to the Romish faith.<sup>3</sup> And soon the anticipated

<sup>1</sup> Let me, from among many, give four such testimonies ;—testimonies of men well known, and of high authority.

1. *Archbishop Sumner*.—In his Episcopal Charge, while Bishop of Chester, in 1841, this venerable prelate, referring to Christ's famous prophetic parable of the tares and the wheat, and declaration that the sower of the former was the Devil, avowed his belief that the Tractarian doctrine answered to that prophecy ; and was the work of a *spirit of evil*, inspiring its human propagators ; with a view to stop, or mar, the good work of evangelic agencies before in progress.

2. *Dr. Arnold*.—"I call all this *Judaizing* a direct idolatry. It is exalting the Church, and the sacraments, *into the place of Christ* ; as others have exalted his mother, and others in the same spirit exalted circumcision." So Dr. Arnold in 1837. *Life*, Vol. ii. p. 74.—How agreeable with what I have written of the germinating apostasy in the fourth century, in my Chapter on the Sealing, as well as with what I write here !

3. *Archdeacon Hare*.—"There is a *lying spirit* stalking through our Church ; and even taking possession of some minds that would otherwise be amongst its pillars and noblest ornaments."

4. *Lord John Russell*.—"There is a danger, however, which alarms me much more than any aggression of a foreign prince. Clergymen of our own Church who have subscribed the 39 Articles, and acknowledged in explicit terms the Queen's supremacy, have been the most forward in leading their flocks step by step to the very verge of the precipice. The honour paid to saints, the claim of infallibility for the Church, the superstitious use of the sign of the cross, the muttering of the Liturgy so as to disguise the language in which it is written, the recommendation of auricular confession, and the administration of penance and absolution,—all these things are pointed out by Clergymen of the Church of England as worthy of adoption, and are now openly reprehended by the Bishop of London in his Charge to the Clergy of his Diocese."

So Lord John Russell in his celebrated Letter to the Bishop of Durham, on occasion of the Papal Aggression in 1851. The conclusion of the Letter is well also to be remembered. "But I rely with confidence on the people of England. And I will not bate a jot of heart or hope, so long as the glorious principles of the immortal martyrs of the Reformation shall be held in reverence by the great mass of the nation : which looks with contempt on the mummeries of superstition ; and with scorn at the endeavours which are now making to confine the intellect, and enslave the soul."

<sup>2</sup> On this I wish clearly to express my opinion. Just as many are professedly *in* Rome, yet not *of* Rome, (on which point see my Note p. 68 *suprà*), so too, I fully acknowledge, in the case of not a few Tractarian doctrinists. With them the fault is in the head, not the heart.

<sup>3</sup> In France the Protestant Journal *L'Espérance* thus wrote : "The Journals of the

event, as regards most of the Tractarian chiefs, took place : Messrs. J. H. Newman, Oakley, Faber, Maskell, Dodsworth, and many others,—followed a little later by Archdeacon Manning, and, alas! by two also that bore the honoured name of Wilberforce,—having, ere the publication of my 4th Edition in 1850, formally abjured Protestantism, and joined themselves to Rome. Still, however, other of the leaders have remained, with whatever inconsistency, in the English Reformed Protestant Church :—a leaven ever energetically working and agitating there in its distinctive character of *priestcraft* ; though scarcely any longer with the expectation and hope, so vain-gloriously and sometimes so bitterly expressed in its earlier and more palmy days, of ejecting evangelic doctrine, and the evangelic Clergy, altogether out of the Church of England.<sup>1</sup>

And not alone in England, let me briefly add, ere concluding this head, and in the various colonies where the Eng-

Romish Church are elated with joy at the progress of Puseyism in England. They proclaim with delight the conversions to Catholicism for which Puseyism had prepared the way. They already see England again attached to the see of Rome." And so *L'Ami de la Religion*, referred to generally by the then Bishop of London, (Blomfield,) ib. p. 69. Let me give one extract from the Number for Oct. 8, 1841. In detailing a conference of a Romish priest with one of the Tractarians, who expressed the intention of the Anglican Catholics to effect a re-union with Rome, it says ; "But what if your Bishops refuse to allow it?" was the priest's question. "Nous les contraindrons," was the reply, "par une force extérieure."

The *Catholic Magazine* of March 1842, p. 133, says ; "Thanks to the theologians of Oxford, . . . our liturgy and its venerable usages, invocation of saints, purgatory, the councils, confession, absolution, veneration of the blessed Virgin Mary, the mysteries of the Eucharist, the authority of the Church, the abandonment of the Protestant principle, and of the doctrine, unheard of till the sixteenth century, of justification by faith alone,—all these are now granted," &c. : adding that the Romanists have now only to press the Tractarians with their own weapons, and show that they are in delusion while lingering out of the pale of the Romish Church.

The same complacency at the progress of Oxford doctrine, and hopeful anticipations from it, was expressed in the Romish journals of the day in Ireland.

I saw it somewhere stated at the time that the authorities at Rome had it in contemplation to allow of the English clergy retaining their wives, in order to facilitate their expected conforming to the Romish Church : but I know not with what truth.

<sup>1</sup> First said Mr. Newman : "We aspire, and intend by God's blessing, to have a *successful fight*." also Dr. Pusey : "If human frailty or impatience precipitates not the issue, *all will be well* ; and the *Catholic* (as the full) *truth of God*, unless violently cast out, will in time *leaven, and absorb into itself, whatever is partial and defective*." And so too the British Critic ; "Our movement must be surely *onward*."—Goode, p. 54.—It was during the progress of the famous Gorham Controversy that not a few of the Tractarians expressed their purpose and expectation of ejecting the Evangelic Clergy from the English Church.

As yet another and notable example of the then swelling words of vanity of the party I may mention, connectedly with this, the fact of at least one Tractarian Clergyman having publicly proposed to *excommunicate the Archbishop of Canterbury*, on account of his expressed judgment in the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in favour of Mr. Gorham.

lish Church has been planted, all over the globe, has this spirit made its voice to be heard, but in the affiliated American episcopal Church too, very powerfully and influentially. Moreover even in the Lutheran Continental Churches there has been its unambiguous echo.<sup>1</sup> Besides that in the Roman Catholic Churches in France, Italy, and Germany, the line of argument in defence and exaltation of the *Papacy*, spoken of under my second head, has embraced very prominently not a little of the arguments for the *priestcraft* doctrinal system also;<sup>2</sup> which is in fact, and ever has been, the necessary basement of the pyramid of which an earthly *Pope* is the proper apex.

Thus have each and every one of these three spirits of evil, the *infidel*, the *popish*, and that of *priestcraft*, been shown to have risen up, and made their hostile clamorous voices incessantly to be heard, most especially in England, the heart of the evangelic missionary movement, just from the time when the waters of the mystic Euphrates had begun to dry up, and thence onward.—And now, as I calmly look back from 1861 on their progress and actings during the last 30 years, there are three things which still strongly impress my mind as characteristic respecting them; all in accordance with the Apocalyptic prefiguration. The first is, how even in the natural and almost necessary antagonism at times of the *infidel* spirit of the one with the *superstitious* spirit of the two others, there has yet generally been an effective playing into each other's hands;<sup>3</sup> most especially in

<sup>1</sup> In Protestant Prussia the *Kreuzritter*, headed by Gerlach and Stahl, were said to be acting like our Tractarians as pioneers for Rome.

In the "Evening Mail," Nov. 28, 1856, there was the statement following by a correspondent of the "Times." "The ultramontane party in Bavaria and Austria laugh in its sleeve at what is going on in the Protestant Church in S. Germany; as it seems that the imprudent and most untimely measures of the High Consistories of Bavaria and Wurtemberg cannot but serve to further the cause of Rome in those kingdoms. A Wurtemberg Correspondent of the Augsburg Gazette writes; 'The high Consistory is evidently working into the hands of the Roman Catholic hierarchy; and Protestantism will receive a fatal blow if the proposed measures of private confession and stricter Church discipline are carried out.'"

<sup>2</sup> So very specially in Mùhler's Symbolism, the most influential of all the writings of the æra in defence of Popery. On "the Church," apostolic succession, the sacraments, justification, &c., so similar are the anti-Protestant views urged by him to those urged by the Oxford Tractators a year later, that one might almost fancy not a little of the voice from Oxford in 1833 to have been the echo of that uttered from Tubingen in 1832.

<sup>3</sup> So the noble Geological Professor of our Cambridge University, Adam

the one point on which they have ever been heart and soul united, viz. opposition to evangelic religion. The second is the continued vain-gloriousness of the spirits, during the period under review, even to the present time.<sup>1</sup> The third is the speed and far range of its outgoing on each fresh emission of each spirit's voice.<sup>2</sup> Nothing, to my mind, could more justly have pictured them, in respect of these as well as of all their other characteristic features, than the Apocalyptic symbol in my text; "There went forth three unclean spirits *like frogs*, out of the mouth of the *Dragon*, and out of the mouth of the *Beast*, and out of the mouth of the *False Prophet*; to gather together the kings (and kingdoms) of the world to the war of the great day of God Almighty."

---

But it must ever be remembered in regard of this final

Sedgwick, in his *Studies of the University*. "Falsehood and Fanaticism have a mighty power of propagation. They not only beget their likeness, but they often beget their opposites. Rationalism has led some men to blind submission. Popery has led to Pantheism, and Pantheism to Popery." Preface, ccciii.

Again, p. cccxxx. "In the University of Cambridge we have, I think, nothing to fear from *material* Pantheism; and we have very little to fear from the *ideal* Pantheism which has of late years so much distorted the teaching of one large metaphysical school in Germany. . . . But we have something to fear from modern Rationalism: for we also have our Rationalists; who, instead of humbly taking the Word of God as their food for life, are willing to cull from it only what suits their taste and pleases their palate.—Much also have we to fear an antagonist form of error, which leads men not only to accept the plain teaching of the Word of God, but to add to it both doctrines and observances which cannot be found within its letter, (e. g. ascetic doctrines and observances,) and to set them up as if they were of divine authority and sanction.—A religion of this kind is pharisaical in principle; is the food of infidelity on the one hand, and of monastic superstition on the other: it is a part of creature-worship, and is the best ally of Pantheism. . . . Superstition, Priestcraft, Pantheism, naturally pander to one another."


<sup>1</sup> Not least, I must say, in the recently published *Oxford Essays*; the writers of which seem to assume, in their crusade against the truth of Revelation, that their writings are the very expression of true science and philosophy: just as if men like Paley and Butler, and other such champions for the truth of revelation, were children in comparison with them.

<sup>2</sup> So, for a recent example, as regards the late *Oxford Essays*. "The newspapers in Sydney, Melbourne, and Victoria, to meet the general curiosity, are publishing this infidel work piecemeal in their columns. Who could have thought it? The Australian no longer pores with glistening eyes over his heap of nuggets. He is not indeed reading the Bible; but he is devouring the *Oxford 'Essays and Reviews'*, which aim at the evisceration of Christianity, and the dethronement of the heavenly oracles." Cited in the *Record*, Aug. 30, 1861, from the *Edinburgh Witness*.—Again, elsewhere:—"We are informed that the '*Essays and Reviews*' are now in process of translation into Gujerattee by a Parsee gentleman at present in London, who takes interest in the subjects discussed by the seven authors, and intends publishing his translation for the use of inquiring minds among his countrymen in India."—So the *Athenæum*, Sept. 7, 1861.






FRENCH BANNER, FROM THE  
WARS OF CLOVIS IN THE TAPESTRY OF RHEIMS.




This is the olde Armys of Fraunce



From Fabians Chronicle

Armoial Shield of Clovis



From Maximilians Mausoleum at Inns

war,<sup>1</sup> that just as, in the case of the Roman heathen Dragon's war against advancing Christianity in the 3rd and 4th centuries, it was not merely by argument and speaking and writing on the part of the literary and of philosophers, that the war was carried on, but by *physical force* also, and at length, in fine, by the mighty armies of Roman heathenism under Maxentius, Maximin, Licinius, so we have to look for the same terrible agency of war, under leaders animated by each and every one of the unclean spirits here described, against evangelic Protestant Christianity; and, as I cannot but suppose, against that country most especially which has been for 300 years, above all others, its favoured home, viz. England.—Do we ask under what leadership? and how? The answers to such questions are as yet involved in the mists of the future. But this I must say, that in France, on a larger scale than in any other country, the three several spirits have been all abroad and active; alike under the Orleans dynasty, and under that of the extraordinary man, Louis Napoleon, who now despotically wields the mighty power of France:<sup>2</sup> one in whose dark mind, judging from his actions, each of the three is as a principle of political action cherished; and whose constant preparing for a war of life and death against England he must be blind who sees not. Moreover there is a curious heraldic fact, accordant with this view, which (considering how frequently such national emblems have been had in view in the Apocalyptic figurations) I cannot permit myself to pass over in silence, though by no means wishing to insist much on it: viz. that, as *the three spirits* do each and all most assuredly energize in the French nation and priesthood, so their Apocalyptic symbol, *the three frogs*, are *the old arms of France*. I append a Plate in illustration of the fact; and subjoin some explanatory notices below.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Mark! the *war* of Armageddon (*πολεμον*): not, as many represent it, the *battle*; as if some single simple battle in Judæa, or elsewhere.

<sup>2</sup> The fact of the three spirits being each and every one just as energetic in France now as under the Orleans dynasty, is too notorious to need illustration.

<sup>3</sup> The engravings given in my Plate exhibit illustrations of this curious fact from France itself, from Germany, and from England.

1. The banner with the three frogs is from ancient tapestry in the Cathedral of Rheims, representing battle-scenes of Clovis; who is said to have been baptized there, after his conversion to Christianity.

2. The second engraving is from Pynsen's edition of Fabian's Chronicle; at the beginning of his account of *Pharamond*, the first King of the Franks, who reigned at Tours about A.D. 420.

3. The other engraving is from the Franciscan Church of Innsbruck: where is a row of tall bronze figures, 23 in number, representing principally the most distinguished personages of the house of Austria; the armour and costumes being those chiefly of the 16th century, and the workmanship excellent. Among them is Clovis King of France, and on his shield *three fleurs de lis* and *three frogs*; with the words underneath, *Clodoveus der erste Christenlich König von Frankreich*.

So as to the engravings.—In explanation, passing over *Montfaucon's* statement about a medal with the device of a *frog* upon it found in Childeric's tomb, (a predecessor of Clovis,) in the year 1623, at St. Brice near Tournay, forasmuch as *Montfaucon* thinks it to have been an Egyptian medal, and so in no way peculiarly connected with the Franks, I may give the following illustrative notices.

1. *Uptonus*, De Milit. Officio, p. 155, like *Fabian*, simply states *three frogs* to have been the old arms of the kings of France; without specifying what race of kings.

2. *Professor Schott* conjectures the *three frogs* to have been distinctively the original arms of the *Bourbons*; *bourbe* signifying *mud*.

3. *Typpotius*, i. 75, gives as the device on a coin of Louis VI (the first French Louis after Hugh Capet, the head of the Bourbons) a *frog* with the inscription, *Mihi terra lacusque*. It is, I think, the only example of that device in his work.

4. In the "Monde Primitif comparé avec le Monde Moderne," by *M. Court de Gebelin*, (Paris 1781,) the author thus writes, p. 181, "Nous venons de voir que les armoiries de la Guyenne sont un *leopard*, celles des Celtes (surtout les Belges) étoient un *lion*, et celles des Franes un *crapaud*. . . Le *crapaud* designe les marais dont sortoient les Franes." And again p. 195: "La Cosmographie de Munster, Liv. ii., nous a transmis un fait tres remarquable dans ce genre. Marcomir, roi des Franes, ayant penetré de la Westphalie dans la Tongrie vit en songe une figure à trois têtes, l'une de *lion*, l'autre d'*aigle*, la troisième de *crapaud*. Il consulta là-dessus, ajoute t'on, un celebre Druide de la contrée, appelé Al Runus. Et celui-ci l'assura que cette figure designoit les trois puissances qui auroient regné successivement sur les Gaules: —les Celtes, dont le symbole étoit un *lion*, les Romains designés par l'*aigle*, et les Franes par le *crapaud*, à cause de leurs marais."

5. In the 6th Century, xlv. of the Prophecies of *Nostradamus* (p. 251), translated by *Garencieres* (London, 1672), there occurs the following verse:

Un juste sera en exil envoyé  
Par pestilence aux confins de son siegle,  
Response au rouge le fera desvoyé,  
Roi retirant à la rane, et à l'aigle.

On which says *Garencieres*; "By the *eagle* he meaneth the Emperor; by the *frog* the King of France; for, before he took the *flower de luce*, the French bore *three frogs*."

6. *Encyclopædia Metropolitana*: "Paulus Æmilius blazons the arms of France argent, three diadems, gules. Others say they bear *three toads* sable, on a field vert (ap. Gwyllim c. i.): which if ever they did, it must have been before the existence of the present rules." Art. on Heraldry.

# APPENDIX TO VOL. III.

## No. I.

### ON THE EPOCH OF THE FIRST ASSUMPTION OF THE DIADEM BY ROMAN EMPERORS.

(See pp. 15 and 125.)

THE precise epoch of the first assumption of the *diadem* by Roman Emperors has been a point disputed. As the question is one that affects a very interesting particular of evidence urged by me in support of my interpretation of Apoc. xii.,—viz. the fact of the diadem having become the distinguishing badge of Roman sovereignty at the time of the heathen Emperors' last war against Christianity, just in accordance with the Apocalyptic representation of the *Dragon* as *diademed* on his heads when making his last attack on the Woman, the Church, in the political heaven,—it seems right that I should acquaint my readers with the nature of the controversy about it, and the authority and arguments, both literary and medallie, on which I base the judgment on it expressed in my Commentary.<sup>1</sup>

It is to be understood then that under the Constantinian dynasty, from Constantine himself downwards throughout the fourth century, it is admitted on all hands that the *diadem* was, as Gibbon states, the distinctive, properly speaking,<sup>2</sup> of the *Augusti* or supreme Emperors; while the *laurel* was the more proper badge of the subordinate emperors, or *Cæsars*: this latter being theirs indeed not exclusively, but in com-

<sup>1</sup> I feel the more bound to do this from the circumstance of my having in my two first Editions published a medal of Maximian as *diademed*: misled, in common with one or two friends who also saw it, by a cast sent me from Paris, in which the leaves on the laurel crown were so far obliterated as to give us the impression of its being a diademed band.

<sup>2</sup> I say, *properly speaking*; because there are one or two exceptional cases under the Constantinian dynasty, which will be noted by me afterwards. See Note 2 p. 541 *infra*.

mon with the Augusti.<sup>1</sup> The case of Julian is one excellently illustrative of the then established distinction. He was in 355 made Cæsar by his first cousin Constantius, the then reigning Emperor, (son to the great Constantine,) *χωρίς του διαδηματος*, as Chrysostom expresses it,<sup>2</sup> i. e. without the diadem distinctive; in which station he continued for five years. Accordingly the medals struck by him during this period both bear the inscription *Cæsar*, and are all *laurelled*: with the exception only of one struck at the precise conclusion of the period, conjoining the *Cæsar* and the *diadem*;<sup>3</sup> which however confirms the rule, rather than violates it. For it seems that at the end of the five years he was tumultuously voted into the dignity of *Augustus*, by the acclamations of the soldiery; and struck the medal, apparently, while waiting the confirmation of their vote by Constantius.<sup>4</sup> On which occasion of his election the soldiers, having sought in vain for a diadem, as the badge of that highest imperial office, (so Ammianus Marcellinus tells the story,)<sup>5</sup> and when he had declined assuming his wife's head-band for a substitute, as being an ornament womanly and ill-omened, a military officer's honorary collar of merit, studded with gold-set stones, was taken and placed on his head; that he might thus wear the semblance at least of that emblem of the Augustan dignity.<sup>6</sup> Soon afterwards he assumed a proper diadem, ambitiously set with pearls and brilliants.<sup>7</sup> And, says Philostorgius,<sup>8</sup> having lived previously five years *εν σχηματι Καισαρος*, i. e. in the inferior Cæsarean office, and with its inferior symbol of dignity, he

<sup>1</sup> The medals of the *Augusti*, through the first half of the fourth century, from Constantine inclusive downwards, appear perpetually *laurelled* on medals, as well as *diademed*.

<sup>2</sup> Orat. 64, in S. Babyl.

<sup>3</sup> On the face there is inscribed, D. N. JULIANUS NOB. CÆS. round Julian's head diademed; on the reverse, VOT. V. MULT. This shows that the coins were struck at the end of his Cæsarean quinquennium; on which see Note 7 below. So Spanheim, in his larger Work, Tom. ii. p. 385.

<sup>4</sup> Zonaras reports (and Julian himself states the same in his Ep. ad Athen., says Valesius on Amm. Marcel. xx. 8) that he wrote Constantius an account of this his elevation in the name of *Cæsar*, not *Augustus*, with a view to conciliate him. Further Zosimus, iii. 9, tells how Julian declared to Constantius that he was ready, on his requiring it, *την του Καισαρος εχειν αξιαν, αποθεμενος το διαδημα*.

<sup>5</sup> "Uti coronatus speciem saltem obscuram superioris prætenderet potestatis." Amm. Marc. ib. 4. It was the torques or collar of a *draconarius*, or *dragon standard-bearer*, that was taken. Zonaras gives a precisely similar report: describing the collar at the same time more fully thus; *επει χρυσιον τις των ταξιάρχων εφορει στρεπτον, λιθους εχοντα χρυσοδετους*. Cited by Valesius ad loc. <sup>6</sup> Amm. M. ib.

<sup>7</sup> So Ammianus xxi. 1; "Quinquennalia Augustus jam edidit: et ambitioso diademate utebatur, lapidum fulgore distincto; cum inter exordia principatus assumpti villi coronâ circumdatus erat."

<sup>8</sup> Hist. Eccles. vii. 15.

lived two years and a half afterwards *εν διαδηματι* : i. e. in the state of imperial supremacy symbolized by the diadem.

All this, as I said, is admitted. But the question remains ;—Had this distinction of symbols been introduced by Diocletian, on his original institution of the new quadripartite form of government, under Augusti and Cæsars ? Had the diadem been at all assumed so early as a Roman imperial badge ? Or, if only first adopted somewhat later by Constantine, then at what time of his reign ? Before his first public act of profession of Christianity, or after it ? before or after that conflict with Maximin, very speedily following after Constantine's profession of Christianity, which I have supposed to be not improbably the *primary* event symbolized by the figuration of the Woman and diademed Dragon in Apoc. xii. ; though also, and indeed yet more specifically, referring to Constantine's last conflicts with Licinius ? On these points different opinions have been held : and, with a view to a satisfactory judgment on them, it may be well to consider the evidence separately with reference to the times before Diocletian,—those under Diocletian,—and those immediately after him at the commencement of the reign of Constantine.

1. As regards the *first* æra inquired into, we may pass over the case of Heliogabalus, whose wearing of a diadem is mentioned by Lampridius ; since this was not his imperial, but his previous pontifical badge, viz. as Priest to the Sun.<sup>1</sup> And, passing it over, *Aurelian* (A.D. 270—275) will be found to be the earliest Roman Emperor, whose assumption of it is directly asserted in history. Says the younger Victor of him ; “ He first among the Romans wreathed his head with a *diadem*, and used precious stones, and a gold-embroidered

<sup>1</sup> So Lampridius in his *Life of Heliogabalus*, c. 23 : “ Habuit et in calciamentis gemmas, et quidem sculptas : . . voluit uti et diademate gemmato, quia pulchrior fieret ; . . quo et usus domi.” This was not however properly an *imperial* diadem, but *priestly* tiara. So Cuper on Lactant. M. P. xix. Herodian too, v. 3, speaking of Heliogabalus as priest to the Sun, before his election to the empire, thus describes his head-dress ; *την τε κεφαλην εκοσμηι στεφανος λιθων πολυτελων χροια διηθησιαμενος* : and again, after his election, ib. 5, thus : *εις ειδος δε τιαρας στεφανηνη επικειμενος χρουσα και λιθοις ποικιλην τιμιοις*. Patinus, p. 329, gives a medal representing this emperor sacrificing, with the inscription, SACERD. DEL SOLIS. ELAGAB. His was in fact the case of a man who, even after election to the empire, kept up his old character of *priest to the sun*, as well as his new of *emperor* ; and showed it in his dress, as well as otherwise.

Lampridius, c. 4, says of Heliogabalus' successor Alexander Severus that he discarded that use of jewels in his robes and shoes which had been affected by Heliogabalus ; “ Gemmas de calciamentis et vestibus tulit quibus usus fuerat Heliogabalus.”

robe.”<sup>1</sup> An illustrative medal is given by Tristanus, exhibiting Aurelian *diademed* on its face; and on the reverse Vaballathus, an Oriental Prince allied with, or who had submitted to him.<sup>2</sup> But I suspect incorrectness in the case; because Patinus gives a similar medal, but with Aurelian’s head *laurelled*.<sup>3</sup> There is also said to be a diademed medal of him, reports Rasche,<sup>4</sup> (whether this same or another,) among the “numi Ducis Arschotani.”—However there exist many well-known medals of his, inscribed “Deo et Domino nostro Aureliano;”<sup>5</sup> the memorials of his assumption to himself of the lordly and divine titles of Oriental despotism: and these, pro tanto, give support to the historic assertion of his having sometimes assumed both the diadem and the dress characteristic of Oriental Princes.

2. Turning to *Diocletian*, who succeeded to the empire A.D. 284, just ten years after Aurelian, and who, with a view to the carrying out of his new constitution for the Roman Empire, took the first step at once in 286, by the appointment of Maximian as joint-Augustus with himself, and in 292 completed it by that of Constantius and Galerius as the two Cæsars,—we have the testimony of Jornandes to the fact of his having himself assumed the *diadem*.<sup>6</sup> And the testimony of Jornandes may be considered that of Cassiodorus, the most learned Roman of his age; as the Roman History by the former was very much taken from the latter.<sup>7</sup> Moreover both by Eutropius and Jerome the fact is asserted of his having adorned his robes and shoes with gems, just like Aurelian;<sup>8</sup> an imperial insigne which

<sup>1</sup> “Iste primus (sc. Aurelianus) apud Romanos diadema capiti innexuit, gemmisque et auratâ omni veste, quod adhuc fere incognitum Romanis moribus videbatur, usus est.” Victor, Epitome.

<sup>2</sup> See Spanheim’s notice of this medal, ubi suprâ; and Cuper on Lactantius M. P. xix. 461. He refers to Tristanus iii. 211, for the medal.

<sup>3</sup> p. 430.

<sup>4</sup> On the word *Diadema*.

<sup>5</sup> Eckhel viii. 365.

<sup>6</sup> “Is gemmas vestibus calcamentisque inseruit, diademaque in capite” A passage this which I have before cited at p. 15.

<sup>7</sup> So Gibbon vii. 11; “Jornandes . . . has abridged the great history of Cassiodorus.”

<sup>8</sup> “Diocletianus imperio Romano primus regie consuetudinis formam, magis quam Romanæ libertatis, invexit; adorarique se jussit; cùm ante eum cuncti salutarentur; ornamentaque gemmarum vestibus calcamentisque indidit. Nam prius imperii insigne in chlamyde purpureâ tantùm erat; reliqua communia.” So Eutropius ix. 26. And similarly Jerome in Chron. “Primus Diocletianus adorari se ut Deum, et gemmas vestibus calcamentisque inseri jussit: cùm ante eum omnes Imperatores more judicium salutarentur; et chlamydem purpuream à privato habitu plus haberent.”

The elder Victor too notices his introduction of the ceremony of *adoration*. “Quippe qui primus, ex auro veste quesitâ, serici, ac purpuræ, gemmarumque vim plantis concupiverit, . . . Dominumque palam dici passus, et adorari se ut Deum.”

was the diadem's proper accompaniment: and so too says the Author of the *Συναγωγή Ἱστοριῶν*, edited by Scaliger; who assigns the date of his first doing so to the year 292, after Galerius' return from his victory over Narses, laden with precious gems as a part of the Persian spoils.<sup>1</sup>—As regards *medallic* evidence, however, no medals of his now exist *diademed*. There are only some in which gems alternate with the laurel on his crown:<sup>2</sup> though on other and most of his medals the laurel appears simply and alone. It is also clear from the nearly contemporary Treatise ascribed to Lactantius, *De Mortibus Persecutorum*, as well as from other good evidence, that, as the *laurel* had not been yet set aside, so the *purple* was also retained; indeed that this latter was in public a chief ensign of both the Augustan and the Cæsarean imperial dignity.<sup>3</sup> So much as to Diocletian.—With regard to his co-Augustus *Maximian*, there occurs in the Panegyric pronounced before him by the orator Mamertinus at Treves, in the

Lactantius, M. P. xviii., represents Diocletian to have objected to Maxentius (Maximian's son) that he was too proud to *adore* his father.

<sup>1</sup> So Cuper on Lactant. M. P. ix. "Auctor *Συναγωγῆς Ἱστοριῶν*, à Scaligero editus, p. 395, narrat eum (Galerium) reversum fuisse βαλαντία πεπληρωμένα εχοντα λιθων τιμιων και μαργαριτων: Diocletianumque tunc primum veste et calceis λιθοις τιμοις και χρυσω κεκοσμημενοις usum esse; et eundem jussisse ut, spreto salutandi veteri more, adoraretur." He adds; "Sed Eusebius initium hujus moris refert ad ann. 295, victum vero Narsem ad ann. 303."

<sup>2</sup> "Rarius cum coronâ ex lauro et *gemmis*, in auro, apud Banduri." So Eckhel viii. 5.—I may observe that in medals of some of the Emperors following, as of Constantians for example, (see Patinus 471,) the jewels which alternate with the laurel are so abundant, that it seems almost doubtful whether the imperial head-band might not be called a jewelled diadem, almost as properly as a laurel crown.

<sup>3</sup> Lactantius M. P. ch. xix., speaks of Diocletian giving his robe of purple to Maximin, on his own abdication, and making Maximin Cæsar: this showing, as the commentators observe, that the purple was an ensign of both the Augustan and the Cæsarean dignity. So too ch. xxv. And in the contemporary Panegyrics other examples occur; e. g. in that of Eumenius to Constantine, ch. viii. In ch. xxv. of the M. P. Constantine is said to have sent his *laureata imago*\* to Galerius, to apprise him of his elevation to the imperial dignity, (that of *Cæsar*, as it appears,) on his father's death.

The fact of Diocletian's retaining the *purple* while emperor does not militate against his having sometimes worn the *diadem*. For Constantine united the *purple* with the *diadem*; the wearing of the diadem being, as we shall presently see, customary with him. Thus, in his Panegyric, ch. 5, Eusebius speaks of Constantine's purple dress thus; τῷ τῆς ἀμπεχούνης ἐξαιρετῶ περιβληματι διαφαινων, και την περπεουσαν αὐτῷ αλουργίδα βασιλικην, μόνος επαξίως ἐμπεριεϊλημμενος. p. 506.

\* Mr. Bridges says of these *images*, or *portraits*:—"They were probably executed in what artists term *encaustic painting*. . . Either the picture when finished was covered with a varnish of oil and melted wax, laid on warm with a brush; or else the colours themselves were mixt up with wax, and used as a tepid dilution." *Life of Constantine*, p. 125, with a list of ancient authorities added.



year 289, the following allusive notice of his imperial insignia and pomp: "Your triumphal *trabeæ*, and consular *fascæ*, and curule chairs, and splendid retinue of attendants, and *that brilliant circle of light which surrounds your divine head*, are but the fair and most august ornaments of your merit."<sup>1</sup> A really remarkable sentence to our point: and, in which *the brilliant circle of light* (which cannot of course be meant of the lac-lustre laurel crown) may most fitly and naturally be explained of the diadem with its brilliants or gold-embroidered band; so as it is in fact explained by the learned Valesius.<sup>2</sup> It is however a passage not quite decisive: as the language *may* also possibly be understood of *the golden radiated crown*, worn not infrequently by the Emperors at that time, so as Arndtzenius explains it;<sup>3</sup> though not I think of the *nimbus*, which Eckhel suggests, not quite consistently with himself.<sup>4</sup> I say that it may *possibly* be understood of the radiated crown; not *probably*. For the word "*augustissima*," *most august*, makes it all but necessary that one at least of the insignia mentioned should be properly *Augustan*.<sup>5</sup> This, out of all the imperial insignia mentioned by Mamertin, the "*circlet of light*" alone can be: and it could be so only if explained of the *diadem*; for the *radiated crown* was *common to the Cæsars*.<sup>6</sup>—Yet once more, passing to *Constantius* and *Galerius*, (the two Cæsars till Diocletian's and Maximian's abdication in 304, then the two Augusti,) we find respecting the former the following notable statement made by Eusebius:—"Having been distinguished at the first by *the diadem* of the imperial *Cæsars*, and in that had his merit tested, he was afterwards adorned with the honour of the highest in rule among the Romans:" i. e. of the *Augusti*.<sup>7</sup> A statement, says Spanheim, dis-

<sup>1</sup> "Trabeæ vestræ triumphales, et fascæ consulares, et sellæ curules, et hæc obsequiorum stipatio et fulgor, et illa lux divinum verticem claro orbe complectens, vestrorum sunt ornamenta meritorum pulcherrima et augustissima." ch. 3.

<sup>2</sup> In his comment on Ammianus Marcellianus' notice (xxi. 1) of Julian's diadem, as "*lapidum fulgore distincto*," Valesius observes: "This Libanius calls also, in reference to its form sometimes of a *golden band*, *ταυια χρυση*. So Orat. Fun. in Julian. *φειγγοντος την ταυιαν την χρυσην*." <sup>3</sup> Ad loc.

<sup>4</sup> In Vol. viii. p. 503 he says; "Forte et nimbus est illud capitis ornamentum quod inter alia, *tanquam Augustis proprium*, sic describit Mamertinus; '*illa lux*, &c.'" At p. 504 he speaks of the "*nimbus purus*, i. e. sine radiis, solâ circuli formâ," (the same, I suppose, that he meant at p. 503,) as *first* appearing on a gold coin of *Constantine*, given by Morell.

<sup>5</sup> The reader will observe Eckhel's "*tanquam Augustis proprium*;" showing that he understands the *augustissima* as I do.

<sup>6</sup> See on the inferior dignity of the radiated crown Note <sup>3</sup> p. 541.

<sup>7</sup> Eusebius says that, after the abdication of Diocletian and Maximian, *μονος λοιπον*

tinctly ascribing the diadem to Constantius, even when Cæsar :<sup>1</sup> and which implies a higher distinctive head-ornament to the Augusti ; such as a diadem of superior value and lustre.<sup>2</sup> Nay, even supposing that Eusebius used the word diadem in this passage largely and inaccurately, and meant by it the *σεφανος*, or *laurel crown* of the Cæsarean dignity, still there is almost necessarily implied that the Augusti had then some distinctive head-ornament : and that this could not be the *radiated crown* is evident from what Eckhel tell us, that for some time previous the radiated crown had been lower in dignity than the laurel.<sup>3</sup>—As to *Galerius* there exists among the still extant medals of that Emperor one *diademed* according to Tristanus. But, as it refers to quite the later part of his reign, after the accession of Constantine to the Empire, it may be better to note it under my third and next head.

3. I now then pass on to *Constantine*. And here it becomes necessary to mark the dates of the chief epochs of his earlier years in the imperial office. In 306 then, on his father Constantius' death, he became *Cæsar* ;<sup>4</sup> (*Galerius*, who soon after associated Severus with himself, being the then only surviving Augustus ;) and in 307, on appointment by Maximian who had resumed the purple, *Augustus*. In 310 he put to death Maximian, on his plotting against him : in 312 (*Galerius* having died in the intervening year 311) marched against Maxentius, son to Maximian, who had established himself as Augustus at Rome : and, after one or two previous battles in the north of Italy, defeated and killed him in the battle of the Milvian

Κωνσταντιος πρωτος Αυγουστος και Σεβαστος ανηγορευετο το μεν καταρχας τω των αυτοκρατορων Καισαρων διαδηματι λαμπρυνομενος, και τουτων απειληφως τα πρωτα μετα δε την εν τούτοις δοκιμην, τη των ανωτατω παρα Ρωμαιοις εκοσμηετο τιμη, V. C. i. 18.

<sup>1</sup> “Constantio certè, parenti Imperatoris Constantini, adhuc Cæsari *diadema* illi fastigio peculiare tribuit omnino Eusebius.” Spanheim, De Præst. 681.

<sup>2</sup> It is in this way Spanheim, p. 682, explains two later medals of Constantine's two sons Crispus and Constantine : in which they appear wearing each the gemmed diadem, though still Cæsars, as appears by the inscriptions. These are almost the only exceptions under the Constantinian dynasty to the usual rule of the diadem being confined to the Augusti.

<sup>3</sup> “Coronam radiatam fuisse serius laureà viliorem, [i. e. later than the times of Domitian,] argumentum certum est numus argenteus qui exhibet capita Balbini et Pupieni Augg. et Gordiani Cæsaris, laureatis illis, hoc radiato.” viii. 362.

<sup>4</sup> Constantius died in July. Some writers, as Lactantius M.P. 24, 25, speak of Constantine as Augustus from immediately after his father's death. But the fact of Maximian's having, after his own assumption of the imperial dignity, the next year, made Constantine Augustus renders this impossible.

Bridge. This was on the 27th of October, as the date is clearly defined in his M. P. ch. 44, by Lactantius; <sup>1</sup> Constantine having just previously, either while on march with his army, according to Eusebius, or, as Lactantius seems to imply the date, the day before the battle of the Milvian Bridge, seen the famous vision of the Cross, and assumed it as his ensign.<sup>2</sup> In the March 313 A.D. following, after two months spent at Rome, he issued, conjointly with Licinius, the famous Edict of Milan in favour of Christianity; after which Maximin, having declared war against Constantine and Licinius, in the course of the same year was defeated, and died.—Such are the dates that at present concern us. And from them I infer that the summer or autumn of 312<sup>3</sup> must be regarded as the probable date of Constantine's first act of profession of Christianity. At the times of his elevation successively as Cæsar and as Augustus, Eusebius, it has been remarked, nowhere intimates his having been a Christian: nor

<sup>1</sup> So, I see, Mr. Clinton in his *Fasti*. Compare generally my historic sketch, Vol. i. p. 239 et seq.

<sup>2</sup> *Eusebius* is a little indistinct and indefinite in his narrative of the vision, (V. C. i. 23—33,) in regard of time and place. He seems at first to represent it as occurring immediately before the expedition against Maxentius, some little time after the news of the death of Galerius, which happened in May A.D. 311. On the other hand in ch. 28 he speaks of the vision as accorded to Constantine when on the march somewhere with his whole army: Το στρατιωτικον παν ὃ δὴ στελλομενω ποι πορειαν συνειπετο, και θεωρον εγενετο θαυματος. And what and whither this expedition, *with his whole army following*, but against Maxentius? Further, after describing the *labarum* as made by him in consequence of the vision, ch. 31, he begins ch. 32 with, Αλλα ταυτα μικρον ὑστερον.—On the other hand *Lactantius* is express in fixing it to the day before the final battle with Maxentius, Oct. 27, 312; and both Baluzius ad loc. and other Annotators that I have read on Lactantius and Eusebius, regard this statement as decisive.

It seems to me that the two accounts may be best reconciled by supposing Constantine to have set out on the expedition, which was in the summer of 312, after having a little previously had his mind anxious and thoughtful on the subject of the truth of Christ's religion; and that Constantine may have told Eusebius that it was in answer to prayer, while on the march, and before one of the battles against Maxentius, that the vision was given. We may compare the testimony of the orator *Nazarius*, in his Panegyric (ch. 14) pronounced before Constantine at Rome in the year 321. "In ore est omnium Galliarum exercitus visos qui se divinitus missos præ se ferebant. . . Illi auxiliatores tui, aspici audiri que patientes, ubi meritum tuum testificati sunt, mortalis visus contagium refugerunt. . . Ducebat hos, credo, Constantius pater; &c."\*

<sup>3</sup> I follow Gibbon in his chronology of the march of the campaign: Mr. F. Clinton does not enter into the earlier details of the war.

\* The following is the reported testimony of Artemius the soldier martyr. "Contrà Maxentiam bellum difficillimum incunti signum crucis apparuit in celo, mediâ die super solem radiis coruscans: nos enim qui bello interfuimus signum vidimus, totusque conspexit exercitus." I take this from the *Vita Constantini* by De La Baune, prefixed to the Panegyric on Maximian and Constantine. (Ed. Arndtzenii Valpy, Vol. iii. p. 1311.) Baluzius too cites it, in his Note on the M. P. ad loc. But it is little trustworthy.

in the two Panegyrics address to him in 310 and 311 is he address otherwise by the orator Eumenius than as one still professedly of the old religion.—The importance of this fact to our present question arises hence. Besides other undoubted *diademed* medals of Constantine, the dates of which are not fixed by anything on the medals themselves, and of which some, as Eckhel states it, may very possibly have been of as early a date as A.D. 308,<sup>1</sup> there is one fixed to the year 312 by its note of his being then in his *second consulship*.<sup>2</sup> Moreover in the exergue there are the letters P L N ; signifying that it was coined at *Lyons*,<sup>3</sup> not at *Rome*: and coined consequently, we may probably infer, under directions given before his march; that is, before his conversion to Christianity. So that in fine the *diadem*, in so far as Constantine was concerned, may be considered as a Roman imperial badge already worn by him, *while still professedly of the old Pagan religion*.—I have to add further, with reference to this commencement of the Constantinian æra, that Tristanus describes a medal of *Galerius*, of date somewhere between 307 and 311, in which that Emperor and *Licinius* appear both of them *diademed*:<sup>4</sup> also that in the

<sup>1</sup> I refer to Eckhel's list of the *Numi Vagi* of Constantine, given by him in Vol. viii. p. 78 et seq., the dates of which numi he includes between A.D. 308 and A.D. 337. The heads on these coins he describes (p. 79) as very generally laurelled, *frequently diademed*, and sometimes helmeted, or with a radiated crown; besides one only with a nimbus. "Horum aliquos verisimile est jam anno P. X. 308 signatos fuisse." He adds one or two indices of later date; for example that of having *Cons.* in the exergue, the abbreviation for Constantinople, the date of the dedication of which was A.D. 330. But he intimates no opinion whatever against the *diademed* medals of these *numi vagi* being referable very possibly, just as much as the others *undiademed*, to the earlier years of Constantine's Augustan imperial rule, from A.D. 308 to 312; as well as to the later years of his reign afterwards.

<sup>2</sup> It is thus described by Eckhel p. 74.

CONSTANTINUS. P. F. AUG. Caput diadematum cum margaritis.  
P. M. TR. P. COS. II. P. P. Figura duplici cornu-copie insidens, d. scipionem;  
in areâ astrum; in imo P. L. N.

<sup>3</sup> So Rasche: the letters P. L. signifying Percussum Lugduni, the N. the particular officina of the Mint.

<sup>4</sup> It is thus described by Tristanus, Commentaires, p. 428.

"Les deux effigies de *Galerius Maximianus*, appelé *Jovius* depuis qu'il fut Auguste, et de *Licinius* fait Cæsar par luy, tous deux couronné de *diademes*; dont *Licinius* paroist couvert du manteau, ou chappe consulaire, appellée *palmata*. Entre eux deux il y a une *Victoire*, qui leur met à chacun une couronne sur la teste: laquelle est montée sur un globe, que Galere Maximien tient dans sa main; laquelle *Licinius* soutient de la sienne, comme luy aidant à porter le fardeau de l'empire."

Instead of "*Licinius* fait *Cæsar*," Tristan should have said, "*fait Auguste*:" for Eckhel has shown, (viii. 62, 63,) on both historic and medallie evidence, that *Licinius* was made Augustus at once, without the preliminary step of appointment to the Cæsarship. Thus the *diadems* are on two *Augusti*. As *Licinius* was made Augustus by *Galerius* on Severus' death A.D. 307, and *Galerius* himself died A.D. 311, the

Plates of Patinus, p. 454, there is given a *diademed* medal of the Emperor *Alexander*; who, having been appointed Pro-Prætor in Africa by Galerius' Augustan colleague Severus, assumed the purple soon after Severus' overthrow by Maxentius, A.D. 307, but was in 311 defeated and killed.<sup>1</sup> The same medal is given also, I see, by Medio-barbus. Now though the latter be an author not fully to be trusted, there has never, I believe, been any impeachment of the character of Patinus; himself a learned and very experienced medallist; and who, at the close of his Preface, after inveighing against Golzius' inaccuracies and frauds, the originals of many of whose engraved medals, he says, "no one ever has seen, or ever will see," assures us that, to guard against all mistakes, he had admitted no single medal into his Plates but those of which *he had seen the originals with his own eyes.*<sup>2</sup>

On the whole the fair and reasonable conclusion to be drawn from the evidence thus far adduced seems to me to be as follows:—that under the Diocletianic dynasty, while the *purple* and the *laurel* still continued as before the more usual badge of empire, alike for the Augusti and the Cæsars, yet that the Augusti over and above those older ensigns, were accustomed at times to use at court the silken gemmed or gold-embroidered robe, together with its natural and usual accompaniment the jewelled or gold-embroidered diadem-band,<sup>3</sup> first introduced perhaps by their almost immediate predecessor Aurelian: and that thus with Constantine its use was no innovation, but adopted from his father Constantius; and only made by him, from the commencement of his Augustan supremacy, *more habitual*. This view seems to me to suit all the well-attested historic facts of the case, that we have seen drawn out so fully in evidence; nor am I

date is approximately fixed somewhere between 307, and 311; and most probably 307, with reference to Lieinius' appointment to the Augustan dynasty.

<sup>1</sup> Banduri, ii. 161, thus describes it, among the "Numismata incerti metalli et moduli," as from Tristanus. On the face; "Caput Alexandri diademate gemmato cinctum, ad humeros;" with the inscription, IMP. ALEXANDER P. F. AUG. On the reverse; "Figura muliebris, stolata stans, dextrâ spicas tenet, sinistrâ papavera;" with the inscription, INVICTA ROMA, FELIX KARTHAGO: "in imâ parte P. K."

<sup>2</sup> "Eo consilio ex nummorum typis nullos admisi nisi quorum ipse prototypos oculis usurpasset."

<sup>3</sup> So Synesius conjoins them, as if introduced at the same time, in his Oration Περὶ βασιλείας, as extracted from Petavius' Latin translation by Eckhel, viii. 80. "Quonam tempore Romanas res melius sese habuisse putas? Num ex quo purpurati et inaurati estis, lapillosque ex montibus et barbaro mari quæsitos alios redimitis, alios subligatis, alios cingitis, alios appenditis, alios insidetis?"

aware that there is any counter-historic testimony of value, that is inconsistent with it. Eckhel's counter-authorities, who is the ablest of the advocates for a Constantinian commencing date, and one whose opinion should never be set aside without good reason, are insufficient to bear him out in his theory. For what the *younger Victor* says is, not that Constantine *first* introduced it, (how could he, when he had previously ascribed this to Aurelian?) but simply "that he adorned his royal robe with gems, and his head with a *perpetual* diadem : " <sup>1</sup> what *Julian* satirizes is Constantine's luxurious robes and woman-like adornment of the face; <sup>2</sup> still without a word of his having *first* introduced the diadem : nor again is there a word at all more to that effect in the quotation given from *Synesius*.<sup>3</sup> The only authority that affirms Eckhel's view is the *Chronicon Alexandrinum*, saying, "He [Constantine] first wore the diadem adorned with pearls : " <sup>4</sup> a Chronicle this however of the 8th century ; and of the value of which Eckhel himself thus speaks, with reference to quite another point, a few pages after ; "One's faith is not to be extorted on so weighty a matter by a Chronicle filled with so many trifles and sillinesses." <sup>5</sup> Is it likely, I must beg to ask, if the diadem had been an introduction of Constantine's, that Eusebius (not to name other contemporaries also) should have never made allusion to the remarkable fact?—The want, or at least the great rarity, of authentic *medallic* illustrations of the imperial use of the diadem before the epoch of Constantine's overthrow of Maxentius, does by no means suffice to contravene the truth of the younger Victor and of Jornandes' direct testimonies to the fact of its having been previously used from the times of Aurelian or Diocletian: any more than the want of medallic

<sup>1</sup> "Habitus regium gemmis, et caput exornans perpetuo diademate." It is this Victor who expressly assigns the *first* use of the diadem to Aurelian. See Note <sup>1</sup> p. 538 *suprà*. So similarly Valesius, on Ann. Marcellinus xxi. 1 :—"Aurclianum quidem primum ex Rom. Principibus diadema capiti innoxisse sentiendum est ; sed non *perpetuo* usum fuisse, verum in fastis duntaxat ac solemnioribus diebus."

<sup>2</sup> Εξήραμε (sc. ὁ Κωνσταντίνος) πρὸς τὴν Τρυφῆν. Ἡ δὲ ὑπολαβούσα μαλακῶς, καὶ περιβιλούσα τοῖς πηχεῖσι, πεπλοῖς τε αὐτοῦ ποικίλοις ἀσκήσασα, so led him forward to the goddess Ἀσωτεια. Cass. sub fin.

<sup>3</sup> Previous to the passage cited in Note <sup>3</sup>, p. 514, Synesius had thrown the blame on earlier Princes (that is, earlier than Arcadius,) who had first introduced the dress and habits of luxury : "Nec enim istud tuâ culpâ commissum ; sed eorum qui primi morbi illius auctores extiterunt ; pestemque eam, summo in pretio habitam, temporum successioni tradiderunt." The allusion, as Eckhel thinks, being to Constantine.

<sup>4</sup> "Constantinus primus tulit diadema ornatum margaritis." Eckhel p. 80.

<sup>5</sup> "Chronicon tot nugis naniisque refertum." *ib.* p. 86.

evidence can be viewed as contravening the recorded and undoubted fact of Diocletian's having assumed to himself the title of *Dominus*.<sup>1</sup> And at, and just after that epoch, it seems little credible that, while Constantine the *Western* Emperor used the diadem head-badge, Maximin, the *Eastern* Emperor, and most natural follower consequently, in respect of dress and habits, of his imperial predecessors Aurelian, Diocletian, and, I may add, Galerius,—that *he* should have been less oriental in dress, and sole adherent to the older and less ambitious ornament of the laurel. Hence, in reference to the time of Maximin's making war from the Eastern third of the Roman Empire against the Christian cause, i. e. in 313, which war I suppose to be the one *primarily* contemplated in the Apocalyptic symbolic vision of the Dragon and the Woman, we see the propriety of its depicting the Dragon with a *diadem*, as then and thenceforth the most characteristic *Augustan* head-band.

But the *second* and *chief* event which I conceive to be intended in the vision, is *Licinius'* war against Constantine and the Christian cause in the year 321; “that which may be looked on as the final struggle of Paganism with Christianity.”<sup>2</sup> And of *his* use of the diadem medallie evidence still remains, of which I present my readers with two interesting specimens; both from medals in the collection of the British Museum. On the *first*, which gives the busts of Licinius and his son, with the title *Jovius* attached to each, (so illustrating the fact of Licinius having devoted himself to the heathen cause and deities,) there has been a doubt whether the head-badge is the *laurel*, or the *diadem*.<sup>3</sup> In Banduri's Plate they are distinctly *dia-*

<sup>1</sup> For the letters D. N. (*Dominus Noster*) appear on 'none of the Diocletian coins struck while Diocletian was emperor; but only appear on the coins struck by order of the immediately succeeding Emperors, *after Diocletian's abdication*. Yet Eckhel himself does not argue against the truth of the historian's declaration in consequence. He writes thus: “Etsi, ut supra ex Victore docuimus, appellari se *Domnum ac Deum* Diocletianus voluit, tamen titulus *Domini Nostrī*, quamdiu imperium tenuit, ejus monetam non invasit; sed insertus primū est à successoribus Augustis, in eos numos quos reverentię causā senioribus Augustis cudi fecere.” Eckhel, Vol. viii. p. 14.—Now the title *Dominus* and the *diadem* head-band were so associated in Roman views, that the same reasons which prevented Diocletian from impressing the former on his coins, would prevent him almost equally from impressing the latter. Under the Constantinian dynasty both alike appear;—the title and the diadem.

<sup>2</sup> So Gieseler i. 122.


<sup>3</sup> On the face, D. D. JOVIV. LICINI. INVICT. AUG. ET CAES. Busts of Licinius and his son holding up a Victory together.

On the reverse, JOVI. T. VICT. CONSER. DD. NN. AUG. ET CAES. Below M. K. F. A.





DIADEMED COINS OF THE EMPEROR LICINIUS



*demed*: yet he writes as if he supposed them to be *laurelled*. On inspecting a beautiful specimen of the coin in the British Museum, Mr. Hawkins, the principal of the medal department, has exprest to me an unhesitating persuasion as to its being the *diadem*; and Mr. Burgon, whose acquaintance with classical numismatics is so well known, though a while hesitating on the point, yet, after considering the second Licinian coin to which I also refer, is disposed to the same judgment about it. For, as to that *second* coin, there can be no doubt. It must be acknowledged, Mr. Burgon says, to be a clear case of the *diadem*.

man standing, with spear in left hand, and the right empty and open, is crowned by Victory standing.

# APPENDIX.

## No. II.

### REFUTATION OF MR. HISLOP'S "RED REPUBLIC" THEORY OF NON-IDENTITY BETWEEN THE BEAST FROM THE SEA OF APOC. XIII., AND BEAST FROM THE ABYSS OF APOC. XI., XVII.

(See page 86.)

THE fact of the absolute identity of the *Beast from the sea* of Apoc. xiii., and the *Beast from the abyss* of Apoc. xi. 7 and xvii., (if fact it be,) is one the recognition of which is so essential to a right understanding of some of the most important parts of the Apocalyptic prophecy, and a counter-view on the point involves such fatal errors, that the duty seems laid on the expositor to leave no objections to the right view unanswered, no additional illustration of it that may occur to him unemployed, in order to the more distinct, intelligent, and undoubting impression of it on the minds of his readers. With this feeling I think it well to insert in the present Appendix the substance of a controversial discussion on the subject that occurred early in 1850 between myself and the Reverend Alexander Hislop, of Arbroath. The latter had published some short time previously a little book called "The Red Republic;" a book which gave expression to certain views respecting the imminent future of the Christian Church and European world, which had been suggested apparently to his mind by a comparison (somewhat hasty and superficial as afterwards appeared) of the continental democratic outbreaks in 1848 with some intimations about the *Beast from the abyss* in the Apocalyptic prophecy. Herein he combated the opinion stated in my Book as to the entire identity of the *Beast from the sea* and *Beast from the abyss*. And, while agreeing with me that the *former* figured Roman Anti-Christendom under the Papacy, with a period of 1260

years attached to it by prophecy, (a point this in which he strongly and distinctly dissociated himself from the proper Futurist school,) he at the same time contended that the *latter*, the *Beast from the abyss*, figured yet another and the last phase of the same Roman Anti-Christendom; the phase even then emerging into view, of a "Red Republic" of avowedly infidel democracies: into which Satan, he expected, would fully infuse his own spirit; and by which, as by the *Beast from the abyss* its symbol, Apoc. xi. 7, Christ's faithful sackcloth-robed witnesses would be killed as predicted; an event this consequently, in his judgment, yet future.

As, besides Mr. Hislop's own somewhat boastful assertions to the same effect, a Reviewer of his Book in the Quarterly Journal of prophecy affirmed that "he had proved to demonstration against me that the *Beast from the sea* and *Beast from the abyss* were not one and the same,"<sup>1</sup> I felt it my duty not to leave these assertions unnoticed. And hence certain controversial letters between us in the same Prophetic Periodical,<sup>2</sup> of which I here subjoin an abstract. I have felt the more constrained to this from having seen subsequently in the Life of Hewitson that the opinion of that admirable man appears to have been in favour of views on the subject not very dissimilar from Mr. Hislop's.<sup>3</sup>—It will be seen by the intelligent

<sup>1</sup> Vol. i. p. 436 of the Journal. The Reviewer's signature was given afterwards as W. W.

<sup>2</sup> Ib. Vol. ii. pp. 128—134, 388, 257—265.

<sup>3</sup> So in 1844; Life, p. 129. "Infidelity is the power against which the last war of the Church's premillennial tribulation is to be waged. It is yet predestined to monarchy in Europe. A scarlet-coloured Beast, full of names of blasphemy, it is coming out of the bottomless pit; but only to triumph for a moment; then to go into perdition."

Again in 1848, ib. 319. "That the mystery of iniquity is hastening to its last development, everything in the sky of unfulfilled prophecy, and everything in the on-flow of events, alike portend. That the last form of evil will be impersonated in an individual *man of sin*, gigantic in stature above his predecessors, I have not the slightest doubt. My views have, however, been undecided and fluctuating, more or less for years, as to whether that man of sin will be a *Pope* or an *Emperor*. . . . At all events he will be the joint product of *Popish* and of *Atheistic* wickedness. Or, to speak more correctly, he will be the head of the apostasy that has long been nursed in the lap of Popery, and that will reach its perfect growth under the influence of a pantheistic liberalism. The deification of man is the aim and drift of the times. That the voice of the people is the voice of God, is the watch-word now of the apostasy. Let the apostasy under this form come to a head, and what will the head of it be but that man of sin who will sit in the temple of God showing himself that he is God."—But how so? we may naturally ask. The people supreme; yet under the headship of Pope, or Emperor? Christianity set aside for avowed atheism; yet the head of it to sit, perhaps as Pope, in God's temple, the professedly Christian Church?

Not a little of Hewitson's anticipations answered, in fact, to the prophetic intimation as to the outgoing of the two first of the three spirits like frogs, under the 6th Vial.

reader that, although on certain points there was necessarily in my controversy with Mr. H. a repetition of arguments already given in my Part iv. Chapter iii. § 1 on the self-same subject,<sup>1</sup> (points on which I shall here as much as possible abbreviate,) there was on others of importance what was new : more especially in my application of the continuity of the Apocalyptic revelations in proof of there being no opening for any such change of the one Beast into the other as was the essence of Mr. H.'s hypothesis. On the whole the result, I trust, in my readers' minds, as in my own, will be a stronger conviction than ever of the perfect absolute identity of the *Beast from the sea* and the *Beast from the abyss* ; and that any counterview whatsoever on this point, and by consequence any counterview respecting that most momentous figuration in the Apocalyptic prophecy of the death of the witnesses, by the agency of the Beast from the abyss, as if an event yet future, is a fond and groundless conceit.

1. The four fundamental differences between the two Beasts asserted and objected by Mr. H., and on which his whole theory rests, were soon disposed of. 1. OBJ. "The *Beast from the sea* appeared but of a *πυρρος* or *fiery-red* colour ;—a characteristic not stated indeed about it, but inferable from the fact of its being the colour of the seven-headed Dragon, its predecessor : whereas the *Beast from the abyss* was *κόκκινος* in colour ; that is, of a *double-dyed red*." <sup>2</sup> ANSW. Even admitting the inference about the *πυρρος*, there is no reason for supposing a deeper-dyed red than it to be implied in the *κόκκινος*. For, by comparison of Matt. xxvii. 28 and John xix. 2, it appears that *κόκκινος* was but a synonym of *πορφυρεος*, *purple* :—a colour not deeper surely than *fiery-red*. Besides that the *πορφυρεος*, or purple-scarlet colour, is notoriously a characteristic of the Pope and Cardinals ; and so, on Mr. H.'s own theory of the Beast from the sea, as symbolizing the Roman Papal empire, a colour most characteristic of the *Beast from the sea*.—2. OBJ. "The *Beast from the sea* has only on its heads a name, or names,<sup>3</sup> of blasphemy : whereas the *Beast from the abyss* has its whole body covered with them." <sup>4</sup> ANSW. The sacred text says not so ; but only that the *Beast from the abyss* was full of them. And what if the picture of the Beast, as seen

<sup>1</sup> Beginning p. 71 *suprà*.

<sup>2</sup> Red Republic, p. 125 ; Quart. Journal, Vol. ii. p. 132.

<sup>3</sup> *ονοματα*, it will be remembered, is the best authenticated reading in Apoc. xiii. 1.

<sup>4</sup> Red Republic, p. 121 ; Quart. Journal, *ibid*.

just before its final destruction, did then exhibit accumulated names of blasphemy, compared with the picture of the Beast as seen at the earlier epoch of its rise? Does that set aside the idea of actual identity? If Mr. H. has advanced into the decline of life, I presume that his present portraiture will exhibit many more wrinkles than a portrait of him drawn twenty years ago. And what would he think of the man who should gravely insist that these superadded wrinkles proved demonstratively that it could not be really the same Mr. Hislop? Or, to borrow a Scripture illustration, and this from a passage that Mr. H. himself refers to, would he argue that the living creatures in Ezek. x. 12 were not absolutely the same as those in Ezek. i. 18, because in the one case it is only the *rings of the wheels* connected with them that are said to be full of eyes, in the other *the whole body*?—3. OBJ. There is a marked *absence of diadems* from the heads and horns of the *Beast from the abyss*; as if in indication of the absence of all royalty from the Beast in this its last form, and of its democratic republicanism: whereas in the *Dragon*, representing Pagan Rome, “the seven heads appeared encircled with seven diadems; and in the *Beast from the sea* the diadems had shifted their position from the heads to the horns.”<sup>1</sup> ANSW. But how (as observed in my Chapter on the subject)<sup>2</sup> does Mr. H. know that no diadems were apparent to St. John on the *heads* of the *Beast from the sea*, and on the *heads* and *horns* of the *Beast from the abyss*? When Holy Scripture has once specified the various characteristics of any one symbol,<sup>3</sup> must we deem it necessary that in the description of a second symbol, professedly a kind of substituted counterpart to the former, it should note *every* feature of agreement, as well as of those of disagreement; inasmuch that whatever is not absolutely and expressly noted as visible in the latter, must be supposed to have been absent, even though all but implied in the explanatory comment? Such at least is not Mr. Hislop’s own judgment: for, as we have seen, in the entire silence of Scripture on the matter, he *infers* the *fiery-red colour* of the *Beast from the sea*, simply from the fact of its having been specified as the colour of the *Dragon* its predecessor.<sup>4</sup> Much more might we infer the

<sup>1</sup> See Red Republic, 116—118; Quart. Journal, ib. 132, 263.

<sup>2</sup> See p. 78 *suprà*.

<sup>3</sup> It is on their *first* appearance that the ten horns in the Draconic vision have no diadems assigned to them. Therefore we may here argue from the silence of prophecy as to their not then as yet having become kingdoms.

<sup>4</sup> “The Beast from the sea, as contained in the symbol of the ten-horned Dragon, being simply red.” Quarterly Journal, ib. 132.

other hand Mr. Hislop, fully agreeing with me that the False Prophet of Apoc. xix. was the same with the two-horned Beast of Apoc. xiii., admitted that my double argument would be unanswerable against him, had it been his theory that the *Beast from the abyss* was the Beast under a different *head* from that of the *Beast from the sea*. But in fact his view, he said, was quite different:—that although on one point hesitating, (indeed inclined to differ,)<sup>1</sup> he was yet ready to accept my own general explanation of all the Roman Beast's heads; making the 6th the imperial, the 7th the Diocletianic, the new 7th, growing out of the cicatrice of the old 7th, or 8th in successional order, the Popes: all seated, according to the second meaning of the symbol, on Rome's seven hills:<sup>2</sup> and that this last Papal head he regarded as attaching alike to the *Beast from the sea* and *Beast from the abyss*; the latter having a "*substantial identity*," though not a perfect identity (so as I would have it) with the former; and being only under a different *form*, though still with the same *head*.

On this our controversy also assumed somewhat of a new form. It was my object first to understand my opponent's rather unintelligible theory of *substantial* yet not *perfect* identity; then, from the prophecy's own continuous progress from Apoc. xiii. to xix., without any intimation of such change of *form* occurring to the Beast from the sea, or offering any opportunity for the change, to demonstrate the impossibility of the theory.

2. As to Mr. H.'s theory of only a "*substantial identity*," in contradistinction to a *real* and *actual* identity, it is, I said, exceedingly hard to understand. But, as the best possible approximation to it, I

exist: and so overlooks, as if that which was never to exist, the Beast's 7th head of which the Angel said that it was to last for a little space after the 6th, or imperial, of St. John's time; and which indeed was also seen figured on the Dragon: and moreover to the Papacy, with its admitted 1260 years of domination, assigns no head at all.

<sup>1</sup> Instead of explaining the 7th to be the Diocletianic head, he would prefer to explain it of the *Roman Popes* when simply *Universal Priests*, "*without temporal power*:" which state continued, he says, for about 150 years; a short time: the 8th, or new 7th, being the Popes as the "*Great crowned Priest*;" "*which state has continued now for above 1000 years.*" *Quart. Journal*, p. 264.

But, leaving the question how far Gregory the First could be said to have had no temporal power, we ask, first, How could the 7th, if a *Papal* head, be on the *Pagan* Dragon? 2ndly, How could it be said that the 7th head, if thus meant of the Pope as universal Priest, be said to be cut down with a sword?

<sup>2</sup> Mr. H. fully and distinctly expresses his agreement with me as to this *double* meaning of the symbol of the Beast's seven heads: as indicating alike the seven successive Roman ruling heads, and the seven hills of Rome: which indeed seems to me a view plainly and irrefragably true. See pp. 111—116 *suprà*.

may observe that this said substantial identity is represented by him to exist as well between *the Dragon and two Beasts* as between *the two Beasts* themselves. Says Mr. H. : "I admit most distinctly in my book, and lay it down in express terms, that the Dragon, the Beast from the sea, and the Beast from the abyss, have (*all three*) a substantial identity, indicating one and the same Roman empire from beginning to end.<sup>1</sup> And so, too, in the "Red Republic:" where the idea is illustrated by reference to the *caterpillar*, "as still the same insect, under all its different transmutations, from the worm to the chrysalis, and from the chrysalis to the butterfly; though with form and characteristics very different under these different metamorphoses."<sup>2</sup> Will the coincidences then noted in my first Letter between the *Beast from the abyss* and *Beast from the sea*, which Mr. H. sought to answer by the "substantial identity" theory,<sup>3</sup> hold in regard of the *Dragon*? E. g. had the *Dragon* the lambskin-covered, or professedly Christian, false prophet for his attendant: and did the said False Prophet work miracles in *draconic* Pagan times, before the *Dragon*, or those the *Dragon* inspired, viz. Roman Pagan Emperors? So again as to duration. Said Mr. Hislop; "Since the Beast from the abyss, though of a different *form* indeed, has yet the same *eighth head* as the Beast from the sea, the duration predicable of the latter is also predicable of the former."<sup>4</sup> Is the same then true of the *Dragon* also, Mr. H.'s third co-partner in the substantial identity? Is the Pagan *Dragon* under the same head as the two Beasts? Or is the *Dragon's* duration predicable of them as their duration; and their duration as the *Dragon's*?

Of course the reader may test and confute this curious theory of Mr. Hislop's by as many more references, in the way of comparison, as he pleases to the *Dragon* and the *draconic times* of the Roman empire. I shall not trouble him, or myself, by any more particularizations. But I must not conclude my argument without begging him to insist on its propounder's pointing out where the Beast from the sea, *properly so called*, according to his view, ends; and where the Beast from the abyss, *properly so called*, according to his view,

<sup>1</sup> "For though the Beast from the sea *ceases to exist*, yet still *continues to be!*" So Quarterly Journal, ib. 133. Mr. H.'s theory is indeed, as he seems to wish it to be, "*a mystery.*"

<sup>2</sup> Red Republic, 107.

<sup>3</sup> See Quarterly Journal, i. 582; ii. 132, 133.

<sup>4</sup> See Quarterly Journal, i. 583; ii. 133. The words in inverted commas are, of course, *my* words; giving only the substance of Mr. H.'s reply.



begins. Here the running through the prophecy for hints on the subject will be found most useful. In the transition from the draconic state to that of the Beast from the sea, all is distinctly and fully told in the Apocalyptic interpretation. The Dragon that animated and directed the Roman Pagan empire against Christianity is first cast down from his high elevation and throne; then (though not till after exciting, when thus fallen, certain persecutions against the faithful Church, which result in her flying into the wilderness) plans to make over his throne and power to the Beast from the sea, for the purpose of carrying out his design of war against the "remnant of the Woman's seed that keep the commandments of God and *witness of Jesus*:" himself, as the master-spirit, effectively, though now covertly, watching in the back-ground, to suggest, direct, and help. Then comes in Apoc. xiii. the description of the rise of the Beast from the sea, and of the Dragon's delegation of his former throne and power to him; also of the rise too, and close connexion with that Beast, of the two-horned lambskin-covered Beast, or False Prophet. Whence we trace the Beast of the sea onward, without any sign or hint whatsoever of change of form, or metamorphosis, such as Mr. H. talks of, even to the sixth vial: under which vial we read of "three spirits like frogs, out of the mouth of the *Dragon*, and mouth of the *Beast*, and mouth of the *False Prophet*,<sup>1</sup> gathering together the kings of the earth to the war of the great day of God Almighty;" the account of which war is given in Apoc. xix. And, as its result, we read that the *Beast* was taken, and with him the "*False Prophet* which wrought the miracles before him," and cast into a lake of fire: and that the *Dragon* too was taken, and shut up in the pit of the abyss for 1000 years. Surely it is the self-same *Beast* and *False Prophet* that gathered the kings to the war of Armageddon,—as absolutely the same as the *Dragon* is the same, (save only that under the 6th Vial the False Prophet seems temporarily to have put a veil over his connexion with the *Beast*,) who are in that war thus taken and dealt with. There intervenes indeed, (as if in order to prepare men for understanding the double catastrophe of both the *Beast* and 'the *Beast's* great city *Baby-*

<sup>1</sup> In my Chapter ix. Part v., on the three outgoing spirits like frogs, I have at p. 495 observed on the simple designation of the third spirit as that of the *False Prophet*; without any note of the *False Prophet's* subjection to, or connexion with, the *Beast* from the sea, as its principal. With this temporary distinction, however, it is evidently the same agent; ever, and at all times, emitting its own peculiar and independent voice of *priestcraft*. See my remarks p. 531.

lon,) that famous figuration to which we have so often referred of the Beast in his Harlot-upholding form, called here (as also in Apoc. xi. 7) the *Beast from the abyss*. But in it there is not an intimation of its being any *new* Beast, *rising* up from some opened pit of the abyss, like the pit of the fifth Trumpet's sounding, and to which the *Beast from the sea* then made over his throne and power, like as had the Dragon previously made them over to the Beast from the sea: nor any symbolization of the "disappearance," or "extinction," or "destruction"<sup>1</sup> of the *Beast from the sea*; or of any sloughing of its skin, or changing of its form, in order to this old Beast's becoming thenceforward, in some new form, the *Beast from the abyss*. Not so under the 5th Vial, (the Vial poured out "on the throne of the Beast,") to which I find at length that Mr. H. is inclined, however inconsistently, to refer it;<sup>2</sup> as if forsooth, though not one word is said to that effect, there was now, as in the theatric Green-room, the Beast's sloughing of his skin, and changing colour to the *double-dyed red*, and putting off the diadem from his ten horns, and dotting his whole body with names of blasphemy. And not so, any more, under the 6th or 7th Vial. Nay the Angel's words in Apoc. xvii., "The Beast which thou hast seen he is the eighth king,"—one symbolized, as he also intimates, by the Beast's eighth head, (I mean eighth in order of succession,)—this, while proving first that there is but *one* Beast, one *wholly* and *only*, connected with the 8th headship, does also prove that it must be that same Beast which rose up out of the sea, as seen in the vision of Apoc. xiii. with marks of the previous seventh head having been wounded to death, and the deadly wound healed by a new or eighth head, springing out of the cicatrice of the old one.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> "By that time (*viz.* of the judgment of the great Harlot) the Beast from the sea has *disappeared*." So the "Red Republic," p. 113. "The Beast from the sea is *destroyed*; but only that it may be remodelled in another form, by agency from hell." So the Quarterly Journal, ii. 133. "The eighth head, together with the Beast from the sea to which it belongs, undergoes such a transformation as leads the world to look upon it as *extinct*." "The Beast from the abyss is the Beast in *its resurrection state*." Quarterly Journal, ii. 264, 265. — When speaking of the "disappearance" of the Beast from the sea, had Mr. H. the old Roman myth of Romulus' mysterious unvisited disappearance in his mind?

<sup>2</sup> So in a paper of reply to me, printed, but not published, of which Mr. H. courteously sent me a copy. I speak of his not being consistent in this; as the era of the 5th Vial, so explained, must include, if not being with, A. D. 1848, this being the date of the democratic outbreak on the European Continent: whereas to the subsequent 6th Vial, figuring the drying up of the Euphratean or Turkish power, he, like myself, seems to assign earlier date. The three spirits sent forth in the *latter* part of the 6th Vial he speaks of, p. 235, as already in 1848 abroad.

<sup>3</sup> Mr. H. quite agrees with me on this point.

Thus that which *was* as the Pagan Dragon, *is not* any more in *that* form, but *is* under the new form of the Roman Popedom. And, as observed in my *Horæ*,<sup>1</sup> it was thenceforward unquestionably (if Christ's own language be our guide)<sup>2</sup> entitled to the designation of a Beast from the abyss of hell: as being Satan's creature, delegate, substitute; indeed, as Mr. Cecil calls Popery, the master-piece of Satan.<sup>3</sup>

3. Once more, as to Mr. H.'s supposed *yet future killing of the two Apocalyptic Witnesses* by the Beast from the abyss, he will, I presume, not press the idea, if forced to abandon that of the Beast from the sea's sloughing, and rising up from the abyss, under a new form, at the 5th Vial. If he press it, we have, by repetition of the same testing process, to ask, Where takes place this killing, in the further progress of the Vials? Under the self-same 5th Vial, which is only penal upon the Beast? Or under the 6th, which is poured out on the Euphrates? Or in the gathering of the powers, by the three spirits like frogs, to the war of Armageddon; which war issues in the Beast's destruction, not that of the Witnesses? Or under the 7th Vial, in which there is not a hint of anything like such an event; and of which one result is the division of the great city into *three* parts; not the falling of a *tenth* part of it, so as after the death, resurrection, and ascension of the Witnesses?

It is the allowed omission of this process that has I think, more than anything else, been the source of Mr. Hislop's errors. At the beginning of his Treatise he disclaims the idea of considering the structure of the Apocalyptic Book, and the order and succession of the different visions, as a point at all necessary to a satisfactory explanation of the prefiguration of the Witnesses' death and resurrection: justifying this by reference to Isa. liii., as a prophecy which may be judged of by itself, irrespective of its place in Isaiah's Book.<sup>4</sup> A strange precedent surely; seeing that Isaiah's Book is made up of detached prophecies, without any pretension to structural order and continuity; whereas, on the other hand, the Apocalypse with its three septenaries of Seals, Trumpets, and Vials, and its fittings by means of the three or four times intertwining period of the 1260 days, in one part of the prophecy and another, has order the most remarkable stamped upon it.

<sup>1</sup> See p. 83 *suprà*.      <sup>2</sup> See John viii. 44, Matt. xxiii. 15; also compare James iii. 6.

<sup>3</sup> See p. 70 *suprà*.

<sup>4</sup> Red Rep. p. 10.

I have, however, to thank Mr. H. for a controversy, the result of which so clenches my whole argument: not that alone about the identity of the *Beast from the sea* and *Beast from the abyss*; but that too as to the intimately connected and immensely important question of the time of the Witnesses' death, whether already *past*, or yet *future*.<sup>1</sup> The process it has led me to pursue in tracing the Beast step by step onward, from his first rise in Apoc. xiii. to his destruction in Apoc. xix., will be found most important; not only as furnishing disproof on Mr. Hislop's theory, but as showing that there is not in the Apocalypse a chink, or crevice, into which interpreters of the historical school can by any possibility introduce a *personal infidel Antichrist*, as the slayer of the Witnesses, in lieu of the Papal Antichrist.

<sup>1</sup> With regard to the phrase *ὅταν τελεσῶσι*, which Mr. H. mainly rests on in proof of the prophecy being still unfulfilled, and the witness-slaying future, my readers will always remember what I contend for, that that expression *may* mean, *when they shall have perfected their testimony*, in regard of *subject-matter*, as well as, *when they shall have completed it*, in regard to *time*; and that the latter view is excluded by various considerations too strong to be got over. See my Vol. ii. pp. 416—422.—The critical elaboration of this point of translation is in this 5th Edition, I must observe, much more complete than before.

# APPENDIX.

## No. III.

THE ROMAN POPES' PETRINE THEORY, AND CONSEQUENT PRE-  
TENSIONS AS CHRIST'S APPOINTED VICEGERENTS ON EARTH,  
SHOWN IN ITS VERY FOUNDATION TO BE THE "LIE OF LIES."

(See page 151.)

THE mighty structure of the Papacy rests dogmatically altogether on the supposed truth of the two propositions following:—1st, that Christ's declaration to Peter, "Thou art Peter (Πετρος), and upon this rock (πετρα) I will build my Church, and I give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven, &c." was not address to him as representative of the apostles generally, in whose common name however he had just previously spoken his noble confession of Christ, but meant in the sense of Peter's being constituted distinctively from among the apostles Christ's one supreme Vice-gerent on earth; an appointment to take effect from the time of Christ's leaving this earth, and ascending to heaven:—2ndly, that this appointment was not for Peter's life only, but meant to be entailed for ever on *Peter's successors* in some certain local Bishoprick which he was to settle in; and that *the Bishoprick of Rome*.—I have in my Commentary briefly noticed the very different view that might be taken of Christ's declaration; and exemplified that difference of view from the statements about it made by some of the Fathers.\* The subject however is so immensely important, especially at the present time, that it

<sup>1</sup> "God shall send them strong delusion that they should believe *the lie*:" τῶν ψευδῶν, with the article. So too Thess. ii. 11. Some expositors have explained the article here as marking the intenseness of the lie; as if *the lie of lies*. Or it may simply mark the lie as that of the just before-mentioned apostasy. It will, however, at any rate, be permitted me to make use of the first view of the expression for the heading of my Chapter.

<sup>2</sup> Viz. by Origen, Cyril, Ambrose, Augustine, Chrysostom, all of the 3rd or 4th century. See p. 149 *suprà*.

seems imperatively to demand a more particular examination into the Scriptural evidence concerning it:—indeed this may be deemed almost necessary to the completeness of my comment and proof respecting the prefigured Antichrist. I purpose therefore in the present Paper to examine into the evidence respecting it discoverable in the *New Testament Apostolic Books*, including alike that of the Apostles' *expressed opinions and acts*, from after the time of Christ's ascension, when Peter was first de facto (on the Papal theory) to enter on his immeasurably exalted office: and shall show, alike from the history in the "Acts of the Apostles," and from their Epistles, 1st, the Apostles' palpable ignorance of the Rome-asserted fact of *Peter's own personal supremacy over the other apostles, in the character of Christ's appointed Vice-gerent on earth*; evidence this which, if clear, must surely of itself be decisive on the great question:—2ndly, the falsification, by chronological evidence of the same sacred documents, of *Peter's asserted foundation and primary assumption of the Bishoprick of Rome*; with the divinely ordered purpose of devolving his supremacy as Christ's Vice-gerent on his successors, ever after, in the Roman see. After which, 3rdly, I shall add a supplemental notice of the utter failure even of early *Patristic* evidence in support of the Papal Petrine theory and pretensions; though, in truth, such testimony, when counter to the Apostolic, can weigh but in the comparison as a feather.

I have before me the Treatises of Cardinals Bellarmine and Wiseman in proof of the Papal supremacy; writers among the ablest, I presume, of its ancient and modern advocates: and I shall take care, as I go on, to omit nothing of importance on either branch of evidence urged by them.<sup>1</sup>

#### § I. THE APOSTLES' NON-RECOGNITION OF PETER'S OWN PERSONAL SUPREMACY, IN THE CHARACTER OF CHRIST'S APPOINTED VICE-GERENT ON EARTH.

I have to show this alike from the history in the *Acts of the Apostles*, and from the *Apostolic Epistles*. And certainly it will require no very elaborate investigation of either the one or the other, to con-

<sup>1</sup> That by Bellarmine in the two first Books of his work entitled "De Summo Pontifice:" that by Wiseman in the 8th of his Lectures on the Catholic Church; a Lecture entitled, on the Supremacy of the Pope.—In which latter mark the definition of this supremacy. "Why! it signifies nothing more [sic] than that the Pope, or

vince us that the Apostles themselves were in utter ignorance of Peter's having been endowed during his life with any such supremacy, or vicegerency.

1. *The evidence from the history of the Acts of the Apostles.*

It appears from this, at the outset, that, as Christ before his ascension gave no special commission to Peter, but to all the apostles the same,<sup>1</sup> so, after his ascension, the Holy Ghost on the day of Pentecost made no difference between Peter and the rest.<sup>2</sup>—Nor did Peter, though prominent as their chief speaker, assume any pre-eminence of prerogative or jurisdiction over the other apostles, whether in their own private assemblies, or before the Jews, in that *primary* æra of the Church; reckoning here, as a convenient primary division of the apostolic history, down to the conversion of St. Paul, and admission of Cornelius and the Gentiles. On occasion of their first meeting after Christ's ascension Peter argued indeed, in accordance with Scripture prophecy, that another apostle ought to be chosen in the room of Judas: but, instead of his choosing the new apostle himself, in character of Christ's Vice-gerent, so as the Pope might now choose a Cardinal, the disciples united in choosing out two; and all alike gave forth their lots, in order to God's selecting between the two; whereupon the lot fell on Matthias. Again, in the case of the seven deacons, the twelve apostles all in common requested the believing multitude to choose out the seven; and, when chosen, united in common to lay their hands upon them. And when, somewhat later, news had reached

Bishop of Rome, as the successor of St. Peter, possesses authority and jurisdiction in things spiritual *over the entire Church*; so as to constitute him its visible head, and *the Vice-gerent of Christ upon earth.*" p. 262. Is *nothing more*, we might naturally ask, a misprint for *nothing less*?

<sup>1</sup> "As my Father hath sent me even so send I you. And, when he had said this, he breathed on them, and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost. Whosoever sins ye remit they are remitted, &c." John xx. 21. The same inclusiveness of the Apostles generally appears in Christ's terms of commissioning them, Matt. xxviii. 19, 20, Mark xvi. 15—17, Luke xxiv. 47—50, Acts i. 4—8.—The Romanists dwell on Christ's saying to Peter, "Feed my sheep," as the most distinctive charge they can find here. So Wiseman, pp. 272, 273, saying; "The unrestricted commission to feed the *entire* flock of Christ implies a *primacy and jurisdiction over the whole*. . . . He was invested with an authority of a *distinct and superior order to that of his fellow-apostles*, . . . which excluded the idea of co-ordinate authority." But where in Christ's charge is any such *exclusion* of the other apostles? Wiseman adds, p. 277, "The commission to feed the flock is nowhere given to the others." How then came St. Paul to charge the elders at Miletus with the same commission? Acts xx. 28.

It must, I think, appear a little surprising to the Romanists that Christ, when on the cross, should have committed the Virgin Mary, their "Queen of heaven," to the care, not of his own Vice-gerent on earth, but of St. John. Acts ii. 2—4.

them of certain conversions in Samaria, instead of Peter sending other apostles to confirm the converts, we read that the twelve sent Peter and John. The same in Peter's sermons to the Jews. Did he in them attempt ever once to bind the converts to himself distinctively; or ever once put forth any claim, as the appointed head and earthly centre of union to the Christian Church? Quite the contrary. Neither in that preached on the day of Pentecost, Acts ii., nor in that which followed on the healing of the cripple at the gate Beautiful of the temple, Acts iii., nor in the speech before Annas and his Sanhedrim court in Acts iv., nor in that before the same court in Acts v., nor in fine in the address to Cornelius, Acts x., do we find a single hint of the kind. And, as in Peter's public addresses,<sup>1</sup> so also in Stephen's and Philip's addresses, to the Jewish multitude and the Ethiopian eunuch, respectively. In one and all it is ever *Christ's* supremacy; never *Peter's*. Indeed, so far was Peter's supremacy from being then recognized, that we find him called to account in Acts xi. 2, for his visiting Cornelius.—So we arrive at the *second* period of the apostolic history; dating from the time when Saul of Tarsus comes prominently on the scene, in his new character as the Apostle Paul. We ask, Is there any change visible in the apostolic speech or practice, as reported in the Book of the Acts, now that the sphere of apostolic action was extended, and the apostles about to scatter into different countries, preaching the Gospel? Not the least. In the first Christian Council held, after this its extension, at Jerusalem Peter speaks first indeed: but James uses the most authoritative language, as if the apostle presiding on the occasion; and the decree went forth in the name of the apostles and elders, without any distinction of Peter whatsoever.<sup>2</sup> The same utter silence as to any special prerogative of authority attaching to Peter appears afterwards in St. Paul's various addresses everywhere in the course of his long missionary travels; whether that at Lystra, or that to the jailer at Philippi, or that at Athens, or that to the elders at Miletus; or, still later, that to the Jews in tumult at Jerusalem, that to Felix, that to Agrippa, or that to the

<sup>1</sup> John being almost always associated with Peter in them.

<sup>2</sup> Peter first makes a statement, respecting God having chosen by his mouth first to preach the gospel to the Gentiles: then reasons with them, "Why tempt ye God to put a yoke on the neck of the disciples, &c." St. James says: "My sentence is, &c.:" *εγω κρινω*. And the statement follows; "Then pleased it the apostles and elders, with the whole Church, to send, &c." It was no Petrine "*Motu Proprio*." Acts xv. 7, 10, 19, 22, 23.



Jews whom he gathered to his own hired house on his first arrival at Rome. With which last event the history of the Acts of the Apostles closes.

2. The evidence from *the Apostolic Epistles*.

And surely these supply not in any degree the Apostolic testimony wanting in the Acts to Peter's vicegerency of Christ. Not a hint is there in them about it. By *St. James*, *St. Jude*, and *St. John*, in their epistles, the Apostle Peter is not once mentioned. By *St. Paul* Peter is mentioned more than once; but never in the way of pre-eminence above the rest, as Christ's Vice-gerent on earth. Quite the contrary. Writing to the Galatians he speaks of Peter, James, and John, all conjointly, as seeming, when first he visited Jerusalem, to be pillars: and to the same Galatians tells how Peter erred when he came to Antioch; and how he (Paul) had found it necessary to rebuke him.<sup>1</sup> To the Corinthians again, when noticing the report which had reached him of their party-words, "I am of *Paul*, and I of *Apollos*, and I of *Cephas*," instead of saying in true Papal Roman style how correct the last-mentioned Petrine party were, he denounces all alike: seeing that Christ was to be regarded as the one head of the Church, contradistinctively to *Peter*, quite as much as to Paul or Apollos.<sup>2</sup> Elsewhere he distinctly asserts to them his own equality to Peter.<sup>3</sup> Further, when speaking of the foundation of the Christian Church, he speaks of it not as founded on Peter, according to the Romish interpretation of Christ's declaration in *St. Matthew*, but on the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, "Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone; in whom all the building fitly framed together groweth unto an holy temple to the Lord."<sup>4</sup> Just the very antipodes to Dr. Wiseman's view of Peter having been constituted "the foundation of the moral edifice the Church . . . with a power to hold together the materials in one united whole."<sup>5</sup>—Next turn to *Peter* himself. And lo! in his epistles there is just as total a silence as in the other apostolic epistles about his supposed Vicegerency of Christ, and his being distinctively the foundation of the Church. "To *Christ* coming [not unto *me*, Peter], as unto a living stone, ye also as living stones are

<sup>1</sup> Gal. ii. 9, 11—14.

<sup>2</sup> 1 Cor. i. 12, 13.

<sup>3</sup> In 2 Cor. xi. 5 he says, "For I think I was not a whit behind the very chiefest apostles." But surely, on the Papal theory, this was pretty nearly as blasphemous as the blasphemy which Baronius reprobates of the Constantinopolitan Patriarch equalling himself to the Pope. See p. 183 *supra*.

<sup>4</sup> Eph. ii. 20—22.

<sup>5</sup> Lecture viii. p. 268.

built up a spiritual house." "The elders which are among you I exhort, who am also an elder, and a witness of the sufferings of Christ. Feed the flock of God which is among you, taking the oversight . . . not for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind: neither as being lords over God's heritage, . . . and when the *Chief Shepherd* [Jesus Christ, not Peter] shall appear, ye also shall receive a crown of glory."<sup>1</sup> So in his 1st Epistle. Again, in his 2nd Epistle, when speaking of his own near martyrdom, he gives them his dying charge as it were: but still says not a word of his Vicegerency of Christ; nor warns them that "*extrapalum ecclesiæ Petrinæ*" there was no salvation.—Yet once more, in Christ's own letters to the Churches in Asia, as recorded by St. John, not an allusion is there to the Apostle Peter, or his then successor (as Roman Catholics would have it) in the Roman Bishoprick. Instead of his having devolved the keys to Peter or any successor of Peter, it is of Himself that Christ speaks as holding them; "I am he that have the keys of hades and of death."

Such is the result of our examination into the Scriptural Apostolic records on the 1st great point of our inquiries. And in truth so sensible are the Papal advocates of the weakness of their case, as tested by these records, that they do not pretend to adduce from them even a single testimony in proof of the apostles themselves having understood that Peter was invested by Christ with the mighty distinctive pre-eminence of being his Vice-gerent on earth. What they adduce is merely to the effect of his having been prominent in act and speech among the rest.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> 1 Pet. v. 1—4.

<sup>2</sup> Cardinal Wiseman says, p. 278: "In conformity with this view [that Peter received a *supreme* jurisdiction and primacy over the whole Church beyond the other apostles] we find him ever named the first among them, ever taking the lead in all their common actions, always speaking as the organ of the Church." These *four lines* constitute his whole allusion to the *apostolic history* after Christ's ascension, in proof of the great supposed fact, in a Lecture of 36 pages. His references are to "Acts i. 15, ii. 14, et seq.; iv. 8; v. 8; viii. 19; xii. 13; xv. 7; et al. passim":—just the passages referred to by me, pp. 562, 563, as proving, *in contradiction to Wiseman*, that Peter, though the chief speaker, *never once assumed any such primacy as Christ's vice-gerent on earth, nor anything like it!* So too, however, Belarmino, i. 22.

They add Gal. i. 18, ii. 8, stating that Paul went from Antioch to see Peter, also that "he who wrought effectually in Peter for the apostleship of the circumcision, wrought effectually in me for that to the Gentiles." A strange passage for them to refer to, as evidence that Peter was head of the *Gentile Church*! And why not, while citing this chapter, refer to its verse 6; "They who seemed to be somewhat in conference added nothing to me:" and verse 11; "When Peter was come to Antioch, I withstood him to the face, because he was to be blamed:" in proof of Peter being infinitely exalted over Paul and the other apostles, as Christ's Vicar on earth?

§ 2. FALSIFICATION OF THE THEORY OF PETER'S LOCALIZATION AT ROME AS ITS FIRST BISHOP, AND CONSEQUENT DEVOLUTION OF THE VICE-GERENCY OF CHRIST ON THE ROMAN BISHOPS AFTER HIM, BY THE CHRONOLOGY OF APOSTOLIC HISTORY IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

This is the *second* of the two fundamental lemmas of the Papal Petrine theory:—viz. that *St. Peter was the founder, and first Bishop, of the Church at Rome; and so a devolver on the line of subsequent bishops of Rome, as his successors and representatives, of his own (presumed) matchless prerogative as CHRIST'S VICE-GERENT ON EARTH.* Nor will its falsification be found much less manifest than that of the primary and preceding lemma.

In order to see this it is needful that the inquirer acquaint himself pretty accurately with the true chronology of the apostolic history in the Book of the Acts, with a view to comparison with the Papal supposititious chronology of the same, and so to its refutation. To help him to this I think it well to append a Chronological Chart of the Apostolic History in the Book of the Acts, drawn up more clearly, I think, and more exactly, than any that I have seen elsewhere: premising however as briefly as possible, for my readers' satisfaction, before applying it to the argument in hand, a notice of certain chief data on which its construction has been framed.—And this, 1st, with reference to the epoch assigned in the Chart to *Christ's ascension*; 2ndly, to what concerns the chronology of *the history of St. Paul and St. Peter*, afterwards.

1. As regards *Christ's ascension*, then, the chief data that we have for approximately determining its epoch are as follows:—1st, that his birth must have taken place some four years, or so, before the commencing date of the Vulgar Christian Æra; seeing that it occurred, as Matthew tells us, shortly before Herod the Great's death;<sup>1</sup> which event is by various evidence, historic, medallie, astronomic, fixt to the year U.C. 750:<sup>2</sup> 2. that his public ministry began, as Luke re-

<sup>1</sup> Matt. ii. 1, 15. See Clinton's Fast. ad B.C. 4, Gieseler, i. 37, Greswell i. 278.

<sup>2</sup> Luke iii. 23; *Αυτος δε ην ο Ιησους ωσει ετων τριακοντα αρχομενος, ων, ως ενομιζετο, υιος Ιωσηφ.* This important chronological statement has to be reconciled with that in Luke iii. 1, also referred to in my text, which dates the beginning of John Baptist's ministry as in the 15th year of Tiberius. Now the 15th of Tiberius, *reckoned from Augustus' death*, began August A.D. 28; at which time Christ must have been near 32 years old: and consequently as much more than 32, at his baptism, as we may adjudge to John Baptist's own previous ministry.

lates, when he was *about* 30 years old, and continued through at the least four successive Passovers, and probably two or three more: <sup>1</sup>—whence the date of his death, resurrection, and ascension seems to oscillate uncertainly between A.D. 29, as the earliest year, and A.D. 34, as the latest, to which we may at all probably assign them.<sup>2</sup>

Which point of doubt being otherwise unresolvable, it seemed to me, when investigating the matter, that light might be thrown on it by astronomic science, from the known fact that either the *Thursday*, or the *Friday*,<sup>3</sup> preceding the *Sunday* of Christ's resurrection, was the day of the Jews' Passover, and so the day of full moon, in that particular year. For, as that festival was always fixt to the 14th of the *lunar month* Nisan, the first month of the Jewish year at the spring equinox, the problem for the astronomer's resolution would be simply this;—in which of the five years from A.D. 29 to A.D. 34 inclusive, would the 14th of Nisan have fallen on a *Thursday*, in which on a *Friday*. Most obligingly our Astronomer Royal, Mr. Airey, undertook the question, and furnished me with an answer to it most complete in the two Tabular Schemes which I append. From which Tables I infer that in the years 29, 31, 32 the 14th of Nisan cannot have fallen either on a *Thursday* or a *Friday*; <sup>4</sup> but on *Saturday* or *Sunday*, *Tuesday* or *Wednesday*, *Sunday* or *Monday*, respectively: also that in A.D. 33 it fell on the *Friday*, and A.D. 30, and

As the best solutions of the difficulty we may either take *ὥσει* somewhat indefinitely, "Jesus had then begun to be of *about* 30 years," being in fact 33:—or reckon Tiberius' *ἡγεμονία*, not from Augustus' death, but from *Tiberius' association in the empire with Augustus*, mentioned by Velleius Paterculus, *some two or three years before Augustus' death*. See Elsley on Luke iii. 1, 23, or Lardner, i. 373, &c., for a good abstract on this famous point of difficulty.

The well-known Christian era was first introduced A.D. 525 by the monk Dionysius Exiguus, and is thus sometimes called the Dionysian *Æra*. It makes Christ's birth U.C. 754, or some 4 years later than the true date.

<sup>1</sup> Sir I. Newton thinks *five* Passovers in all.

<sup>2</sup> Clinton prefers A.D. 29, Greswell 30; Gieseler gives the alternative dates 31, 32, or 33; supposing Christ's age at death to have been *at least* 34 years.

<sup>3</sup> The *Thursday* is the day preferred by Lightfoot, Whitby, Scott, &c.; their judgment being grounded on what is said Matt. xxvi. 17—19, Mark xiv. 12, Luke xxii. 7, 6.

The *Friday* is preferred by Sir I. Newton and others; their opinion in its favour being grounded on what is said in John xviii. 28, xix. 14.

To myself the statements in the three former Evangelists seem almost decisive in favour of the *Thursday*. In John xviii. 28 the *Feast of unleavened bread*, which was often called the *Feast of the passover*, seems meant: and the *παρασκευή τῆς πάσχα* in John xix. 14, 31 to have been the preparation of the *passover sabbath*. Mark xv. 42, so, I think, explains it.

<sup>4</sup> I omit the *Friday* in the first column of A.D. 29, as only "barely possible."

### COMPUTATION OF THE 14TH DAY OF NISAN,

On the supposition that the Moon is visible at the first Sunset that occurs more than 18 hours after conjunction.

YEAR.	FIRST VISIBILITY OF THE MOON, AS INFERRED FROM TRUE CONJUNCTION.		MEAN CONJUNCTION.		1ST DAY OF NISAN.	14TH DAY OF NISAN.	DAY OF THE WEEK.
	EVENING OF		EVENING OF				
A.D. 29	March 5		March 4 (barely possible)		March 5	March 18	Friday
	April 3		March 5 (to be seen well)		March 6	March 19	Saturday
A.D. 30	March 23		April 3		April 4	April 17	Sunday
			March 23		March 24	April 6	Thursday.
A.D. 31	March 13		March 13		March 14	March 27	Tuesday.
	April 11		April 11		April 12	April 25	Wednesday.
A.D. 32	March 30		March 31		March 31	April 13	Sunday.
			March 20		April 1	April 14	Monday.
A.D. 33	March 20		March 20		March 21	April 3	Friday.
A.D. 34	March 10		March 9		March 10	March 23	Tuesday.
	April 8		April 8		March 11	March 24	Wednesday.
					April 9	April 22	Thursday.

If the Moon were not visible unless sunset occurred more than 23 hours after conjunction, the line for A.D. 30 must be altered as follows :—

A.D. 30	March 24	March 24	March 25	April 7	Friday.
---------	----------	----------	----------	---------	---------

1855, April 6.

G. B. AIREY.

TIMES OF NEW AND FULL MOON.

(Jerusalem Mean Solar Time, civil reckoning,) in the Months of March and April, A.D. 29 to 34.

YEAR.	TRUE TIME OF		MEAN TIME OF	
	NEW MOON.	FULL MOON.	NEW MOON.	FULL MOON.
A.D. 29	Friday, March 4, 3h. A.M. Saturday, April 2, 7h. P.M.	Friday, March 18, 9h. P.M. Sunday, April 17, 5h. A.M.	Thursday, March 3, midnight. Saturday, April 2, 1h. P.M.	Friday, March 18, 6h. P.M. Sunday, April 17, 7h. A.M.
A.D. 30	Wednesday, March 22, 8h. P.M. Friday, April 21, noon.	Wednesday, March 8, 1h. P.M. Thursday, April 6, 9h. P.M.	Wednesday, March 22, 9h. P.M. Friday, April 21, 10h. A.M.	Wednesday, March 8, 3h. A.M. Thursday, April 6, 4h. P.M.
A.D. 31	Monday, March 12, 1h. A.M. Tuesday, April 10, 2h. P.M.	Tuesday, March 27, 1h. P.M. Wednesday, April 25, 10h. P.M.	Monday, March 12, 6h. A.M. Tuesday, April 10, 7h. P.M.	Tuesday, March 27, 1h. A.M. Wednesday, April 25, 1h. P.M.
A.D. 32	Friday, February 29, noon. Saturday, March 29, 10h. P.M. Monday, April 28, 9h. A.M.	Saturday, March 15, 10h. P.M. Monday, April 14, 11h. A.M.	Friday, Feb. 29, 3h. P.M. Sunday, March 30, 4h. A.M. Monday, April 28, 4h. P.M.	Saturday, March 15, 9h. A.M. Sunday, April 13, 10h. P.M.
A.D. 33	Thursday, March 19, noon. Friday, April 17, 9h. P.M.	Thursday, March 5, 1h. A.M. Friday, April 3, 5h. P.M.	Thursday, March 19, 1h. P.M. Saturday, April 18, 1h. A.M.	Wednesday, March 4, 6h. P.M. Friday, April 3, 7h. A.M.
A.D. 34	Tuesday, March 9, 5h. A.M. Wednesday, April 7, 1h. P.M.	Tuesday, March 23, 6h. P.M. Thursday, April 22, 10h. A.M.	Monday, March 8, 9h. P.M. Wednesday, April 7, 10h. A.M.	Tuesday, March 23, 4h. P.M. Thursday, April 22, 4h. A.M.

1855, April 6.

G. B. ATHER.

perhaps too A.D. 34, on the *Thursday*.<sup>1</sup> Hence, if we suppose that it was on the Jews' own Passover-day that Jesus Christ had prepared and ate the Passover with his disciples, (which view I think the most probable,) then, as we know he did this on the *Thursday*,<sup>2</sup> Thursday must that year have been the 14th of Nisan; and the year, *so ruled*, either A.D. 30, or 34. If, on the other hand, we think that Christ anticipated a day in his Passover Feast, and that *Friday* was the *Jews'* own Passover-day, then we must in all probability assign the year of his death to A.D. 33.—Very remarkably the year of Messiah's making the Jewish typical sacrifice to cease, according to Daniel's prediction in his memorable far-seeing prophecy of the seventy hebdomads,—supposing him to have meant, as it is most generally thought that he meant, the cessation of the typical sacrifice in its efficacy, from being abrogated by the offering of Christ's own antitypical sacrifice,—I say the year so predicted, as measured from the Decree in the Jews' favour of the 7th of Artaxerxes, B.C. 457, would fall either on the April of A.D. 30, or the April of A.D. 34, according as the Hebrew word in Dan. ix. 27, fixing the time, and rendered by our English translators *in the midst*, be so translated, or translated, as it also rightly may be, *in the half*;<sup>3</sup> so including the whole last half week of the seventy, or  $3\frac{1}{2}$  years of Christ's ministry, consummated in his death, as the æra of the supersession by him of the old sacrifices of the Jewish law.

Thus much as regards the alternative dates of Christ's ascension, given doubtfully in the Chart.

2. Then, next, in regard of its subsequent *Apostolic Chronology*, we had the following data, deduced chiefly from the Book of the Acts of the Apostles, for approximately fixing on its several most important details.—1st, there are sundry breaks of time indicated in

<sup>1</sup> I must beg to refer to the Appendix of my Warburton Lectures, p. 463, for Mr. Airey's explanatory Letter; as well as for fuller details of my own argument.

<sup>2</sup> Towards evening of the day, before sunset, according to Moses' injunction, Exod. xii. 6, Numb. ix. 3, "Ye shall kill the lamb," "Ye shall eat the passover," *between the two evenings*.\* Accordingly the little remnant of Samaritans at Nablous, or Sychar, still kill the passover-lamb on Mount Gerizim a little before sunset, on the 14th Nisan, in preparation for the passover feast; which is ate immediately afterwards.

<sup>3</sup> "And he (Messiah) shall confirm the covenant with many for one week; and *in the midst* of the week he shall cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease." Dan. ix. 27. The  $\text{בְּתוֹכָהּ}$ , here used, has the meaning of *in the middle*, Judg. xvi. 3; the meaning of *the half*, Exod. xxiv. 6, 2 Sam. xviii. 3. So Gesenius.

\* So the Hebrew, as in the Margin of our Bibles: that was between the sun's afternoon decline and setting; or between 3 and 6 P.M. at the vernal equinox.

the history of the eight first Chapters <sup>1</sup> sufficient to warrant the supposition of an interval of some two, three, or more years between Christ's ascension and Paul's conversion, such as the date of the latter event at A.D. 36 implies, if the former be placed A.D. 34, 33, or 30; a date thus chosen approximately by reference to other evidence, such as follows.—2. Forasmuch as Damascus came first under the rule of King Aretas shortly after Tiberius' death, A.D. 38,<sup>2</sup> the fact of Paul's escape from that city, after returning to it from his time of retreat in Arabia subsequently to his conversion, having occurred under the governorship of a man appointed by King Aretas,<sup>3</sup> shows that that escape must have been later than A.D. 38; whence his *first visit to Jerusalem*, soon after following, that same in which *he held conference with Peter*, may with probability be placed about A.D. 40:—a visit thus dated by himself three years after his conversion;<sup>4</sup> and to which his trance in the temple mentioned Acts xxii. 17, and which I think also to be alluded to Rom. ix. 3,<sup>5</sup> seems best referable.—3. The period of two years allowed in the Chart for Paul's home mission work in Tarsus and Cilicia, after leaving Jerusalem, seems well to consist with the narrative in the Acts;<sup>6</sup> and not more than is needed to account for many of the hardships and sufferings specified in 1 Cor. xi. 23—26 as then already undergone by him in his missionary work, but of which no account appears in the detailed history of his intervening life given by St. Luke.—Which interval, 4thly, followed by a "whole year's" stay in Antioch (Acts xi. 26), would bring the time of Paul's *second visit to Jerusalem*, on occasion of the *famine*, to

<sup>1</sup> Breaks noted in the Column of Scriptural authorities in my Chart. See on this an elaborate essay in Mr. Greswell.

<sup>2</sup> Most probably, as argued by Conybeare and Howson, (Life of St. Paul, i. 89, 109,) "Caligula assigned the City of Damascus [soon after his accession, as their argument implies] as a free gift to Aretas." Aretas was previously king of Petra.

<sup>3</sup> Compare Gal. i. 17, 18, 2 Cor. xi. 32, 37, Acts ix. 23—35.

<sup>4</sup> Gal. i. 17. See Note <sup>3</sup> *infra* p. 572.—Paul's successive visits to Jerusalem constitute, we may say, the backbone of Pauline chronology: and are specially to be noted with reference to the controversy to which I am about to apply it.

<sup>5</sup> *Ηυχομένη γαρ αὐτός ἐγώ ἀνάθεμα εἶναι ἀπο* (or rather *ὑπο*) *τε Χριστοῦ, ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀδελφῶν μου κ.τ.λ.* I undoubtingly adopt Dr. Burton's translation of this; "I made it a matter of prayer that I might myself be specially devoted by Christ (as a missionary) on behalf of my brethren, my kindred according to the flesh." *Ανάθεμα* bears the sense so given it, as well as *ἀνάθημα*. (See Schleusner.) For *ὑπο* there is good MS. authority; and indeed *ἀπο* may be taken in the same sense. To see the striking agreement of this with Paul's account of his trance and prayer in the temple, given Acts xxii. 17, it only needs to read, and compare, the last-mentioned passage.

<sup>6</sup> See Acts ix. 30, xi. 25, Gal. i. 21; passages specified in the Scripture column in my Chart.



about A.D. 44 or 45: just consistently with what we know otherwise about the famine; as having occurred shortly after Herod's death early in 44, and continued through the winter of 44 and 45.<sup>1</sup>—5. As regards St. Paul's subsequent sojourn at Antioch, and then his 1st great *foreign missionary tour* from thence, by Cyprus, the Pisidian Antioch, Iconium, Lystra, &c., and further stay for "a long time," after returning, in the great Antioch, we may reasonably, I think, assign to all this a period of some three or four years; and so are led to place his *third visit to Jerusalem*, on occasion of the *apostolic Council* held there, at about A.D. 49 or 50:<sup>2</sup> with which date well agrees what he intimates in Gal. ii. 1 of this having occurred *fourteen years* after his conversion;<sup>3</sup> from A.D. 36 to A.D. 50 being just 14 years.—6. The time necessarily occupied in his 2nd *great foreign missionary tour*, by Cilicia, Galatia, Mysia, into Thrace and Greece, including a year and a half's stay at Corinth begun soon after Claudius' expulsion of the Jews from Rome,<sup>4</sup> and then a return by way of Ephesus to Jerusalem, where was to be spent "the feast,"<sup>5</sup> probably of Pentecost, can scarcely have included less than three years; so fixing the date of this his *fourth visit to Jerusalem*, approximately, at A.D. 52.<sup>6</sup>—After which, 7thly, and a stay "for some time" at Antioch,<sup>7</sup> followed his 3rd *great missionary tour*, first to Ephesus, where he staid between two and three years,<sup>8</sup> and then into Macedonia and Achaia; returning by way of Troas, Miletus, and Cæsarea to *Jerusalem*; this being his *fifth visit* there, the same on which occurred

<sup>1</sup> See my Warburton Lect. p. 468. To much the same effect write Conybeare and Howson, ii. 561.

<sup>2</sup> See on all this the SS. authorities in my Chart.

<sup>3</sup> This I consider, with Macknight (on Gal. ii. 1) and others, to be the *terminus* from which the 14 years' period, as well as the 3 years' mentioned Gal. i. 18, is to be reckoned.

<sup>4</sup> Acts xviii. 2. For the exact date of Claudius' expulsion of the Jews from Rome we have no good historic authority. Orosius indeed, B. vii. ch. 6, assigns it, as if on Josephus' authority, to Claudius' 9th year. But I do not find it mentioned at all by Josephus. Suetonius mentions the fact, but gives no date. So far as regards the argument with Bellarmine and the Romanists, however, it is sufficient to know that it occurred before Paul's arrival at Corinth.

<sup>5</sup> Acts xviii. 21. It is not said what feast. Howson (i. 452), after Wieseler, supposes the Feast of Pentecost.

<sup>6</sup> In the chronological arrangement of this, and Paul's other great missionary tours, I have of course had careful regard to what is reported of the length of his stoppings at different places, and time to be allowed for his journeyings. It was a gratification to me to find, after drawing up the Chart, that the chronology in Messrs. Conybeare and Howson's Book, afterwards published, very much agreed with my own on this head.

<sup>7</sup> Acts xviii. 23.

<sup>8</sup> Ibid. xix. 8, 10.

*the tumult in the temple*: to all which we may fairly assign a term of five years; and so place this visit and tumult at A.D. 57.—Then, 8thly, followed his two years' imprisonment in Cæsarea, first under Felix' government, then under that of Festus; another test-point of our chronology, and on which it well agrees with the dates respecting these Roman Procurators in Tacitus.<sup>1</sup>—9. Adding three-quarters of a year for his voyage to Malta, wintering there, and journey in the next spring to Rome, the date of his arrival there fixes itself about March or April A.D. 60: a date on which sacred and profane history are found well to agree, in the fact of there being *just then* but one Prætorian Præfect at Rome, as stated Acts xxviii. 16;<sup>2</sup> and one leaving margin of time enough, moreover, for Paul writing thence his Epistle to Colossæ previous to the Laodicean earthquake, an event which happened sometime before Oct. 13, that same year.<sup>4</sup>—10. The two years past in his own hired house at Rome during this imprisonment occupy from A.D. 60 to 62.—After which, 11thly, comes his 4th and last missionary tour, as inferred from the Epistles to the Hebrews, to Timothy, and to Titus;<sup>5</sup> bringing the epoch of his second imprison-

<sup>1</sup> Tacitus, Ann. xii. 54, speaks of Felix's appointment to the Procuratorship of Judæa as having been made some time before the 12th year of Claudius, or A.D. 52; Josephus dating it at the beginning of Claudius' 13th year. Either, but especially the former, would sufficiently agree with St. Paul's statement, as made A.D. 57, according to my Chronology, to the effect of Felix having been then many years judge to the Jewish nation'; *ἐκ πολλῶν ἔτων κριτικῶν οὐτα τῷ ἐθνεὶ τέτρω.* Acts xxiv. 10.

<sup>2</sup> The centurion is there said to have delivered Paul to the *captain of the guard* (*τῷ παραποσειδαρχῷ*), in the singular. Now Burrhus, who was for some time the *one* captain of the Prætorian guard, died early in 62 (Tacit. Ann. xiv. 51); and, after his death, Nero appointed *two* prætorian captains to succeed him. Whence we infer that it must have been before Burrhus' death in 62 that Paul arrived.

<sup>3</sup> See Col. iv. 15, 16.

<sup>4</sup> This is the ending day of the 6th year of Nero; to which year Tacitus, Ann. xiv. 27, refers the earthquake. Of this I have spoken largely in my 1st Volume, pp. 45, 546.

<sup>5</sup> Accordantly with the data left us we may suppose Crete to have been taken by Paul in his way from Italy to Syria, (a visit promised in his Epistle to the Hebrews,)\* and Titus left there to set the Cretan Churches in order: then a journey made westward by the apostle by way of Macedonia, and so on to Nicopolis; Timothy being left at Ephesus, on his progress thitherward, with the charge of superintending the Christian Church in that city and neighbourhood: then some final missionary circuit to have been made by way of Troas, Miletum in Crete, and Corinth,† followed by his second

\* Heb. xiii. 23. I speak of this as St. Paul's Epistle, so as it is designated in our English authorized version, having no doubt myself as to the fact; though well aware, of course, of the doubts respecting it exprest by many critics. It would be found interesting, and I think not difficult, to draw out proofs of its Pauline origin.

† *Troas* alluded to, as shortly before visited by him, in 2 Tim. iv. 13; *Miletum* and *Corinth*, ib. 20. At *Troas* he may have seen Timothy, agreeably with his intimated intention, 1 Tim. iii. 14; at *Miletum* have taken up Titus with him to Rome; whose leaving for *Dalmatia* is noted 2 Tim. iv. 10: with which last local notice well agrees

ment at Rome, and, after awhile, his martyrdom, to somewhere about A.D. 65 and 66.

In all this we cannot be far wrong. The chronology is consistent, as we have seen, with all its many and various testings. As to the chronological dates of St. Paul's Epistles, they are severally noted in another column of the Chart; and, in fact, with the exception of that of the Epistle to the Galatians, are so interwoven with the history as to tell themselves; <sup>1</sup> a point this also to be carefully attended to, both as furnishing fresh chronological testing-points, and as bearing on my coming argument.

And now then, turning to the *application*, he will be prepared to consider intelligently that article in the *Papal Petrine theory* which represents Peter as the first founder and first Bishop of the Roman Church; and so the transmitter of his Vicariate of Jesus Christ to the Roman Popes, as his successors in the see:—a connexion this with him which, as we saw, is the second essential foundation-stone of the Pa-

imprisonment at Rome. Supposing this, the Epistle to *Titus* and *1st to Timothy* may be considered to have been written in the course of his progress through Macedonia and Southern Dalmatia to Nicopolis: this being probably the well-known Epirote city Actium, called Nicopolis after Augustus' victory there over Antony.\* As to the *2nd to Timothy*, it is generally admitted to have been written during the second imprisonment of the apostle at Rome, and when now at length about to be offered in martyrdom, A.D. 66, or thereabouts.†

<sup>1</sup> I have little doubt myself of the Epistle to the Galatians having been written during Paul's two or three years' sojourn at Ephesus. And this is the usual view of Commentators. But this is unimportant to my argument.

---

the hypothesis of Paul having been in Dalmatia and Epirus previously.—Timothy's youth, spoken of 1 Tim. iv. 12 and 2 Tim. ii. 22, is no objection to this chronology of the two Epistles: as *youth* included among the Romans the age to 35. And if Timothy was 15 when first converted at Lystra, he may have been about 33 or 34 in A.D. 66. See Greswell iv. 244.

\* See Tit. iii. 12.

† Since writing the above I have consulted Paley's *Horæ Paulinæ*, and Mr. Greswell, and find on the main points correspondence in their opinions. Only Paley says nothing about the *Epistle to the Hebrews*, apparently as doubting its being St. Paul's: and Dr. Greswell supposes Paul to have written that Epistle *after having visited Spain*, on liberation from his first imprisonment at Rome, and when returned thence to Italy en route eastwards. To which supposition I can see no objection.

In his Chapter on the Epistle to Titus Dr. Paley thus writes:—"If we suppose that St. Paul, after his liberation at Rome, sailed from Asia taking Crete on his way,—that from Asia and from Ephesus the capital of the country he proceeded into Macedonia,—and crossing the Peninsula in his progress came into the neighbourhood of Nicopolis, we have a route which falls in with everything."

Mr. Greswell thus writes and dates:—"Paul's 1st arrival in Rome A.D. 59; arrival of Timothy and Epaphroditus 60; Liberation of Paul and visit to Spain 61; Imprisonment of Timothy at Rome 61; Return of Paul from Spain, and liberation of Timothy, 63; Circuit of Crete 64; Wintering of Paul at Nicopolis in Epirus 65; Circuit of Dalmatia 65; (Martyrdom of Peter at Rome 65;) Apprehension of Paul in Asia 66; Second arrival of Paul in Rome, and audience before Nero, 66; Martyrdom of Paul 66."

pace. Assuredly we can scarce even thus hurriedly have glanced over the history and chronology of the Acts without the impression that, so far as its testimony goes, instead of furnishing direct evidence of the fact of Peter's having early gone to Rome at the time supposed by Papists, there founded the Roman Church, assumed its Bishoprick, and done this preliminarily to devolving upon its bishops after him whatever pre-eminent dignity or prerogative attached to himself, the sacred narrative is altogether silent about it; nay that the whole bearing of the evidence offered by it is *against* the truth of any such localization of St. Peter. For where do we find in it, I will not say a hint of Peter's having ever been to Rome,—but a chronological crevice during which, consistently with its history, we may suppose him settled there? I shall however best illustrate this by sketching Cardinal Bellarmine's Romano-Petrine theory, and attempted mode of reconciling this theory of Peter's early localization at Rome with the sacred records we have been examining:<sup>1</sup>—premising this, that, accordantly with all Church law, it is essential to the Papal Petrine theory that *Peter* should have been the *first* apostle acting as apostolic missionary there, not Paul; for the laws of the Church, from the so called Apostolic Constitutions of the 2nd and 3rd centuries to the Council of Trent in the 16th, forbid the intrusion of any other bishop into the diocese of one already occupying it.<sup>2</sup>

We find then that it is virtually admitted by Bellarmine in his argument that, in order to Peter's being first Bishop of Rome, the Church

<sup>1</sup> I say Cardinal Bellarmine's, distinctively; for Dr. Wiseman, more cunningly, shirks all direct discussion of the all-important question. "I presume," says he, "it will not be necessary to enter into any argument to show that Peter was the first Bishop of Rome:" p. 278: adding that eminent Protestant writers on the subject *generally* admitted it. An assertion, I must beg to say, of which, as Wiseman expresses it, the truth is very questionable.

<sup>2</sup> So the 13th of the (so called) Apostolic Canons; *επισκοπον μη εξειναι καταλειψαντα την εαυτη παροικιαν ετερα επιπηραν, και υπο πλειωνων αναγκαζεται.*

The Council of Nice, A.D. 325, in its 8th Canon provides that any Novatian bishop who might conform to the Catholic Church in a place where there was a Catholic Bishop, should only be counted as a chorepiscopus, or presbyter, in order that there might not be two bishops in one city: *ινα μη εν τη πολει δυο επισκοποι ωσιν.*

So again three several Councils of Carthage, held A.D. 348, 390, 397: and, in fine, the Council of Trent, Sess. vi. c. 5: "Nulli episcopo liceat, cujusvis privilegii prætextu, pontificalia in alterius diocæsi exercere." Hard. i. 11, 326, 687, 953, 963; and x. 45.

Romish writers, among others Dr. Wiseman, have argued the question about Peter's connexion with Rome as if it were merely that of Peter's *ever* having been at Rome; and then triumphantly quoted Protestant ecclesiastical historians and divines, admitting that Rome was the scene of his martyrdom.

of Rome ought to have been *founded by St. Peter*.<sup>1</sup> And, after noticing the fact of the existence of a Christian Church at Rome at the time when St. Paul wrote his Epistle to the Romans, and thrown out, as a presumption in favour of his view, the very foolish question, "By whom founded if not by Peter,"<sup>2</sup>—as if forsooth Peter was the only Christian evangelist in existence,<sup>3</sup>—he proceeds thus to sketch from imagination the *Petrine Scripture chronology*, accordantly with his theory of the Roman Church having originally been founded by him.—It is his suggestion that Peter remained after Christ's ascension some four or five years in Jerusalem; near the end of which Paul first saw him there, three years after his conversion:—that he then went to *Antioch*, and there past near seven years as its first Bishop; having in the course of this septennial period toured, and founded Churches, in Pontus, Asia, Galatia, Cappadocia, and Bithynia:—that then, in the seventh year of his Antiochian episcopate, and the eleventh from Christ's ascension, he returned to Jerusalem, and was imprisoned by Herod; then, that self-same year, (being the second of Claudius's emperors, and a year before Herod's death,) went to *Rome*; <sup>4</sup> there *founded the Roman Church*, and there established his see (transferred thence from Antioch), as *Rome's first Bishop*: till at length, expelled thence by Claudius' decree, in common with Aquila and other Jews he returned to Jerusalem; on news of which the Antiochian Church sent up Paul and Barnabas to see him, and to take their part in the Council of Jerusalem:—finally, that after Claudius's death, A.D. 55, Peter returned to Rome, and there continued in exercise of his epis-

<sup>1</sup> Bellarmine fences a little at first, (ii. 1, 6,) by intimating that a person might be Bishop of Rome *without having gone there*; as certain Popes were consecrated Bishops of Rome during the time of the Papal See being at Avignon. But he passes quickly from it to prove Peter's early localization at Rome: no doubt bethinking him that the *Roman See had been long founded* before the Popes were consecrated Bishops of it, while at Avignon. But could Peter have been made Rome's first Bishop before ever he had been to Rome to found the Roman Church? <sup>2</sup> ii. 2. 13.

<sup>3</sup> "They that were scattered abroad (after Stephen's death) went everywhere preaching the word." "And they which were scattered abroad on the persecution that arose about Stephen travelled as far as Phenice, Cyprus, and Antioch, preaching the word. . . And a great number believed, and turned to the Lord." Acts viii. 4, xi. 19—21. Was Peter among those preachers? Clearly not.—It is observable that among the converted on the day of Pentecost there are said to have been "*strangers of Rome*." Acts ii. 10. And was not the Christian *centurion* (x. 1) of the *Italian band*? Might not these, though with inferior powers and gifts, have taken the gospel to Rome?

<sup>4</sup> See the bracket in my Chronological Chart, which includes the period during which Bellarmine supposes Peter to have been first at Rome.

copate, though not without sundry missionary excursions thence, until his death, A.D. 67; having been Bishop of Rome twenty-five years altogether.

Such is Bellarmine's marvellous theory of the Petrine Scripture chronology: and surely it may naturally remind us of the efforts of an ingenious advocate to account for a witness's time in some difficult case, and otherwise evading the force of strong concurrent circumstantial evidence against him.—Let us see how his theory will suit the recorded facts. As to the original formation of the Church at *Antioch*, we have seen already that Peter had nothing whatever to do with it. It was certain Hellenists of Cyprus and Cyrene, or Jews using the Greek language, who, after the scattering abroad from Jerusalem, in consequence of the persecution in which Stephen suffered martyrdom, first preached Christ's gospel there.<sup>2</sup> And when, in the course apparently of those two or three years that Paul spent in Arabia, the numbers had so increased as to form a considerable Church there, and tidings of this had come to the apostles at Jerusalem, (shortly perhaps after St. Paul's first visit of a fortnight to them in that sacred city,) we read that they sent Barnabas thither, (not Peter,) to confirm the Antiochian Christians in the faith: and that Barnabas, after so acting a while by himself, fetched Paul from Tarsus to assist him, not Peter.<sup>3</sup> Nor is there a single hint of Peter's joining them there previous to Paul and Barnabas' visit to Jerusalem with the Antiochian Christians' alms, about the time when Peter was imprisoned by Herod; or after their return back to Antioch; or during their first missionary Pamphylian tour thence, and return again to Antioch; or before their next visit to Jerusalem, when the Council was held there at which Peter assisted. So as to the Scripture evidence of Peter's supposed primary episcopate at *Antioch*.—Then, 2ndly, as to that which more closely concerns us, viz. *Peter's* asserted *early preaching at Rome* after the imprisonment by Herod, and return, in consequence of Claudius' expulsion of the Jews, in time to be present at the Council at Jerusalem, alike the Claudian date in the Acts, and its account of the Council, put their negative upon it. First, I say, *the Claudian date* negatives it. For some considerable time must needs have elapsed between that Council, and Paul's returning to Antioch, starting thence on his second tour, and accomplishing all its long course through Asia Minor, Thrace, Macedonia, Thessaly, and so to Corinth. And it

<sup>1</sup> Bellarm. De S. P. ii. 6, 7.  
VOL. III.

<sup>2</sup> See Note <sup>2</sup>, p. 567.

<sup>3</sup> Acts xi. 22—26.

was only on his arrival there that he found Aquila and Priscilla *just lately* come to Corinth from Rome in consequence of the edict.<sup>1</sup> Can we believe the same edict to have expelled Peter a full year earlier? Also *what past at the Council* negatives it. For in Peter's speech, though mentioning the fact of his being chosen out (in the case of Cornelius evidently) to open the door of the Church to the Gentiles, and how God himself sealed this as his will by giving the Holy Ghost to those Gentile believers, even as to the Jewish, he yet tells not a word of his having been moreover to *Rome*, and there too founded a flourishing Gentile Church, and there become its first Bishop. All the good tidings as to the spread of Gentile evangelization are from Paul and Barnabas:—"Then all the multitude kept silence, and gave audience to Barnabas and Paul, declaring what miracles and wonders God had wrought among the Gentiles [i. e. in their first or Pamphylian missionary tour] by them."<sup>2</sup> Moreover the Letter written by the Council (Acts xv. 23,) is address to the Brethren from out of the Gentiles in "Antioch, Syria, and Cilicia," not those in Rome or Italy; though we know that, after the formation of a Christian Church there, the same tendencies to Jewish ritualistic errors showed themselves in it just as in the early Churches elsewhere.

But, though this gives the coup de grace to Bellarmine's early Petrine Roman theory, might not Peter be yet supposed to have preached at Rome *before* Paul's arrival there, though *after* the Jerusalem Council, consistently with the sacred narrative? Let us see.—Take first the epoch of Paul's second short stay at Corinth, when Paul wrote his Epistle to the Romans. In this Epistle two significant facts are noticeable, bearing on the point in question, which must strike any discerning inquirer:—*one*, that amidst the many Christian brethren saluted by Paul in the last chapter of the Epistle, as then sojourning at Rome, the name of *Peter* occurs not as one then settled there; nor any allusion to him as likely soon to return, if just then absent from his Roman See, so as Bellarmine would suggest,<sup>3</sup> on some temporary missionary excursion:—the *other*, that St. Paul in Chapter i. tells how he longed to see the Christians there, "in order to impart to them some spiritual gift;"<sup>4</sup> which surely could scarce have been wanting to

<sup>1</sup> Acts xviii. 2: προσφάτως ἐληλυθота ἀπο τῆς Ἰταλίας.

<sup>2</sup> Acts xv. 12. Bellarmine makes xviii. 2 precede xv. 12.

<sup>3</sup> Bellarm. ii. 7. See p. 576.

<sup>4</sup> Rom. i. 11. ἵνα τι μεταδώχω ἰσχυρίσμα ὑμῖν πνευματικόν.—On which χαρίσματα, or

the Romish Church, if Peter with equal (indeed, according to the Romanists, immeasurably superior) apostolic powers had been for some time previous pretty much fixed among them: and strangely inconsistent moreover with what he had himself written not long before to the Roman Christians, as well as indeed to the Corinthians, a little previously, of the point that he made, and would make, of not building in his missionary plans and ministrations upon another man's foundation.'—Yet again take the still later epoch of Paul's first arrival at Rome. And surely we read in the Acts of the Apostles that which almost necessarily negatives all idea of Peter being *then* there; or having previously been settled there in character of chief pastor of the Church. As Paul advanced near to Rome there occurs no intimation of Peter being among the brethren who went to meet him at Appii Forum, nor of Paul finding him there on his arrival. Moreover, when the Jews of Rome came together to hear him on his invitation, what, as reported by St. Luke, was their statement to Paul as to what they knew, and had heard, about Christianity? Just this:—"We desire to hear of thee what thou thinkest: for, as concerning this sect, we know that it is everywhere spoken against."<sup>2</sup>—Proceeding still onwards in the chronology, St. Luke mentions that, after this, "Paul dwelt two whole years in his own hired house, and received all that came in to him, preaching the kingdom of God:" but still with the same total silence in reference to Peter's ever having been at Rome during that time. Moreover, in all the four Epistles written by Paul during these two years from Rome, alike those to the Colossians, Philemon, the Ephesians, and the Philippians, among

supernatural spiritual gifts, imparted only by an apostle, compare 1 Cor. xii. 4, &c. See Whitby on Rom. i. 15.

<sup>1</sup> Rom. xv. 20; 2 Cor. x. 16.

<sup>2</sup> It is right to give Bellarmine's reply to this. He says (ii. 7. 12); "Falsum est Judæos Romæ miratos doctrinæ novitatem, quando Paulus prædicavit eis Christum, quasi nemo antea tale aliquid prædicasset. Nam, si Romæ nullus prædicaverat Judæis, antequam Paulus eo veniret, quis eos Judæos Romanos converterat ad quos ipse Epistolam scripsit?"

But this is not a fair way of putting the argument. The question is whether they could have had that measure of feeling, agitation, and conviction on Paul's addressing them, if an apostle similarly endued from on high, and similarly charged with the ministry to the Jews, had been for years acting the part of an apostle among them.—The true account of the whole seems to be that, as in the case of the founding of the Church of Antioch, so at Rome inferior agency was the first instrumentality for preaching the gospel and forming a Church of mixt Jews and Gentiles: (on which see my Note <sup>2</sup> p. 576:) the inferiority of the agency leading the unconverted Jews there to neglect and despise it.



the various salutations sent from Rome none occurs as sent by Peter. Nay; even on occasion of Paul's second and last imprisonment at Rome, he tells in his 2nd Epistle to Timothy' how, when he was called up to trial before Nero, "no one stood by him."<sup>1</sup> Could Peter then at that time have been with him at Rome?—So that, on the whole, we are all but forced to the conclusion that *Paul* was the first of the apostles that arrived and preached at Rome: and consequently (even supposing that Peter came afterwards, and was martyred there) that the apostle Paul must, by reason of the priority of his visit and labours, be considered first Bishop of Rome, on Bellarmine's own principles, not the apostle Peter: i. e. supposing it was competent to either of them to merge their extraordinary and far higher office of *apostle* in the lower office of a *local Bishop*; a supposition, on Scripture grounds, scarce admissible.

To add corroboration on this point from the *Apostolic Epistles* is superfluous. And indeed one sentence may pretty well tell all; viz. that they furnish no notice of Peter ever having been at Rome, or been Bishop of Rome, whatsoever: and of course therefore none of his thinking to devolve on Bishops of Rome, as his successors, whatever apostolic dignity or pre-eminence might attach to himself.—There is however one among the Apostolic Books where Rome, in reference to its *future* history, is spoken of. In his Apocalypse, or Revelation of things to come, St. John describes Rome under an *ecclesiastical* figure. But it is as a *harlot*, holding out the cup of her fornication; yea, as "the mother of harlots and of the abominations of the earth:"—Christ's true Church, the one built on the foundation (not of Peter distinctively, but) of the twelve apostles of the Lamb, being described as never established on earth, so as to be a rejoicing among men, until the utter and *everlasting* destruction of the usurping harlot, the seven-hilled Babylon;<sup>2</sup> as also of the Beast of the same seven hills upholding her.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> 2 Tim. iv. 16.

<sup>2</sup> Not a *temporary* destruction by the Goths and Vandals; so as Bellarmine (ii. 2. 9), with strange disregard of his elsewhere declared *futurist* Apocalyptic views, would represent it.

<sup>3</sup> It is curious that *John* survived all the apostles, not *Peter*. So that, on the Papal theory, the beloved disciple John must for some 30 years have been subject to the Roman Pope Linus or Clement, as then Christ's Vice-gerent on earth!!

In fine we come to the conclusion, that if the Romish theory of the Papal supremacy were really true,—if Peter, and the Bishops of Rome in succession after him, were really the Vice-gerents of Christ on earth, and Rome the one true Church, and no salvation without its pale,—then the Apostles must either themselves have been in utter ignorance of it; or else (together with Luke the historian as a consenting party to the fraud) knowingly, wilfully, systematically, have suppressed their knowledge. In which latter case the whole human race might surely with justice rise up in outcry against the apostolic choir, as having banded together to deceive them to their perdition, with a malignity absolutely unparalleled in all our fallen world's annals of crime: and this with the Satanic adjunct of doing it under the mask of simplicity, benevolence, and artlessness, such as never yet hypocrite of this world has been able for any length of time to keep up—Nay, with reverence be it spoken, in such case our Lord Jesus Christ himself might be arraigned as *particeps criminis*; because of never having hinted one word about the Bishops of Rome, as Peter's intended successors in the Vice-gerency, though men's salvation was absolutely to depend on so recognising them: and having moreover permitted, nay and by his Spirit inspired his apostles so to act, and so to write, as necessarily to lead men astray from that absolutely vital truth of Christianity.

### § 3. EARLY PATRISTIC NON-RECOGNITION OF PETER'S AND THE ROMAN POPE'S VICE-GERENCY OF CHRIST.

After what we have seen who will wonder that the Papal advocates should hurry as they do over *Apostolic* ground, and hasten to make out a case for themselves, if possible, from *Patristic* evidence? Yet, in the judgment of common sense, of what worth could be the latter, however favourable, if opposed to the former? As I remarked at the beginning of this Paper, its weight in the comparison would be but as a feather.—I must not however conclude my Paper without showing the reader how vain is all that Bellarmine and Wiseman<sup>1</sup> urge from

<sup>1</sup> *Bellarmino*, as before, in his Book ii., *De Summo Pontifice*, four first Chapters: (my Edition of his Works is that of Milan, 1721, in 4 Volumes:)—*Wiseman*, as before, in his Lectures on the Catholic Church.

I have looked into *De Maistre*, to see if any additional testimonies are offered by him, on the point in question, from the fathers of the three first centuries. But,

the earlier patristic writers in proof of their dogma of the Papal supremacy:—a dogma, let it never be forgotten, which makes *the Roman Bishop*, as Peter's successor, *Christ's plenipotentiary Vice-gerent on earth*; without adherence to whom in that character, and as the head to the universal Church, *no human being can be saved*. It will be my care well to mark the *chronology* of the patristic testimonies as we go on: that which Papal advocates would fain to have overlooked by the reader, and often cover therefore more or less with a misty veil. Of course the nearer its place to apostolic times, the greater (*cæteris paribus*) the value of the patristic testimony.

1. (B.)<sup>1</sup> "*Anacletus* (about B.C. 95) docet, Ep. 3, propter Petrum sedem Romanam ecclesiam esse omnium aliarum caput." So Bellarmine. But *Anacletus' Epistles* are notoriously *spurious*, and of a much later date.

2. (B and W.) *Pope Clement*, (about A.D. 110,) says Bellarmine in his *Apostolical Constitutions*, B. vii. c. 46, says, "Petrum, imminente morte, sibi reliquisse Romanum episcopatum." But, like *Anacletus' Epistles*, these *Apostolical Constitutions* by *Clement* are notoriously *spurious*.

But, says *Wiseman*, in his *Epistle* (which no doubt is genuine) this Roman Pope *Clement* "examined and corrected the abuses of the Church of Corinth."—Such is *Wiseman's* first patristic exemplification, in proof that "all [Christians], from the earliest ages, acknowledged the authority of Peter to exist in his successors [at Rome], as their inherent right."<sup>2</sup> Does Dr. W. then give any evidence to show that the then Corinthian Church sought the Roman *Clement's* authoritative intervention in its case, as Peter's rightful successor, and so Christ's Vice-gerent:—or that it received his Letter as one bearing with it that plenary and divine authority of jurisdiction:—or that *Clement* himself grounded his own intervention on any such mighty claim; or that he express himself as writing in the way of authoritative intervention at all; and not simply as a sympathizing Christian minister and bishop, just as *Ignatius*

though saying at the beginning of his Chapter on the subject, (B. i. Ch. 8.) "Nothing in all ecclesiastical history is so invincibly demonstrated as the monarchical supremacy of the Sovereign Pontiff," i. e. as Peter's successor, yet (as any one acquainted with the subject might be sure would be the case) he adds nothing to Bellarmine's early patristic authorities. *Irenæus*, *Tertullian*, *Cyprian* alone figure in his meagre list.

<sup>1</sup> B. and W. signify *Bellarmino* and *Wiseman*, as the adducers of the testimony cited.

<sup>2</sup> Lect. viii. p. 281.

or Polycarp might have done and written?—Dr. Wiseman gives no evidence from Clement's Letter, or from other contemporary or nearly contemporary history, or indeed from any history at all, in proof of any one of these three points. And in fact the Letter itself, in its whole strain and spirit, puts a direct negative on Dr. W.'s representation respecting it: and is thus an early and strong testimony in proof that Clement, like Peter before him, was in utter ignorance of the dogma of Romish Papal supremacy.

3. (B.) *Ignatius*; about A.D. 115. "Non sicut Petrus et Paulus præcipio vobis." So Ignatius, in his Epistle to the Romans: proving at least, according to Bellarmine, that Peter had been at Rome, and had taught the Roman Christians. Even if admitted, however, this proves nothing for the doctrine of Papal supremacy. Nor does it necessarily even imply Ignatius' belief of Peter having been at Rome: or mean more than that he could not speak, or write, to the Romans, or to any others of the Christian body, with the same authority and weight that attached to the words of Paul and Peter.<sup>1</sup>

4. (B.) *Papias*, about A.D. 130. "Papias says that 'Peter in his first Epistle, which he wrote from Rome, mentioned Mark: in which Epistle he figuratively calls Rome Babylon.' So we are told by Eusebius."<sup>2</sup> But this is nothing more (as indeed Bellarmine fairly states it) than Papias' testimony to the fact of Peter's having been at Rome when he wrote his 1st Epistle;—an epistle of which the date, according to the most esteemed critics, (as Lardner, Michaelis, Whitby, &c.) was not very long before his 2nd Epistle, or before his death; and so, as Lardner well places it, somewhere between 63 and 65 A.D. Let me add that the ground of Papias' opinion as to Peter having written his Epistle from Rome seems from the passage itself to have been this, that Peter sends in it the salutations of the Church in *Babylon*:<sup>3</sup> Papias, St. John's disciple, being of course strongly

<sup>1</sup> Milner, in his "End of Controversy," refers, I think, to the *προκαθηται*, said of the Roman Church in Ignatius' inscription of his Letter, *τη εκκλησια ηγαπημενη, . . . ητις προκαθηται εν το χωριου Ρωμαιων*, as a testimony to the primacy of the Roman Church, of course as the Church of St. Peter. But, as Usher remarks in his comment on the passage, "Planum est Ignatium de Romanâ ecclesiâ ut *topica* hic loqui, non ut *Ecumenicâ*." The verb being put *absolutely*, I should think the idea intended by it is this;—"the Church which *sits prominent*," i. e. before the world; the object, from its very site in the heathen capital, of special regard and observation.—Of its *bishop* (the supposed *Vicar of Christ* on earth) there is no mention, from beginning to end of the letter; nor an allusion to him. <sup>2</sup> H. E. ii. 15.

<sup>3</sup> 1 Pet. v. 13. The word *Church*, as is well known, is here supplied by the trans-

impres with the fact of St. John's designating Rome figuratively as Babylon in the Apocalypse; and thence inferring that the Babylon Peter dates from, though without a mark of anything symbolic attached to it, meant figuratively Rome also.

5. Bellarmine further adds *Dionysius of Corinth*, (A.D. 170,) as a later witness to the same fact of Peter having taught and been martyred at the same time as Paul at Rome: <sup>1</sup> also *Caius*, some 40 years later, as witnessing to the fact of his having there suffered martyrdom, as well as St. Paul.<sup>2</sup> A point this which I have no wish to contest.

6. (W.) "*Pope Victor* (A.D. 192) examined and corrected the abuses of the Church of Ephesus." Did he so act then in the declared character of Peter's successor and Christ's Vice-gerent: and was he by the Oriental Churches acknowledged and deferred to in that character, in the manner that Dr. Wiseman intimates?<sup>3</sup> Quite the contrary. 1st, Pope Victor never profest to be Christ's Vicar, or Vice-gerent: 2. the Orientals refused to listen to him: 3. sundry Christians of the West, especially Irenæus, reprov'd him for his pride. Such is Eusebius' report of the matter.<sup>2</sup> What it illustrates is, not the Roman Bishop's acknowledged supremacy, but the Roman Bishop's pride, even then peeping out. It showed, agreeably with St. Paul's prophecy, that, were but the "let" of imperial power removed from the seven hills, and the restraining grace withdrawn of God's Holy Spirit, there was a principle of priestly ambition at work even then at Rome,<sup>3</sup> which might well grow to be a source of trouble to the Christian Church.

7. (B. and W.) *Irenæus*. (A.D. 175.) "Quoniam longum est in hoc tali volumine omnium ecclesiarum enumerare successiones, maximæ et antiquissimæ et omnibus cognitæ, à gloriosissimis duobus apostolis Petro et Paulo Romæ fundatæ et constitutæ ecclesiæ, eam quam

lators. The original is simply *ασπαζεται υμας η εν Βαβυλωνι συνεκλεκτη, και Μαρκος ο υιος μου.*

<sup>1</sup> Says Eusebius on this point, H. E. ii. 25; *Αμφω γαρ, . . . εις την Ιταλιαν ὁμοσε διδαξαντες, εμαρτυρησαν κατα τον αυτου καιρον.* In which passage I presume that ὁμοσε, according to its usual meaning, is an adverb of *place*, not *time*: and that thus Dionysius only makes the *martyrdom* of Paul and Peter to have synchronized.

<sup>2</sup> This was Caius the Presbyter, of about the date A.D. 200. He is the first that speaks of their tombs as an object of interest to Christian visitors at Rome. *Εγω τα τροπαια των αποστολων εχω δειξει. Εαν γαρ θελησης απελθειν επι τον Βατικανον, η επι την ὁδον την Ωστιαν, ευρησεις τα τροπαια των ταυτην ιδρυσαμενων την εκκλησιαν.* Ap. Euseb. H. E. ii. 25.

<sup>3</sup> Wiseman, *ibid.* See my citation from him, p. 582.

<sup>4</sup> H. E. v. 24.

<sup>5</sup> So, if I remember right, remarks Gibbon.

habet ab apostolis traditionem, et annuntiatam hominibus fidem, per successiones episcoporum pervenientem usque ad nos indicantes, confundimus omnes [sc. hæreticos]. . . . Ad hanc enim ecclesiam, propter potiorem [al. potentiozem] principalitatem, necesse est omnem convenire ecclesiam; hoc est eos qui sunt undique fideles. . . . Fundantes igitur et instruentes beati Apostoli ecclesiam Lino episcopatum administrandæ ecclesiæ tradiderunt. Succedit autem ei Anacletus: post eum, tertio loco ab apostolis, episcopatum sortitur Clemens.”<sup>1</sup>

I have given this passage almost in full, as one rested on perhaps more than any other by the Papal advocates. If I remember right M. De Pradt speaks of Pope Pius VII having referred to it in the Letter written by him to the Emperor Napoleon during his adversity; as the strongest plea he could fall back on, when absolutely forced to look out for what was strongest in favour of the Papal supremacy. But what is the amount of its testimony? 1. From the context itself it is clear that Irenæus refers to *Rome*, the great apostolically founded Church of the West, not as having any superiority to other great apostolically founded Churches, such as those of Antioch or Ephesus; but as the one which, on account of its priority,<sup>1</sup> as well as apostolicity of origin, compared with the other Churches of the West, was to them naturally and properly the centre of reference for information as to apostolic doctrine.—2. Irenæus (like other fathers of the same age)<sup>2</sup> assigns to *Paul and Peter a common propriety* in the act of founding the Church of Rome, and appointing Linus to its Bishoprick.<sup>3</sup> He says not a word of Peter having been himself distinctively Rome’s first Bishop; or of his devolving on Linus

<sup>1</sup> De Hær. iii. 3.

<sup>2</sup> Principalitatem; its priority or primitiveness; not primacy. So Gieseler, i. 97.

<sup>3</sup> E. g. Dionysius of Corinth and Caius, referred to p. 584 *suprà*.

<sup>4</sup> Says Dr. Wiseman; “To Peter, as St. Irenæus observes, succeeded Linus; to Linus Anacletus; then in the third place Clement.” This, as my readers will see by reference to the citation itself, is incorrect. Linus is not spoken of by Irenæus as *successor to Peter*; but that Peter and Paul, *conjointly*, committed the episcopate and administration of the Church to Linus.

The differences of early patristic testimony on this point of the first post-apostolic bishops of Rome, and their ordainers, are well known, and admitted by Bellarmine. Tertullian, it will be seen, makes Clement the one ordained by Peter. The pseudo-Clementine Constitutions, adduced, we saw, as if genuine by Bellarmine, (vii. 46,) make *Linus* to have been ordained Bishop by *Paul*, Clement (coincidentally it would seem) by Peter. By some it is said that Paul ordained a bishop for the Church of the *Gentiles* at Rome; Peter one for that of the *Christianized Jews*. If so, whose successor in the Episcopate ought the Roman bishops subsequently to be counted? Surely of *Paul*, not *Peter*.

his own distinctive prerogative of being Christ's Vice-gerent on earth. Peter and Paul are associated by Irenæus as, in his mind, quite on a par the one with the other:—*a notion incompatible with any recognition of the doctrine of Papal supremacy.* For, according to *it*, as compared with *Peter*, the Church's "pater atque princeps," "non viget quidquid simile aut secundum:" and the language about Paul can only be

"Proximos illi tamen occupavit  
*Paulus* honores."

Irenæus is a decided witness *against*, not *for*, the Papal suprematists.

8. (B.) *Clement of Alexandria.* (A.D. 194.) The testimony of this father is referred to by Bellarmine, as if implying from what is said of Mark's writing his Gospel, under Peter's eye, at Rome, not only Peter's having taught, but having founded, a Church there. This, as bearing indirectly on my present subject, and as connected with the chronological argument in my last Section, I must here just notice. "Peter having publicly preached the word at Rome, many who were there entreated Mark to write the things which had been spoken, he having long accompanied Peter, and retaining what he had said: and, when he had composed the Gospel, he delivered it to them who asked it of him." All well as regards the point of Peter's *some* time teaching at Rome. But at what time? What says Clement just before, as told of by Eusebius? "As to the order in which the four Gospels were written, Clement thus reports the tradition which he had heard from older prebyters:—that the two Gospels which contain the genealogies (viz. those by Matthew and *Luke*) were first written: then that by *Mark*," under the circumstances above mentioned. Now, though the point is one on which decisive evidence is wanting, yet I think that Mill's and Lardner's opinion is most generally followed, which is to the effect that, as the Book of the Acts is almost professedly a sequel to the Gospel by Luke, and the date of his writing of the Acts, by internal evidence, after Paul's first imprisonment at Rome, Luke's Gospel was probably written not long before Paul's emancipation. Thus the Alexandrian Clement's testimony would place both Mark's writing his Gospel, and Peter's preaching at Rome, previously, late down in apostolic times. Irenæus' statement agrees with this; saying that "after the deaths of Peter and Paul Mark, the disciple and interpreter of Peter, delivered to us in writing the

things preached by Peter.”—Thus there is nothing in this contrary to the argument drawn out by me in the last Section, to the effect that Paul preached the Gospel at Rome long before Peter; and was the first Apostolic organizer of the Roman Church.

9. (B. and W.) *Tertullian*; about A.D. 200. After challenging the heretical sects to trace up their Churches, if they could, to Apostles, Tertullian thus contrasts the apostolic origin of the orthodox Churches. “Smyrnæorum ecclesia habens Polycarpum ab Joanne consecratum refert; Romanorum Clementem à Petro ordinatum edit: proinde utique et cæteræ exhibent quos, ab apostolis in Episcopatum constitutos, Apostolici seminis traduces habeant.” So in Ch. 32 of his *De Præscr.*: and in Ch. 36 thus, a little afterwards:—“Percurrere ecclesias Apostolicas, apud quas ipsæ adhuc cathedræ Apostolorum suis locis præsentur . . . Proxima est tibi Achaia, habes Corinthum. Si non longè es à Macedoniâ, habes Philippos, habes Thessalonicenses. Si potes in Asiam tendere, habes Ephesum. Si autem Italiæ adjaces, habes Romam; unde nobis quoque auctoritas præsto est. Ista quàm felix ecclesia cui totam doctrinam Apostoli cum sanguine suo profuderunt: ubi Petrus passioni Dominicæ adæquat; ubi Paulus Joannis exitu coronatur.”

Is there a word here corroboratory of Peter’s asserted Vice-gerency of Christ, or the Papal supremacy? any of Rome being the one centre of authority, guardian of the faith, and mother and mistress of all Churches? Quite the contrary. The reference for the true Christian doctrine is directed to be made to *any* apostolically founded Church: as well to *Ephesus*, once presided over by John, or *Philippi* and *Corinth* founded by Paul, as to *Rome* ennobled, according to Tertullian, by Peter’s and Paul’s martyrdoms.

But De Maistre adds two other citations, as if to his purpose, from Tertullian. 1. *Scorp.* c. 10:—“Si adhuc clausulam putas cælum, memento claves ejus Dominum Petro, et per eum Ecclesiæ reliquisse.” Here, in whatever sense the grant to *Peter* be understood, it is plain that Tertullian considered it to be devolved, *through him*, not on the *Roman Bishop*, but generally on *the Church*. And in what light he regarded anything like the assumption of such power by the Roman Pontiff, as if the head of the Church, and universal bishop, appears abundantly from what he says of some such proud speaking and acting by him, in the 2nd additional citation made most unfortunately



by De Maistre from his *De Pudicitia*, ch. i. "Audio edictum esse propositum, et quidem peremptorium:—Pontifex scilicet Maximus, Episcopus episcoporum, dicit, Ego et mœchiæ et fornicationis delicta pœnitentiâ functis dimitto. O edictum cui ascribi non poterit bonum factum! . . . Absit, absit, ab [ecclésiâ] sponsâ Christi tale præconium!" De Maistre's observation is a little amusing. "Le ton irrité, et même un peu sarcastique, ajoute sans doute au poids du temoignage." Certainly it adds weight to Tertullian's protest against the Roman Bishop's assumption of such rank and authority, as nothing less than a shameless usurpation.

10. (W.) *Origen*. (A.D. 240.)—Says Cardinal Wiseman: <sup>1</sup> "Thus writes the acute and learned Origen; 'What was before granted to Peter seems to have been granted to all: . . . but, as something peculiarly excellent was to be granted to Peter, it was given simply to him, *I will give thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven*. This was done before the words, *Whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth, &c.*, were uttered. And truly, if the words of the Gospel be considered, we shall there find that the last words were common to Peter and the others; but that the former, spoken to Peter, imported a great distinction and superiority.'" —Did then the acute and learned Origen understand this "great distinction and superiority" to have been given to Peter as head and representative of the Bishops of Rome? Listen to his comment on the most famous clause in Matt. xvi. 18, the passage just referred to, I mean, *Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church*. "The rock is every disciple of Christ. If thou thinkest that the whole Church was built by God on Peter alone, what wouldst thou say concerning John the son of thunder, or each other of the apostles? Shall we dare to say that the gates of hell shall only not prevail against Peter; but that against the other apostles and perfect Christians they shall prevail? Or, that to Peter alone are given by Christ the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and that no other of the blessed shall receive them? . . . It is said to Peter, and to every Peter."<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> pp. 276, 277.

<sup>2</sup> Πέτρα γὰρ πας ὁ Χριστὸν μαθητῆς . . . Εἰ δὲ ἐπὶ τοῦ ἑνὸς ἐκεῖνον Πέτρον νομιζοίς ὑπο τοῦ Θεοῦ οἰκοδομεῖσθαι τὴν πᾶσαν ἐκκλησίαν μόνου, τί ἀν φησαίς περὶ Ἰωάννου τοῦ τῆς βροντῆς υἱοῦ, ἢ ἐκαστὸν τῶν Ἀποστόλων; . . . παρωνυμοὶ πέτρας πάντες οἱ μὴ τὰι Χριστοῦ. . . Λέλεκται τῷ Πέτρῳ, καὶ παντὶ Πέτρῳ. Cited by Gieseler i. 154.

Card. Bellarmine (B. i. c. 10) observes on this; "Origenes *allegoricè* exponit hunc locum; non *literaliter*, ut Erasmus somniat!"

What comes of *Origen* as a witness for the Papal supremacy ?

11. (B. and W.) *Cyprian*, about 250. " *Navigare audent ad Petri cathedram, atque ad ecclesiam principalem unde unitas sacerdotalis exorta est ; a schismaticis et profanis literas ferre, nec cogitare eos esse Romanos, quorum fides apostolo prædicante laudata est, ad quos perfidia habere non possit accessum.*"—Here there seems something a little more like a testimony for our Papal advocates. *Cyprian* calls Rome the *see of Peter* ; the chief Church whence sacerdotal unity springs ; and that with the Romans perfidy could make no way. But why did not *Bellarmino* and *Wiseman* add the sentence next but one following :—" *Cum statutum sit ab omnibus nobis, et æquum sit pariter ac justum, ut unius cujusque causa illic audiatur ubi est crimen admissum ; et singulis pastoribus portio gregis sit ascripta, quam regat unusquisque et gubernet, rationem sui actûs Domino redditurus ?*"<sup>1</sup> Why! instead of a witness for *Rome's* supremacy of jurisdiction, *Cyprian* is a most strong witness for *each Bishop's* supremacy of jurisdiction, in his own sphere. Each several Bishop he considered to be in his own diocese the inheritor of that grant to Peter, " *On this rock I will build my Church :*" nor would he admit of the Roman Bishop's interference in his diocese. As to any one calling himself (in the sense of universal ecclesiastical jurisdiction) *Bishop of Bishops*, he declares in solemn Council that it was not an idea to be tolerated ; and that the only tribunal for judging him, or any other Bishop, was that of the Lord Jesus himself.<sup>2</sup>

12. From *Cyprian* Dr. *Wiseman* flies to the *Councils*. And is it then to the first great General Council of the Christian Church, that of *Nice* ? Oh ! no. The Council of *Nice* speaks indeed in its 6th Canon of the Bishops of Rome, and awards them patriarchal dignity, but only on the same footing as the Patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch.<sup>3</sup> The Council of *Nice* is directly *against* the Papal supremacy. And so Dr. *Wiseman* takes refuge in the later and comparatively obscure *Council of Sardica* in Thrace :<sup>4</sup> citing its declaration that there ought to be

<sup>1</sup> Cited by Gieseler, *ibid.* 155.

<sup>2</sup> " *Neque quisquam nostrum episcopum se esse episcoporum constituit : . . . quando habeat omnis episcopus pro licentiâ libertatis et potestatis suæ arbitrium proprium ; tanquam judicari ab alio non possit, cum nec ipse possit alterum judicare. Sed expectemus universi judicium Domini nostri Jesu Christi.*" Alloc. in Council. Carth., A.D. 256. *Ibid.* 154.

<sup>3</sup> Τα αρχαια εθη κρατειτω . . . ὥστε τον Αλεξανδρειας επισκοπον παντων τουτων εχειν την εξουσιαν, επειδη και τω εν τη 'Ρωμη επισκοποι τουτο συνηδες εστιν ὁμοιως δε και κατα την Αντιοχειαν, και εν ταις αλλαις επαρχιαις τα πρεσβειω σωζεσθαι ταις εκκλησιαις.

<sup>4</sup> Held A.D. 344. See Gieseler i. 256, 257.

an appeal "from the priests of the provinces to the *head*, i. e. to the *see of Peter*." Not till the middle of the 4th century, when the apostasy was already rapidly making way, do we find *even thus much* of the Romish Papal Petrine doctrine: and even then, and there, nothing about the *Roman Pope*, in character of Peter's successor, being *Christ's Vice-gerent on earth!*

Thus, *even patristically considered*, we see that it was not till the opening of the 5th century, when the Roman Empire was breaking up into ten kingdoms, (just agreeably with Scripture prophecy,) that the direct doctrine of the Papal supremacy was broached; and so *Antichrist* (in other words *Christ's usurping self-appointed Vicar*) born.<sup>1</sup>

In fine, upon the showing of these Papal champions themselves, there seems nothing left as a foundation-principle for their doctrine but Mr. Newman's *theory of development*:—a theory this which supposes that the Church visible was to contain within itself *a constant power of developing new dogmas*, as time might advance, and circumstances change.<sup>2</sup> But against this (without entering further into its manifest unscripturalness) there stands St. Paul's solemn and emphatic declaration, "Though I, or an angel from heaven, were to preach any other gospel unto you than that we have preached, let him be accursed." For the difference of Paul's preaching and Papal Rome's preaching is palpable. So that either the Spirit of God, thus speaking by Paul (with reverence be it said), must have spoken lies, or else the *dogma* of the Papal supremacy must be a *lie*, a *lie against the Holy Ghost*; and with the curse of God resting on the Church which upholds it. There is indeed one grand system of development that Holy Scripture *does* tell of. But it is the development of *falsehood*, not of gospel-truth: the

<sup>1</sup> Considering all this, and what the earlier fathers' testimony is as to the Papal Petrine theory, not to add that of other fathers elsewhere cited by me as to the true and anti-Papal meaning of Christ's famous words, "Thou art Peter, and unto thee, &c." it is really awful to think of the perjury required of all ministers of the Roman Church on ordination to the Priesthood, in the oath;—"I will never take and interpret the Scriptures otherwise than according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers!"

<sup>2</sup> So, very much, De Maistre ubi supra, before Newman. "The monarchical supremacy of the Sovereign Pontiff was not indeed at its origin what it became some centuries later. But in this precisely does it show itself divine; for everything that exists legitimately, and for ages, exists at first only in the germ, and is *developed* successively."

development of the *mystery of iniquity*, of the *Man of Sin*, and of the *apostasy* to be headed by him on the *Babylon of the seven hills*.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Then, says Dr. Wiseman, (p. 288,) "You must account how the Almighty uniformly made use of this dreadful apostasy, as the only means in his hand to *preserve and disseminate his religion*." Truly he must, in so saying, have reckoned not a little on the credulity of his hearers. Compare my Part iii. Ch. i., and Part iv. Ch. v. § 2, &c., on the *Papal religion*.—As regards its *catholic extension*, to which (p. 290) Dr. W. also refers, is not that predicted of *Antichrist's kingdom*, Apoc. xiii. 3? And as to this its extension, and preservation, being a sign of *Divine Providence* watching with favour over it, (p. 288,) was such the case too with Mahommedism? Let Dr. W. remember what is written, "And he (*the Dragon*) gave him his power, and seat, and *great authority*." Apoc. xviii. 2.

# APPENDIX.

## No. IV.

### WITNESS OF THE REFORMING FATHERS OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND, TO THE FACT OF THE ROMAN POPE BEING THE PREDICTED MAN OF SIN, AND ANTICHRIST.

(See p. 192.)

AT the page referred to I have mentioned Bishop Warburton's testimony to the fact of our Reforming Fathers having regarded Popery as the great predicted Apostasy from the faith, and the *Popes* as the predicted *Man of sin* and *Antichrist*; a testimony cited verbally in a Note at the beginning of Section 5 of the History of Apocalyptic Interpretation in my 4th Volume. An attempt has been made of late to represent the case otherwise; and that the Reformers of our Church did not so regard the *Popes* as *Antichrist*, though they regarded *Papal Rome* as *Babylon*. So the Rev. C. Maitland, in his lately published Book entitled "The Apostolic School of Prophetic Interpretation." Speaking of the opinions held from time to time about the Man of Sin and Antichrist, he says, p. 5, that "the Reformers of England prudently held their ground *in silence*; [i. e. on this point about Antichrist;] confident of one thing only, that Babylon was Rome." An assertion expanded and explained at p. 372:—"The Reformers of England kept closest [i. e. as compared with the Protestants of the Continent] to the primitive teaching: recognising Rome as Babylon: and yet so respecting her worship of the Father and the Son, as to abstain from treating her as Antichrist." Thus Mr. C. Maitland directly opposes himself to Bishop Warburton, as to the matter of fact. The distinction he supposes the English Reformers have made between the religion of the Apocalyptic Babylon, which he makes Popery, and the religion of the Beast Antichrist, which he makes to

be something quite different from, and worse than Popery, is so manifestly absurd, seeing that the Babylonian woman is depicted as riding the Beast Antichrist, in fellowship of the completest intimacy and union, that without further inquiry my readers would probably be well satisfied as to the correctness of Bishop Warburton's statement. The subject is however so important, the times so critical, and the views of the early Reformers and founders of our English Church on the point in question so often overlooked, if not misrepresented, that it seems to me desirable that the truth about it should be fully and plainly stated, and well and universally understood. I subjoin therefore a series of testimonies out of our Reformers on the subject; from Tyndale, the early Translator of the Bible, and one of the protomartyrs of the English Reformation, A.D. 1536, down to the Translators of our version of the Bible in 1611, and Articles of the Irish Church in 1615. With reference to any distinction Mr. C. M. might wish to make between *opinions* thus verbally exprest, and the *course of action* pursued, (not "*treating* the Church of Rome as Antichrist's,") I must beg my readers to remember that *they took, and justified, the mightiest of all steps* that could be taken, that of *separating from her communion*, distinctly on the strength of that opinion.—I give the testimonies chronologically.

1. TYNDALE. (Martyred A.D. 1536.)

"Now, though the Bishop of Rome and his sects give Christ these names, [*Jesus, a Saviour, Christus, King anointed over all men, Emmanuel, God is with us, Sanctus, that is, holy, that halloweth, sanctifieth, and blesseth all nations,*] yet in that they rob him of the effect, and take the significations of his names unto themselves, and make of him but an hypocrite, as they themselves be, they be the right *Antichrists*, and 'deny both the Father and the Son;' for they deny the witness that the Father bare unto the Son, and deprive the Son of all the power and glory that his Father gave him."<sup>1</sup>

2. CRANMER. (Archbishop of Canterbury, 1533; martyred 1555.)

"But the *Romish Antichrist*, to deface this great benefit of Christ, hath taught that his sacrifice upon the cross is not sufficient hereunto, without another sacrifice devised by him, and made by the priest; or else without indulgences, beads, pardons, pilgrimages, and such other pelfry,

<sup>1</sup> Tyndale's Works, Vol. ii. p. 183. (Parker Ed.)

to supply Christ's imperfection: and that Christian people cannot apply to themselves the benefits of Christ's passion, but that the same is in the distribution of the bishop of Rome; or else that by Christ we have no full remission, but be delivered only from sin, and yet remaineth temporal pain in purgatory due for the same; to be remitted after this life by the *Romish Antichrist* and his ministers, who take upon them to do for us that thing which Christ either would not or could not do. O heinous blasphemy, and most detestable injury against Christ! O wicked abomination in the temple of God! O pride intolerable of *Antichrist*, and most manifest token of the *Son of perdition*; extolling himself above God, and with Lucifer exalting his seat and power above the throne of God!"<sup>1</sup>

3. LATIMER. (Bishop of Worcester, 1535—1539; martyred 1555.)

"'Judge not before the Lord's coming.' In this we learn to know *Antichrist*, which doth elevate himself in the Church, and judgeth at his pleasure before the time. His canonizations, and judging of men before the Lord's judgment, be a manifest token of *Antichrist*. How can he know saints? He knoweth not his own heart."<sup>2</sup>

4. RIDLEY. (Bishop of Rochester 1547, and of London, 1550—1553; martyred 1555.)

"The see [of Rome] is the seat of Satan; and the bishop of the same, that maintaineth the abominations thereof, is *Antichrist* himself indeed. And for the same causes this see at this day is the same which St. John called in his Revelation 'Babylon,' or 'the whore of Babylon,' and 'spiritually Sodoma and Ægyptus,' 'the mother of fornications and of the abominations upon the earth.'<sup>3</sup>

5. HOOPER. (Bishop of Gloucester, 1551—1554; martyred 1555.)

"If godly Moses and his brother Aaron never acclaimed this title [to be God's vicar and lieutenant] in the earth, doubtless it is a foul and detestable arrogancy, that these ungodly bishops of Rome attribute unto themselves to be the heads of Christ's Church. . . .

"Because God hath given this light unto my countrymen, which be all persuaded, (or else God sent them to be persuaded,) that [neither] the bishop of Rome, nor none other, is Christ's vicar upon the earth,

<sup>1</sup> Preface to Defence, &c., in Works of Archbishop Cranmer, Vol. i. pp. 5—7. (Parker Ed.)

<sup>2</sup> Third Sermon before Edward VI, in Works of Bishop Latimer, Vol. i. pp. 148, 149. (Parker Ed.)

<sup>3</sup> Farewell Letter, in Works of Bishop Ridley, p. 415. (Parker Ed.)

it is no need to use any long or copious oration : it is so plain that it needeth no probation : the very properties of *Antichrist*, I mean of Christ's great and principal enemy, is so openly known to all men that are not blinded with the smoke of Rome, that they know him to be the Beast that John describeth in the Apocalypse." <sup>1</sup>

6. PHILPOT. (Archdeacon of Winchester; martyred 1555.)

"I doubt not but you have already cast the price of this your building of the house of God, that it is like to be no less than your life ; for I believe (as Paul saith) that God hath appointed us in these latter days like sheep to the slaughter. *Antichrist* is come again ; and he must make a feast to Beelzebub his father of many Christian bodies, for the restoring again of his kingdom. Let us watch and pray, that the same day may not find us unready." <sup>2</sup>

7. BRADFORD. (Prebendary of St. Paul's 1551 ; martyred 1555.)

"This word of God, written by the prophets and apostles, left and contained in the canonical books of the Holy Bible, I do believe to contain plentifully 'all things necessary to salvation,' so that nothing, as necessary to salvation, ought to be added thereto. . . . In testimony of this faith I render and give my life ; being condemned, as well for not acknowledging the *Antichrist of Rome* to be Christ's Vicar-generall, and supreme Head of his Catholic and universal Church, here and elsewhere upon earth, as for denying the horrible and idolatrous doctrine of transubstantiation, and Christ's real, corporal, and carnal presence in his supper, under the forms and accidents of bread and wine." <sup>3</sup>

8. HOMILIES OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND. (Authorized, 1563.)

"Our Saviour Christ and St. Peter teacheth, most earnestly and agreeably, obedience to kings, as to the chief and supreme rulers in this world, next under God. But the bishop of Rome teacheth that they that are under him are free from all burdens and changes of the commonwealth, and obedience towards their prince, most clearly against Christ's doctrine and St. Peter's. He ought therefore rather to be called *Antichrist*, and the successor of the Scribes and Pharisees, than Christ's vicar or St. Peter's successor ; seeing that not only in this point, but also in other weighty matters of Christian religion,—in

<sup>1</sup> Declaration of Christ, Ch. iii. in Early Writings of Bishop Hooper, pp. 22—24. (Parker Ed.)

<sup>2</sup> Letter to Robert Glover, in Writings of Archdeacon Philpot, p. 244. (Parker Ed.)

<sup>3</sup> Farewell to the City of London, in Writings of Bradford, p. 435. (Parker Ed.)



matters of remission and forgiveness of sins, and of salvation,—he teacheth so directly against both St. Peter and against our Saviour Christ: who not only taught obedience to kings, but also practised obedience in their conversation and living; for we read that they both paid tribute to the king.”<sup>1</sup>

“Neither ought miracles to persuade us to do contrary to God’s word; for the Scriptures have for a warning hereof foreshowed, that the kingdom of *Antichrist* shall be mighty ‘in miracles and wonders,’ to the strong illusion of all the reprobate. But in this they pass the folly and wickedness of the Gentiles, that they honour and worship the relics and bones of our saints; which prove that they be mortal men and dead, and therefore no gods to be worshipped; which the Gentiles would never confess of their gods for very shame.”<sup>2</sup>

“The true Church . . . hath always three notes or marks whereby it is known; pure and sound doctrine, the sacraments ministered according to Christ’s holy institution, and the right use of ecclesiastical discipline. . . . Now, if ye will compare this with the Church of Rome,—not as it was in the beginning, but as it is presently, and hath been for the space of nine hundred years and odd,—you shall well perceive the state thereof to be so far wide from the nature of the true Church, that nothing can be more. . . .

The Popes, in not hearing Christ’s voice, as they ought to do, but preferring their own decrees before the express word of God, do plainly argue to the world that they are not of Christ, nor yet possessed with his Spirit. . . . They are worthily accounted among the number of false prophets and false Christs, which deceived the world a long while. The Lord of heaven and earth defend us from their tyranny and pride, that they never enter into his vineyard again: . . . and of his great mercy so work in all men’s hearts, by the mighty power of the Holy Ghost, that the comfortable gospel of his Son Christ may be truly preached, truly received, and truly followed in all places, to the beating down of sin, death, the pope, the devil, and all the kingdom of *Antichrist*!”<sup>3</sup>

9. JEWEL. (Bishop of Salisbury, 1559—1571.)

“Such shall be the power and authority of *Antichrist*; so shall he possess the consciences of the people; so shall he sit as an idol in

<sup>1</sup> Homily of Obedience, Part iii.; Homilies, p. 114. (Ed. Corrie, Cambridge, 1850.)

<sup>2</sup> Homily against Peril of Idolatry, Part iii.; Homilies, p. 234.

<sup>3</sup> Homily for Whitsunday, Part ii.; Homilies, pp. 465, 466, 467, 471.

their hearts ; so shall he stand in the place of God, and ‘ show himself that he is God.’ The people shall receive his doctrine, and believe his word ; they shall fall down before him, and worship him : they shall say, ‘ Who is like unto the beast ? what creature is so beautiful as he ? ’ they shall honour him as God. But what is he which hath suffered himself to be so called ? Who is he which hath been called by the name of God ? . . . who hath been so wicked ? who hath ever so much forgotten himself ? in what place hath he dwelt ? or what hath he been ?—Here methinketh I see the secret motions of your heart. You look that I should name the *Bishop of Rome* ; that it is he which hath suffered himself to be called by the name of God. I will not tell you in mine own words. Unless the bishop himself so speak, I will not tell you. . . Then let us see what he hath written of himself, and what he hath suffered others to write. Pope Nicholas saith, . . . ‘ It is well known that the Pope of the godly prince Constantine was called God.’ . . . In the Extravagants it is set down : *Dominus Deus noster papa* : ‘ Our Lord God the Pope.’<sup>1</sup> Mark these words : ‘ Our Lord God the Pope.’ In them the Pope is called Lord, and is called God. O merciful Lord God, which from thy heavens beholdest this vanity, how great is thy mercy in suffering this ! I devise not this. His own books, his own doctors, his own decrees and decretals speak it, and set it down ;—*Credere Dominum Deum nostrum papam non potuisse statuere, prout statuit, hæreticum censeretur* : ‘ To believe that our God the Pope might not decree as he decreed, it were a matter of heresy.’ It is so written there : he hath heard it, he hath seen it, he knoweth it is so : yet he suffereth it to go abroad, and thereby suffereth himself to be called ‘ God.’ He hath burnt many saints of God, and holy men, for no other cause but for the profession of the Gospel : he hath in many places burnt the Holy Bible, and such books as teach nothing but godliness. Where did he ever burn, (what speak I of burning ?) where may it appear that ever he controlled, any for so writing, or called in such speeches ?<sup>2</sup>

“ Many places of the Holy Scriptures, spoken of Antichrist, seemed in old times to be dark and doubtful ; for that as then it appeared not unto what state and government they might be applied : but

<sup>1</sup> “ Latterly the word *Deus* has been omitted.” Ayre, on Jewel ; Vol. i. p. 96.

<sup>2</sup> Exposition of 1 Thess. ii. 4, in Works of Jewel, Vol. ii. p. 906, 907. (Parker Ed.)

now, by the doctrine and practice of the Church of Rome, to them that have eyes to see, they are as clear and as open as the sun." <sup>1</sup>

"We are not the ministers of *Antichrist*, Master Harding, but the witnesses of the truth of Christ. He is *Antichrist*, as St. Paul showeth you, 'that sitteth in the temple of God, and advanceth himself above all that is called God.' And to speak more particularly of the matter, by St. Gregory's judgment he is *Antichrist*, or 'the forerunner of *Antichrist*, that calleth himself the universal bishop,' and vaunteth himself as 'the king of pride,' and hath 'an army of priests prepared for him,' and setteth himself, as Lucifer, above all his brethren. These be the words of St. Gregory: by such colours he blazed out the kingdom of *Antichrist*. Of him Cardinal Franciscus Zabarella saith thus: . . . 'The Pope doth what him listeth, yea, though it be unlawful, and is more than a God.' This is *Antichrist*, Master Harding, by the judgment of the wise and godly: and the supporters of him, whosoever and wheresoever they be, are the ministers of *Antichrist*.'" <sup>2</sup>

10. BECON. (Chaplain to Archbishop Cranmer, and Prebendary of Canterbury. Died 1567.)

"*Antichrist* hath set up divers sacrifices for sins, but namely that vile and abominable sacrifice of the mass, which he calleth a propitiatory, expiatory, and satisfactory sacrifice for the sins of the quick and the dead, necessary *ad salutem*. This sacrifice he braggeth to be of like dignity, and of equal price, with that sacrifice which Christ the high and everlasting Bishop offered on the altar of the cross, yea, to be the very same: again, that he and his chaplains, in that sacrifice of the idolatrous mass, do daily offer up the Son of God to the Father of heaven for the daily sins of the people. *Antichrist* moreover is not ashamed to say that Christ, by the sacrifice of his death done on the altar of the cross, did only put away original sin; but he and his shavelings, by the sacrifice of their mass, putteth away all other sins at all times, both actual, venial, mortal, &c." <sup>3</sup>

11. SANDYS. (Bishop of Worcester, 1559, of London, 1570, and Archbishop of York, 1576—1588.)

<sup>1</sup> Defence of the Apology; Vol. iv. p. 744.

<sup>2</sup> Defence of the Apology, Part iv. ch. vi. div. 1, in Works of Bishop Jewel, Vol. iv. pp. 673, 674.

<sup>3</sup> The Acts of Christ and of *Antichrist* (which see *passim*), in Works of Becon, Vol. iii. p. 523. (Parker Ed.)

“ Christ proposeth his heavenly treasures, remission of sins, justification, sanctification, mercy, grace, and salvation, freely. He that ‘ sitteth in the temple of God,’ and termeth himself Christ’s Vicar, doth in like sort offer unto the people bread, water, wine, milk, pardon of sins, grace, mercy, and eternal life; but not freely. He is a merchant; he giveth nothing, and that is nothing which he selleth; for, although he make large promises to the buyer, he selleth that which he hath not to deliver. . . . Thus you see a manifest difference between Christ and *Antichrist*.”

“ We that profess Christ and his Gospel are charged with a defection, a schism, and a falling away. . . . We gladly grant that we are fallen away from the Bishop of Rome, who long ago fell from Christ: we do utterly abandon his usurped and proud authority; we have happily forsaken that synagogue of Satan, that den of thieves, that polluted church, that simoniacal temple; and we joyfully confess that we have no society or fellowship with his darkness. In our sermons we preach Christ, and none else but him: . . . and, in yielding up our souls, we flee for mercy only to the merits of Christ Jesus, our merciful Saviour. This is our apostasy. We have forsaken him that hath forsaken God, and whom God hath forsaken: we have left that man of sin, that rose-coloured harlot with whom the kings of the earth have committed fornication, that triple-crowned beast, that double-sworded tyrant, that thief and murderer, who hath robbed so many souls of salvation, and sucked so much innocent blood of Christian martyrs; that adversary unto Christ; that pretended Vicar, who hath displaced the person, not only taking upon him Christ’s room and office, but also boasting himself as if he were a god; and being content of his parasites so to be called. This wicked *Man of sin* is at length revealed by the sincere preaching of the gospel.”<sup>1</sup>

12. FULKE. (Master of Pembroke Hall, Cambridge, 1578—1589.)

“ The second argument is, that *Antichrist* is called ‘ the adversary; ’ and therefore is the greatest enemy of Christ, ‘ denying Jesus Christ to be God and man, or to be our Mediator.’—I answer, the Pope doth so, denying the office of Christ; although, with the devils, he confess in words Jesus to be ‘ the Holy One of God,’ and to be ‘ Christ the Son of God.’ . . . His Divinity the Pope denieth by denying his only power in saving; his wisdom, in his word to be only sufficient;

<sup>1</sup> Sermons of Archbishop Sandys, i. and xx.; pp. 11, 12, 388, 389. (Parker Ed.)

his goodness, in the virtue of his death to take away both pain and guilt of sin; which he arrogateth to himself by his blasphemous pardons. Christ's humanity he denieth by his transubstantiation; his mediation, in which he is principally Christ, he denieth by so many means of salvation as he maketh beside Christ; viz. man's merits, ceremonies invented by man, pardons, a new sacrifice of the mass, &c."

"The city with seven hills is still the see of *Antichrist* described by St. John. . . The see being found, it is easy to find the person by St. Paul's description, and this note especially, that excludeth the heathen tyrants, 'He shall sit in the temple of God.' Which when we see to be fulfilled in the Pope, although none of the eldest fathers could see it, because it was performed after their death, we nothing doubt to say and affirm still, that the Pope is that 'man of sin' and 'son of perdition,' the adversary that lifteth up himself 'above all that is called God,' and shall be destroyed 'by the spirit of the Lord's mouth, and by the glory of his coming.'" <sup>1</sup>

13. WHITGIFT. (Archbishop of Canterbury, 1583—1604.)

"For any thing to be a note of *Antichrist* is not in the nature of any creature in itself; (for to that end nothing was made of God;) but it hangeth altogether of consenting to Antichrist's religion and the professing thereof. The which consent and profession being changed into the consent and profession of Christianity, there can stick in the things themselves no note or mark of Antichrist's religion. The use of bells was a mark of Antichristianity in our churches, when the people by them were called to masses, and when they were rung against tempests. Now they are a token of Christianity, when the people by them are gathered together to the gospel of Christ and other holy actions." <sup>2</sup>

14. HOOKER. (Master of the Temple; died 1600.)

"I permit it to your wise considerations, whether it be more likely, that as phrensy, though itself take away the use of reason, doth notwithstanding prove them reasonable creatures which have it, because none can be frantic but they,—so Antichristianity, being the bane and plain overthrow of Christianity, may nevertheless argue the church wherein *Antichrist* sitteth to be Christian. Neither have I ever hitherto heard or read any one word alleged of force to warrant,

<sup>1</sup> Fulke's Answers, pp. 368, 373. (Parker Ed.)

<sup>2</sup> Whitgift's Defence of the Answer to the Admonition, Tract 7, ch. 5, div. 5, p. 276. (Lond. Byunceman, 1574.)

that God doth otherwise than so as hath been in the two next questions before declared, bind himself to keep his elect from 'worshipping the beast,' and from 'receiving the mark in their foreheads:' but he hath preserved and will preserve them from receiving any deadly wound at the hands of the *Man of sin*; whose deceit hath prevailed over none to death, but only such as 'never loved the truth, such as took pleasure in unrighteousness.' They in all ages whose hearts have delighted in the principal truth, and whose souls have thirsted after righteousness, if they received the mark of error, the mercy of God, even erring, and dangerously erring, might save them: if they received the mark of heresy, the same mercy did, I doubt not, convert them."<sup>1</sup>

15. ANDREWES. (Bishop first of Chichester, then successively of Ely and Winchester. Died A.D. 1626.)

In 1610 he published a work called *Tortura Torti*, in answer to Cardinal Bellarmine's Work in defence of Popery, written by him under the assumed name of Matthew Tortus. The whole object and subject of Andrewes' work is the refutation of Bellarmine; and proof of the Roman Pope's being the *Man of Sin*, and *Antichrist*, of St. Paul's, St. John's, and Daniel's prophecies.

16. TRANSLATORS OF THE AUTHORIZED ENGLISH VERSION OF THE BIBLE. (A.D. 1611.)

"Their contentment every day increaseth and taketh strength, when they observe that the zeal of your Majesty toward the house of God doth not slack or go backward, but is more and more kindled; manifesting itself abroad in the farthest parts of Christendom, by writing in defence of the truth; which hath given such a blow unto that *Man of Sin* as will not be healed."<sup>2</sup>

17. ARTICLES OF THE IRISH CHURCH. (Agreed on by the Archbishops, Bishops, and rest of the Clergy of Ireland, in Convocation at Dublin, A.D. 1615.)

"§ 80. The Bishop of Rome is so far from being the supreme head of the universal Church of Christ, that his works and doctrine do

<sup>1</sup> Sermon on Justification, sect. 27, in Works of Hooker, Vol. iv. pp. 653, 654. (Ed. Keble, Oxf. 1836.) It may be useful to compare the above passage from Hooker with the extract and argument from Dr. S. R. Maitland, cited pp. 295, 296, *suprà*.—Also let me ask how, such being Hooker's declared opinion, Mr. C. Maitland, at p. 372, could allow himself by a partial citation to give his less informed readers the impression of Hooker having been satirical on the very idea of the Pope's being Antichrist?

<sup>2</sup> Epistle Dedicatory to King James I.

plainly discover him to be that *Man of Sin* foretold of in the Holy Scriptures, whom the Lord shall consume with the Spirit of his mouth, and shall abolish with the brightness of his coming.”<sup>1</sup>

---

Citations similar to the above might be multiplied almost indefinitely.<sup>2</sup> But the above are abundantly sufficient to show that the Reformers of the English Church, all through the 16th century, were just as decided as the Continental Reformers in their opinion as to the *Popes of Rome* being the great predicted *Antichrist*, and *Man of Sin*. As to the time at which opinion began to change on this point in the Church of England, my readers will find information in the following very interesting Letter from Barlow, Bishop of Lincoln, to the Earl of Anglesey in the reign of Charles the 2nd: a letter written in answer to two questions that the Earl had put to him;—the one, *Whether the Pope be Antichrist?* the other, *Whether salvation may be had in the Church of Rome?*

After saying, in answer to the *former* question, “I do really believe the *Pope* to be *Antichrist*,” he thus proceeds to state the opinions of the English Fathers about it.<sup>3</sup>

“The most learned and pious divines of England ever since the Reformation, (and of foreign Churches too,) have been of the same opinion, and judged the *Pope* to be *Antichrist*. So Jewel, Reynolds, Whittaker, Ussher, &c. The translators of our Bible into English, in King James his time, call the *Pope* that *Man of Sin*. And in both

<sup>1</sup> Confession of Protestant Churches, p. 22. (Ed. Dublin, 1835.)

The Articles of the Episcopal Church of Ireland were drawn up by the illustrious *Ussher*, then Professor of Divinity in Trinity College, Dublin. The Irish Church was then a distinct and independent national Church: but it was in intimate connexion with the Church of England; and included almost *verbatim* the famous *nine Lambeth Articles*, drawn up at Lambeth Palace under the direction of Archbishop Whitgift. *Ibid.* Pref. xi.

<sup>2</sup> *Ussher* himself thus writes on the point. “As Christ is the head of the Church which is his body, so *Antichrist* is the head of the Romish Church, which is his body. And this Antichrist is one who, under colour of being for Christ, and under the title of his Vice-gerent, exalteth himself above and against Christ: opposing himself unto him in all his offices and ordinances, both in Church and Commonwealth: bearing authority in the Church of God: ruling over that city with seven hills which did bear rule over nations, and put our Lord to death: a man of sin, a harlot, a mother of spiritual fornications to the kings and people of the nations, a child of perdition, and a destroyer; establishing himself by lying miracles and false wonders. All which marks together do agree with none but the *Pope of Rome*.” *Ussher's Body of Divinity*, p. 412. Edit. London, 1677.

<sup>3</sup> I copy from the Letter as given in the *Dublin Examiner* for 1839, pp. 379, 380.

our Universities the question *An Papa sit Antichristus* was constantly held *affirmative*; as appears by their questions disputed in their public Acts and Commencements, which are extant in print. I have heard it so held in Oxon many times between the years 1624 and 1633. The first who publicly denied the Pope to be Antichrist in Oxon was my late Lord Archbishop, Dr. Sheldon. The Doctor of the Chair (Dr. Prideaux) wondering at it said, *Quid mi fili; negas Papam esse Antichristum?* Dr. Sheldon answered, *Etiam, nego.* Dr. Prideaux replied; *Profecto, multum tibi debet Pontifex Romanus: nullus dubito quin pileo Cardinalitio te donabit.* After this Dr. Hammond denied *the Pope*, and affirmed *Simon Magus*, to be *Antichrist*.<sup>1</sup>

“But, which is much more, the Church of England has in her Homilies, confirmed by Acts of Parliament and Convocation, and subscribed by all the Clergy and all Graduates in the Universities, declared the Pope to be Antichrist. And then I desire to know whether they be true and obedient sons of the Church of England, who publicly deny her established doctrine, which they had before publicly subscribed?”

<sup>1</sup> Compare the account of this change of opinion given from Cressener in my History of Apocalyptic Interpretation, Vol. iv.



# APPENDIX.

No. V.

## ON THE WORD שָׁבִיעַ<sup>1</sup>

(See page 275.)

THE object of this inquiry is to endeavour to determine the *biblical* meaning of the word שָׁבִיעַ, i. e. whether it signify uniformly (like the word "*week*," by which it is translated) a period of seven *days*, or whether it signify a hebdomad of *days, weeks, months, or years* to be determined by the context in which it occurs.

The word שָׁבִיעַ, according to the Masoretic punctuation, occurs in its various forms all together 20 times in the Old Testament writings. Of these 20 cases, we may, I think, exclude from our consideration Ezek. xlv. 21, הַגְּ שִׁבְעוֹת יָמִים, because there is both internal and external evidence against the present reading; inasmuch as (1.) the feast of the passover was a feast of only seven days' duration, and therefore could not be designated "a feast of *weeks* of days;" and (2.) there is another reading שִׁבְעַת יָמִים (as Arch. Secker informs us), by which words the duration of this feast is elsewhere commonly expressed: which reading our own translators appear to have followed, their rendering being "a feast of seven days." Nineteen cases therefore remain for examination; in 17 of which the word שָׁבִיעַ is used absolutely, and in two of which it is used with the addition of the word יָמִים (days).

(1.) and (2.) The word occurs for the first time in Gen. xxix. 27, 28, with reference to Jacob's fulfilling the week of Leah before Rachel was given to him in marriage. "Fulfil her week," &c. &c.

It has been alleged that the word שָׁבִיעַ, may in this place refer to

<sup>1</sup> I am indebted for this paper to the Rev. C. J. Elliott, Vicar of Winkfield, near Windsor, and some time Hebrew University Scholar at Cambridge.

the second period of seven *years*, during which Jacob served Laban, and not to the seven *days* during which the marriage feast lasted.

But, if we refer to Gen. xxxi. 41, we shall find that Jacob served Laban only 20 years in all; viz. 14 years for his two daughters, and six years for the cattle.

Again we find, from Gen. xxx. 25, that when Jacob *began* to serve Laban for the cattle, i. e. *at the end of the 14 years' servitude*, Joseph was already born; and hence, inasmuch as Rachel had been long barren, she must have been given to Jacob a considerable time before the completion of the second hebdomad of years, to which the word שָׁבוּעַ in these places has been thought by some to refer. It follows, therefore, that the word שָׁבוּעַ must be understood with reference to the seven days' duration of the marriage-feast (see Judges xiv. 12), and not to the second seven years of Jacob's service.

(3.) The next passage for examination is Lev. xii. 5, וְיִטְמָאָה שְׁבַע יָמִים, "then she shall be unclean two weeks."

It has been suggested that יָמִים "days" may be here understood, the words שְׁבַע יָמִים having been used in ver. 2.

To this suggestion, however, it will suffice to state in answer that the word שְׁבַע יָמִים is the constructive state of the cardinal number שֶׁבַע "seven;" whilst the word שְׁבַע יָמִים is the dual form (absolute) of the noun שָׁבוּעַ, "a week." The translation "two sevens, i. e. (of days)" is therefore utterly inadmissible; and the correctness of the authorized version needs no further vindication.

(4.) (5.) (6.) and (7.) With reference to the passages, four in number, in which the words חַג שְׁבֻעֹת, or חַג הַשְּׁבֻעֹת occur, viz. Exod. xxxiv. 22, Deut. xvi. 10, 16, and 2 Chron. viii. 13, it may suffice to observe that as the "feast of weeks" derived its name from the time appointed for its observance, viz. seven weeks, or a week of weeks, from the day in which the sheaf of the firstfruits of the barley-harvest was offered, it may be inferred not only that the mode of calculating time by weeks was familiar to the Jews; (which mode of calculation renders it improbable that there should be no word in the Hebrew tongue corresponding to the word "week;") but, also, that the word שָׁבוּעַ, without any qualification or explanation, was a word understood by them as denoting simply and absolutely a period of seven natural days.

(8.) and (9.) This inference will be strongly confirmed by the use of the word, in the same connexion, in Deut. xvi. 9, where it occurs

twice; "Seven *weeks* (שָׁבוּעַת) shalt thou number unto thee: begin to number the seven *weeks* (שָׁבוּעוֹת) from such time as thou beginnest to put the sickle to the corn." It is almost too obvious to admit of proof that the word שָׁבוּעַ is here used in the precise and determinate signification of a period of seven days; for if we substitute for the word "*weeks*" the word "hebdomads" or "sevens" in a passage, the purport of which is to determine the *precise period* at which a particular festival was to be observed, such substitution will scarcely fail to convince the stoutest defenders of the ambiguity of the word שָׁבוּעַ, that it must have conveyed to the ears of those to whom the precept was addressed, not a variable and doubtful, but a fixed and determinate signification.

(10.) and (11.) The same remark will apply to the use of the word שָׁבוּעַ in Numbers xxviii. 26, בַּשָּׁבוּעוֹתֶיכֶם, "when your weeks be out;" and in Jer. v. 24, שָׁבוּעַת הַקָּצִיר, "the appointed weeks of harvest," or the weeks of the laws, i. e. the legitimate weeks of harvest, with reference in the former case to the period of the observance of the same festival of weeks or wheat-harvest, and in the latter, probably, to the interval of seven weeks between the day of the presentation of the firstfruits of barley and of those of wheat harvest.

(12—17.) Having now examined all the passages in the other books of the Old Testament in which the word שָׁבוּעַ occurs, and having found that in every case (if Ezek. xlv. 21 be rightly excluded) it is used, *without the addition of any qualifying word denoting time*, as a natural week of seven days' duration, we should, I think, be fairly entitled to assume that in the six cases in which it is found in the 24th, 25th, 26th, and 27th verses of Daniel ix., it ought to be rendered, as it is in our authorized version, by the word "week," and not by the ambiguous word "hebdomad," and that if the accomplishment of the prophecy show that 490 *years*, not *days*, must be understood by the "70 weeks," some more satisfactory solution of the difficulty must be sought, than the alleged ambiguity of the word employed.

But we are here met by the objection, that in the other two cases in which the word שָׁבוּעַ occurs in the prophecies of Daniel, viz. x. 2, 3, it is no longer, as in the instances already cited, and in which alone it occurs in the other books of the Old Testament, used absolutely, but with the addition of the qualifying word יָמִים *days*. The passages are these: ver. 2, "In those days I, Daniel, was mourn-

ing three full weeks," *שְׁלֹשָׁה שָׁבוּעִים יָמִים*, literally three weeks, days; and in the following verse, "Till three whole weeks were fulfilled," *עַד מְלֵאֵת שְׁלֹשֶׁת שָׁבוּעִים יָמִים*, literally until the fulfilment of a triad of weeks, days. Now had these passages admitted of the translation, (which is given to the former of them in the marginal reading of our Bibles,) "weeks of days," they might, I think, be fairly adduced in proof of the ambiguity of the word *שָׁבוּעַ*, and the correctness of the rendering "hebdomad," whether of days, weeks, months, or years, as the context might determine.

But inasmuch as in both places the word *שָׁבוּעִים* is in the *absolute* and not the *constructive* state; the translation "weeks of days" is altogether inadmissible, and the word *יָמִים* must be regarded as standing in apposition with the preceding word *שָׁבוּעִים*, and rendered "three weeks, days, or, as in our authorized translation, "three full" or *whole* "weeks."

The correctness of this translation (unless, indeed, the word *יָמִים* be simply pleonastic) will at once appear upon a comparison of these passages with others, in which the word *יָמִים* is similarly used in conjunction with other words denoting time. Thus we read, Gen. xxix. 14, that Jacob abode with Laban "the space of a month," *יָמִים הַדָּשׁ*, literally a month, days, or, *possibly*, as the marginal reading is, "a month of days;" the word *הַדָּשׁ* retaining the same form in its constructive as in its absolute state.

Again, we read Gen. xli. 1, that "it came to pass at the end of *two full years* (*שְׁנַתַּיִם יָמִים*), literally two years, days, that Pharaoh dreamed;" the word *יָמִים* being here, as in Dan. x. 2, 3, in apposition with the preceding word *שְׁנַתַּיִם*. To these instances may be added Numbers xi. 20, 21, "a whole month," *יָמִים הַדָּשׁ*; 2 Sam. xiii. 23, "two full years," *לְשְׁנַתַּיִם יָמִים*; Jer. xxviii. 3, "two full years," *שְׁנַתַּיִם יָמִים*, &c. &c.; from all which passages it will appear that the addition of the word *יָמִים* to nouns denoting time, is in accordance with the idiom of the language, and must be understood, not as implying any ambiguity in the meaning of the word which precedes it, but either pleonastically or as marking the completion of the full period which the words denote.

The result of the whole inquiry is, that the word *שָׁבוּעַ* appears to be invariably used in the fixed and determinate signification of a week of seven natural days, and that the addition in two instances out of 19 of the word *יָמִים* affords no stronger proof of the ambi-

guity of the period denoted by the word שָׁבוּעַ, than its precisely parallel use in conjunction with חֹדֶשׁ (a month), and שָׁנָה (a year), affords of the ambiguity of the periods which those words uniformly and invariably denote, whether found with or without the addition of יָמִים.

# APPENDIX.

## No. VI.

### ON LÜCKE'S COUNTER-PAPAL THEORY OF THE ANTICHRIST.

THE respect that I feel due to the eminent German theologian above-mentioned induces me not to pass in silence over his counter-view to my own on the great subject of *Antichrist*:—I say, generally, the respect due to himself; for certainly, on the particular subject referred to, his opinion seems to me to be markedly characterized by a want of reasonableness and good sense. Professor Lücke's theory is given us in his Commentary on St. John's Epistles, and has special reference to the *Antichrist* there spoken of.<sup>1</sup>

The three passages in St. John's Epistles which speak of Antichrist have been already cited by me at pp. 101—107 *suprà*; and must be referred to by my readers, in order to the better understanding of my abstract of Lücke's exposition of them. It is to the effect following.

The idea of *Antichrist* travelled down from the Old Testament times and theology, though not without some changes, into the Christian times and theology: and was in either connected with certain current views as to a twofold grand division of the world's chronology. The Jewish doctors divided the entire time of the world's duration (*τοῦ αἰῶνος*) into the *present* and the *future* æon; the *present* being that previous to Messiah's manifestation; the *future* that of Messiah's reign of blessedness. Towards the close of the present æra an increased prevalence was expected by them of evils moral, political, and physi-

<sup>1</sup> I use Repp's Translation, in Clarke's Biblical Cabinet.

cal; including false prophets, moral corruption of men, wars, &c.: evils that externally, it might be thought, would be a hindrance to Messiah's manifestation; but which would in fact be a sign of its being near at hand. And "as all felicity was connected with the person of Messiah, so there arose early a notion of combining in one ideal person a *counterpart of Messiah* (afterwards called *Antichrist*) all the calamities of the above-mentioned evil times:—a notion founded on Ezekiel's fiction of Gog, and on Daniel's description of the antichristian Antiochus Epiphanes."<sup>1</sup>—After Jesus Christ's death and ascension the Christians extended the world's *present æon* (*αἰὼν οὖτος*), so as to include the time of the earthly establishment and development of Christ's kingdom in the Church's state of militancy: St. John's *last hour* (*εσχάτη ὥρα*) being the closing time of this its period of militancy; and the immediate precursor of Christ's reappearance in glory, to judge the world, and accomplish the victory of his kingdom. At the first the apostles had formed a very *material* conception of *this the re-appearance of Christ*: expecting it soon, making chronological calculations about it, and reckoning that in the destruction of Jerusalem there would occur his visible manifestation and final œcumenic judgment. But after the destruction of Jerusalem they gained a more profound knowledge of the purport of Christ's kingdom: and, though still with the hope of surviving to witness personally Christ's return from heaven, yet they ceased to calculate times, and understood the *parousia* (Christ's re-manifestation) more and more in a spiritual sense. Thus in the Apocalypse we find a more material representation of the subject. But in his Epistles (which Lücke supposes of later date than the Apocalypse) St. John takes a more elevated view of it; seeming to think it near indeed in regard of time, but with no such idea of it as might please the senses.—In similar manner the Apostles' view of the *Antichrist* changed and progressed. At first they took up the idea sensually, politically, and according to Jewish doctrines: but by degrees they came to regard it in a more spiritual point of view. In Matt. xxiv. Christ himself had foretold of pseudo-prophets in his Church. In Acts xx. 29, and 2 Tim. iii. 1, St. Paul had predicted the growing corruption of the antichristian *ψευδός*. And when these corruptions, at the time of St. John's Epistle, had increased, he reminds the disciples that the phenomenon was none

<sup>1</sup> pp. 168—172; also p. 48.

other than what had been predicted; that Antichrist, as they knew, was to come; St. Paul having in 2 Thess. ii. expressly declared that before Christ's manifestation there must be that of Antichrist: and from the fact of there being then many antichristian heretics, he infers the presence of the Antichrist *κατ' ἐξοχήν*; and that, consequently, the time then present must be *the last hour*, and Christ's second coming near at hand.<sup>1</sup>

Lücke here enters shortly on the more proper intent of the word *αντιχριστος*. From its etymology Grotius had explained it to mean "*qui se Christum facit*," a pretended *soi-disant* Christ: somewhat as the similar compound *αντιβασιλευς*, one *qui falso se regem dicit*, a false or pretended king. To which Lücke objects that this is incorrect; and that *αντιβασιλευς* means rather an *opposition-king*, a *counter-king*; just as the parallel compounds *αντιδικος* and *αντιμαχος*; and as *αντιθεος* also is used sometimes, viz. in the sense of a *counter-God*.<sup>2</sup> At the same time he observes that the use of *αντιλεων* in the sense *like a lion*, and *αντιθεος* *like a god*, might favour Grotius' view: and adds moreover that both Hippolytus and the Acta Martyr. explain the word *Antichrist* as *quasi Christus*. But this, he says, being a later explanation, proves nothing respecting St. John's use of the word. It seems in St. John's Epistles to answer to St. Paul's *αντικειμενος*, (2 Thess. ii. 4,) *he that opposeth*; being a principle of *opposition to Christ and Christ's truth*. There is however this distinction between St. Paul's view ("which belongs to an earlier stage of the notion") and St. John's;—that St. Paul seems to mean a hostile persecuting heathen principle *without* the communion of the Church, the external opposition of non-Christianity against Christianity; while St. John means the principle of falsehood and heretical seduction, resisting Christ's gospel truth, *within* the Church; "the internal antithesis among Christians themselves between the true faith and its counterfeit."<sup>3</sup>

And what the form of antichristian falsehood and counterfeit then chiefly prevalent, and more particularly alluded to by St. John? It is that of *doketic Gnosticism*: a system which by denying Jesus Christ's having come in the flesh, in other words his proper humanity,

<sup>1</sup> pp. 172—175.

<sup>2</sup> pp. 176, 177. See for a fuller view of the etymological subject my Vol. i. pp. 66, 67; also pp. 104, 105 *suprà*.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid*.



denied the Messianic character and dignity of Jesus;—a denial which is the very essence of anti-Christianity; as it makes Jesus Christ's atoning death and redemption of men to be merely ideal: although, Lücke repeats, these pseudo-apostolic or pseudo-prophetic Antichrists of the doketic Gnostic sects continued by profession within the Christian communion; and boasted indeed of a purer and more speculative knowledge of God than other Christians.<sup>1</sup> So in particular. The source however of all this antichristian disorder is, according to St. John, *the world*, (κοσμος,) *the antichristian world*: there being meant by the word all ungodly habits and modes of thought and mind which were under the sway of the Prince of this world; as well as, generally and historically speaking, the then existing antichristian systems of Judaism and Paganism.<sup>2</sup>

The above is a sketch of Lücke's explanation of the subject, pretty much in his own words. And I must confess, after abstracting it, to anything but a clear comprehension on more than one point of Lücke's meaning.—Thus, first, I find it difficult to understand what Lücke regards as the right idea of *Christ's epiphany*; that epiphany, or manifestation, the brightness of which, according to St. Paul, (conjointly with Daniel and the Apocalyptic St. John,) is to be the destruction of Antichrist. For he ascribes "*material*" conceptions of it to those who wrote before the fall of Jerusalem, i. e. to all the New Testament writers except St. John:—this material view including a calculation of chronological periods, watching the signs of the times, and expecting both that it was near and that there was that in it which would please the senses; while they who wrote after the fall of Jerusalem, in Lücke's opinion, viz. St. John in his Epistles, exhibited a *much more profound* and *spiritual* view of it. Yet, for my own part, I am unable to see in St. John any different idea of Christ's coming, and the blessings it was to bring, from what is express by Paul or Peter.—Again, in regard of *Antichrist*, I can see no difference of opinion, such as Lücke supposes, in what is said about him by Paul and by St. John. For, seeing that Paul's Antichrist was to sit *in the temple of God*, or *Christian professing Church*, (such, I presume, being Lücke's view of the phrase, as well as Hengstenberg's, not that of *a temple at Jerusalem*.) Paul's Antichrist was thereby defined as an *internal* enemy, within the communion of the Church

<sup>1</sup> pp. 80, 81.

<sup>2</sup> pp. 63—65; also 162, 163.

visible, just as much as St. John's.—As to Lücke's idea that from the fact of there being then many lesser Antichrists, such as the doctetic Gnostics, St. John inferred the fact of the already accomplished coming and presence of the great predicted Antichrist, it is but the mere expression of his opinion. He gives no argument for it; and I feel persuaded could give none.—The way moreover in which he speaks of the notion about Antichrist as if originally, to no inconsiderable extent at least, a mere Jewish "*notion*," that past downwards into the Christian Church, and even in the apostolic times and apostolic minds was very shifting, very uncertain, very changeable, till at length (being more profoundly appreciated by St. John) it with him settled down into the vague spiritual notion of its being *the Christ-opposing principle of man's evil nature* and of *an evil world*,—this appears to me an opinion altogether unfounded, and most objectionable.

It was evidently from Daniel's prophecies that the idea was primarily derived by the apostles: and then (with clearer light, not vaguer, from the Holy Spirit) recognized by them, and set forth to the disciples, as a divine and most solemn prediction. More especially what was said in Dan. vii. about the *little horn* of Daniel's 4th dominant Beast, (well understood to be the Roman empire,) and in Dan. xi. about the king that was to exalt himself above every god, furnished the chief data. And of these the former, more especially, was understood to mark the due order of the chronology; viz. after the 4th great empire, that of *Rome*, had broken up into its last or ten-horned form. Thus all was *definite* in the original prophecies:—definite as to *order of time*; definite too as to both the *personality* and the *local seat* of the predicted enemy. And, as Daniel had marked the breaking up of the Roman empire from its primary form to be a necessary preliminary, so Paul declared that till that *let* was removed, *the little horn*, that same person and power that would exalt himself above every god, would not appear.—All, I say, was here definite: nothing indefinite, so as in Lücke's idea of *Antichrist*.

But what of St. John's saying, "We know that it is *the last time*, because there are already *many Antichrists*"? The question is an interesting one; and one on which I have scarcely entered elsewhere. Let me then thus very briefly here express my view of it.

Well has Schlegel said that there can be no philosophy of the his-

tory of our world without a recognition of the acting and the power, all through, of the *Spirit of Evil*. Essentially the enemy of God, it was in that character that he first seduced man from his allegiance to God. And in the same spirit, when men multiplied on the face of the earth, he deceived them to worship *anti-gods*, instead of the true God. Hitherto it was as a pure Spirit that God had been revealed to man;—viz. as the Creator Spirit, and the Spirit of Providence. So the *anti-gods* then set forth in *God's place* were depicted to deluded man's imagination correspondingly; i. e. as *incorporeal invisible vice-gods acting in creation*, and *incorporeal vice-gods acting in the governance of the world*. And as, in this character, they received men's worship, they became in fact *anti-gods* in the other sense too of the compound; i. e. *opposition-gods* to the true God.—So the *first ages* of the world past away.—Then came the world's *later* or *Messianic age*. God had now manifested himself in the immeasurably more glorious character of *God-man* the Saviour; and so fulfilling the functions, in order to save him, of man's *prophet, priest, and king*. Then began Satan's substitution of *counterfeits* and *opposers* here too;—of *anti-christs* at first on a *smaller scale*: but with the plan in his mind never forgotten of a mightier and more perfect Antichrist; that which was the special subject of Daniel's and St. Paul's prophecies. The doketic Gnostics set aside Jesus Christ in his *prophetic* character very specially; though not in that alone indeed.<sup>1</sup> They were Satan's preliminarily suggested and imperfect *vice-Christ*s and *opposition-Christ*s. In this character John recognised them; and as the concomitants and signs of the world's *last age or hour*. But only preliminarily to the great Antichrist:—him whose birth was to be ushered in by two signs of quite different and independent character; viz. the *religious* sign of *corruption within the Church working into an apostasy from the faith*; (from the *faith*,<sup>2</sup> not from the *Church visible*;) the *political* sign of *the Roman empire breaking up into ten kingdoms*.—All which was well understood by the primitive fathers of the first three centuries, as we have seen; and the signs watched for accordingly by them with intense interest. And when at length apostasy so rose within the Church visible, and the Roman empire too so broke up, then (as had been pretty much anticipated) came *he of Rome*, the Bishop on the seven hills, the usurping *vice-Christ* and *opposition-Christ*; usurping

<sup>1</sup> See Vol. i. p. 63.

<sup>2</sup> So 1 Tim. iv. 1.

Christ's place alike as *Prophet, Priest, and King*; and fulfilling, and (as I have said elsewhere) almost more than fulfilling, all that was predicted of the great Antichrist;—the *Man-God* in the place of the *God-Man*.<sup>1</sup>

The point in Lücke's comment on St. John's Epistles which to my own mind seems the most true, most valuable, most interesting, is the manner in which he develops and insists on the true Christian's *inward experimental light from the teaching of God's Spirit*,—the light of truth and light of love,—as alike their privilege and their safeguard from the seductions around them. And truly, as it was then, so it is now. Not the so-called *Pope*, nor the so-called *Church*, or so-called *Priests*,—but *Christ himself*, by the direct influence of his Spirit, is the life, light, and salvation of each *true* disciple. “Ye have an unction from the Holy One, and understand all things.”<sup>2</sup> “He that is born of God keepeth himself, and the Wicked One toucheth him not.” “He that hath the Son hath life; and He that hath not the Son of God hath not life.”<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See my p. 185 *suprà*.

<sup>2</sup> Compare my remarks Vol. i. p. 273.

<sup>3</sup> A notice of other chief counterviews to the common Protestant view of Antichrist, such as are unfolded in comments on the *Apocalyptic* prophecy, will be given in my critical notices of those comments in the Appendix to my ivth Volume.

# APPENDIX.

## No. VII.

PARALLELISM BETWEEN THE OUT-SPEAKING AGAINST CHRISTIAN TRUTH OF THE MODERN INFIDEL SPIRIT, AND THAT OF THE DRAGON OF ROMAN HEATHENISM IN THE THREE CENTURIES OF ITS CONFLICT WITH CHRISTIANITY.

(See pp. 500, 501.)

AT the passage above referred to it has been intimated by me that it is not merely the imperial persecution of Christians by *heathen Roman Emperors*, or their renewed battling for a while afterwards under Julian for the old supremacy, when that supremacy had been in part taken from them by other and Christian emperors, that is to be considered as exhibiting the spirit of the symbolic *Dragon* of Roman Paganism figured in Apoc. xii.; but also the speakings and writings of the *heathen philosophers* during that same period against Christianity. Of their *actings* from early times in stirring up the populace and the provincial authorities to persecute Christians I have spoken briefly and generally in my chapter on the 5th Seal;<sup>1</sup> and in my chapter on the three spirits like frogs, in the present volume, have also noted certain not unparallel *actings* of the same spirit within our own times, alike in England and elsewhere, since the commencement of the palpable drying up of the waters of the

<sup>1</sup> See my Vol. i. p. 213.—Of the manner in which the Draconic spirit used such as remained of influential heathens, whether philosophers or others, as its mouth-piece, to invite the invasion of the professedly Christianized empire by floods of barbarian Pagans or Arians, even as ready to give up the whole Roman social system to ruin, if Christianity might but perish in the ruins of society, the reader may remember the illustrations offered in the 2nd Chapter of this Volume, pp. 61, 62, from Augustine's high contemporary authority.

mystic Euphrates. But of its ancient writings and arguments against the truths of Christianity,<sup>1</sup> with appeal to the reason and intellect of the intellectual,<sup>2</sup> and the parallelism on this head too between it and the spirit which has spoken in the writings of modern sceptics, I have said but little. And I propose, therefore, in this Paper to supply the omission, and to trace the parallelism.

Of course I take *Celsus*, *Porphry*, and *Julian* as the chief and fittest representatives of the old heathen Draconic spirit in this point of view.<sup>3</sup> Of the same spirit in modern times, (while not forgetting the infidel *Voltaire* and his associated *Encyclopedists* of the French revolutionary æra,—writers however who, from the terrible effects of their principles as soon afterwards developed in the tragedies of the Revolution, seemed for a while at the beginning of the present century to be very much dreaded, and set aside,<sup>4</sup>) I may specify such German writers as *Wegscheider*, *Strauss*, &c., as fit representatives in the earlier half of the period now more particularly under review; and, during the latter half and in our own language or country, *Theodore Parker*, *Mr. F. Newman*, *Mr. Greg*, and (strange to say, considering their position in the Church of England) the writers of the seven "*Essays and Reviews*" now so notorious, regarded conjointly, and as a whole.

1. And in the 1st place, and as preliminary to my more particular statements and points of comparison, let me beg my readers to note how alike in the one case and the other *human reason and intellect* have been made the *one* court of appeal; to the exclusion not merely of reference to God as the needed enlightener of human reason in its search after Divine truth, (which from *heathen* sceptics could scarce be expected,) but also to the exclusion very much of the voice of what in every age must have been recognized as equally parts of the moral constitution given by God to man, I mean the *conscience* and the *heart*:—the *heart* with its upward aspirations, craving after the knowledge of its Creator, God; the *conscience*, with its instinctive sense of right and wrong, suggesting man's sinful-

<sup>1</sup> See my allusions to these writings, pp. 497, 498, *suprà*.

<sup>2</sup> "While the ancient world, in order to maintain itself on its own religious foundation, was endeavouring to suppress Christianity by force, intellectual weapons too were combined with outward violence in attacking the new principle, which had begun to reveal its power in human life." Neander, Ch. Hist. i. 214.

<sup>3</sup> Let me refer to Lardner's and Neander's abstracts of the opinions of these ancient sceptics, as my chief authorities on this head.

<sup>4</sup> See pp. 412, 501, *suprà*.

ness as the origin and cause of the Deity's hiding himself from him.<sup>1</sup> "In the Platonic philosophy," says Neander,<sup>2</sup> "everything is referred back to the intellectual element, to knowledge in religion; and the deeper practical ground of religious conviction and the religious life, and their connexion with the moral bent of the affections, is overlooked." So, too, it was the theory of the Neo-Platonism which Celsus affected, and of which Porphyry and other contemporary or nearly contemporary heathen assailants of Christianity were for the most part disciples, that all essential religious truth was to be derived from the soul, and its direct inward perceptions; (the philosopher's soul of course, not that of the vulgar;) so that man's abstract intuitive knowledge or ideal of God, that Being of beings, TO ON, the absolute and infinite One, through the eye of the mind, was to be opposed and preferred to a religion based essentially, like that of Judaism or Christianity, on historic facts and moral considerations.<sup>3</sup> For there was held by the old Pagan Draconic philosophy not merely the general pantheistic notion of a Divine *soul of the world*, but specially the pantheistic idea of a Divine principle in the *κοσμος νοητος*, or *invisible world of mind and intelligence*.

The same characteristic attaches to the modern infidel school. By it the so-called *subjective* or *internal rationalistic* view is made the *one* grand source and test of Divine knowledge.<sup>4</sup> The very appellation of *Rationalists* assumed by them shows that this characteristic is their boast; and alike by one and all the principle is acted out. As regards Christ himself, says Strauss, "I know in what I have believed; namely, a *subjective*, not an *objective* Christ."<sup>5</sup> In proof of his being substantially followed on this point by the various classes of *English* infidels, take up any of their books; and we shall find the appeal made almost uniformly to man's *unassisted* reason and intellect. Strange that it should be so with any that call themselves Christians; seeing that the wisdom whereby we may judge of things spiritual is so expressly declared in the New Testament to be that which is not the wisdom of this world, but what must needs be

<sup>1</sup> See Neander i. 16.

"Video meliora, proboque,  
Deteriora sequor,"

was the confession of conscience in the Epicurean Horace. Contrast the case of Clemens, as described, *ib.* p. 44.

<sup>2</sup> i. 29, speaking of Plutarch.

<sup>3</sup> Neander i. 221; Gieseler i. 112.

<sup>4</sup> Not in the combination hinted at at the end of Mr. Pattison's historical Essay on English Rationalism, p. 329.

<sup>5</sup> Christian Observer, Dec. 1846, p. 763.

taught us *from without* by the Holy Divine Spirit. When Dr. Temple, in his strange Essay on God's Education of the World,<sup>1</sup> thus defines his educational process, "First comes the Law, then the Son of Man, then the *gift of the Spirit*," he means not by the last expression God's own Spirit in the New Testament sense, as supernaturally illuminating the human soul,<sup>2</sup> but man's own well-educated spirit. For, says he, "the human race was then *left to itself*, to be guided by the teaching of the *Spirit within*." And, presently after; "The Spirit, or conscience,<sup>3</sup> has now come to full strength in the soul. As an accredited judge, invested with full powers, he sits in the tribunal of our inner kingdom, and legislates without appeal, except to himself. His office is, in fact, to guide us into truth."<sup>4</sup>

2. When the old heathen philosophers came in this spirit, and with these fixed principles of judgment, to consider *Christianity*, as it more and more advanced around them, they could not but acknowledge it as a new and extraordinary power in life. But as a directly supernatural and exclusively Divine revelation from heaven, such as the Christians declared it to be, the idea presented itself to them as altogether inconsistent with their philosophic views of God, and man, and nature; and suited only for ignorant and credulous men, such as those to whom that religion characteristically made, in fact, its chief appeal.<sup>5</sup> The historical fact of its having originated in Judæa, through the teaching of Jesus of Nazareth, in the reign of Tiberius, (to which time history clearly pointed for its commencement,) of his having been an eminent Theosophist, of his having been unjustly persecuted by Jewish bigots, and at length crucified, so as the Christian books affirmed, they fully allowed. Indeed, as regarded Jesus himself, they were ready to allow his claims to the admiration of men, and to a place, perhaps a high place, among the heroes and philosophers of the

<sup>1</sup> Strange, from his ascribing to God an education of the world, or rather of the world's élite, which he would most certainly himself shrink from deeming fit and sufficient for any of his children or pupils!

<sup>2</sup> Essays, pp. 5, 31.—Contrast Christ's saying "When he the Spirit of truth (God's own Spirit) is come, *He* shall guide you into all truth."

<sup>3</sup> In the less proper sense, I presume, of conscious intellect. So too p. 45, &c.

<sup>4</sup> Dr. T. (pp. 43, 48, &c.) speaks of the present period as that of "*the maturity of mankind*," "*the mature mind of his race*." Is it so in regard of *spiritual* knowledge? Rather surely, as St. Paul represents man's estate here, 1 Cor. xiii., it is that of children, and of those that see things, as in a metal mirror, darkly.

<sup>5</sup> So Celsus, speaking of the foolishness of the gospel, ap. Lardner vii. 222, and Neander i. 223. "Christians say, Do not examine, only believe; faith makes blessed. Let no wise man approach, but the ignorant and uneducated children."



world.<sup>1</sup> But, as to what those books asserted of the supernatural and miraculous respecting him, a philosopher must on the decisive grounds of reason, *à priori* to all more particular investigation, at once reject it. Said Celsus; "God will not do that which is contrary to nature: for He is himself the reason of all things in nature; and, consequently, can no more do things contrary to nature than contrary to himself."<sup>2</sup> As to Christ's asserted divine eternal pre-existence, that could only attach to the Being of beings, TO ON; the Infinite and Absolute One, God himself. Again, if this Infinite One, the Universal Father, had in His mind some scheme of mercy and salvation for the race of mortal men, was it credible that he should have confined the revelation of it within such narrow limits of *time* and *space* as the Christian books asserted:—of space as having been limited to the little country of Judæa; of time as having not fully been made known till Jesus Christ's birth, some 4000 years after man's creation? So alike Celsus, Porphyry, and Julian: and then, as Porphyry further objected, with such tremendous penalties attached to the unbelieving; nothing less than *everlasting* punishment; albeit they were Christ's own words, "With what measure ye mete it shall be measured to you again."<sup>3</sup>—More particularly, in regard of Christ's asserted supernatural birth of a Virgin, miraculous acts during life, (except in so far as the powers of magic might account for them,)<sup>4</sup> and *bodily* resurrection and ascension to heaven after death, not only were there the *à priori* objections of reason against such facts, but the evidence for them, even in the Christian books themselves, was clearly insufficient and self-contradictory. If Jesus Christ was to be sent forth in man's form for the enlightenment

<sup>1</sup> So Celsus (Lardner ib. 247), but in measured terms; also Hierocles, ap. Neander, i. 236. Lucian (ib. 216) speaks of him as "the great man crucified in Palestine." Said Porphyry (Neander i. 235); "Jesus Christ must not be calumniated; but those pitied who worship him as a God: he, though a pious soul, and ascended to heaven, having become by fatality an occasion of error to them." The very oracles of the heathen, as Neander adds, spoke respectfully of Christ.

<sup>2</sup> Ap. Lardner, ib. 245.

<sup>3</sup> See Lardner vii. pp. 249, 438—440, 623; and Neander iii. 118. Said Celsus; "If God would deliver mankind why did he send Christ to the remote corner only of Judæa?" Said Porphyry; "If truth, life, and salvation be in Christ exclusively, and only believers in him saved, what of all before him? Did God, the gracious and merciful, let all perish, perish everlastingly, that lived in times previous?" Said Julian; "If God be the Creator God, and light to man come only by Christ, wherefore would He neglect all but Jews for thousands of years before him?"

<sup>4</sup> Both Celsus and Hierocles (Lardner, pp. 233, 232, 483; Neander i. 219) supposed the possibility of this.

and salvation of men, did God need to use a virgin mother's womb as the medium of transmission? Could he not have created him? And did not the Christian's own story of Joseph's thinking of divorcing his betrothed wife, suggest another very different and more natural solution of his birth? <sup>1</sup> Further, as regards the asserted voice of God from heaven, at his baptism, declaring him to be *his Son* in some higher and more peculiar sense than could belong to mere man, where was the credible witness to attest it? <sup>2</sup> And once more, in reference to his asserted bodily resurrection after death, besides the negative to it from the fact that never once did any one that had really died rise again in the same body, how inadequate was the testimony, and what discrepancies in the Gospel records concerning it! It seemed most reasonable to ascribe the belief of Christians on this point to some optical delusion, impressed on the credulous minds of those women that first visited his tomb on the 3rd morning after his crucifixion; <sup>3</sup> and from them transmitted to, and in their then excitement of feeling inconsiderately and ardently believed in by, the disciples generally.

As to the evidence of the *old Jewish prophecies*, so constantly urged by the Christian writers in proof of Jesus Christ's divinely predestined earthly mission and history, the Jews themselves might suffice as counter-witnesses. <sup>4</sup> Led, as they were, by those prophecies to expect some great deliverer and exalter of their nation, how could they receive *him* as the promised One, who did none of the great things promised for the Jewish people? <sup>5</sup> In fact, what Christians appealed to as Messianic prophecies of Jesus Christ were applicable to many other persons in history, more probably than to Jesus of Nazareth; <sup>6</sup> and the Evangelists' citations of them often notoriously in the mere way of accommodation. <sup>7</sup>—Besides, that the Jew-

<sup>1</sup> So Celsus. (Lardner, p. 225.)

<sup>2</sup> Celsus. (ib. 228.)

<sup>3</sup> So Celsus, ap. Lardner, pp. 221, 239, 242; and Neander i. 231.

<sup>4</sup> Celsus puts sundry of his objections in the mouth of a Jew.

<sup>5</sup> Celsus. (Lardner, p. 233.)

<sup>6</sup> So Celsus. (Lardner, p. 250.) Porphyry, urging the same argument, illustrates by reference (Lardner, p. 402) to Daniel's prophecy of the stone cut out without hands, which smote the great image on the feet, and then became a great mountain that filled the whole earth, as a fond prediction by some Jew of *Israel's* future greatness and glory. Julian, again, (Lardner, 621,) instances to the same effect the prophecy in Moses about a prophet like to him.

<sup>7</sup> Julian (ib. 626) exemplifies in the Evangelists' citation and application to Jesus of the passage in Hosea, "Out of Egypt have I called my Son;" with a view "to impose on ignorant Gentiles."

ish Old Testament SS. were demonstrably corrupted in multitudinous parts; sometimes in the case of the prophetic Book of Daniel, not genuine:<sup>1</sup> elsewhere, as in the case of the prophecy of Shiloh falsified by the event;<sup>2</sup> or, as in that of much in the writings ascribed to Moses, explained by Christians with forced interpretations as types and allegories, in order to obviate the objections urged against them.<sup>3</sup> In which last-mentioned writings a special objection was made by Julian against Moses' accounts of the creation, the fall, and the division of languages at Babel, as incredible and false.<sup>4</sup>

Such, I think, will be found to be a pretty accurate, as well as full, sketch of the arguments of these several chief heathen controversialists, as handed down to us, against Christianity; i. e. against Christianity in its pretensions as distinctively the one true religion supernaturally revealed by the Supreme God for the enlightenment and salvation of men. And thus the result of their critical rationalistic examination into the subject was simply this:—that all that was supernatural in the Christian story was to be set aside, all view of Jesus of Nazareth as the divine and divinely appointed Saviour of fallen man, through the acting out of his various offices as their propitiatory atonement, mediator, righteousness; and so all idea also set aside of his having opened a way of restoration for sinful men to the infinitely Holy One: the only residuum, admissible by true philosophy, being that of his having been a great theosophist, and admirable teacher and example of moral wisdom and virtue.

How similar in all this our modern rationalists, albeit professedly Christian, to those older rationalists of Roman Heathendom, will be found abundantly evident by all that choose to acquaint themselves with their anti-christian writings.—Did Celsus and Porphyry urge à

<sup>1</sup> So, as is well known, Porphyry. (Lardner, 397, 399, Neander i. 233.) Daniel's Book was written, he asserts, on the ground of internal evidence, by some Hellenist, who wrote in Greek, living in Judæa about the time of Antiochus Epiphanes.

Porphyry explained the two last of the pseudo-Daniel's four Beasts, or Empires, as meant of Alexander's Macedonian kingdom; the former being the undivided under Alexander the Great himself, the latter the same divided kingdom under Alexander's four chief successors: from whom in the Seleucidæan line there were ten kings in succession to Antiochus Epiphanes; who answered to the 4th Beast's little horn. On which, says Jerome very naturally, how could Judas and the Maccabæans' subsequent government, after the fall of Antiochus, have been spoken of by any writer then living as universal and everlasting? The 1260 days Porphyry supposed to have been intended by the pseudo-Danielic writer, of the time of Antiochus' profanation of the temple; the 1335 as extending to his death.

<sup>2</sup> So Julian. Lardner, p. 624.

<sup>3</sup> So Porphyry, *ib.* p. 397.

<sup>4</sup> *Ap.* Lardner, *ib.* 623.

*priori* against Christianity, in regard of its claim to have been supernaturally revealed from heaven, that a supernatural religious revelation (supposing it possible) from the Universal Father needed to be universal, so too their modern successors. Says Theodore Parker; "There is no monopoly of religion by any nation or age. Religion itself is everywhere one and the same. He that worships truly, by whatever form, worships the only God: and He hears the prayer, whether called Brahma, Pan, or Lord, or by no name at all. Each people has its prophets and its saints. . . . Inspiration, like God's omnipresence, is co-extensive with the human race. As God fills all space, so all spirit." And Dr. Temple, with the same views apparently, makes heathen Greece and Rome as truly a medium of God's education of man to what he calls their perfect manhood, as Palestine Jewish and Christian.

Again, did the rationalists of Roman Heathendom, whatever their measure of distrust of the Christian's original historic records, yet admit the fact of the Christian religion having originated in Judæa, from the teaching of him that was called Jesus of Nazareth, in the times of the Emperor Tiberius, and, moreover, that he was a distinguished and pious theosophist, so too the most of their modern followers. Says Quinet,—herein opposing himself to Strauss, who would have Jesus to be little more than the imaginary personification of the ideas prevalent in Judæa at the time about an expected deliverer, and of which something like the prototype must be found in the old Jewish SS.,—that, had this alone been the case, then Christianity, as it rose in the 1st century, would be an effect without a cause.<sup>1</sup> And very strong too are their expressions of admiration, both of the teacher and his teaching. Take, for example, the testimonies on this head of Theodore Parker and Mr. Greg.<sup>2</sup> But, as to whatever is

<sup>1</sup> He adds: "If I knew nothing of the SS. and even the name of Jesus was banished from the earth, I should be compelled to suppose a powerful impulse (of mind) in some quarter about the time of the Emperor Tiberius." On Ultramontanism. (Compare T. Parker, to the same effect, as cited in the next note.)

So when Quinet's famous countryman Le Verrier had before him the phenomena of certain unexplained perturbations of the planet Uranus, he hence inferred the existence of some correspondingly located, though hitherto undiscovered, perturbing planetary cause.

Somewhat curiously, when adverting to the state of Christianity in Germany at the time of his writing, Quinet, though himself a rationalist in religion, yet speaks of the German rationalists' arguments as but the reproduction of those of Celsus, Porphyry, and Julian.

<sup>2</sup> "Has the New Testament exaggerated the greatness and the beauty of Jesus? Measure his religious doctrine by that of the time and place he lived in, or that of any

asserted of the *supernatural* about him, alike in regard of the heralding of *prophetic prediction*, or facts of his *personal life and history*, it is declared, as the result of reasonable inquiry, to be mere myth and fiction.—1st, not one distinct *prophecy* of him is there allowed to be in the Old Testament SS. Indeed the genuineness and truth of those SS., even *historically*, is rudely questioned; e. g. Moses' account of the creation, even yet more strongly (as an inference, premature inference surely, from the modern geological discoveries) than by the old heathen anti-christian controversialists.<sup>1</sup> The chief so-called *Messianic* prophecies are in detail noticed, and declared to have no reference to Jesus as a promised Saviour:—not alone Moses' prediction of the prophet like himself, or that in David's 22nd Psalm, but even Daniel's prophecy of the 70 hebdomads, and that in Isaiah liii. Like as by Celsus of old, so by our modern rationalists, the application made of this last by Jewish Rabbinical anti-christian expositors, whether to suffering Jeremiah (its authorship being by some second Isaiah of Jeremiah's time), or to suffering Israel, has been declared to be the truer solution.<sup>2</sup> The dictum has been pronounced that there is no such thing as *prognostication* in the Old Testament SS. prophets.<sup>3</sup>—Then, 2ndly, as regards the asserted *miraculous facts* asserted time and any place; yes, by the doctrine of eternal truth, consider what a work his words and deeds have wrought in the world; remember that the greatest minds have seen no further, and added nothing to the doctrine of religion,—that the richest hearts have felt no deeper, have set no loftier aim, no truer method, than this of *perfect love to God and man*;—and then ask, Have the Evangelists overrated him? Shall we be told such a man never lived, and that the whole story is a lie? Suppose that Plato and Newton never lived, and that their story is a lie:—but who did their works, and thought their thoughts? It takes a Newton to prize a Newton. What man could have fabricated a Jesus? None but Jesus." So Theodore Parker, Disc. p. 271.

And Greg, p. 233; "Such an one we believe was Jesus of Nazareth;—the most exalted religious genius whom God ever sent on earth; in himself an embodied revelation; humanity in its divinest phase; God manifest in the flesh, according to eastern hyperbole." This however he says after affirming, "We can find no adequate reason for believing Jesus to be the *Son of God*; nor his doctrines to be a direct and special revelation to him from the Most High."

<sup>1</sup> One of the seven Essays, that by Mr. Goodwin, (an Essay to the statements in which sundry exceptions suggest themselves,) is devoted in this way to objections against the *Mosaic Cosmogony*. So too, allusively, Dr. Temple, p. 47; also Greg, pp. 44—50; &c.

<sup>2</sup> So argued out as Bunsen's demonstration, by Dr. R. Williams, in the second of the seven Essays, pp. 67—74.

<sup>3</sup> So Coleridge, Essays, p. 66.—See on the whole subject of Old Testament SS. prophecy, thus treated, Mr. Greg's 4th chapter, chiefly following De Wette. At the beginning of the chapter he lays down "four points that need to be ascertained with precision, in order to establish the claim of any anticipatory statement, promise, or denunciation, to the rank and title of a prophecy:—viz. I. what the event was to which the alleged prediction was intended to refer;—2. that the prediction was uttered

of Jesus of Nazareth in the Gospel histories, whether respecting his supernatural birth, his miraculous actions, his transfiguration, divinely appointed vicarious death, or resurrection, the general *à priori* objection urged, we saw, originally by Celsus,<sup>1</sup> as if miracles were as a violation of God's own constitution of nature impossible, is thus repeated by Strauss:—"Our modern world, after centuries of research, has attained a conviction that all things are linked together by a chain of causes and effects which suffers no interruption." Accordingly, says Schleiermacher; "Not if a voice from heaven were to assert it, would I believe in supernatural miracles, such as in the Gospels are ascribed to Christ." For, as Wegscheider adds; "That which is *above* reason is rightly said to be *contrary* to reason." And so B. Powell, Greg,<sup>2</sup> and other modern sceptics. And the asserted non-inspiration, non-genuineness, and frequent discrepancies and errors of the various Books both of Old Testament and New Testament are elaborately argued out, in order, on each point alluded to, to confirm the *à priori* conclusions of reason. So e. g. severally in Greg's Chapters on the Inspiration of the Scriptures, the Authorship and Authority of the Pentateuch and of the Old Testament Books generally, on the Prophecies, Origin of the Gospels, Nature and Limits of the Fidelity of the Gospel History, Limits of Apostolic Wisdom and Authority, Miracles and Resurrection of Jesus, and the question, Is Christianity a Revealed Religion?

---

Enough has now been said to show the parallelism of the voice that speaks by the mouths of our modern sceptics, with that (figured in Apoc. xii. as the Dragon) which spoke 1600 years ago by the mouths of the Pagan anti-christian philosophers of Roman Heathendom. And with this, my professed purpose in this Chapter

*in specific, not vague language* before the event;—3. that the event took place specifically, not loosely, as predicted;—and, 4thly, that it could not have been foreseen by human sagacity." As regards sundry of the Old Testament prophecies, to demand a precise answer to *all* these four requisitions is, I think, from the nature of the case, unreasonable. In regard of the Apocalypse, as stated in my Preface, I willingly accept Mr. Greg's conditions, and am ready to meet him on each of them.

<sup>1</sup> See p. 620, *suprà*.

<sup>2</sup> Greg, p. 248. The religious man, who believes that all events, mental as well as physical, are pre-ordered and arranged according to the decrees of infinite wisdom, and the philosopher who knows that by the wise and eternal laws of the universe cause and effect are indissolubly chained together, and that one follows the other in indelible succession, equally feel that this ordination, this chain, cannot be changeable at the cry of man. . . . If the purposes of God were not wise, they would not be formed:—if wise, they cannot be changed, for then they would become unwise

being accomplished, I might bring it to a close. But I cannot allow myself to do so without suggesting,

3rdly, yet another point of similitude between the two schools of scepticism, the ancient and the modern; viz. the unfairness with which evidence more than questionable, and which has, in fact, been in great part already refuted, is too generally urged in favour of our sceptics' hypotheses:<sup>1</sup>—witness the little reference by them to late defensive Treatises on the genuineness of the Books of Moses, and other Books of the Old Testament, by Havernick, Hengstenberg, &c., in Germany, as well as those by Christian apologists, whether of older or later date, in England: also, yet more, their extraordinary silence on the vast, indeed insuperable, difficulties, inconsistencies, and self-contradictions of their own theory, even as if determined to shun all consideration of them. Let me just suggest a few, based on their own admitted principles.

1st, then, with reference to the *à priori* argument against the possibility of any evidence of the *supernatural* or *miraculous* attaching, such as it claims, to Christianity,—an impossibility arising out of the fixity of the laws of nature, as expressing, in fact, the fixed mind and will of God,—observe the complete answer furnished by these sceptics themselves in their admission, indeed strong assertion, of the *free will of man*. “The doctrine of the *foreknowledge of the Deity*,” says Mr. Greg,<sup>2</sup> “which in a Supreme Being is equivalent to *foreordination*, however metaphysically true and provable, we cannot hold, so as to follow it out fairly to its consequences. For this would negative the *free will of man*.” Now, by the laws of cause and effect, different consequences must needs follow according as man, in this his perfect independence of will, follows one course of action or another: and the chain of events in the world's history must vary correspondingly; the law of the universe not having such absolute fixity as to prevent it.—Unable themselves to explain this manifest

<sup>1</sup> Their conclusion respecting the Book of Daniel, as written by an Hellenist Jew of the times of Antiochus Epiphaneus and the Maccabees, is a notable example. Would not the writer have been a fool, and literary suicide, had he really lived in those times; and, drawing his picture from what was before him, represented (as if in a divine prophecy) Antiochus Epiphaneus' kingdom as the subjugator and domineerer over all the rest of the divisions of that of Alexander the Great? and moreover the Maccabean kingdom as the destroyer of that of Antiochus, and a universal as well as everlasting kingdom filling the whole earth? So Jerome, as referred to p. 622 Note <sup>1</sup> *suprà*. And see too my Note at p. 62 *suprà*.

<sup>2</sup> p. 255. I pray the reader who may, in the course of clear duty, have to read such infidel works as Mr. Greg's, well to ponder on and weigh what is here written.

inconsistency on their own principles, our theorists have to fall back on what they call the "resources of Omnipotence;"<sup>1</sup> as that which may perhaps reconcile what seems to the human reason irreconcilable. Why then may there not be a change in that chain of events which the law of nature might otherwise prescribe, in answer, say, to the prayers of Jesus in his time of humiliation as man,<sup>2</sup> or the prayers of one of God's prophets or apostles, or other less eminent of his servants, if God see fit? Here too we may just as reasonably fall back on the resources of Omnipotence.<sup>3</sup>

2ndly, there is the difficulty arising out of the cry against the religious systems of our sceptical philosophers, of that which of course they admit to be as truly a part of man's moral constitution as his *reason and intellect*, though effectively excluding it from any place in the seat of judgment, I mean his *heart and conscience*. Was St. Paul in error when he spoke of the heathen (i. e. of mankind when destitute of the light of revelation) as feeling after God, if haply they might find him; or, as all their life through fear of death in bondage? How touching is the picture of that noble philosopher, the elder Pliny,'s deep inner aspirations of feeling, as sketched by Neander;<sup>4</sup> how illustrative of the truth of the apostle's representation! "Lost in admiration of an immeasurable creative Spirit, as manifested in his works, beyond all human comprehension, his admiration of it served only to awaken in tenfold strength the depressing sense of the narrowness and vanity of man's existence. He saw nothing to fill up the chasm betwixt feeble man and that unknown all-transcending Spirit. 'What God is,' says he, 'it is beyond the compass of man's understanding to know. The vanity of man, and his insatiable longing after existence, have led him also to dream (reason could only view it as a dream) of a life after death. A being full of contradictions, he is the most wretched of creatures; since the other creatures have no wants transcending the bounds of their nature. Man is full of desires and wants that reach to infinity, and can never be satisfied. His nature is a lie.<sup>5</sup> Among these so great evils, the best thing God has bestowed on man is the power to take

<sup>1</sup> Ib. p. 285.

<sup>2</sup> "And I know that thou hearest me always."

<sup>3</sup> Said Celsus; "If we ask how the resurrection was possible, it is the Christian's answer, 'All things are possible to God.'" Lardner vii. 244.

<sup>4</sup> Vol. i. p. 14.

<sup>5</sup> How is one reminded by this striking passage in the heathen philosopher of Pascal's still more striking passage to the same effect in his "Thoughts";—"When I see the contradictions in man's nature, &c."



his own life." To all which cry from the inner depths of man's soul for some revelation from heaven, like Christianity, can it be the dictate of reason itself that God intends no answer to be given but that of our sceptics: an answer to the effect, as Mr. Greg expounds it, with strange self-satisfaction, that Pliny was indeed correct in his view of God and of man;—that God is too vast and high, with the concerns of the whole universe under his superintendence, to condescend to particular providences respecting individual men;<sup>1</sup> that to attempt approaching Him in prayer therefore is absurd; and that, as to any comfort under trouble in the thought of his sympathy, or any assured hope, through his kindness towards man, of a better futurity after death, the idea is all unphilosophic and absurd; the only proper and philosophic state of feeling being that of acquiescence in the present state of things, and present darkness about any future and better state after death, as knowing that all that is is best?<sup>2</sup>

3rdly, How inconsistent all this with that character of God, which our sceptics themselves are many of them wont to hold forth as one of the noblest and most admirable sayings of the Christian Scripture, viz. that "God is love." Can there be love without sympathy? or sympathy without (where the power exists, as it must exist with him) seeking out some way, not inconsistent with his other attributes, specially that of his holiness,<sup>3</sup> of delivering the object of his sympathy from the sorrows and evils that oppress him? "God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son" (his only begotten *coequal divine Son, the Creator*, observe, not "an innocent creature," or *created being*, so as Mr Greg and others would represent it)<sup>4</sup> "to live and die (as man) for it; that whosoever believeth on him should not perish, but should have everlasting life." How does this answer to the human soul's cry in sorrow, sickness, and the sure and near prospect of death!

Mark our sceptics' gross self-contradictoriness in their view of

<sup>1</sup> Compare Celsus, ap. Neander i. 229.

<sup>2</sup> So in his extraordinary Chapter xvi. on Christian Eclecticism.

<sup>3</sup> It is one of the points that most notably exemplify the shallow metaphysics of our sceptics and semi-sceptics, who are so fond of dwelling almost exclusively on God's being Love, that they seem never to have reflected that God could not be Love without being also the Holy One.

<sup>4</sup> So p. 265; "It is for orthodox dialectics to explain how divine justice can be vindicated by punishing the *innocent*." Jesus Christ's true divinity, as well as true manhood, is an essential part of the Christian scheme of salvation for fallen guilty men, as laid down all through Holy Scripture.

*Jesus Christ's life, doctrine, and character.* We have seen in what strong terms of admiration they express themselves regarding him. He was, they admit, the perfection of virtue. And yet, as described by the Evangelists, there was the claim made, made habitually by him, to a superhuman dignity, and supernatural powers, acts, and offices, and a superhuman deliverance from death, as well as superhuman life before birth, such as our sceptics affirm to have been entire error. It is the object of elaborate effort with them, in order if possible to exculpate him from such a charge, to throw discredit on the Gospel records, as written some 30 years, or more, after his death, and consequently as the depository of traditions gathered together in the interval incorrect, as well as correct, respecting him; St. Mark's Gospel, they say, (as if some help towards their object,) being the earliest, as well as shortest and simplest.<sup>1</sup> But still, do what they will, they cannot accomplish it. His claim to be the Son of God, the Messiah that was to come, the grandest subject of Old Testament prophecy, the antitype of the typical propitiatory sacrifices of the law, the performer of all kinds of miracles, the predictor of his own death, and of his resurrection too on the third day,—all this is so interwoven with each Gospel history, that they acknowledge their inability to separate it; and consequently have to admit *Christ's error* on these points.<sup>2</sup> But could error on such points be looked on as the mere error of a deluded fancy? Was his character, according to their own ideas, that of a weak-minded, imaginative, self-deluding enthusiast? If not,—and with his own characteristic penetration of mind he could not but well know the gist and importance of all the mighty pretensions thus predicated of himself, and yet they were false,—then were they false pretences (on their theory) of the most heinous guilt; and such as justly to render him liable to the charge made against him by the Jews, of being a liar and a blasphemer.

<sup>1</sup> So, c. g. Greg.

<sup>2</sup> So Theodore Parker. "It is apparent that Jesus shared the erroneous notion of the times respecting devils and demoniacal possessions. But he never set up for a teacher of physiology. The acceptance of this error is no impeachment of his moral and religious excellence. The errors of great men are the glory of dunces alone. . . . He was mistaken in his interpretation of the Old Testament, if we may believe the Gospels. But, if he supposed those earlier writers spoke of him, it was but a trifling mistake, affecting his head, not his heart. He is said to have been an enthusiast, who hoped to found a visible kingdom in Judæa, and to return in the clouds (i. e. in the divine character of the Messiah of Dan. vii.). But what then? Even if the dull Evangelists have not thrust their fancies into his mouth, it does not militate against his morality and religion." Discourses ap. Birks on Rationalism, p. 34. See too Greg, p. 160, &c.

4thly, and consequent on this, is the absurdity of making Christ's apostles also,—men of the most evident sincerity and blamelessness of character and life, and who abandoned everything that is usually dear to men for a life of privation and labour and suffering simply and solely from their thorough belief in what they asserted of the supernatural about Jesus of Nazareth,<sup>1</sup> specially including the fact of his *bodily resurrection after death*, and *ascension to heaven*, (in order, as he himself said, still to carry on, for all that should heartily believe on him, his work of a Saviour for them,) the absurdity, I say, of making them false witnesses and ministers of fraud and falsehood.—And (not to dwell further on this) the absurdity too,

5thly, of ascribing to this ministration of the most arrant system of fraud and falsehood *effects the most blessed* (for these our sceptics do not deny):<sup>2</sup> viz. that of the transformation of the immoral and the vile into characters virtuous, noble, holy, and of the hopeless to a hope full of immortality. “Such and so vile were some of you,” says St. Paul to the Corinthian Christians; “but ye are washed, but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified, through the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God.”<sup>3</sup> Yes, the message and ministry was accompanied by a purifying, transforming power in its application to the heart of these individuals *ab extèrà*, from heaven, by God's own Almighty Spirit. What Celsus acknowledged to be “the most difficult of things, viz. a complete change of nature, from bad to good,<sup>4</sup> that was effected in innumerable instances in the apostolic times by the preaching of Christ crucified,” (of Christ, i. e. of Jesus in his character of the promised Messiah and Saviour,) “to the Jews a stumbling-block, and to the Greeks, foolishness.” And this not only in apostolic times; but the same in all times and all places, where the gospel message has been faithfully delivered, even to our own day. And how so? Not by the mere tale of the life, character, and death of Jesus of Nazareth, 1800 years ago, wonderful as that tale is; but through the application of it to the heart

<sup>1</sup> Every student of divine truth on these all-important questions should familiarize himself with Paley's argument in his *Evidences*:—also with the admirable proof in his *Horæ Paulinæ* of the truthfulness alike of the *Historic Book of the Acts*, and of the *Pauline Epistles*, from comparisons of the one and the other.

<sup>2</sup> So, e. g. Theodore Parker, in a passage already in part cited by me. “Has the New Testament exaggerated the greatness and embellished the beauty of Jesus? Consider what a work his words and deeds have wrought in the world; that he is still the way, the truth, and the life to millions,” &c. <sup>3</sup> 1 Cor. vi. 11.

<sup>4</sup> Ap. Neander, i. 227.—So again Arius and Epictetes, with reference to Christians' singular triumph over the fear of death. *Ib.* p. 217.

by God's own Almighty transforming Spirit :—by his own Almighty Spirit, I say, (so different from the inward human spirit which seems all that Dr. Temple would recognize as operating in God's education of the world,<sup>1</sup>) sealing the story of Jesus ; and setting him forth as still living, still acting as our gracious, loving, sympathizing Saviour in the court of heaven, by pleading what he did and suffered for us whilst on earth.

When the humble and sincere inquirer has well pondered on all these difficulties, inconsistencies, and self-contradictions of infidelity, and then reverts to consider the whole subject, inclusive as well of the objections of enemies as eulogies of friends, he will, if I much mistake not, come to the conclusion that there is the stamp of divine truth upon the gospel record, though God may have been pleased, with a view to try his people's faith, to leave some unexplained difficulties in it : and in humble prayer wait on Him to diminish, if not remove, those difficulties ; waiting for their full solution in the more perfect light of heaven. There is the analogy, he will remember, on this head, of difficulties in God's natural and providential government of the world.<sup>2</sup> And

Where reason fails, with all its powers,  
There faith prevails, and love adores.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See p. 619 *suprà*.

<sup>2</sup> Well of course should Bishop Butler's Analogy be studied on this point ; on whose admirable and indispensable work to an intelligent inquirer after divine truth, I observe much that is both interesting and just in Mr. Pattison's historic Essay.

<sup>3</sup> Let me be permitted to conclude this Chapter with two illustrative citations, singularly in contrast the one with the other : the one a well-deserved burlesque (after the manner of the Author of "*The Frogs*,") of the irrationalism of the modern so-called Rationalistic Pantheist's Creed ; the other the history, in simple truth, of the conversion to Christianity of a devotee of just such Rationalistic Pantheism.

1. THE RATIONALISTIC PANTHEIST'S HYMN TO THE INFINITE.\*

"The voice of yore,  
Which the breezes bore,  
Wailing aloud from Paxo's shore,  
Is changed to a gladder and livelier strain,  
For the great god PAN is alive again ;  
He lives and he reigns once more.  
With deep intuition and mystic rite  
We worship the Absolute-Infinite ;  
The universe, Ego, the plenary void,  
The subject-object identified :  
The great Nothing, Something, the Being thought,  
That mouldeth the mass of chaotic nought ;  
Whose beginning unended, and end unbegun,  
Is the One that is All, and the All that is One.

\* Supposed to be uttered by a Chorus of Teutonic Professors.

Hail Light with Darkness joined!  
 Thou Potent Impotence!  
 Thou quantitative Point  
 Of all Indifference!  
 Great Non-Existence, passing into Being,  
 Thou two-fold Pole of the Electric One,  
 Thou lawless Law, thou Seer all unseeing,  
 Thou Process ever doing, never done!  
 Thou Positive Negation!  
 Negative Affirmation!  
 Thou great Totality of everything  
 That never is, but ever doth become;  
 Thee do we sing,  
 The Pantheists' King,  
 With ceaseless bug, bug, bug, and endless hum, hum, hum." \*

## 2. DR. DUFF'S ACCOUNT OF THE CONVERSION OF A HINDOO RATIONALISTIC PANTHEIST AT CALCUTTA.

In giving an account of the baptism of a recently converted Brahmin at Calcutta, Dr. Duff mentions incidentally the spread of rationalistic principles amongst some of the educated Hindoos. If rigid adherents to the old system, they would be simply Pantheists. "But, from reading English books, they have now produced a new system of their own, strangely compounded of old Hindoo Pantheism and Western or European Monotheism. Rejecting now the divine inspiration of the Vedas, these regard the Vedas simply as the most ancient and venerable of human compositions, abounding with truth and fiction, with much that is good, and a great deal more that is foolish and false. Accordingly, they take from the Vedas all that may suit their purpose, and reject all the rest. They constantly talk of the '*intuitions of reason*;' and other similar phrases which they have learnt from the schools of the West. In short, their system is now merely a scheme of modern Hindoo Rationalism; bearing the same relation to the ancient Hindoo sacred writings that the scheme of German and English Rationalists (such as that of the recent Essays and Reviews) bears to the inspired Christian Scriptures."

The new convert (Benimadhad Chakrabasti) belonged to this class; and "early last year became not only an adherent to this system, but a Lecturer upon it. In his zeal he received a copy of the Bible for the express purpose, as he now says, of demonstrating its imposture, and holding it up to ridicule and contempt. Behold, however, the finger of God! On reading the Bible with such an object he was soon disappointed; as he found much more there to admire than to condemn. A struggle commenced in his mind; and, during this initial mental struggle, a vacancy having occurred in our branch school at Bansberia, he applied for it and obtained it. The *Christian* converts at the head of that school took him in hand, instructed him, met all his objections, and held up the lamp of life, so that at last he fairly surrendered his heart to God. He came to Calcutta; nobly withstood the importunities and assaults of his friends; and, being found prepared, he was publicly baptized by me on the 20th, in the presence of a crowded assembly of natives. Thus have we had another drop. Oh! for the long-expected shower!" †

\* I cite the above from a very clever Dramatic Pamphlet, entitled "Scenes from an unfinished Drama, entitled *Φροντιστηριον, (Rationalism,)*" embodying the phrasology of the Schools of Schelling and Hegel, in imitation of 'The Clouds of Aristophanes; published at the Oxford Commemoration of June, 1852.

† Copied from the Record of April 5, 1861.