



LIBRARY

OF THE

Theological Seminary,

PRINCETON, N. J.

*Case,*

BS1556.

*Shelf,*

F12

*Book,*

111

I received the Rev. J. Brockbridge

to his sincere friend

W. F. Giles



W. G. Giles

A  
**DISSERTATION**  
ON THE  
**PROPHECIES,**

THAT HAVE BEEN FULFILLED, ARE NOW FULFILLING, OR WILL  
HEREAFTER BE FULFILLED,

RELATIVE TO THE

**GREAT PERIOD OF 1260 YEARS;**

THE PAPAL AND MOHAMMEDAN APOSTACIES;  
THE TYRANNICAL REIGN OF ANTICHRIST, OR THE INFIDEL  
POWER;

AND

THE RESTORATION OF THE JEWS

AND WHICH IS ADDED,

**AN APPENDIX.**

---

---

BY THE REV. GEORGE STANLEY FABER, B. D.  
VICAR OF STOCKTON-UPON-TEES.

---

---

*Second American from the second London Edition*

IN TWO VOLUMES.

---

VOL. I.

---

"Shut up the Words, and seal the Book, even to the time of the end: many shall run to and fro, and knowledge shall be increased" DAN. xii. 4.

---

NEW-YORK:

PUBLISHED BY M. AND W. WARD, AND EVERT DUYCKINCK.

*George Long, printer.*

---

1844



TO THE

HONOURABLE AND RIGHT REVEREND FATHER IN GOD,

*SHUTE BARRINGTON, LL. D.*

LORD BISHOP OF DURHAM.



MY LORD,

THE kindness which I have uniformly experienced, particularly in a late instance, from your Lordship, encourages me to request permission to place the following Work under your protection.

It treats of a subject peculiarly interesting to every serious Protestant : for the famous period of 1060 prophetic days, so frequently mentioned by Daniel and St. John, comprehends the tyrannical reign of those three great opponents of the Gospel, Popery, Mohammedism, and Infidelity. This period indeed may not improperly be styled *the permitted hour of the powers of darkness* ; since the true Church is represented as being in an afflicted and depressed state during the whole of its continuance, and since its expiration will be marked by a signal display of the judgments of God upon his enemies and by the commencement of a new and happy order of things.

In the subject which I have chosen so many eminent expositors have preceded me, that I fear my choice of it

*alone* may render me liable to the charge either of needless repetition, or of unwarrantable presumption. Your Lordship however, I am confident, will not prejudge me from the mere *statement* of my subject: and the candour, which I anticipate from my venerable Diocesan, I feel myself justified in claiming from the Public.

In fact, had I nothing new to offer upon the subject, the discussing of it afresh would have been plainly superfluous; but an attentive examination of the writings of Daniel and St. John has led me to think, that in some points my predecessors have partially erred, and that in others they have been altogether mistaken. In the interpretation of Prophecy knowledge is undoubtedly progressive. The predictions of Scripture, extending as they do from the earliest periods to the consummation of all things, although they be gradually opened partly by the hand of time and partly by human labour undertaken in humble dependence upon the divine aid, are yet necessarily in some measure *a sealed book, even to the time of the end*. As that time approaches, we may expect, agreeably to the angel's declaration to Daniel, that *many will run to and fro, and that knowledge will be increased*. Hence it was observed by Sir Isaac Newton, that "amongst the interpreters of the last age there is scarce one of note, who hath not made some discovery worth knowing." Nothing however requires so much caution and prudence, so much hesitation and circumspection, as an attempt to unfold these deep mysteries of God. An intemperate



.....  
 introduction of new interpretations is highly dangerous and mischievous : because it has a natural tendency to unsettle the minds of the careless and the wavering, and is apt to induce them hastily to take up the preposterous opinion that there can be no certainty in the exposition of Prophecy. On these grounds I have ever been persuaded, that a commentator discharges his duty but very imperfectly, if, when he advances a new interpretation of any prophecy that has been already interpreted, he satisfies himself with merely urging in favour of his scheme the most plausible arguments that he has been able to invent. Of every prediction there may be many erroneous expositions, but there can only be one that is right. It is not enough therefore for a commentator to fortify with elaborate ingenuity his own system. Before he can reasonably expect it to be adopted by others, he must shew likewise, that the expositions of his predecessors are erroneous in those points wherein he differs from them. Such a mode of writing as this may undoubtedly expose him to the charge of captiousness : it will likewise unavoidably increase the size of his Work ; and may possibly weary those readers, who dislike the trouble of thoroughly examining a subject : but it will be found to be the only way, in which there is even a probability of attaining to the truth. This plan I have adopted : and it has at least been of infinite use to myself. It has at once compelled me, in the course of writing and revising the present Dissertation.

to relinquish, as utterly untenable, many opinions which I had once adopted ; and it has confirmed me in adhering to those, which I have retained. In short, it enables me to say, that not a single new interpretation is here advanced without having been previously subjected to the severest scrutiny. Whatever would not bear the test of all the objections, which I was able to alledge against it myself, has been rejected, as still less being able to bear the test of those which others might alledge.

Flattering as the countenance of the great may be, that of the good as well as great is much more rationally satisfactory. Your Lordship's character can be heightened by no testimony of mine. Yet I may be allowed to say, that the favours which I have received from you, have been rendered doubly valuable, both by the manner in which they have been conferred, and by the recollection of the hand that conferred them.

I have the honour to be,

MY LORD,

Your Lordship's much obliged and  
dutiful humble Servant,

GEORGE STANLEY FABER.

*Stockton-upon-Tees,*

*June 29, 1805.*

## PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION.



THE work, which is here offered to the Public, is founded upon the three following very simple principles.

1. to assign to each prophetic symbol its proper definite meaning, and never to vary from that meaning;

2. To allow no interpretation of a prophecy to be valid, except the prophecy agree, in every particular, with the event to which it is supposed to relate;

3. And to deny, that any link of a chronological prophecy is capable of receiving its accomplishment in more than one event.

If we examine the predictions of Daniel and St. John agreeably to these principles. we shall find, that *two great enemies* of the Gospel, *Popery* and *Mohammedism*, are described as commencing their tyrannical career together at the beginning of a certain period which comprehends *1260 years*, and as perishing together at the end of it: that, towards the close of this period, a *third power* is introduced; whose characteristic marks are a total disregard of all religion, an impious determination to do according to his will, and an open profession of absolute atheism, blended nevertheless with the worship of a certain foreign god and other tutelary deities whom his fathers never knew: that *this last power* is likewise destined to be destroyed at the end of *the 1260 years*: that he will previously unite himself, for political reasons, with *Popery*: that the stage of their joint overthrow will be *Palestine*: and that, when the period of *1260 years* is completed, *the restoration of the Jews* will commence. All these matters may, I think, be clearly deduced from prophecy: and the actual completion of many predictions relative to them afford us ample warrant for concluding, that the rest will likewise be accomplished in God's own good season.

.....

The present awful state of the world naturally leads all serious men to search the Scriptures: and the attention of more than one modern writer has been laudably directed to the elucidation of those prophecies, which either have been fulfilled, or are now fulfilling. Those, who have considered the subject most at large, are, I believe, Mr. Whitaker, Dr. Zouch, Mr. Kett, and Mr. Galloway.\* Mr. Whitaker and Mr. Zouch, with some exceptions, have undertaken to defend the scheme of interpretation adopted by Mr. Mede and Bp. Newton: while Mr. Kett and Mr. Galloway, though they differ from each other in many points, have avowedly attempted to establish a new scheme of interpretation.

I. Although I am not able to assent to several of Mr. Whitaker's opinions, most sincerely can I recommend his *Commentary on the Revelation* to the attention of every protestant, particularly every English protestant. At the present juncture, when *Papery* once more begins to rear its hydra head, a full statement of its abominable principles was peculiarly seasonable. This has been most satisfactorily executed by Mr. Whitaker: but he appears to me at the same time to have exceeded his commission, in branding *the Papacy* with the title of *Antichrist*. Many indeed and wonderfully explicit are the prophecies, which describe the detestable cruelties and unholy superstitions of *that great Apostacy*; which teach us the precise duration of its persecuting tyranny; which foretell its union with rebellious *Infidelity*; which point out both the place and manner of its destruction: but I have not yet been able to discover upon what *scriptural* grounds the name of *Antichrist* has been so generally applied to it. St. John is the only inspired writer who uses the term; and nothing that he says relative to it, affords us any warrant for conferring it upon *the Papacy*. "He is Antichrist, that denieth the Father and the Son:" *the Church of Rome* never denied either the Father or

\* To these I might have added Archdeacon Woodhouse and Mr. Bicheno; but I had not read their writings at the time when the first edition of this work was published. In the present edition, those of Mr. Bicheno are occasionally animadverted upon in the notes: but the scheme of the Archdeacon possesses so much unity of design, that I found it more convenient to consider it altogether apart in an appendix.

the Son : therefore *the Church of Rome* cannot be *the Antichrist* intended by St. John. As for the identity of *Antichrist* and *the little horn of the Roman beast*, it seems to me to have been rather taken for granted, than proved.

Valuable however as Mr. Whitaker's Commentary is in many respects, he is guilty of one inconsistency which must not be passed over unnoticed. While he asserts, that he gives no interpretation of a symbol but what may be justified by some text of Scripture, he very unwarrantably explains the prophecies of the Apocalypse sometimes *figuratively* and sometimes *literally*. Thus, for instance, the effusion of *the first, the fourth, and the fifth, vials* he interprets *figuratively* ; and yet to the effusion of *the second and the third* he affixes an absolutely *literal* meaning, supposing *those two vials* to describe a series of wars carried on both by *sea* and by *land*. Now it is obvious, that, if we interpret these predictions sometimes *figuratively* and sometimes *literally*, we involve them in the same indecision and uncertainty, as if we apply a symbol sometimes to *one thing* and sometimes to *another* : for, if the mode of interpretation is in every particular instance to be left to the option of the commentator, who shall draw the line between the *literal* and the *figurative* prophecies of the Apocalypse ? The whole book, excepting those very few passages which are avowedly descriptive, must be understood either *literally* throughout or *figuratively* throughout : otherwise it will be utterly impossible to ascertain the meaning designed to be conveyed.

The whole of the present Dissertation was written, and the corrections of it were nearly completed, before I had perused Mr. Whitaker's former publication, intitled *A general and connected view of the prophecies*. I there found, what gave me no small satisfaction, that the mere force of evidence had led two writers, between whom no communication had ever passed, to adopt the same opinion relative to *the little horn of the Macedonian he-goat* and *the proper method of ascertaining the date of the 1260 years*. Unconnected as we have been with each other, we have naturally treated the subject with some

degree of difference ; and, while I assent in the general to Mr. Whitaker's opinions on these points, I feel myself compelled to protest against his idea, that any of the numbers of Daniel and St. John may be considered as *round numbers*. The perfect accuracy, with which some of them have been already filled up, affords the best warrant for believing that the rest will likewise be filled up with equal accuracy. Indeed the very notion of a *round number* is irreconcilable with that of a *definite and specific number*. Hence I think, that Mr. Whitaker's attempt to harmonize the number mentioned in *the eighth chapter* of Daniel, with the date which he rightly assigns to *the 1260 years*, by adopting the reading of the Seventy, entirely fails of success, because the calculation produces *2404 years*, instead of *2400 years*, which it ought to have produced had it been founded upon just principles, even were the reading of the Seventy the genuine reading.\* A similar train of ideas had once led me to adopt this very hypothesis of Mr. Whitaker ; but the same reason which forced me to erase it from my own work, forces me also to reject it in his. On the same grounds, his opinion, that *the holy city* mentioned in *the eleventh chapter* of the Revelation is *the literal city of Jerusalem*, will be found equally untenable, even independent of other objections to which it is liable. The taking of Jerusalem by the Persians in *the year 1614*, can never be made to synchronize with the delivering of *the saints* into the hand of *the Papal little horn* in *the year 606* ; nor is it to me at least at all satisfactory to be told, that the nearest *round number*, which will include the whole time intervening from *the year 614* to *the year 1866*, will be 1260.† Since *the saints* are to be given into the hand of *the little horn* during the precise period of *1260 years*, and since *the holy city* is to be trodden under foot by the Gentiles during the self-same period of *42 prophetic months* ; the reign of *the little horn* and the treading of *the holy city* under foot must be exactly commensurate. Consequently, if *the saints* were first given into the hand of *the little horn* in *the year 606*,

\* General View, p. 272—277.

† *Ibid.*

*the holy city* must have begun to be trodden under foot in that same year. But *the literal Jerusalem* did not then begin to be trodden under foot by *the literal Gentiles*.\* Therefore *the literal Jerusalem* cannot be meant by *the holy city*; nor *the Christians of Jerusalem surrounded with the abominations of Mohammedism* by *the two witnesses*. Mr. Whitaker seems to allow that this prophecy may be understood in a *figurative* sense, as it is by Bp. Newton, no less than in a *literal* one: I, on the other hand, will venture explicitly to assert, that it is incapable of any other than a *figurative* sense. In short, in *the self-same year* that *the saints* were first delivered into the hand of *the little horn*, the mystic *holy city* began to be trodden under foot by a new race of idolaters, *the mystic witnesses* began to prophesy in sackcloth, *the mystic woman* fled into the wilderness, and *the ancient pagan Roman beast* revived. So again: in *the self-same year*, at the termination of *the 1260 days*, that series of events will commence, by which the kingdom shall be given unto *the saints*, the power of *the little horn* shall be destroyed, *the sanctuary* shall be cleansed, and *the beast* shall be slain. These synchronisms must ever be kept in view: and, unless they be *absolutely perfect*, they are in effect *no synchronisms*. A failure of *four years* or of *eight years*, as in the two cases which have been last discussed, destroys a synchronism no less completely than a failure of *as many centuries*.

2. Dr. Zouch's *Work on Prophecy* is liable to many of the same objections as the two works of Mr. Whitaker: but it deserves the same commendation and attention from the protestant reader, on account of its severe though just censures of *Popery*. Differing as I do very essentially from Dr. Zouch in many points, I with pleasure acknowledge my obligation to him for the interpretation of *the apocalyptic image of the beast*, which I have adopted in the present work: an interpretation so simple, so natural, so perfectly according both with the text and with the event, so little liable to any rea-

\* In strictness of speech *the literal Jerusalem* began to be trodden under foot long before, even in *the year 70*; so that Mr. Whitaker's scheme is untenable either way. See Luke xxi. 24. which can have no relation to Rev. xi. 2.

sonable objection, that I cannot but wonder how it came to be overlooked both by Mr. Mede, Sir Isaac Newton, and Bp. Newton.

Mr. Kett's *History the Interpreter of Prophecy*, and Mr. Galloway's *Commentary on the Revelation*, I have read with much attention: but I have risen from the perusal of them unconvinced. Both of these respectable authors appear to me to have fallen into several considerable errors; although the *general* idea, that *many recent events are foretold by the inspired writers*, is, I think, well founded.

3. Mr. Kett has involved the beautifully simple, and chronologically accurate, prophecies of Daniel in much needless confusion, by his scheme of ascribing to the same prediction a *primary* and a *secondary*, and sometimes even a *three-fold* and a *four-fold*, accomplishment. Had he more fully considered the nature of *chronological* prophecy, he would not have fallen into this mistake. Whatever may be the case with *insulated* predictions, it is physically impossible that a *chronological* one can admit of more than a *single* completion. The only difference between a *connected series of chronological prophecies*, and a *regular history*, is this: a *series of strictly chronological prophecies* is a *prospective detail of successive future events*; a *history* is a *retrospective detail of successive past events*. As well therefore might we suppose, that, when a *history* relates *one* circumstance, it ultimately means *another*; as expect to find, in a *chronological prophecy*, what Mr. Kett terms *double links of accomplishment*. The thing in both cases is equally impossible. The very circumstance of a prophecy being a *chronological* one excludes every idea of a *two-fold* completion. And, when it is further recollected, that Daniel more than once connects his predictions with certain specific numbers of years, it will appear yet more evidently, that Mr. Kett's system is perfectly untenable.

4. The preceding error cannot be charged upon Mr. Galloway: but, although he escapes this fault, he is repeatedly guilty of another; I mean *the want of a strict adherence to unity of symbolical interpretation*. If a symbol may signify *one* thing in *one* part of a prophecy,



and *another* thing in *another* part, there never can be even any approximation to certainty in explaining an hieroglyphical prediction. The whole must be mere vague conjecture : for a prophecy, delivered in symbols which admit of no specific definition, may safely bid defiance to the most elaborate efforts of the most acute commentator. This injudicious method of exposition has, I am persuaded, excited a greater degree of prejudice against every attempt to explain the writings of Daniel and St. John, than any other cause whatsoever. It has given a handle to the ignorant and the irreligious to represent these portions of Scripture as altogether unintelligible : whereas figurative language is undoubtedly as plain as any mere literal language, provided only the symbols of which it is composed be accurately and definitely understood ; and for the right understanding of them Scripture itself furnishes a key.

Besides the preceding *general* objections to the respective schemes of Mr. Kett and Mr. Galloway, I have many *particular* ones to their application of certain prophecies both of Daniel and St. John to *the tremendous infidel power of France* ; a power, which nevertheless I cannot refrain from esteeming *the long expected Antichrist*. But I will not anticipate the observations which will appear with more propriety in the body of my work. For the present, suffice it to say, that I am not conscious of ever having been guilty of the worse than childish vanity of introducing a new exposition merely because it is a new one. The Scriptures contain subjects much too solemn to be trifled with : and a commentator upon the prophecies ought never to displace any interpretation of his predecessors, without first assigning very weighty reasons for it.

With regard to *the 1260 prophetic days*, I have followed the most usual interpretation, which supposes them to be 1260 *natural or solar years*. Mr. Fleming indeed is of opinion, that, although *these prophetic days* be doubtless 1260 *years*, yet they are 1260 *years*, each consisting of no more than 360 *natural days* ; because *each great prophetic year* contains, not 365 *years*, but only 360 *years*. Hence he argues, that *the 1260 years*,

being years consisting of only 360 *natural days* each, are in reality no more than 1242 *solar years*; and that they must be estimated as such in all computations that are made respecting them.\* Independent however of the confusion introduced by such a mode of reckoning (for, would we be perfectly exact in it, we ought to attend both to the surplus of days above *the 1242 years*,† and to the hours and minutes by which *the true solar year* exceeds 365 days,) the Apocalypse itself, I think, affords us a sufficient proof of its erroneousness. Many other numbers are mentioned in that mysterious book besides *the 1260 years*; we must unavoidably therefore conclude, that the same mode of reckoning, which is used in one case, must be used likewise in another. Now Mr. Fleming himself allows, compelled thereto by the exact accomplishment of the prediction, that *the five prophetic months of the Saracenic locusts* are 150 *natural years*, not 150 *years of no more than 360 days each*;‡ and Bp. Newton has admirably shewn from the event, that *the prophetic hour, and day, and month, and year*, allotted to the victories of *the Euphratèan horsemen*, are equivalent to 391 *solar years and 15 days*, being the period comprehended between A. D. 1281 and A. D. 1672.§ Such then being the case, since *both these sets of numbers* are evidently to be computed by solar years, *the number 1260* must, if we would preserve consistency, be computed by solar years likewise. Consequently *the 1260 prophetic days of Daniel and St. John* are 1260 *complete solar years*, not, as Mr. Fleming supposes, only 1242 *solar years*.

\* Fleming's Apoc. Key, p. 20, 21, 22.

† 1260 years of 360 days each are equivalent to 1242 years and 270 days,

$$1260 \times 360 = 453600. \frac{453600}{365} = 1242 \frac{270}{365}$$

‡ Apoc Key, p. 37, 38

§ Mr. Fleming attempts to reconcile this period with his own scheme by computing it from *the rise of the Turkish empire to the taking of Constantinople*; but he forgets that the prophet directs us to compute it from the time when *the four Sultanies* were prepared to be let loose against *the Greek empire*; an expression, which implies that they were *already* in existence, though as yet bound fast by the dispensations of Providence, previous to the commencement of the period in question. See Apoc. Key, p. 39, 40.

To conclude : whatever may be the faults of the present work, they are exclusively my own. Had this, and my two former publications, been perused by the eminent characters to whom they are respectively inscribed, previous to their being sent to the press, they doubtless would have been much more perfect than they are : as it is, I alone am responsible for the errors which they may contain.

*Jan. 20, 1805.*

# P R E F A C E

## TO THE SECOND EDITION.

---

WHEN the first edition of this Work was published, we had not received intelligence of the disastrous termination of the campaign of 1805, at the battle of Austerlitz: *now*, although one decisive victory has been gained over the armies of Prussia, we are nevertheless in a state of somewhat similar uncertainty respecting the final issue of the present contest. I can therefore only again observe, as I then observed, that “the Christian cannot reasonably doubt, that the hand of God is stretched forth over the earth in a peculiar and remarkable manner; and that all things will assuredly work together to fulfil those prophecies which yet remain unaccomplished, and to prepare a way for the last tremendous manifestations of God’s wrath.”

The Work, of which a second edition is now offered to the public, was wholly written in *the year 1804*. After it was written, and even while I was revising and correcting it for the press, so many important events occurred, that I soon found it an endless labour perpetually to alter the text: hence I adopted the plan of preserving the text substantially the same as it was *originally* written, and of introducing into *additional* notes any remarkable passing circumstances that seemed to throw fresh light on my subject. The same plan is still pursued in the present edition. Except where I have corrected some errors (of no very great moment so far as my *main* subject is concerned,) into which I have since seen reason to believe that I had fallen, the text remains the same as it stood in *the year 1804*: and whatever matters of importance have occurred previous to my sending to the press, in *June 1806*, the revised copy from which this second edition has been printed, are all thrown into the notes. Yet so rapidly do great events succeed each other, that *even* this has not been sufficient

to bring the present edition perfectly down to the day of its publication: and it is only in a Preface that I have an opportunity of mentioning the formal resignation of the Roman Carlovigian emperorship by the chief of the house of Austria, the entire dissolution of the Germanic body, and the rapid formation of a new feudal empire subject to France under the title of *the Rhenish confederacy*.\* While the reader therefore is requested to consider the body of the work as written in *the year 1804*, he will find its proper date annexed to every note which has been *subsequently* added. Such, when the peculiar nature of my subject is considered, a subject on which every day throws new light, was thought to be on the whole the best plan which I could adopt.

Nothing is more favourable to the cause of truth than fair and open discussion. My work has been attacked; and I have answered the attack. As yet I have seen no reason to alter any of my main positions: however, both the attack and the reply are before the public. Though I am little inclined to be swayed *entirely* by mere authority, it would nevertheless argue an intolerable degree of presumption to slight with wayward petulance the opinions of those, whose superiority of learning and talents is acknowledged by all. Two of my positions, which were impugned with peculiar acrimony, were *the application of Daniel's wilful king† to infidel France, which I conceived to be the great Antichrist of the last days*; and *the reference of the remarkable expedition against Palestine and Egypt,‡ not to the king of the north, but to this wilful king*. Yet in both these positions I have the satisfaction to say that I am supported by the very high authority of the late Bp. Horsley. A letter, which I received from him, contains the following passage. "I entirely agree with you, that the latter part of the 11th chapter of Daniel (i. e. all that follows the 30th verse) has no sort of relation to Antiochus or any of the

\* In one of the last sheets which was sent to me previous to the impression being struck off, I have had it in my power to notice the assembling of the Jews by Buonaparte: but I have carefully avoided indulging myself in any speculations on this event.

† Dan. xi. 36—39.

‡ Dan. xi. 40—45.

Syrian kings. And the wilful king of the last ten verses I can understand of nothing but the great Antichrist of the last ages." This alone is a sufficiently explicit declaration, that his Lordship conceived the wilful king to be the subject of *all* the last ten verses of the 11th chapter, and that he did not refer the *six* last of those ten verses to the king of the north, as Mr. Whitaker maintains that we ought to do. If however the declaration contained in the Bishop's letter to me required any explanation, a most full explanation of it would be found in his Lordship's letter to Mr. King on Isaiah xviii. He there scruples not to avow his belief, that in the monstrous tyranny of infidel France, he beheld the rise of the Antichrist of the West, or at least of a principal and conspicuous branch of Antichrist: and to this Antichrist thus interpreted, the Antichrist depicted in Dan. xi. 36—39, he unreservedly ascribes the whole expedition into Palestine, foretold in Dan. xi. 40—45; adding, in perfect harmony with ver. 45, that he thinks there is ground for believing, as the early fathers believed, "that Palestine is the stage on which Antichrist, in the height of his impiety, will perish."\* Thus it appears, that his Lordship held the very opinion which drew upon me the censure of Mr. Whitaker. He supposed Daniel's wilful king to be the great Antichrist of the last ages; he supposed the great Antichrist of the last ages to be infidel France; and he supposed, that the expedition into Palestine would be undertaken by the great Antichrist or the wilful king, and consequently not by the king of the north.

Nov. 24, 1806.

\* See Bp. Horsley's Letter on Isaiah xviii. p. 102, 105, 106, 107, 108, 86, 87, 88, 98, 103, 104, 105, and see the citation from this letter in the second volume of the present work.

# CONTENTS.

---

## VOL. I.

---

### CHAP. I.

#### *General statement of the subject.*

THE 1260 years cannot have any connection with the persecutions of pagan Rome, p. 25.—They are the period of the dominance of the great Apostacy, and of the reign of the two little horns, p. 27.—They comprehend likewise towards their conclusion the tyranny of the Infidel king, who was destined to arise after the era of the Reformation, p. 35.—At the end of the 1260 years all these enemies of God will be destroyed, and the restoration of the Jews will commence, p. 36.—These matters are predicted in four of the prophecies of Daniel. 1. The dream of Nebuchadnezzar. 2. The vision of the four beasts. 3. The vision of the ram and the he-goat. 4. The latter end of the prophecy of the Scripture of truth, p. 36.—With these four prophecies the Apocalypse is closely connected, p. 46.—This grand chronological prediction contains a history of the Church of Christ from the days of St. John to the end of the world, p. 47.—It is divided into three successive periods of seven seals, seven trumpets, and seven vials, p. 48.—Under the three last trumpets the period of 1260 days is comprehended; the final trumpet containing the seven vials, p. 49.—This period is equal to the whole duration of the great two-fold Apostacy in its dominant state, p. 49.—The History of the Apostacy is detailed in two distinct parallel prophetic lines, p. 50.—The little book contains the peculiar history of the Western Apostacy under all the three woe-trumpets, p. 51.—Under the last woe-trumpet Antichrist is fully revealed, p. 52.—This last woe-trumpet comprehends along with its seven vials two remarkable periods of God's wrath, the harvest and the vintage, p. 54.—The harvest synchronizes with the three first vials; and the vintage with the last vial, p. 55.—After all the vials have been poured out, and the enemies of the Lord have been destroyed, the Millennium will commence, p. 56.—Points of correspondence between the prophecies of Daniel and St. John, p. 59.

---

### CHAP. II.

#### *On the symbolical language of prophecy.*

One symbol does not represent many different things, though one thing is frequently represented by many different symbols, p. 62.—

Symbols typify at once both temporal and spiritual things, provided the matters thus typified have a mutual relation and correspondence. p. 63.—Symbols may be reduced into various classes.—1. Heaven, with its subordinate symbols, p. 64.—2. Earth, with its subordinate symbols, p. 65.—3. A city, with its subordinate symbols, p. 68.—4. A woman, p. 72.—5. A vine, p. 73.—6. A beast, with its subordinate symbols, p. 73.

---

### CHAP. III.

*Concerning the scriptural phrases of the latter days, the last days, and the time of the end.*

In the old Testament, the phrases of *the latter days* and *the last days*, are synonymous; for the original expression, thus variously translated, is *the end of days*, p. 77.—*The end of days* denotes primarily *any time yet to come*, but secondarily *the period of the Millennium*, p. 78.—In the new Testament, *the last days*, when not spoken of prophetically, signify, *the whole period of the Gospel dispensation*, p. 80.—But, when *the latter days*, and *the last days*, are spoken of prophetically, then they bear two entirely distinct significations, p. 80.—In this case, *the latter days* import *the reign of superstition*, which continues during the greater part of the Apostacy: while *the last days* mean *the reign of Atheism and Infidelity*, which openly commences under the last woe-trumpet towards the termination of the Apostacy, p. 81.—The propriety of this distinction appears from a survey of the different prophecies professedly descriptive of *the latter days* and *the last days*, p. 82.—What we are to understand by the term *Antichrist*, p. 87.—*The time of the end* is *the termination of the 1260 days*; and it apparently extends through the 75 years, which intervene between that termination and the commencement of the Millennium, being the period of God's great controversy with his enemies, p. 91.

---

### CHAP. IV.

*Concerning the two first prophecies of Daniel, and the little horn of the fourth beast.*

From the days of Nebuchadnezzar to the commencement of the Millennium, there are to be no more than four empires, universal so far as the Church is concerned: the Babylonian; the Medo-Persian; the Macedonian; and the Roman, p. 98.—These are doubly symbolized by the different parts of a large human image, and by four distinct beasts, p. 98.—The last or Roman beast is described as having ten horns, and a little horn rising up among and behind them, p. 99.—The history of the little horn is not an epitome of the whole history of Antichrist, considered as Papal, Mohammedan, and In-



.....

fidel, p. 102.—Nor is the little horn itself revolutionary France, p. 106.—On the contrary, it is the Papacy, p. 117.—Yet it cannot be the temporal kingdom of the Papacy; but must be that spiritual kingdom of the Bishop of Rome, which, small as it originally was, grew at length into a catholic spiritual empire, symbolized by the second beast of the Apocalypse, p. 117.—It was to arise during the period that the Roman empire was divided into ten kingdoms, p. 119.—It was to be harmless during the first part of its existence; but, after the saints had been given by the secular power into its hand, it was to become an universal ecclesiastical tyrant, utterly offensive in the eyes of God, p. 119.—At that period of their being thus given into its hand, the 1260 days of the great Apostacy of the man of sin, considered in its dominant state, commenced, p. 120.—Exact correspondence of the character of the little horn with the character of the Papacy, p. 127.—The three horns, which were to be plucked up before the little horn, are not the Greek sovereignty in Italy, the kingdom of the Lombards, and the western imperial authority in Italy, p. 131.—Neither are they the Exarchate of Ravenna, the kingdom of the Lombards, and the state of Rome, p. 132.—But they are the kingdom of the Heruli, the kingdom of the Ostrogoths, and the kingdom of the Lombards, p. 135.—The body of the fourth beast comprehends the whole Roman empire, both in the East and in the West, p. 144.—But the ten horns are to be sought for only in the West, p. 144.—For the Constantinopolitan Emperor was the representative of the sixth head, and consequently cannot be esteemed one of the ten horns likewise, p. 145.—The ten horns are the ten kingdoms, into which the Empire was *originally* divided, p. 148.

---

## CHAP. V.

*Concerning the vision of the ram and the he-goat, and the little horn of the he-goat.*

The ram symbolizes the same power as the bear in the preceding vision; and the he-goat, the same as the leopard: the ram therefore is the Medo-Persian empire; and the he-goat, the Macedonian, p. 149.—The great horn of the he-goat is the imperial dynasty of Alexander, p. 150.—His four horns are the four Greek kingdoms erected by Cassander, Lysimachus, Ptolemy, and Seleucus, p. 150.—The little horn of the he-goat is not Antiochus Epiphanes, p. 151.—Neither is it the Roman power in Macedon and the East, p. 151.—Nor is it a compound symbol, typifying at once Antiochus Epiphanes, the Roman power in the East, Mohammedism, and the infidel republic of France, p. 158.—But it relates to Mohammedism alone: because nothing, except the spiritual empire of Mohammed, corresponds with it in every particular, local, circumstantial, and chronological, p. 159.—The tyrannical reign of both the spiritual little horns, Papal and Mohammedan, is to be dated from the same year 606, p. 163.—The propriety of fixing upon this date shewn, both

from the circumstance of the saints having been delivered into the hand of the Papal horn in this very year, and from its being the only date which will make all the prophetic numbers of Daniel harmonize together, p. 164.—Date of the vision of the ram and the he-goat ascertained by a computation deduced from the year 606, p. 173.—The character of the little horn of the he-goat perfectly corresponds with the character of Mohammedism in every particular, p. 185.—Whence it is concluded, that it symbolizes Mohammedism and nothing but Mohammedism, p. 211.

---

## CHAP. VI.

*Concerning Daniel's last vision, and the king who magnified himself above every god.*

The first part of this prophecy is both unconnected with the period of the 1260 days, and has been so amply and satisfactorily explained by Bp. Newton, that it is impossible to add any new observations to those which he has already made, p. 212.—But the second part is attended with considerable difficulties, p. 213.—What power did Daniel mean to describe under the character of the king, who was to magnify himself above every god? p. 213.—He is not a compound power, including both the Eastern Emperors and Western Popes, p. 213, 216.—Neither is he a double type; relating primarily to the Papacy, and ultimately either to Mohammedism or Infidelity, p. 214, 233.—What are we to understand by his disregarding the desire of women? p. 225.—He cannot be the same power as the man of sin, p. 230.—The power, which he typifies, must be sought for after the Reformation, as appears from the chronological series of events detailed by Daniel previous to the first mention of him, p. 221, 234.—It must likewise be sought for, as is manifest from the character of the king, in the last days of Atheism and Infidelity, p. 225.—The king however is not to be, like the mockers of the last days, any single individual, but a nation composed of individuals who openly profess the principles of the mockers, p. 238.—This nation is revolutionary France, the long-predicted Antichrist, p. 240.—The Atheism of France, p. 241.—Her worship, notwithstanding this Atheism, of a foreign god and tutelary deities, p. 241.—In what manner she caused her foreign god, and the upholders of her tutelary deities, to rule over many, p. 243.—In what manner she honoured them with desirable things, p. 247.—In what manner she has divided the land among the upholders of her tutelary deities for a price, p. 248.—Although the principles of Antichrist were working even in the apostolic age, yet eventually the main cause of his success in propagating his blasphemous opinions was the corruption of the truth by Popery, p. 249.—It was predicted however, that some of those, who had clean escaped from them that live in error, should be deluded by the false teachers of the last days, p. 251.—This accordingly has happened in various protestant countries, p. 251.—The possible objection, that the French have again

professed themselves Christians, answered, p. 251.—1. The established religion in France is a mere political puppet, p. 251.—2. The prophecies relative to the duration of the great dominant Apostacy, could not have been accomplished, unless Antichrist had become the avowed supporter of it, p. 252.—3. The prophecies, relative to the great events which are about to take place at the close of the 1260 years, could not have been exactly fulfilled, unless Antichrist, at some period or another of his existence, had actually leagued himself with the Papacy, p. 253.—The wars of the infidel king with the kings of the North and the South are not to take place till the time of the end, and consequently are still future, p. 256.—Such likewise is the case with his invasion of Palestine, and his destruction there, at the period of the restoration of the Jews, p. 267.

---

## CHAP. VII.

### *Of the four first apocalyptic trumpets.*

The seven apocalyptic trumpets may be divided into the four, which prepare the way for the revelation of the man of sin; and the three which comprehend the whole history of the apostacy in its dominant state both in the East and in the West, and which are styled *woe-trumpets*, p. 270.—The silence at the opening of the seventh seal indicates the anxious expectation of the troubles about to be produced by the sounding of the trumpets, p. 271.—By the sounding of the four first trumpets, he, that letted or prevented the revelation of the man of sin, is taken out of the way, p. 273.—At the sounding of the first trumpet, the northern nations, under Alaric, Radagaisus, and Attila, overrun the Roman empire, p. 273.—At the sounding of the second, Genseric king of the Vandals assaults the Western Empire from the South, and hurls it from its base, like a huge blazing mountain, p. 278.—At the sounding of the third, the line of the Western Cesars becomes extinct in the person of Augustulus, p. 280.—At the sounding of the fourth, the Roman Empire, considered as one great whole, experiences an eclipse of its power and splendor, by the downfall of its Western half, p. 282.—Statement of the grounds on which this explanation of the four first trumpets is adopted in preference to that of Bp. Newton, p. 283.

---

## CHAP. VIII.

### *Of the three last apocalyptic trumpets, or, as they are peculiarly styled, the three woe-trumpets.*

The prophecy here divides itself into two distinct lines, treating severally of the Eastern and Western branches of the great Apostacy, p. 285.—The first of the three woe-trumpets describes the com-

mencement of the dominance of the two-fold Apostacy, p. 286.—The second represents it in the zenith of its power, till the primary and only partial manifestation of Antichrist, p. 286.—The third exhibits its downfall, displaying at the same time the multiplied horrors of the harvest and vintage of the Lord, or the uncontrolled reign of the atheistical king and his subsequent destruction along with the other enemies of God, p. 286.

---

## CHAP. IX.

*Concerning the effects of the two first woe-trumpets in the East.*

At the sounding of the fifth trumpet, or the first woe-trumpet, in the East, the Apostate star Sergius opens the door of the bottomless pit, and lets out the impostor Mohammed with his Saracenic locusts, p. 287.—At the sounding of the sixth trumpet, or the second woe-trumpet, the four Sultanies of the Turkish horsemen are loosed from the river Euphrates ; and, in due season, slay the third part of men, or subvert the Constantinopolitan monarchy, p. 291.

## DISSERTATION, &amp;c.

## CHAPTER I.

*General Statement of the Subject.*

IN the Prophecies of Daniel and St. John, frequent mention is made of a certain period, during which, for wise purposes, unknown to us, the enemies of God should be allowed to persecute and oppress his *Church*. This period is indifferently described as consisting of *three times and a half*, *42 months*, or *1260 days*: for if we reckon *a time* or *a year* to contain *360 days*, *42 months*, or *1260 days*, will, in that case, be exactly equal to *three such years and a half*. In the language of prophecy however, as it is well known, *natural years* are termed *days*. Hence *1260 days* mean *1260 years*: and, by a parity of reckoning, *42 months* mean *so many months of years*; and *three years and a half* the same number of *years of years*. Consequently the period, during which *the Church* is to be oppressed by her enemies, amounts to *1260 natural years*.\*

\* That *days* mean *years*, may, I think, be proved, so far as matters of this nature are capable of proof, from the writings even of Daniel and St. John themselves.

We may venture to assume, that the same mode of computation, which is used by these writers in one passage, will be used by them in all other passages; at least in all those, which are marked by the common feature of treating, not of the fate of individuals, but of the fortune of communities. Hence, if any of their numerical prophecies be *already* accomplished, we shall thereby have a clue for ascertaining the proper method of interpreting all the rest.

Upon these principles, when we find that Daniel's famous prophecy of the *70 weeks* has been proved by the event of our Lord's advent to speak of *70 weeks of years*, or *490 years*, we may infer that his *three years and a half* mean *years of years*, and that his *2300*, *1290*, and *1335*, *days*, mean the same number of *natural years*. In a similar manner, finding equally from the event that the *ten days persecution of the church of Smyrna* mean the *ten years persecution* carried on by Diocletian, that the *five months ravages of the Saracenic locusts* mean *150 years*, and that the *year, the month, the day, and the hour of the Euphratèan horsemen* mean *391 years and 15 days*: we may thence infer, that St. John's *three years and a half* are *years of years*; his *42 months*, *months of years*; and his *1260 days* and his *three days and a half*, the same number of *natural years*. But we find that the *three years and a half*, the *42 months*, and the *1260 days*, are all plainly descriptive of one and

Both Daniel and St. John have given us abundantly sufficient reasons for concluding, that this period of persecution and trouble has no connexion with the persecutions which *the Church* endured from *the pagan Roman Emperors*. The first of these prophets, in his

the same period: hence we are *circumstantially* led to conclude, even *a priori*, that they all denote the same space of time. If then we adopt the ancient mode of computing by years of 360 days each, we shall find, that by such a mode of computation *three years and a half* exactly contain 42 *months*, or 1260 *days*: hence we are *numerically* led to conclude, that the three expressions are only different modes of describing one and the same period. The result of the whole is, that *prophetic days* mean *years*: and that *the three years and a half*, *the 42 months*, and *the 1260 days*, are alike used to denote 1260 *natural years*.

I am aware that a *year* is sometimes used in its *literal* sense, as in Isaiah vii. 8 xxiii. 17. Jerem. xxv. 11, 12, and even by Daniel himself when predicting the punishment of the individual Nebuchadnezzar (Dan. iv. 25.); yet other instances may be brought, as well as those already adduced, to prove that *days*, in the language of prophecy, mean *years*.

"After the number of the days in which ye searched the land, even forty days, each day for a year, shall ye bear your iniquities, even forty years." (Numb. xiv. 34.) "Lie thou also upon thy left side, and lay the iniquity of the house of Israel upon it; according to the number of the days that thou shalt lie upon it, thou shalt bear their iniquity. For I have laid upon thee the years of their iniquity, according to the number of the days, three hundred and ninety days: so shalt thou bear the iniquity of the house of Israel. And, when thou hast accomplished them, lie again on thy right side, and thou shalt bear the iniquity of the house of Judah forty days: I have appointed thee each day for a year." (Ezek. iv. 4, 5, 6.)

The only writers, that I have met with, who are unwilling to allow *the three times and a half* to be the same period as *the 1260 days*, are Mr. Burton and Mr. Galloway. The former asserts, without a shadow of authority from Daniel, that *each time* comprehends 70 *prophetic weeks*, or 490 *years*, merely because the famous prophecy relative to the Messiah, includes a period of 70 *weeks*; (Dan. ix. 24.) and he dates *the three times and a half* from the year 49, or the preaching of the Gospel to the Gentiles: consequently they bring him down to the year 1764, when the Jesuits were suppressed. Now, independent of his having no warrant for asserting, that a *time* comprehends 70 *weeks*, the event itself has shown him to be mistaken: for, whenever *the three times and a half* shall expire, *the Jews* will begin to be restored. (See Dan. xii. 7.) A *time*, however, as we learn from Daniel himself, is a *year*. (Dan. iv. 25.) But, a *year*, according to the old computation, comprehends 360 *days*, not 70 *weeks*. *Each time*, therefore, must comprehend 360 *prophetic days*. Consequently *three such times and a half* are exactly equal to 1260 *days*. Whence we may naturally conclude, that the two expressions mean the same period. In addition to these objections to Mr. Burton's scheme, it may be observed, that Daniel directs us to date *the three times and a half* from the era when the *saints* were delivered into the hand of *the little horn*. (Dan. vii. 25.) *The little horn*, however, was not to arise until *the Roman Empire* was divided into *ten Kingdoms*. (Dan. vii. 8.) It will follow, therefore, that *the three times and a half* cannot be dated from the year 49, which expired long before *the Empire* was thus divided. (Burton's Essay on the Numbers of Daniel and St. John, p. 247. *et infra*.) Mr. Galloway maintains, that *the three times and a half* are merely *three natural years and a half*. Yet he asserts, that *the 1260 days* are not *natural* but *prophetic days*. The use which he makes of this separation of the two periods from each other, shall be considered hereafter. The Papists maintain *the 1260 days* to be mere *natural days*. This they do for obvious reasons.

vision of the four great beasts or empires,\* intimates, that the power, into whose hand the saints should be given during the appointed period of 1260 years, should begin to arise in the age in which the last beast, or the Roman Empire, was divided into ten horns or kingdoms. The Roman Empire, however, was not thus divided till after it had become Christian, and till all the persecutions of the pagan Emperors had ceased. Whence it will necessarily follow, that the period of 1260 years cannot include the persecutions of Paganism, and that the power symbolized by the little horn of the Roman beast must be some power at once posterior to and distinct from the line of the pagan Emperors. The second of these prophets, in a similar manner, describes a variety of important events-as taking place between his own age and that in which the 1260 years may be supposed to have commenced; and, like Daniel, teaches us, that the date of those 1260 years is to be sought for, not at any era while the Roman Empire was one great monarchy, but after it had been broken into ten kingdoms. Independent indeed of chronological considerations, the very term of 1260 years plainly shews, that that period can have no relation to the tyranny of pagan Rome. Constantine published his famous edict for the encouragement of Christianity, and the abolition of all persecution, in the year 313. The primitive Church, therefore, was only subject to the malice of Paganism during the space of 313 years:† whereas it is, more or less, to be subjected to the malice of the little horn during the space of 1260 years.

But, although the pagan Roman Empire, has no connection with the persecution of 1260 years, we are evidently to look for the grand promoter or promoters of it within the limits of the old Roman Empire. The little horn, the ten horns, and the last head of the fourth beast, all arise out of that beast; the Roman Empire, therefore, must necessarily comprehend every one of these powers.

So again: since the Roman Empire had embraced Christianity previous to its division into ten kingdoms,

\* Daniel vii.

† This will of course be understood as only a loose computation. It serves, however, for the present purpose, as well as a more exact one.

since *all those ten kingdoms* were converted very soon after their foundation, and since *the little horn* is represented as being contemporary with them, and as springing up among them: *the little horn*, whatever it may be designed to symbolize, must be some power at least *nominally* Christian. This point is proved by history: for, at the time when *the Roman Empire* was divided, we shall in vain look for the rise of any pagan power within the limits of *the Empire*, that at all answers to the prophetic character of *the little horn*. Yet it is manifest, that *the little horn* must have been long since in existence, because it is described as first beginning to make its appearance at the era of the division of *the Roman Empire*.

If then *the little horn* be the type of *some Christian power*, it must be one that has greatly fallen away from the purity and simplicity of *the primitive Church*; because it is described as wearing out the saints during the space of *three times and a half*, or 1260 *natural years*, and as speaking great words by the side of the Most High, so as to place itself upon an equality with God.

The nature both of *this power*, and of *its apostacy*, we are clearly taught by St. John. In the Apocalypse the same *ten-horned beast*, or *Roman Empire*, as that mentioned by Daniel, is described as standing in *the wilderness*. Here, however, he appears without his *little horn*; and instead of it is represented as supporting *a harlot*, who, precisely like *the little horn*, is said to be a great persecutor of the faithful; for St. John beheld her "drunken with the blood of the saints, and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus." Now we learn from the ancient prophets, that *an adulterous woman* is the type of *an apostate and idolatrous church*;<sup>\*</sup> the apocalyptic *harlot*, therefore, must symbolize *some such church*. But St. John tells us, that *this harlot* is *the great city* which in his time reigned over all the kings of the earth, and whose seat of empire was founded upon seven hills: *the harlot*, therefore, must be *some apostate church*, whose influence extends over all the kings of the earth, and whose seat is in the seven-hilled city Rome.

\* See Isaiah lvii. 5—10. Jerem. ii. 20. iii. 1—20. Ezek. xvi. xxiii.



As for the peculiar nature of the *apostacy* with which this church is stigmatized, it is very largely described by the Apostle in the course of his prophetic vision. The church in question was to be notorious for persecuting the saints of God; for making all nations drunken with the cup of her spiritual fornication or idolatry; for working pretended miracles; for compelling the whole world to worship an image; for laying such as presumed to dissent from her under the severest interdicts; and for carrying on an iniquitous traffic in all sorts of valuable commodities, and (what distinguishes her from common traders) in the souls of men.

This same ecclesiastical power is likewise described by St. Paul, and its deflection from primitive Christianity is expressly styled by him *an Apostacy*. "Now we beseech you, brethren," says he to the Thessalonians, "by the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, and by our gathering together unto him, that ye be not soon shaken in mind, or be troubled, neither by spirit, nor by word, nor by letter, as from us, as that the day of Christ is at hand. Let no man deceive you by any means: for that day shall not come, except there come an *Apostacy* first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition; who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he, as God, sitteth in the temple of God, shewing himself that he is God. Remember ye not, that, when I was yet with you, I told you these things? And now ye know what withholdeth, that he might be revealed in his time. For the mystery of iniquity doth already work: only he, who now letteth, will let, until he be taken out of the way. And then shall that wicked be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming: even him, whose coming is after the working of Satan, with all power, and signs, and lying wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish: because they received not the love of the truth, that they might be saved. And for this cause God shall send them strong delusion, that they should believe a lie; that they

all might be damned who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness.”\*  
 .....

The nature of *this apostacy*, which should be upheld by *the man of sin*, he also, like St. John, elsewhere sets forth at large. “Now the spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall apostatize from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines concerning demons, through the hypocrisy of liars, † having their conscience seared with a hot iron, forbidding to marry, and commanding to abstain from meats, which God hath created to be received with thanksgiving of them which believe and know the truth.—Refuse profane and old wives’ fables, and exercise thyself rather unto godliness. For bodily exercise profiteth little: but godliness is profitable unto all things, having promise of the life that now is, and of that which is to come.” ‡ Here we learn, in addition to the marks of *the apostate church* given us by St. John, that it should be noted for the worship, not only of idols, but of demons or canonized dead men; for its prohibition of marriage to certain classes of men: for its superstitious injunctions to abstain from particular kinds of food; and for its attachment to vain traditions and bodily mortifications, which have no warrant from scripture, and which are very far from being conducive to real godliness.

Though I have cited the prophecies relative to *the man of sin* and the *Apostacy*, I shall purposely refrain from discussing the character of that arch enemy of sound religion, because I have nothing to add to Bp. Newton’s excellent Dissertation upon the subject. I am aware that some great modern names have applied the prophecy, of *the man of sin* to French *Infidelity*; but I have not yet seen any arguments which convince me of the propriety of such an application. In *every* particular, as

\* 2 Thes. iv. 1.

† The ingenious Mr. Whitaker conceives the word *δαίμονων* to be an adjective, and translates the passage “giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of wretched men speaking lies in hypocrisy.” How far such a translation be allowable according to the general idiom of the inspired writers of the New Testament, I will not take upon me to determine. It certainly accords very well with the context of the passage. General View of the Prophecies p. 231.

‡ 1 Tim. iv. 1

Bp. Newton hath fully shewn, the prediction answers to *Popery* and *the Pope*: in several particulars it by no means answers either to *French Infidelity* or *the French Republic*. Hence I conclude, that Bp. Newton's interpretation is the true one.\*

The period, assigned both by Daniel and St. John to the tyrannical reign of *the man of sin* or *the little horn of the Roman beast*, and the dominance of *the great western Apostacy*, is *three times and a half*, or 1260 years. Here, therefore, we must define the proper mode of dating that period.

In prophecies, which are *strictly chronological*, the overt acts of communities, or the heads of communities, are necessarily alone considered in the fixing of dates; because it would be impossible for us to know how to date any particular period from the insulated and unauthorized acts of individuals. But in prophecies which are *not strictly chronological*, the scope is much more wide, and much less definite; extending, not merely to communities and their heads, but to every individual whose actions the prophecies may describe. On these grounds there are two entirely different dates to *the Apostacy*. The *first* is its date when considered as relating to *individuals*: the *second* is its date, when considered as relating to *that community over which the man of sin presides*. St. Paul describes *the apostacy* in its *first*, or *individual* character; Daniel and St. John specify its triumphant duration in its *second* or *general* character. Now it is manifest, that the date of *the Apostacy*, when considered *individually*, is the very day and hour when any single Christian individual was first guilty of any one of those acts which characterize *the Apostacy*; and it is equally

\* In one point, however, I certainly think his Lordship mistaken. He singularly confounds, as it appears from his citations, *the man of sin*, whom he rightly judges to be *the first little horn* mentioned by Daniel, both with *the second little horn*, and with *the king who magnified himself above every god*. Thus he makes *the two little horns* and *the king* to be all *one and the same power*; herein being inconsistent even with his own scheme of interpretation, which had previously represented *the second little horn* as *the Roman Empire invading the East by way of Macedon*. Mr. Kett, agreeably to his favourite plan of double accomplishments of the same prophecy, fancies, that *the man of sin* is at once both *the Papal* and *the Infidel power*. (Compare Hist. the Interp. Vol. ii. p. 23, 24. with Vol. i. p. 381.) I shall hereafter shew, that such a plan is altogether untenable.

manifest, that this date never can be ascertained by *man*, but is known unto *God* alone. We can say, indeed, in general terms, that monkish celibacy, and a superstitious veneration of saints and angels, were creeping fast into the Church during the fourth, fifth, and sixth centuries; but we shall find it impossible to point out the precise year of their commencement. Such being the case, Daniel and St. John, in their chronological prophecies, consider *the Apostacy* only in its *public* and *authorized* capacity; and teach us to esteem *the 1260 years*, as being the period of *the public dominance of the Apostacy*, not of *its individual continuance*. Accordingly they both specify, with much exactness, the era, from which those years are to be computed. Daniel directs us to date them from the time when *the saints were by some public act of the state delivered into the hand of the little horn*: and St. John, in a similar manner, teaches us to date them from the time when *the woman, the true Church, fled into the wilderness from the face of the serpent*: when *the mystic city of God* began to be trampled under foot by a new race of Gentiles, or idolaters; when *the great Roman beast*, which had been slain by the preaching of the Gospel, revived in its bestial character, by setting up an idolatrous spiritual tyrant in the Church, or, as Daniel expresses it, by delivering *the saints* into the hand of such a tyrant; and when *the witnesses* began to prophecy in sackcloth. A date, which will answer to these concurring particulars, can certainly have no connection with the mere acquisition of a *temporal* principality by the Pope. It seems most probably to be the year, in which *the Bishop of Rome* was constituted *supreme head of the Church*, with the proud title of *Universal Bishop*: for by such an act *the whole Church*, comprehending both good and bad, both *the saints* of the Most High and those who were tainted with the gentilism of *the Apostacy*, considered *individually*, were formally given by the chief secular power, *the head of the Roman Empire*, into the hand of the encroaching *little horn*. This year was *the year 606*, when the reigning Emperor Phocas, the representative of *the sixth head of the beast*, declared Pope Boniface to be *Universal Bishop*: and the

*Roman church* hath ever since shown itself to be *that little horn*, into whose hands *the saints* were then delivered, by styling itself, with equal absurdity and presumption, *the Catholic or universal Church*. The year 606 then seems to be the date of *the 1260 years*, and the era of what St. Paul terms *the revelation of the man of sin*. The *Apostacy*, in its *individual* capacity, was already in existence *previous* to such revelation; hence he represents it as commencing *before* it: but, as soon as *the man of sin* was openly revealed, by having *the saints* delivered into his hand, then apparently commenced *the 1260 years* of the *Apostacy* in its *public* and *dominant* capacity.\*

Hitherto I have spoken only of the *western Apostacy of the Romish Church*, predicted by St. Paul, and represented by Daniel under the symbol of a *little horn* springing up out of the *fourth* or *Roman beast*, which should exercise a tyrannical authority over *the saints* during the period of *1260 years*; I must now notice *the contemporary eastern Apostacy of Mohammedism*.

In the Apocalypse, St. John describes the origin of this false religion at the beginning of *the first woe-trumpet*; the blast of which introduces, in *the self-same year 606*, the *universal episcopacy of the Roman prelate*, and the *commencement of Mohammedism*. From the description, which he gives us of *the rise of Mohammedism*, it appears, that we are to consider it in the light of an *apostacy*, no less than *Popery*, though an *apostacy* doubtless of a very different nature. *A star which had fallen from heaven*, or an *apostate Christian minister*, is said to open the bot-

\* I with pleasure strengthen myself with the concurring opinion of Mr. Whitaker, relative to the proper mode of dating *the 1260 years*: and the more so, because my own sentiments on the subject were decidedly formed, so far as we may be allowed to form sentiments on such a subject, previous to my knowing what he had written respecting it. "When then were they (*the saints*) thus given into his (*the little horn's*) hand; and any authority, that may be called *universal*, granted to *the Pope*? Was it not, when he was first acknowledged *Universal Bishop*? Then did he become a monarch diverse from the first. Then were the souls of men, an article of merchandize in the mystic Babylon, given into his hand. And so well was this title deemed to merit the reproach of speaking great things, that Mr Gibbon has made the following remark on Gregory. 'In his rival the Patriarch of Constantinople, he condemned the *Anti-christian* title of *Universal Bishop*, which the successor of St. Peter was too haughtily to concede, and too feeble to assume' Yet, within a few years, in the year 606, did Boniface assume the title of *Universal Bishop*, in virtue of a grant from the tyrant Phocas." General and connected View of the Prophecies, p. 207, 208.

unless *jud*, and to let out *Apollyon* and his figurative locusts; and we shall find, in exact harmony with the prophecy, that *Mohammedism* is in reality a sort of corrupted and apostate Christianity. Like the divine religion of the Messiah, it claims to be a revelation from God, at the hand of an inspired prophet, to call the world from the vanities of polytheism to the worship of the one true God, and to declare authoritatively a state of future rewards and punishments. Like the Gospel, it professes to build itself upon the law of Moses; and allows the divine commission both of the Jewish legislator, and of Jesus Christ, the Son of God. But, borrowing the peculiar tenet of the *fallen star*, it pronounces the Saviour of the world to be a mere mortal, and makes void the whole of the Gospel; it contaminates, with licentious impurity, the doctrine of future retribution; it presumptuously thrusts the Messiah from his office; and, like its fellow apostacy *Poper*y, it propagates and upholds itself by the sword. It appears, moreover, from a computation which will hereafter be made from the numbers of Daniel, that, like *Poper*y, it is to reign precisely 1260 years; and consequently, since both these apostacies commenced in the same year, that they are both likewise to begin to be overthrown in the same year. Of this period nearly twelve centuries have already elapsed: we are therefore fast approaching to the time of the end, and to the day of God's controversy with the nations. The prosperous duration then of *Mohammedism* being the very same as the prosperous duration of *Poper*y,\* and each being considered by the inspired writers as an apostacy or deflection from pure Christianity, we shall not wonder to find them both represented by the very same symbol of a little horn. Accordingly, as we shall hereafter see, Daniel describes *Poper*y, or the western apostacy of the man of sin, under the image of a little horn springing up among the ten contemporary horns of the Roman beast; while he predicts the tyranny of *Mohammedism*, or the eastern apostacy founded upon the anti-trinitarian doctrines of the *fallen star*, under the kindred image of another little horn

\* The reader will of course understand that I mean *Poper*y properly so called, or the reign of the little horn after the saints had been given into his hand.

arising out of the ruins of *one of the four Greek horns of the Macedonian beast.*\*

These two great enemies of the Gospel flourish during the whole space of *the 1260 years* comprehended under *the three woe-trumpets*; a *third enemy* is predicted as arising towards *the close* of those years, as continuing only *a short space of time*, and as perishing firmly leagued with *Popery* at *the very time of the end*, or after *the termination of the 1260 years*. St. John brings him upon the grand stage of the world with the blast of *the third woe-trumpet*, and foretells that his open development should be immediately preceded by the fall of *a tenth part of the great Roman City*. The miseries, with which he should afflict mankind, he figuratively describes as *a harvest of God's wrath* which should precede *the dreadful vintage of the time of the end*; and he sets forth more distinctly the nature of those miseries under the pouring out of *a certain number of the seven vials*. Daniel describes *the same power*, as *a king or state* rising up after the era of *the Reformation*, and marked by a lawless contempt for all religion. And St. Paul, St. Peter, and St. Jude, concur in describing with wonderful accuracy the principles which should be adopted by the adherents of *this power*. As for St. John, in addition to what he has said upon the subject in the Apocalypse,

\* Here again I shall strengthen myself with the concurrence of Mr. Whitaker; and I may here again observe, that my own opinion relative to *the little horn of the he-goat* was formed previous to my knowing what was Mr. Whitaker's opinion on the subject. "In *the seventh chapter* of Daniel there is evidently given the prediction of *the man of sin*, or *the slavery of the Western empire*; and in *the eighth* appears to be described *the rise and progress of Mohammed and his followers*, or *the subjugation of the Eastern*. I here use the language of hesitation, not from any doubt, but from a sincere desire to avoid any just imputation of arrogance in bringing forward an interpretation, in which I am not patronized by any preceding writer. Let however only the latter part of the vision of *the Ram and the Goat* be seriously considered; and I think *the rise, the progress, and the character, of Mohammed* will be "fully manifest." (Gen. View of the Proph. p 91, 92.) Mr. Whitaker would have expressed himself with greater accuracy had he considered *the little horn* as being *Mohammedism*, instead of *Mohammed and his followers*. His present mode of interpreting the prophecy has led him into the error of applying the expression, "he shall be broken without hand," (Dan. viii. 25.) to *the dwindling away of the Saracenic empire and the personal fall of Mohammed*; whereas it relates to the destruction of *the little horn itself, or the Mohammedan religion* at the end of the period mentioned in the 14th verse; for, if *the king of fierce countenance be the little horn, the breaking of the king must be the breaking of the horn*. Gen. View of the Proph. p. 134.

he teaches us, that the leading badge, whereby this monster whom he styles *Antichrist* might be known, should be *an open denial of the Father and the Son.\**

At *the commencement of the time of the end*, which synchronizes with *the termination of the 1260 years*, when the judgments of God begin to go forth against these *three enemies* of the Messiah, *the restoration of the Jews* will commence; and, when *God's great controversy with the nations* is fully decided, and when not only *Judah* but likewise *the whole house of Israel* has been brought back into the land of their fathers, then will begin the long-expected period of *millennian happiness*. This period, which is styled *the reign of Christ and his saints upon earth, or the reign of the symbolical mountain*, will comprize the space either of 1000 years or of 360,000 years, according as the number predicted be composed of natural or prophetic years. Which of the two be intended by St. John, the event must determine.

These are the principal matters, of which the prophecies relative to *the 1260 years* will be found to treat. Previous to my discussing them at large, I shall bring together in one point of view *the four predictions* of Daniel which relate to them, and afterwards briefly state the manner in which I conceive the Apocalypse ought to be arranged.

I. The first of these four predictions is *the dream of Nebuchadnezzar* with Daniel's interpretation of it.

“Thou, O king, sawest; and, behold, a great image. This great image, whose brightness was excellent, stood before thee; and the form thereof was terrible. This image's head was of fine gold, his breast and his arms of silver, his belly and his thighs of brass, his legs of iron, his feet part of iron and part of clay. Thou sawest, till that a stone was cut out without hands, which smote the image upon his feet that were of iron and clay, and brake them to pieces. Then was the iron, the clay, and the brass, the silver and the gold, broken to pieces together, and became like the chaff of the summer threshing floors; and the wind carried them away, that no place was found for them: and the stone, that



smote the image, became a great mountain, and filled the whole earth. This is the dream, and we will tell the interpretation thereof before the king—Thou art this head of gold. But after thee shall arise another kingdom inferior to thee, and another third kingdom of brass, which shall rule over all the earth. And the fourth kingdom shall be strong as iron: forasmuch as iron breaketh in pieces and subdueth all things: and, as iron that breaketh, all these shall it break in pieces and bruise. And, whereas thou sawest the feet and toes, part of potter's clay, and part of iron; the kingdom shall be divided; but there shall be in it of the strength of the iron, forasmuch as thou sawest the iron mixed with miry clay. And, as the toes of the feet were part of iron and part of clay, so the kingdom shall be partly strong and partly broken. And, whereas thou sawest iron mixed with miry clay, they shall mingle themselves with the seed of men: but they shall not cleave one to another, even as iron is not mixed with clay. And in the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom, which shall never be destroyed: and the kingdom shall not be to other people; but it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall stand forever.”\*

2. The second is Daniel's vision of *the four beasts*, and *the little horn of the fourth beast*.

“I saw in my vision by night; and, behold, the four winds of heaven strove upon the great sea. And four great beasts came up from the sea, diverse from one another. The first was like a lion, and had eagle's wings: I beheld till the wings thereof were plucked, and it was lifted up from the earth, and made stand upon the feet as a man, and a man's heart was given to it. And behold another beast, a second, like to a bear; and it raised up itself on one side, and it had three ribs in the mouth of it between the teeth of it: and they said thus unto it, Arise, devour much flesh. After this I beheld, and lo another, like a leopard, which had upon the back of it four wings of a fowl; the beast had also four heads; and dominion was given to it. After this I saw in the night

\* Dan. ii. 31.

visions, and behold a fourth beast, dreadful and terrible and strong exceedingly; and it had great iron teeth: it devoured and break 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. I considered the horns; and, behold, there came up among them another little horn, before whom three of the first horns were plucked up by the roots: and, behold, in this horn were eyes like the eyes of a man, and a mouth speaking great things. I beheld, till the thrones were set, 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. 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. I beheld then because of the voice of the great words which the horn spake: I beheld even till the beast was slain, and his body destroyed, and given to the burning flame. As concerning the rest of the beasts, they had their dominion taken away: yet their lives were prolonged for a season and a time. I saw in the night visions; and, behold, one like the Son of man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of days, and they brought him near before him. 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. I, Daniel, was grieved in my spirit in the midst of my body, and the visions of my head troubled me. I came near unto one of them that stood by, and asked him the truth of all this. So he told me, and made me know the interpretation of the things. These great beasts, which are four, are four kings, which shall arise out of the earth. But the saints of the Most High shall take the kingdom, and possess the kingdom for ever, even for ever and ever. 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, break in pieces, and stamped the residue with his teet; and of the ten horns that were in his head; and of the other which came up, and before whom three fell; even of the horn that had eyes, and a mouth that spake very great things, whose look was more stout than his fellows. I beheld, and the same horn made war with the saints, and prevailed against them: 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. Thus he said, The fourth beast shall be the fourth kingdom upon earth, which shall be diverse from all kingdoms, and shall devour the whole earth, and shall tread it down, and break it in pieces. And the ten horns are ten kings that shall arise out of this kingdom: and another shall rise behind them;\* and he shall be diverse from the first, and he shall subdue three kings. And he shall speak great words by the side of 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 a time. But the judgment shall sit, and they shall take away his dominion, to consume and to destroy it unto the end. 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." †

\* I have adopted this translation of the passage from Mr. Mede; who, instead of *after the kingdoms*, would render the original expression *behind them*, following therein the Greek version  $\alpha\pi\iota\sigma\omega\alpha\nu\tau\omega\upsilon$ : and he takes the meaning to be, that *the ten horns* were not aware of the growing up of *the little horn*, till it overtopped them. (Works Book iv. Epist. 24.) In reality *the little horn*, as we shall hereafter see, did not spring up posterior in point of time to the *other horns*, but gradually arose among them, during the turbulent period in which *the Roman empire* was broken into *ten kingdoms* by the northern nations.

† This is the literal translation of the original passage: and its import I apprehend to be, not that *the little horn* should speak great words *against the Most High*, but that he should arrogantly place himself upon an equality with God; or, as St. Paul expresses it, that he should sit as God, in the temple of God, shewing himself that he is God. Symmachus appears to me to come much nearer the real meaning of the expression than our present English version; "Ut interpretatus est Symmachus, sermones quasi Deus loquitur?" Hieron. Comment. Vol. iii. p. 1103. cited by Bishop Newton.

3. The third is the vision of *the ram and the he-goat*, and *the little horn* which was to spring out of *one of the four horns of the he-goat*.

“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. 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. 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 he-goat had a notable horn between his eyes. 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. And I saw him come close unto the ram, and he was moved with choler against him, and smote the ram, and break 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. 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. And out of one of them came fourth a little horn, which waxed exceeding great toward the south, and toward the east, and toward the pleasant land. And it waxed great even against the host of heaven; and it cast down some of the host and of the stars to the ground, and stamped upon them. Yea, he magnified himself even against the Prince of the host; and by him the daily sacrifice was taken away, and the place of his sanctuary was cast down. And the host was given over to him by reason of their transgression against the daily sacrifice: and it cast down the truth to the ground, and it practised, and prospered. Then I heard one saint speaking, and another saint said unto that certain saint which spake, For how long a time shall the vision last, the daily sacrifice be taken away, and the transgression of desolation continue, to give both the sanctuary and the host to be

trodden under foot? \* And he said unto me, Until two thousand and three hundred days; † then shall the sanctuary be cleansed. 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—And he said unto me, Understand, O son of man, for the Vision shall reach even unto the time of the end ‡—And he said, Behold, I will make thee know what shall be in the latter end of the indignation: for it (the Vision) shall reach even to the appointed time of the end. The ram, which thou sawest, having two horns, are the kings of (the united empire of) Media and Persia. And the rough goat is the King of Grecia. And the great horn, that is between his eyes, is the first king. Now, that being broken, whereas four stood up in its stead, four kingdoms shall stand up out of the nation, but not in his power. And at the end of their kingdom, § when the transgressors are come to the full, a king of fierce countenance, and teaching || dark sentences, shall stand up. 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 people of the holy ones. And through his policy also he shall cause craft to prosper in his hand; and he shall magnify himself in his heart and he shall destroy many in negligent security. ¶ He shall

\* See Bp Newton's Dissert. xv.

† The Seventy read 2400 days, and certain copies mentioned by Jerome 2200 days. These varying numbers will be discussed hereafter.

‡ So the LXX and the Arabic version translate this passage, and I believe very rightly, as the context indeed sufficiently shows. It had just before been declared, that *the length of the vision should be 2300 days*: it is now declared, that the vision should be *to the time of the end* or *to the termination of those days*: and it is immediately after declared, that it should be *to the appointed time of the end*. All these seem to be only different modes of specifying the same thing, namely, *what the argel considered to be the length of the vision*.

§ The meaning of the expression (if we may judge from the symbolical part of the prophecy.) is, *not during the latter period of their kingdom, but after the complete termination of their kingdom*: that is to say, *the king of fierce countenance was to stand up, not while they were yet reigning, but some time or other after they had ceased to reign*.

|| The word, here used in the original, is in the Hiphil or causal form; whence it will not signify *understanding* as it is rendered in our English translation, but *causing to understand, or teaching*.

¶ I conceive the phrase to mean, *he shall destroy many while in a state of negligent security, and little suspecting that any attack would be made upon them from that quarter.* (See Parkhurst's Heb. Lex. Vox. 772.) The Sev-

also stand up against the prince of princes; but he shall be broken without hand. 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 many days.”\*

4. The fourth is contained in *the latter end of the eleventh Chapter*, and extends to *the conclusion of the Book*.

“And after him (Antiochus Epiphanes†) arms shall stand up, and they shall pollute the sanctuary of strength, and shall take away the daily sacrifice, and they shall place the abomination that maketh desolate. And such as do wickedly against the covenant he shall cause to dissemble‡ with flatteries: but the people, that do know their God, shall be strong and do exploits. And they that understand among the people shall instruct many: yet they shall fall by the sword and by flame, by captivity and by spoil, many days. Now, when they shall fall, they shall be holpen with a little help: but many shall cleave to them with flatteries. And some of them of understanding shall fall§ in purifying them, and in purging them, and in making them white, even to the time of the end: because it is yet unto the time appointed. And (after this second persecution of the men of understanding) a king shall do according to his will; and he shall exalt himself, and magnify himself above every god,

enty and the Arabic translate the passage “he shall destroy many by fraud,” which conveys an idea nearly similar. There is a passage in the book of Judges, which is an excellent comment on these words of the prophet. “Then the five men departed and came to Laish, and saw the people that were therein, how they dwelt careless, after the manner of the Zidonians, quiet and secure.—And they came unto Laish, unto a people that were at quiet and secure: and they smote them with the edge of the sword, and burnt the city with fire.” (Judg. xviii 7, 27.) The same idea occurs in the book of Proverbs: “Devise not evil against thy neighbour, seeing he dwelleth securely by thee.” (Prov. iii. 29. See also Ezek. xxxviii. 11.) Tacitus uses a similar mode of expression. “In latere Chaucorum Cattorumque, Cherusci nimiam ac marcentium diu pacem illaccessiti nutrierunt: idque jucundius quam tutius fuit; quia inter impotentes ac validos fulso quiescas.” Tac. de mor. Germ. C. 36.

\* Dan. viii. 3.

† See Sir Isaac Newton’s Observ. on Dan. c. 12. p. 188, 189.

‡ The Arabic version and the LXX read this verb plurally; and I firmly believe that such is the proper reading, for *the Roman arms* are here spoken of. Hence, as it is said, *they*, (the arms) *shall pollute, they shall take away, they shall place*; so it seems to have been likewise originally said, *they shall cause to dissemble*.

§ That is *perish*. The word used here is the same as that which occurs immediately above, when *the men of understanding* are said to *fall* by the sword and by flame.

and shall speak marvellous things against the God of gods, and shall prosper till the indignation be accomplished: for that, that is determined, shall be done. Neither shall he regard the God of his fathers, nor (him who is) the desire of women,\* nor regard any god: for he shall magnify himself above them all. Yet, when he is established (in power,) he shall honour tutelary gods together with a god†; even, together with a god whom his fathers knew not, he shall honour them with gold, and silver, and with precious stones, and desirable things: and he shall practise‡ (prosperously). Unto the upholders of his tutelary gods,§ together with the foreign god whom he shall acknowledge, he shall multiply glory: and he shall cause them to rule over many: and he shall divide the land (among them, selling it) for a price. And at the time of the end a king of the South shall butt at him; and a king of the North shall come against

\* Such, I am convinced, is the proper translation of the phrase חמרת נשים. It means, not the desire of women by others, or the wish to have women; but, on the contrary, that which women themselves desired to have. This point will be discussed at large hereafter.

† “Whereas the preposition ל in לאלת is usually neglected, I express the preposition ה, and construe God and Mahuzzim apart as two; viz. To or together with, God he shall honour Mahuzzim. For the preposition ה is made of אל, and signifies the same with it, namely an addition or adjoining of things, ad, juxta, apud, to, besides, together with; as Lev. xviii. 18. Thou shalt not take a wife to her sister אל אחתה, that is, together with her sister.” (Mede’s Works Book III. Apostacy of the latter times. Part I. Chap. 16.) Mr. Mede supposes the foreign god adored along with the Mahuzzim to be Christ; and renders the passage “together with God he shall honour Mahuzzim.” The foreign god however, venerated by the king, certainly cannot be Christ, both because the prophet had just before declared, that the king should speak marvellous things against the God of gods; and because, as we shall hereafter see, he was specially to reject the worship of Christ, here represented as the desire of women or wives, as Haggai styles him the Desire of all nations. On these grounds, I render the passage “together with a god he shall honour Mahuzzim,” rather than “together with God he shall honour Mahuzzim.”

‡ “Faciet, id est, mirè succedet quicquid agit.” (Calv apud Pol. Syn in loc) “It cast down the truth to the ground, and it practised and prospered.” (Dan. viii 12.) The same word is used in the original in both these passages. See also Rev. xiii 5, and Bishop Newton’s remarks upon the word πομπή in his Dissertation upon that Chapter.

§ “למוצרי מעוים, cu. todibus Maozim, ex בצר—Liquet ex verbo המושלים, dominos faciet eos, notari in vocabulo מוצרי personas, non munitiones.” (Houbigant in loc cited by Bp. Newton.) The Bishop himself considers the word to mean defenders, supporters, or champions: and these champions he supposes to be the popish priests and monks. Though I entirely differ from his Lordship in the interpretation of the prophecy, and though I am unable to discover in it any allusion to Popery, yet I think him perfectly right in his translation of the word in question.

him like a whirlwind, with chariots, and with horsemen, and many ships. Yet he shall enter into the countries, and shall overflow, and pass over, and shall enter into the glorious land, and many countries shall be overthrown: but these shall escape out of his hand, even Edom, and Moab, and the chief of the children of Ammon. He shall stretch forth his hand also upon the countries: and the land of Egypt shall not escape. But he shall have power over the treasures of gold and silver, and over all the precious things of Egypt: and the Lybians and the Ethiopians shall be at his steps. And tidings out of the East and out of the North shall trouble him: therefore he shall go forth with great fury to destroy, and to devote many to utter destruction under the pretext of religion.\* And he shall plant the curtains of his pavilions between the seas in the glorious holy mountain; yet he shall come to his end and none shall help him. And at that time shall Michael stand up, the great prince which standeth up for the children of thy people: and there shall be a time of trouble, such as never was since there was a nation even to that same time: and at that time thy people shall be delivered, every one that shall be found written in the book. And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake; some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt. And they that understand† shall shine as the brightness of the firmament; and they that turn many to righteousness as the stars for ever and ever. But thou, Daniel, shut up the words, and seal the book, even to the time of the end: many shall run to and fro, and knowledge shall be increased. Then I Daniel looked; and, behold, there stood other two, the one on this side of the bank of the river, and the other on that side of the bank of the river. And one said to the man clothed in linen, which was above the waters of the river, Until how long shall be the end of the wonders! And I heard the man clothed in linen, which was above the waters of the river; and he held up his right hand and his left hand unto heaven, and swear by him that liveth for ever, that it

\* Heb אֲחֵרִים.

† The persons mentioned above Chap. xi. 33, 35.



shall be until a time, and times, and a half; and when he shall have finished to scatter the power of the holy people, all these things shall be finished. And I heard, but I understood not: then said I, O my Lord, what is the end of these things? And he said, Go thy way, Daniel; for the words are closed up and sealed till the time of the end. Many shall be purified, and made white, and tried; but the wicked shall do wickedly; and none of the wicked shall understand: but the wise shall understand. And from the time that the daily sacrifice shall be taken away, and the abomination that maketh desolate set up, there shall be computed a thousand two hundred and ninety days. Blessed is he that waiteth, and cometh to a thousand three hundred and five and thirty days. But go thou thy way till the end be; for thou shalt rest, and stand in thy lot, at the end of the days.”\*

*These four prophecies of Daniel*, when the former part of the last of them is added to it, extend from *his own time to the time of the end, or the termination of the 1260 days*—In the *first of them* he gives only the *temporal* history of the world, bringing it down however to the *spiritual* victories of *the stone*, and the triumphant reign of *the mountain*—In the *second*, he gives the same history of the world, under a different set of symbols; further introducing a *power*, not mentioned before, under the denomination of a *little horn*, into whose hand the *saints* of the Most High were to be delivered during the space of a *time and times and the dividing of a time*, or *three prophetic years and a half*—In the *third*, he gives only a partial history of the world; totally omitting the *first and the fourth great beasts* or *pagan empires*, and describing *another wicked power*, under the kindred symbol of a *second little horn*, which was to come forth out of the dominions of the *Macedonian he-goat*, but at the last end, or after the termination, of his kingdom. He moreover instructs us, that the length of the vision, including the exploits of the *second little horn*, should be *2300 days*; or, according to the reading of the *Seventy*, *2400 days*; or, according to another reading mentioned

\* Dan. xi. 31—45. xii. 1—13. The beginning of the last four prophecies I have omitted, as having no immediate connection with my subject.

by Jerome, 2200 *days*—In *the fourth prophecy*, after detailing the fortunes of the Persian and Greek empires, after noticing the Roman conquests in the East, and after predicting the destruction of Jerusalem, the persecutions of the primitive Christians, the conversion of the Empire under Constantine, the declension of real piety, and the second persecutions of the reformers under Popery: after he has foretold all these particulars in regular chronological succession, he introduces, towards the close of this his last prophecy, *a third power*, under the title of *a king* or *kingdom*, describing it in such a manner as to lead us to conclude that it is *the Antichrist* predicted by St. John. While the tyranny of this monster is at the height, but at some indefinite period after its development,\* he teaches us, that the great work of *the restoration of the Jews* shall commence. He adds, that to the end of the wonders it shall be *three prophetic years and a half*, or *1260 prophetic days*; and that the whole† of them shall not be finished, till God has ceased to scatter his ancient people, or, in other words, till he has begun to restore them. He next informs us, that from the taking away of *the daily sacrifice*, and the setting up of *the abomination of desolation*, there shall be *1290 days*, which is exactly *30 days* more than the former number; but he does not tell us what particular event will take place at that era. And he lastly pronounces a blessing upon him, who should wait and come to *a third number*, or *1335 days*: which is *75 days* longer than *the first number*, and *45 days* longer than *the second number*.

\* The wars of *the power* here predicted, which terminate in his destruction, Daniel places at *the time of the end*; consequently *the rise of the power* must be expected before *the time of the end*, though after *the Reformation*. Compare Dan. xi. 35, 36 with Ver. 40.

† That is to say *the whole of the wonders comprehended within the space of the 1260 years*. These wonders therefore do not include the overthrow of *the Roman beast*, of *the two little horns*, and of *the wiful king*, which takes place after the expiration of those years: still less do they include the resurrection of the just and the unjust, predicted in Dan. xii. 2. Very apposite is the remark of Bp. Newton, that *the beast* is not so much *slain* exactly at the end of *the 1260 years*, as that the judgments of God then begin to *go forth* against him. "The 1260 years of the reign of *the beast* I suppose, end with *the 1260 years of the witnesses* prophesying in sackcloth: and now the destined time is come for the judgments of God to overtake him: for, as he might exist before *the 1260 years* began, so he may exist likewise after they are finished, in order to be made an eminent example of divine justice." Dissert. xxvi.

With the latter part of these four prophecies of Daniel, the revelation of St. John is immediately connected, being in fact only a more minute and comprehensive prediction of the same events. As Sir Isaac Newton justly observes, it "is written in the same style and language with the prophecies of Daniel, and hath the same relation to them which they have to one another, so that all of them together make but one complete prophecy."\*

The Apocalypse contains a history of the *Christian Church militant* from the days of St. John to the very end of time. This history, or at least that part of it which relates to the period of 1260 days, is hieroglyphically detailed as a war between the *Lamb* and the *Dragon*, or between *Christ* and *Satan*: and upon examination it will be found, that there is the most exact antithetical correspondence between their respective kingdoms and followers. *The Lamb* hath his throne in the midst of heaven: *the Dragon* hath his seat upon the earth. Before the throne of *the Lamb* there is a sea of crystal, solid, durable, unfluctuating, transparent: in the dominions of *the Dragon* there is also a sea; but, like the natural ocean, it is for ever turbid and restless, agitated by every wind, and exhibiting a surface perpetually varying. Upon the sea of glass, those, that have gotten the victory over *the Dragon* and his agent *the Beast*, stand eternally secure, having the harps of God in their hands, and singing the song of Moses and the Lamb: out of the other sea rises *the Beast with seven heads and ten horns*, having a mouth that speaketh great things, and having upon his heads names of blasphemy. The seat of *the Lamb* is the holy city, or the spiritual Jerusalem; the strong hold of *the Dragon* and *the Beast* is another city, termed the great city, or the mystic Babylon. *The Lamb* hath two witnesses, his ministers, who prophesy in sackcloth 1260 days: *the Dragon* hath also his minister, the false prophet, at whose instigation a new race of gentiles, composing the empire of the ten-horned Beast, tread the holy city underfoot 42 months; which is the same space of time as 1260 days, or, as it is elsewhere expressed, three times and a half. Lastly, in the service of *the Lamb*

\* Observations on the Apocalypse Chap. ii. p. 254.

and in the midst of heaven, is *a woman* clothed with the sun, having the moon under her feet, and upon her head a crown of twelve stars; who is the mother of a man-child, destined to rule all nations with a rod of iron: while, in the service of *the Dragon*, and proudly seated upon *the Beast*, is *another woman*, arrayed in purple and scarlet, and decked with gold and precious stones, and pearls; who is the mother of harlots and abominations of the earth.

Such are the two kingdoms of *Christ* and *Belial*, which are ever in direct opposition to each other: and the Apocalypse, after exhibiting a prophetic view of their long-continued warfare, terminates triumphantly with the total overthrow of the Dragon and his adherents, the millennian reign of Christ upon earth, and the second resurrection.

The book of the revelation is divided into *three grand successive periods*; the *seven seals*, the *seven trumpets*, and the *seven vials*. Of these *the seventh seal* comprehends *all the seven trumpets*; and *the seventh trumpet*, all the *seven vials*. This is manifest from the following consideration. *The seventh trumpet* is styled *the last of the three great woes*, and *all the seven vials* are jointly styled *the last plagues*. There cannot however be *two last periods*. Consequently *the last woe* must necessarily synchronize with *the last plagues*. But, if *the last woe* synchronize with *the last plagues*, it must of course comprehend them as *so many parts of one grand whole*. On these grounds I cannot think, with Mr. Mele, that *the seven vials*, or at least *six out of the seven*, belong to *the sixth trumpet*.\* Such an arrangement, by making *the six first vials* precede *the third woe*, certainly contradicts the express declaration of the prophet, that *the vials* are *the last plagues*: for *those six vials* cannot be esteemed *the last plagues*, if they be succeeded by *the third woe*. It moreover breaks the regularity and concinnity of the whole prophecy: for, since the Apocalypse is divided into *the three periods of the seals, the trumpets, and the vials*; and since *all the seven trumpets* are comprehended under *the seventh seal*; it seems much more

\* Clay. Apoc. Pars II. Synchron. 2.

natural to place *all the seven vials*, in a similar manner, under *the seventh trumpet*, than to assign *six of them* to *the sixth trumpet*, and *the seventh* to *the seventh trumpet*. In short, Bp. Newton's arrangement, which I have here followed, appears to me, in every point of view, far preferable to that of Mr. Mede.\*

Under *the six first seals*, and *the four first trumpets of the seventh seal*, the history of *the Roman empire*, before and after the days of Constantine to the beginning of *the seventh century*, is chronologically and circumstantially related. But, at the beginning of *this century*, a new era commences : and the prophet henceforth describes a series of troubles and persecutions, which *the true Church* was to undergo during the space of *1260 prophetic days*, or *1260 natural years*. The events of that space of time are comprehended under *the three last trumpets*, which are usually denominated *the three woe-trumpets* : and *the third of these woe-trumpets* contains, as I have just observed, within its own particular period, *the seven vials* ; which are declared to be *the seven last plagues*, as being a history of *the third and last woe*. This period of *1260 days*, so frequently mentioned both by Daniel and St. John, is equivalent to the triumphant duration of *the great Apostacy* in its dominant state, or the reign of *the two little horns* in the East and in the West : for the superstitions symbolized by *these two apostate horns*, as we shall hereafter see, commenced their tyrannical career together in the very same year ; and will continue jointly to depress the Gospel of Christ, till (what Daniel styles) *the time of the end*. Towards the close of *the 1260 days*, and after the era of *the Reformation*, it is predicted, that *the king* who magnified himself above every god, or *the long expected Antichrist*, will be revealed in all his horrors : *that great Antichrist*, whose special badge, as we are informed by St. John, should be *an open denial both of the Father and of the Son*, an unreserved profession of Atheism and Infidelity.

Of *the three woe-trumpets* then which synchronize with *the 1260 days* (the *third* however extending *beyond*

\* See Bp. Newton's very lucid statement of this matter in his Dissert. on Rev. xv.

the termination of those days,\*) the *first* comprehends the space from the commencement of the dominance of the *Apostacy* to its attaining the zenith of its power; the *second* extends from the era, when it attained the zenith of its power, to the complete developement of *Antichrist* or the *Infidel king*: and the *third* predicts the outrageous and bloody domination of that impious monster, his subsequent *wieo* with the false prophet or the western apostate *little horn*, his complete destruction at the time of the end, and the final subversion of the whole *Apostacy* in both its branches.† After all these matters are accomplished, then commences the joyful part of the *third woe-trumpet*, when the kingdoms of this world become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ.

The *Apostacy* of the *two little horns* being of a *two-fold* nature, it was necessary that the prophet should give a *double* though *synchronical* account of it: hence, at the

\* *The last of the seven vials* will apparently begin to be poured out as soon as the *1260 years* shall have expired. It seems to occupy the period, or perhaps the first division of the period, which intervenes between the end of the *1260 years* and the commencement of the *Millennium*. This whole period is *75 years*; which Daniel divides into *30 years* and *45 years*. When the *seventh vial* is completely exhausted, the joyful part of the *seventh trumpet* commences. See Rev. xi 1—19; where, for the consolation of the Church, the order of events is inverted, and the joyful part of the *seventh trumpet* spoken of before its *woeful part*. See Bp Newton's Dissert. in loc.

† Dr Hammond and Mr Burton strangely apply the *three woes* to the death of our Lord, the sacking of Jerusalem by Titus, and its final destruction by Adrian. This notion is so utterly irreconcilable with the whole chronology of the Apocalypse, particularly that part of it which relates to the *1260 days*; and it is moreover so perfectly incongruous with the prophetic description of the *three woes*, that I cannot refrain from expressing my wonder that it should ever have been seriously adopted. What resemblance can be discovered between the prophecy contained in Rev. ix 1—12, which treats of the *first woe*, and the death of Christ with its immediate consequences, I cannot imagine: and I am as little able to discover any similarity between the *second woe*, described in Rev. x. 13—21, and the sacking of Jerusalem by Titus. As for the *third woe*, which brings us through its *seven vials* to the end of the present order of things, how can it have any connection with the destruction of Jerusalem by Adrian which happened many centuries ago? When Mr Burton asserted, that *two of the woes* were past in St. John's time, because we read, "The second woe is past, behold the third cometh quickly;" (Rev. xi 14.) he surely must have overlooked the denunciation of the angel, "Woe, woe, woe, to the inhabitants of the earth by reason of the other voices of the trumpets of the three angels, which are yet to sound" (Rev. viii 13). In fact Mr Burton ought to have known, that St. John describes an event as past, when he has advanced beyond it in the chronological order of his prophecy. He does not mean to intimate by the expression, that the event had literally taken place in his own days: but that he was about to announce another event which should succeed in point of time the event last predicted. Hammond's Paraphrase on the New Test. Fol. 906. Burton's Essay on the numbers of Daniel and St. John, p. 104—107.

commencement of the *first woe-trumpet*, the Apocalypse branches out into two distinct concurrent lines of prophecy. In the *ninth chapter* of the Revelation, the history of the *two first periods* of the *eastern branch* of the *Apostacy* is detailed, under the *two first* of the *three woe-trumpets*, separately from the *corresponding periods* of the *western branch*: and afterwards the *whole contemporaneous history* of the *western branch*, under all the *three woe-trumpets*, is likewise separately detailed, in order to prevent confusion, in what St. John terms a *little book* or *codicil* to the larger *general book* of the *whole Apocalypse*. This *little book* contains the *eleventh, twelfth, thirteenth, and fourteenth chapters* of the Revelation: and, in point of chronology, all these chapters run *parallel* to each other, relating severally, though with some variety of circumstances, to the *same period* and the *same events*; so as to form jointly a complete history of the *western Apostacy*, and of all the principal actors in it. That the chapters of the *little book* run parallel, and not successive, to each other, is manifest from the express declaration of the *three first* of them. All these represent themselves as describing one and the same period, namely, that of the *1260 years*: consequently, if they describe the same period, they must necessarily run parallel to each other.\* The *last chapter* of the *little book* does not indeed specifically make any such declaration respecting itself; but its contents, as we shall hereafter see, afford a sufficient degree of internal evidence to prove that it likewise relates to the period of *1260 years*, and therefore that it runs parallel to its three predecessors.

1. The *first* of the four chapters describes the desolate prophesying of the *witnesses*, and the treading under foot of the *holy city* by a new race of gentiles, differing from their heathen predecessors only in name, during the space of *1260 days*: predicting, in its *13th verse*, the primary

\* It may not be improper to observe, that the *third chapter* of the *little book*, which answers to the *thirteenth chapter* of the *Revelation*, ought to have been divided into *two chapters*, the division taking place at the *eleventh verse*. The *second apocalyptic beast* is contemporary, during the whole period of his existence, with the *first*; consequently the latter part of the *thirteenth chapter*, commencing with the *eleventh verse*, runs parallel with the former part of the same chapter. Such being the case, the contents of the *little book* would be more clearly arranged, if this chapter were broken into two.

and only partial manifestation of *Antichrist*, when it is declared that *the second woe* is past ; and announcing, in its 15th verse, the sounding of *the seventh trumpet* or *the third woe*, at the first blast of which he is fully revealed.

2. The *second* shews us, who was *the prime mover* of the persecution carried on against *the symbolical woman*, or *the true Church*, during the appointed period of *the 1260 days*.

3. The *third* reveals to us the political character and history of *the seven-headed and ten-horned beast*, who was to wage war with *the saints* for the space of *42 months* or *1260 days* ; and describes likewise the form and actions of his instigator and associate *the two horned-beast*, who is elsewhere styled *the false prophet*.\* These *two beasts* acting in concert together, tread *the holy city* under foot *42 months* ; and persecute *the mytic woman* and *her offspring*, or *the two witnessess* of Christ who are his *true prophets*, during the same period of *1260 days*.

4. The *fourth* describes the internal state of *the true Church* throughout the prevalence of *the western Apostacy* ; predicts *the Reformation* ; and divides some of the most prominent events of *the seventh trumpet*, which are detailed hereafter in *the larger book* under *the seven vials*, into *two grand classes*, *the harvest* and *the vintage* of God's wrath, separated from each other by an indefinite period of time ; teaching moreover, that *the wine-press* shall be trodden in a certain country, the space of which extends *1600 furlongs*.

It seems, as if St. John, when he received *the little book* from the hand of the angel, imagined that it would contain the full and exclusive history of *the third and last woe-trumpet* : and such a supposition was not unnatural, for he had already heard *the two first woe-trumpets* sound, before the angel gave him *the book*. We must observe however, that, although *the second woe-trumpet* had begun to sound, the prophet had not as yet received any intimation that *the second woe* was past. The angel therefore, to prevent the possibility of any such mistake, solemnly swears by the Almighty, that " the time (of *the last woe*) shall not be yet, but in the

\* Rev. xix. 20.



days of the voice of the seventh angel," or *the last of the three angels* who bore *the three woe-trumpets*, "when he shall begin to sound, and when the mystery of God shall be about finishing."\* Hence, when St. John was eagerly proceeding to write the history of *the seven thunders*, which are apparently the same as *the seven vials* comprehended under *the last woe-trumpet*, he heard a voice from heaven arresting his progress and commanding him to "seal up those things which the seven thunders uttered, and to write them not."† The reason of this is evident: they were not yet to come to pass, for the prophet had still to detail the events contained under *the two first woe-trumpets*, so far as they respected *the western branch of the Apostacy*, the peculiar history of which the angel was now presenting him with in *the little book*. He had still to "prophesy again before many peoples, and nations, and tongues, and kings;"‡ *the beast*, when he commenced his new term of existence during *the 42 months*, being no longer, as throughout his

\* Rev. x. 6, 7. Such I conceive to be the proper translation of the passage. The angel does not swear, that *time shall be no longer*, but that *the time*, namely of *the third woe*, shall not be yet. (See Bp. Newton's Dissert on this chapter.) So again the aorist *τελειωθη* ought not here to be translated *should be finished*, but *should be about finishing*, or *should draw near to its completion*. It is a mode of expression exactly analogous to that used by the prophet in Rev. xi. 7: where the active subjunctive aorist *τελειωσθι* ought, in a similar manner, to be translated, as Mr. Mede justly observes, *they shall be about finishing*, not *they shall have finished*.

† Mr. Whitaker thinks, that *the seven thunders* are *the seven crusades* undertaken for the purpose of delivering Palestine from the hands of the Infidels; and that St. John was forbidden to write them, because *the restoration of the Jews* was not to take place till *the seventh angel* had sounded. (Comment on Rev. p. 176 et infra.) Vitringa is of the same opinion. But, since it is expressly declared, that the time of *the seven thunders* should not be yet, but in the days of the voice of *the seventh angel*; and since the blast of *the seventh trumpet* produces the effusion of *the seven vials*: it appears to me much more probable, that *the seven thunders* are in effect the same as *the seven vials*. Both Mr. Mede and Bp. Newton censure those, who attempt to explain *the seven thunders*, on the ground that the angel charged St. John to seal them up and to write them not. This censure I cannot but think a little unreasonable: for *the sealing up of the thunders*, and *the writing them not*, does not mean, that they were never to be understood; but simply, that the events, predicted under them, were not then to be written, but were to be reserved for a future part of the Apocalypse, namely that which treats of *the seventh trumpet*. Hence the angel asserts, that their time shall not be yet, but in the days of the voice of *the seventh angel*. When he began to sound, then they should begin to be understood; till then they should be sealed up. See Dan. xii. 9.

‡ Rev. x. 4.

§—"the beast, that was, and is not, and yet is." (Rev. xvii. 8.) More will be said upon *this revival of the beast* hereafter.

ancient term of existence,\* *one great undivided power*, but having now, under the prophecy of *the little book*, put forth *ten different horns*, each bearing a separate and independent crown.† He had still therefore to prophesy *again*; or a second time to go over the same period in the West, that he had already gone over in the East. Hence, although the contents of *the little book* extend to the very termination of *the 1260 days*, as St. John repeatedly declares, yet they *peculiarly* detail the effects of *the two first woe-trumpets*. The sounding of *the third woe-trumpet* accordingly, which brings us down to the very end of those days, is simply *mentioned* in *the little book*; and an intimation is briefly given, that toward the close of *the 1260 days* the *harvest* and *the vintage* of God's wrath should be gathered in: for the particular account of the calamities, which *the concluding trumpet* was about to produce, is reserved for the pouring out of *the seven vials*, and for the subsequent chapters more largely explanatory of the effects of *the last vial*.

Having finished the contents of *the little book*, which relates the history of *the western branch of the Apostacy* chiefly under *the two first woe-trumpets*, though without excluding *the third woe-trumpet*, the prophet returns to *the larger book* which contains the general history of *the Church*, in order that he may fully detail the consequences of the sounding of *the last woe-trumpet*. This concluding *trumpet* affects both the East and the West: and it conducts us, through the two grand epochs of *the harvest* and *the vintage*, and through the different stages of its *seven Vials*, to the very *time of the end*, to the destruction of *the two-fold Apostacy*, to the complete overthrow of *Antichrist*, and to the commencement of *that happy period*, when all the kingdoms of the world shall become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ. Hence we find, that, from the great variety of important matter which it contains, a very considerable portion of the Apocalypse is exclusively devoted to it. This portion includes *the fifteenth, the sixteenth, the seventeenth, the eighteenth, and the nineteenth, chapters*; all of which constitute jointly one continued prophecy

\* Rev. x. 11.

† Rev. xiii. 7.

of the events comprehended under *the third woe-trumpet*—The *fifteenth* chapter is a kind of *introductory preface* to the pouring out of *the Vials*, in order that this final display of God's wrath against his impenitent and irreclaimable enemies may be described with the greater majesty—The *sixteenth* chapter contains a summary and distinct account of the miseries, brought upon mankind by the atheistical principles of *Antichrist*, during the period of *the figurative harvest*; of the events which will intervene between *the harvest* and *the vintage*; and of *the earthquake*, during the period of *the vintage*, by which *the great city* will be divided into three parts, when “Babylon will come in remembrance before God to give unto her the cup of the wine of the fierceness of his wrath.” These various events are represented as taking place in consequence of the successive pouring out of *seven Vials*: the *three former* of which synchronize, I apprehend, with *the harvest* of God's wrath: and *the last*, with *the vintage*; while *the remaining three* are poured out between the two grand periods of *the harvest* and *the vintage*, and relate to certain intermediate events—The *three following* chapters, namely, *the seventeenth*, *the eighteenth*, and *the nineteenth*, give a full and explicit account of *the vintage*, which synchronizes, as I have just observed, with *the last Vial*. The events of *the vintage* are *the division of the great city into three parts*, mentioned in *the sixteenth chapter*, immediately upon the pouring out of *the last Vial*; *the subversion of the mystic Babylon*; and *the total overthrow of the confederacy of the beast, the false prophet, and the kings of the Roman or Papal earth, in the battle of Armageddon*. The *confederacy* itself will *unconsciously* be gathered to the place of its destruction by the secret diabolical influence of three unclean spirits; but this will *physically* be brought about by the military despotism exercised under *the fourth Vial*, by the subversion of *the Ottoman empire* under *the sixth Vial*, and by *the political earthquake* at the beginning of the effusion of *the seventh Vial*, which divides *the great city, or the Latin empire*, into three parts.

All the events of *the vintage* or *the last Vial* will hap-

pen at *the time of the end*, or at *the termination of the 1260 years*.\* *Antichrist* himself will then perish, united as at present, contrary to every expectation at his original developement, with *the false Romish prophet*; for, according to the sure word of Scripture, one fate awaits them both in *the region between two seas near the glorious holy mountain, in the country which extends 1600 furlongs, in the valley of Megiddo*.† Then will *the fulness of the Gentiles* be come in: then will *the wine-press of God's wrath* begin to be trodden in the valley of concision:‡ then will *the great controversy of Jehovah with the nations* commence.

At the beginning of this time of unexampled trouble, that is to say, at the expiration of *the 1260 years*, the Almighty will put forth his hand to bring back his ancient people *the Jews* to the country of their fathers: and, when that is accomplished, and when *Antichrist* is over-

\* Mr. Mede believes, like myself, that *the seventh vial* will begin to be poured out exactly at *the termination of the 1260 years*: for he supposes, that *the first blast of the seventh trumpet* and *the first effusion of the seventh vial*, which he justly calls *the vial of consummation*, exactly synchronize; and he maintains, that at this era *the three times and a half* terminate. (Compare Clav. Apoc. Pars Alt. Synchron. iii. v.—Comment. Apoc. in Tub. vii. et in Phial. vii.—and the plate at the end of the Clavis.) Though, as I have already observed, I prefer Bp. Newton's arrangement of *the seventh trumpet*, I think Mr. Mede's opinion nearly indisputable, that *the 1260 years* expire when *the vial of consummation* begins to be poured out, because the contents of *that vial* plainly shew that it relates to *the time of God's great controversy with the nations*. But *this great controversy*, *this period of unexampled trouble*, synchronizes, according to the unanimous testimony of all the prophets who treat of the subject, with *the restoration of the Jews*: which restoration commences, according to Daniel, at *the close of three times and a half*: therefore *the contemporary period of unexampled trouble*, must commence at *the close of the three times and a half*; and consequently *the effusion of the seventh vial*, which relates to that period, must likewise commence at *the close of the three times and a half*: in other words, *the seventh vial* must begin to be poured out, so soon as *the three times and a half* or *the 1260 years* expire; which was the point asserted.

† That is to say, between *the Mediterranean sea* and *the Dead sea*, in *the land of Palestine*, the length of which country extends 1600 Jewish *Risin* or *stadia*. The subject will be discussed at large hereafter. Mr. Mede very justly remarks, that *the treading of the wine-press at the period of the symbolical vintage* is the same as *the great battle of Armageddon under the last vial*; and for this plain reason: *the beast, the false prophet, and their confederates*, cannot experience *two final overthrows*. *The vintage* however, predicted in *the little book*, is represented as being the last event that takes place in that book: but *the little book* reaches to the end of *the 1260 years*, and indeed in its first and last chapters extends *beyond the end of those years*: therefore *the vintage* must take place after the end of *the 1260 years*. Hence it must necessarily be the same as *the battle of Armageddon*; which is the last event of *the last vial*, and consequently takes place after the end of *the 1260 years* likewise. See Mede's Comment. Apoc. in Vindemiam.

thrown, *the lost ten tribes of Israel* will likewise be restored, and will henceforth form only one people with *Judah*. Then will *the first resurrection* take place, and *the Millennium* will commence. That there will be a *preternatural manifestation of the Messiah* at this eventful period, we have, I think with Mr. Mede, reason to expect.\* But, whether *the first resurrection* mentioned by St. John as taking place before *the Millennium*, and *the continued reign of Christ with his saints upon earth during the Millennium*, are to be understood in a literal or in a figurative sense, time alone can determine.† Such “secret things,” as unaccomplished prophecies, “belong unto the Lord our God;” and it is a vain waste of time to weary ourselves with conjectures respecting *the precise mode* of their accomplishment. Upon these points, when we go beyond what is written, we exceed our commission: and it has almost invariably been found, that the commentator, who attempted to shew *how* a prophecy was about to be fulfilled, was, by the event, convicted of *error*. We may safely and positively declare what *will* come to pass, and we may even say *how* it will come to pass, so long as we resolutely confine ourselves to *the explicit declarations of Scripture*: but to point out *the manner* in which an event will be accom-

\* This point is discussed at large in a Work which I am now preparing for the press on *the restoration of Israel and the overthrow of the Antichristian confederacy*.

† Mr. Mede strongly maintains, that *the first resurrection* will be a *literal resurrection of the martyrs*. I confess that his arguments rather silence me, than convince me. *The resurrection* is not unfrequently used in Scripture to typify *the political resurrection of a nation or community*. Should such be the meaning of the *apocalyptic first resurrection*, it will simply denote that *the saints of God, long oppressed by the Papacy*, shall ultimately be raised up to political power and influence, agreeably to the *literal* predictions both of Daniel and St. John (Dan. vii. 27. Rev. xx. 4, 6.) To this interpretation however, which I could wish to adopt, Mr. Mede urges objections not very easy to be answered. (See a curious discussion of this point in his Works Book iv. Epist. 20.) Abp. Tillotson is inclined to understand *the reign of Christ* in a spiritual sense. “Though I see no sufficient grounds from Scripture to believe the personal reign of Christ upon earth for a thousand years: yet it seems to be not improbable, that some time before the end of the world, the glorious kingdom of Christ, I mean the prevalency of the pure Christian religion, should be of as long a continuance, as the reign of Mohanmed and Antichrist have been, both of which have now lasted about a thousand years.” (Serm. Vol. x. p. 177.) The reader will find the question, *Whether the first apocalyptic resurrection ought to be understood figuratively or literally*, very well discussed in Lowman’s Paraphrase on Rev. xx. I dare not give an opinion on the subject.

plished, *any further than the word of God hath revealed the manner of it*, is to pry too curiously into what he hath purposely concealed, and to aim at becoming *prophets* instead of contenting ourselves with being humble and fallible *expositors* of prophecy. What *the Bible* hath declared, that *we* may without hesitation declare: beyond this, all is mere vague conjecture. It was very wisely remarked by Sir Isaac Newton, that “the folly of interpreters has been to foretell times and things by the Apocalypse, as if God designed to make them prophets. By this rashness they have not only exposed themselves, but brought the prophecy also into contempt. The design of God was much otherwise. He gave this and the prophecies of the Old Testament, not to gratify men’s curiosities by enabling them to foreknow things, but that after they were fulfilled they might be interpreted by the event, and his own Providence, not the interpreter’s, be then manifested thereby to the world. For the event of things, predicted many ages before, will then be a convincing argument, that the world is governed by Providence.” May I add, without the imputation of vanity, in the words of the same great and good man? “Amongst the interpreters of the last age there is scarce one of note who hath not made some discovery worth knowing: and thence I seem to gather, that God is about opening these mysteries. The success of others put me upon considering it; and, if I have done any thing which may be useful to following writers, I have my design.”\*

At the close of *the Millennium*, Satan will again be let loose to deceive the nations: when *the last confederacy* against *the Church*, which this world shall ever behold, will be formed by certain enemies of the Messiah, whom both St. John and Ezekiel concur in denominating *Gog and Mag g.*† Upon this occasion, God will specially interfere in behalf of his people. While the enemies of *the saints* are encompassing the camp and the beloved city, fire will come down from heaven and devour them. Their great instigator *the devil* will then be finally cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, to which *the beast*

\* Observ. on the Apocalypse, p. 251, 272, 253.

† Rev. xx. 8. Ezek. xxxviii. xxxix.

and the false prophet had already been consigned at the commencement of the thousand years: and the second, or general resurrection will take place. The Apocalypse triumphantly concludes with a figurative description of the happiness of the pious.

The following scheme will shew, at one point of view, the manner in which I arrange that part of the Apocalypse, which treats of the 1260 days, under the three successive periods of the woe-trumpets.

	Rev.				
The two first Woe-trumpets.	{	IX.	{ History of the Eastern Apostacy under the two first woe-trumpets.	} The little book.	
		X.	{ Introduction to the little book.		
		XI.	{ Contemporary history of the Western Apostacy under the two first woe-trumpets, and to the end of the third;		
		XII.	{ the particular events of the third; however are reserved for the subject of the following prophecy.		
		XIII.			
		XIV.			
The third Woe-trumpet.	{	XV.	{ Introduction to the pouring out of the Vials.	} The harvest of God's wrath.	
		XVI.	{ The pouring out of the Vials.		Vial 1.
					Vial 2.
					Vial 3.
					Vial 4.
					Vial 5.
					Vial 6.
Vial 7.					
XVII.	{ A detailed account of the events about to take place under the seventh Vial; such as the destruction of the scarlet whore, the overthrow of Babylon, and the battle of Armageddon.	} The vintage of God's wrath.			
XVIII.					
XIX.					

If we compare the four preceding prophecies of Daniel with the Revelation of St. John, the point of their chronological coincidence will of course be that age of the Roman empire in which St. John flourished; or the period, as the Apostle himself tells us, when the fourth great beast was existing under his sixth head.\* Hence the feet of the image branching out into ten toes, the fourth beast with ten horns, and the apocalyptic beast with seven heads and ten horns, must all be designed to symbolize the same power. It is equally evident, that the three years and a half of Daniel are the three years and a half, the 42 months, or the 1260 days of St. John.

\* Rev. xvii. 10.

Since then *the feet of the image, the ten-horned beast, and the seven-headed and ten-horned beast, are one and the same power: the victory achieved by the stone over the feet of the image must be equivalent to the victory of the Lamb over the beast, the false prophet, and the confederated kings;\** and the *triumphant reign of the mountain, to the duration of the Millennium.†* In a similar manner the *judgment of Daniel's fourth beast by the Ancient of days must be the same as the victories of the stone and the Lamb:‡* while the *beasts, whose dominion was taken away, and whose lives were prolonged during the reign of the mountain, (for there was no other reign during which they could be prolonged,§ inasmuch as the first judgment was already past,) must be identified with the Gog and Magog mentioned by St. John, as existing during the period of the Millennium, and as making a final effort against the Church towards the close of it.\** Lastly, *the second judgment, predicted by Daniel as taking place after the season to which the lives of the three first beasts had been prolonged, must be the second judgment, foretold by St. John as about to commence at the expiration of the Millennium.†*

These coincidences are sufficiently obvious, but to ascertain the others is attended with a greater degree of difficulty; more especially since such a variety of opinions has been entertained by those, who have written upon the subject. As far as I am able to judge, and I shall attempt to prove in the sequel what I am now about to advance, *the two little horns and the atheistical king, mentioned by Daniel, are three distinct powers. The first of the little horns, into whose hand the saints were to be*

\* Dan. ii. 34—Rev. xix. 17—21.

† Dan. ii. 35.—Rev. xx. 6.

‡ Dan. vii. 9, 10, 11.—Dan. ii. 34—Rev. xix. 17—21.

§ This prolongation “the Rabbins take for some season and time after the fourth beast was destroyed; and R. Solomon, at the time of the war of Gog and Magog, which they look for soon after their restitution, upon the destruction of the fourth beast” (Mede's Works Book iv. Epist. 24.) They appear to me to be perfectly right in their general idea respecting this passage; but the war of Gog and Magog, the precise epoch of which is not defined by Ezekiel, will not take place, as we are taught by St. John, till 1000 years, either natural or prophetic, after the restoration of the Jews. This war of Gog and Magog will be discussed at large in the work, which, as I have already mentioned, I am now preparing for the press.

\* Dan. vii. 12. Rev. xx. 7, 8, 9.

† Dan. vii. 13. Rev. xx. 11



given during the space of *three times and a half*, is the same as *the second beast*, or *the false prophet*, of the Apocalypse, who was to instigate *the ten-horned beast* to make war upon *the saints* during the synchronical period of *42 months*.‡ The *second of the little horns*, which, as we shall hereafter see, was to flourish in the East during the same space of *1260 days*,§ and to the end of the *2300, 2400, or 2200, days*, is *the spiritual dominion of the Apocalyptic Abaddon*, the angel of the bottomless pit, and the king of the locusts, which is prolonged, though under a different name, during the reign of *the Euphratèan horsemen*.\* And *the impious king*, whose characteristic mark is, that he should not regard any god,† is *the great Antichrist* predicted by St. John: who, in a similar manner, was to deny both the Father and the Son;‡ whose primary and only partial development was to take place at the end of *the second woe*,§ who was to be fully revealed at the blast of *the third woe*;|| who was to pour like an overwhelming flood upon *the symbolical woman* during the latter part of her sojourn in *the wilderness*;¶ who was to be the instrument of God's vengeance during the period of *the figurative harvest*;\*\* who was to perish between *the two seas*, united with *the false prophet*, at the time of *the vintage*;†† and whose exploits are more largely and particularly detailed under *the seven vials*.‡‡

‡ Dan. vii. 8, 25. Rev. xiii. 5, 11.

§ In absolute strictness of speech, *the second little horn*, will not exist during the whole 1260 days, although *Mohammedism* will, of which *this horn* is the symbol; because *Mohammedism* did not become a *horn of the he-goat*, until about 30 years after its original commencement. But more will be said on this subject hereafter.

\* Dan. viii. 9, 13, 14. Rev. ix.

† Dan. xi. 36.

‡ 1 John. ii. 22.

§ Rev. xi. 13.

|| Rev. xi. 15.

¶ Rev. xii. 15.

\*\* Rev. xiv. 14, 15, 16;

†† Dan. xi. 45. Rev. xix. 11—21. Rev. xiv. 17—20.

‡‡ Rev. xvii.

## CHAPTER II.

*On the Symbolical Language of Prophecy.*

THE illustrious Sir Isaac Newton has well observed, that “for understanding *the prophecies*, we are, in the first place, to acquaint ourselves with *the figurative language of the prophets*.”\* He has accordingly given us a catalogue of *symbols* with *their several interpretations*, of which I shall occasionally avail myself in the course of the following disquisition; the main object of which is to point out and insist upon *the exact precision of the prophetic language*.

The predictions of Daniel and St. John are, with the single exception of Daniel’s last prophecy, written in *the language of symbols*. It will be necessary therefore to ascertain the import of *the several symbols* which are used in their writings: for, without a right understanding of *the symbols*, it is impossible to learn what *things* are designed to be represented by them; and, unless we learn what *things* are designed to be represented by them, it will be a fruitless labour to attempt to interpret *the prophecies themselves*.

In the ordinary languages of men, *words* are the signs of *things*. *Different words* however are frequently used in all languages to express nearly *the same thing*: whence they are termed *synonyms*: and the use of them, so far from making a language *obscure*, renders it *more copious*, and consequently *more beautiful*. But, in some instances, the matter is precisely reversed: and *the same word* is used to express *different things*. Whenever this occurs, a degree of *obscurity*, which is a manifest defect in a language, is necessarily introduced: and *the obscurity* is greater or less, both according as *the same word* represents a greater or a less number of *different things*, and in proportion as its context enables us less or more to ascertain the precise meaning designed to be annexed to it in any particular passage.

\* Observations on the Prophecies, p. 16.

Let us apply these remarks to the *symbolical language of prophecy*. If *various symbols* be used to represent *the same thing*, we shall be in no danger of mistaking the prophet's meaning, provided only we can ascertain the import of *each individual symbol*: because such variety will only serve to heighten the beauty of the imagery, without introducing the slightest degree of obscurity. But, if, on the contrary, *the same symbol* be used to express *many different things*, which have no necessary analogical relation to each other; it will be utterly impossible to understand a prophecy couched in such *ambiguous terms*, because the context can never lead us, as is the case in ordinary languages, to any certain interpretation of it.

Upon this principle the *symbolical language of prophecy* is constructed. In the rich imagery of Daniel and St. John, *different symbols* are frequently used to express *the same thing*: but *no one symbol* is ever used to express *different things*; unless such *different things* have a manifest analogical resemblance to each other. Hence the *language of symbols*, being purely a *language of ideas*, is in one respect more perfect than any ordinary language can be: it possesses the variegated elegance of *synonyms*, without any of the obscurity which arises from the use of *ambiguous terms*.\*

As prophecy relates both to *things temporal* and *things spiritual*, its symbols must be divided into *two grand classes*; the one typifying *temporal*, and the other, *spiritual*, objects. And here it may be observed, that *every division* of these *two parallel classes* has a kind of *leading symbol*, which comprehends and is connected with a *variety of other symbols* belonging to the division of which this is the head. Thus, the *symbolical heaven*

\* In some measure the Hebrew language forms an exception to the arbitrary ambiguity of other languages. "It will be demonstratively evident to any one," says Mr Parkhurst, "who will attentively examine the subject, that the Hebrew language is *ideal*; or that from a certain, and that no great, number of primitive and apparently arbitrary words, called *roots*, and usually expressive of some idea or notion taken from nature, that is, from the external objects around us, or from our own constitutions, by our senses or feelings, all the other words of that tongue are derived or grammatically formed; and that, wherever the radical letters are the same the *leading idea or notion runs through all the affections of the word*, however numerous or diversified." Preface to Heb. Lexicon.

comprehends *the sun, the moon, and the stars*: and thus, *the symbolical earth comprehends the sea, the rivers, the islands, and the mountains*. The several divisions of the two parallel classes shall be treated of in their order.

1. *The symbolical heaven*, when interpreted *temporally*, signifies *the whole body politic*. As such, it comprehends *the sun, or the sovereign power* wheresoever it be lodged; *the moon, or the people* which is the allegorical wife of the sovereign power; and *the stars, or the princes and nobles* of the realm. If this idea be further pursued from *a single kingdom* and from *an undivided empire* to *an empire split into many kingdoms* like the Roman empire, *the sun* will be *the government of that state*, which, from its superiority of power, resembles *the bright orb of day* in the midst of *the stars* or *independent kings* of the imperial firmament; and *the moon* will be *the whole body of the people* throughout the whole empire. Such being the case, *the blackening of the sun, the turning of the moon into blood, the falling of the stars, and the departing of the heavens like a scroll*, will mean either *the subversion of a kingdom* or *the subversion of an empire*, according as the tenor of the prophecy shall determine: while *the shooting of a single star from heaven to earth* denotes *the downfall of a sovereign prince*.\* Upon the same principle, *the eclipsing of the heavenly bodies* means *a partial calamity*, not extending to *the utter subversion of the whole kingdom or empire*: and, when *the sun is said to scorch men with fire*, a *grievous tyranny*, exercised by *the supreme power*, whether at the head of *a kingdom or an empire*, is denoted. *The political heaven* is sometimes termed *the air*: in which case, as *thunder, lightning, hail and clouds*, are generated and supported in *the atmosphere*; so *convulsions, tumults, and uproars*, are produced and maintained in *an ill-regulated or expiring body politic*.

On the other hand, *the symbolical heaven*, when interpreted *spiritually*, signifies *the whole body of the church militant*, considered as including both *Christ its head* and *all the members of his mystical body*.† In this case, *the*

\* See Isaiah xiv. 12.

† Hence we find *the Church militant* perpetually described in the parables as *the kingdom of heaven*. (See particularly Matt. xiii. 24—50.) In all the parables,

*sun* will represent *our Lord*; *the moon*, his allegorical consort *the Church*; and *the stars*, his appointed *pastors* and *teachers*. Christ however is not only *the head* of his faithful people, *the sun* of their religious system; but he is likewise “*a priest* for ever after the order of Melchisedek.” Hence he is typified, not only by *the sun*, but by a *star* also, termed, by way of eminence over *all other stars* or *priests*, “*the bright and morning star*.”\* *The spiritual heaven*, or *the Church*, is God’s appointed channel of conveying blessings to his people: *the soft dews*, and *gentle rains* therefore of *this spiritual heaven*, symbolize *the graces of the Holy Ghost*.† Lastly, as *the present heaven* signifies *the Church militant*; so a *new heaven*, succeeding *the present heaven* when it passes away, is *the Church triumphant*.‡

2. *The earth*, when taken in a *temporal sense*, imports, in the abstract, *the territorial dominions of any Pagan or irreligious empire*. *The sea*, ever turbulent and restless, represents *nations in a tumultuary or revolutionary state*. *A flood* is a *large body of men put in motion for some given purpose*, rarely, perhaps never, a *good one*. *Rivers and fountains* mean *nations and their political heads* while in a *tranquil state*; their affairs flowing along in a gentle and even course like the stream of a river, and not subject to violent agitations like the sea.§ *An earthquake* is a *sudden convulsion in an empire*, violently overturning

contained in this chapter, since both good and bad are represented, as being equally included in *the kingdom of heaven*, and since it is declared that a final separation between them will only take place at the day of judgment; it is evident, that *the kingdom of heaven*, which they speak of, is not *the literal and future*, but *the symbolical and present*, kingdom.

\* Rev. ii. 28 and xxii. 16. See also Numb. xxiv. 17.

† See Isaiah xlv. 3. and Rev. xvii. 15. See also Sir Isaac Newton’s *Observations on Daniel*, p. 19.

‡ There is one instance, in which this set of hieroglyphics is applied to *domestic life*; and another, the only one in the Apocalypse, in which it is used to describe *the Pagan hierarchy and religion* (See Gen. xxxvii. 9, 10 and Rev. vi. 12, 13, 14.) In both these cases however the very same ruling idea may be observed, as when the symbols are applied to *an empire* or to *a pure religion*.

§ Sir Isaac Newton supposes, that *fountains* are “*cities, the permanent heads of rivers politic*;” but the other interpretation appears to me more agreeable to symbolical analogy. As *fountains* are *the heads of Rivers*, so are *sovereigns the heads of their people*; whence we are accustomed, even in our ordinary conversation, to style the King *the fountain* of honours and dignities we might add, of all public offices, both civil and military; and, in most countries, of the laws also.

the existing order of things ; as a literal earthquake subverts cities and villages, and occasions universal confusion and destruction. *Mountains and islands are kingdoms and states. The turning of the sea into blood denotes the bloodshed occasioned by tumults and revolutions: and the drying up of a political river, signifies the gradual exhaustion and declension of the particular nation symbolized by that river.* If we consider this set of hieroglyphics in a *limited* point of view, *the earth* will mean, not merely *the territorial dominions of any irreligious empire taken in the abstract, but the dominions of that particular empire which is in open opposition to the Church of Christ during the period of the chronological prophecy which treats of it.* Thus *the four beasts*, mentioned in one of Daniel's visions, are said to arise out of *the sea*, or out of the midst of *conflicting nations* : and the angel afterwards explains them as being *four kingdoms or empires*, which should arise out of *the earth*, or *the general territorial dominions of Paganism, as opposed to the Levitical Church of God.* Afterwards when the affairs of the Jewish nation were specially connected with *the four great empires* in regular succession, to the almost entire exclusion of *other states* ; each of *these earths* or *Pagan empires* became successively *the symbolical earth or Pagan state hostile to the Mosaical heaven or Church, to the exclusion of all other earths.* And even *the Jewish nation* itself, when it had filled up the measure of its iniquities by crucifying the Lord of life, became *an earth or antichristian state* in opposition to *the real Church of God.\** Now *the whole of the Revelation* relates to *that part of the reign of the fourth or Roman beast*, which was about to succeed the period of time when **St. John** wrote : consequently, whenever the *temporal symbol earth* occurs in the Apocalypse, it invariably means *the territorial dominions of the Roman empire*, whether existing under *its sixth or seventh head*, and whether united in *one great monarchy* or branching out

\* "All the tribes of *the earth*," that is, *the Jewish earth*, "shall mourn." (Matt. xxiv. 30.) This prophecy may possibly relate *ultimately* to the times of the second advent ; but there seems to be little doubt, that it *primarily* relates to the destruction of Jerusalem.

into *ten legal horns*.\* This being the case, *the sea, the rivers, the fountains, the floods, the islands, the mountains, and the earthquakes, of the apocalyptic earth*, denote the very same *objects and circumstances* as those of *the political earth when considered abstractedly and generally, only with a limitation either to the pagan or the papal Roman empire*.

Very few of this set of symbols are ever used in a *spiritual sense*. *The earth* however, when taken in that acceptation, denotes a *state of paganism or apostacy*; that *very state* in short, which is the main characteristic of a *temporal earth, or a pagan or apostate empire*. Hence *the shooting of a star from heaven to earth is the apostacy of a Christian pastor*; being a desertion of *heaven or the Church, for the earth or an heretical and antichristian state*.† *A mountain* imports *the triumphant kingdom of the Messiah*; which, from a *stone or a small beginning*, is to become a *great mountain* and fill *the whole earth*,‡ being established upon the top of all other *mountains or kingdoms*, and being exalted above all other *hills or petty states*.§ Accordingly Daniel informs us, that *the kingdom, symbolized by a great mountain in the dream of Nebuchadnezzar, should never be destroyed, but that it should break in pieces, and consume, all the kingdoms which had preceded it*:|| in other words, that it should divest them of their characters of being kingdoms of *the symbolical earth*, and should cause them to become kingdoms of *the symbolical heaven*. As *temporal rivers* signify *nations in a settled state*: so, in the blessed region

\* From a want of due attention to the remarkable *precision of the symbolical language of prophecy*, Mr. Galloway has annexed no less than *five* different significations to the word *earth*, all within the compass of the single book of *the Apocalypse*, and two of them within the compass even of a *single chapter* of that book; thereby rendering it, upon *his* scheme, utterly impossible to ascertain the definite meaning of St. John. In Rev. viii. 13, he supposes *the earth* to signify *Christian Rome in her schismatic and wicked state*, previous to the commencement of what may be properly termed *the Papal domination*: in Rev. xvi. 4, *the Papal Apostacy*; in Rev. xii. 9, *Atheism*; in Rev. xii. 16, *Germany*; and lastly, in Rev. xiii. 11, 12, 14, *the revolutionary power of France*. See Comment. p. 167, where all these *different interpretations of the same symbol* are summed up together even by Mr. Galloway himself. It is somewhat remarkable, that not one of them is the true one.

† This self-same compound hieroglyphic, when used in a temporal sense, denotes, as I have already observed, *the downfall of a sovereign prince*.

‡ Dan. ii. 34, 35.

§ Isaiah ii. 2.

|| Dan. ii. 44.

of eternal felicity, we are figuratively told, that there is "a pure river of water of life, clear as crystal, proceeding out of the throne of God and of the Lamb;" apparently typifying the everlastingly settled state of the pious, and as such free both from those sudden angry floods which swell and pollute the streams of *temporal rivers*, and from that gradual exhaustion which so frequently dries up their *political waters* and converts them into *shallow brooks*.\* And, as the *temporal sea* aptly typifies *worldly nations* ever agitated and unsettled † so we are specially informed by the apocalyptic prophet, that hereafter there shall be "no more sea;" save only a clear "sea of glass like unto crystal," and consequently incapable of being ever ruffled.

3. The third set of symbols commences with that of a *city*, under which may be arranged various other symbols connected with it. In the Apocalypse two cities are mentioned, *the great city* and *the holy city*, *the city of the dragon* and *the city of the Lamb*. *The great city* is *the Roman empire*, both *temporal* and *ecclesiastical*, both *secular* and *papal*; the mystic name of which is *Babylon*; *the holy city* is the *Church of Christ*, the mystic name of which is *Jerusalem*. *The great city*, thus representing both *the spiritual empire of the Pope*, and *the temporal empire which upheld his authority*, is accordingly exhibited to us as *a harlot or apostate church* riding triumphant upon *a beast or idolatrous empire*. It is moreover said to consist of *ten parts* or *streets*, which answer to *the ten horns of the beast*, and which denote *the ten kingdoms* into which *the Roman empire* was divided.‡ In this same *great city*, which is spiritually termed *Sodom* and *Egypt*, and within the limits of which (the province of *Judea*) our Lord was crucified, is *the throne* or *seat of the dragon*, which he has transferred to his special dele-

\* If the reader dislike this interpretation of *the river of life*. let him by all means reject it. Though I have been led to it, as perhaps most agreeable to symbolical analogy, I am by no means disposed to *insist* upon its propriety. It may, or it may not, be the true exposition.

† "The wicked are like *the troubled sea* when it cannot rest, whose waters cast up mire and dirt. There is no peace, saith my God, to the wicked." (Isaiah lvii. 20, 21.) The same allegorical language is used by St. Jude. "Raging waves of *the sea*, foaming out their own shame." Jude 13.

‡ Rev. xi. 13.



gate the beast. If then the city mean the empire, the throne will signify the tyrannical authority exercised within the empire: a throne, even in our ordinary mode of speaking, being used as synonymous with the authority exercised from the throne. The great city is described as being seated upon the sea,\* so as to be a conspicuous object to those who navigate it; and, like opulent natural cities, as having abundance of merchants and ship-masters. These merchants, who enrich themselves by trading with her, are declared by the prophet to be the great men of the earth or Roman empire.†

\* That is, the troubled ocean of worldly politics and conflicting nations. (See the preceding remarks on the symbolical sea.) In a similar manner, the great scarlet whore is represented as sitting upon many waters; which the angel afterwards explains to signify "peoples, and multitudes, and nations, and tongues." Rev. xvii. 1, 15

† It might seem from Rev. xvii. 9, 18 that the great city does not mean the Roman empire, but the literal city of Rome. To such an opinion however there are insuperable objections. The harlot who is said to be Babylon, or the great city, is evidently the adulterous church of Rome, after the period when the Empire had been divided into ten kingdoms. That Church however, although its peculiar seat was the literal seven-hilled city, extended its sway over the whole Western Empire: consequently the church of Rome, in its largest acceptation, must be the apocalyptic Babylon, or the great city, unless we confine it (which is an absurdity) within the limits of literal Rome. Hence the spiritual great city must mean the whole papal empire. So again: since our Lord is said to have been crucified in the great city, and since the great city undoubtedly means Rome in some sense or another, it is evident that the secular great city cannot be literal Rome, because our Lord never was crucified there; whereas he was crucified in the great city, if by it we understand the whole Roman empire. Further: the first apocalyptic beast, which is undoubtedly the Roman empire, is said to have ten horns or kingdoms; and the great city is said to consist of ten different parts or streets (Rev. xi. 13.) Hence it is natural to conclude, that the ten parts of the city are the same as the ten horns of the beast. But, if that be the case the great city must mean the empire at large. It is described indeed as seated upon seven hills, in allusion to the site of its literal capital; but we are moreover informed that the seven heads of the beast allude to seven forms of government, a circumstance which plainly shews that the empire as including the city must be intended. For, if we confine the great city of the Apocalypse to literal Rome, we shall find it impossible to discover within the literal city of Rome all the seven forms of government and the eighth which is one of the seven. Some have supposed the short-lived seventh head to be the Exarchate of Ravenna, some the line of Italian Cæsars from the death of Theodosius, and some the kingdom of the Ostrogoths. None of these powers however made Rome their capital. In short, let us interpret the short-lived seventh head as we please, we shall find nothing within literal Rome that at all answers to the prophetic description of it. If then we are obliged to go without the limits of literal Rome to discover all the heads of the beast, the great city must likewise be understood as extending without the limits of literal Rome. In short, as the great city Babylon means not only Babylon itself, but likewise the Babylonian empire: so the great city Rome means not only Rome itself, but likewise the whole Roman empire. The one is used as a type of the other: and, in addition to their mutual resemblance in other particulars, they are perhaps the only two large powers that have ever existed, whose empire and whose capital city have each borne the same name.

As the *great Babylon* is the same as the *symbolical earth* or *Roman empire*; so the *holy city* is the same as the *first heaven*, or *church militant*, whence it is also aptly termed a *camp*. After the *beloved city* or *first heaven* of the millennium shall have passed away, it will be succeeded by the *second holy city*, the *new heaven*, the *church triumphant*, the duration of which shall be commensurate with eternity itself.

This *holy city of God* is furnished, like the *literal Jerusalem*, with a *temple*, an *altar*, and a *court without the temple*. It hath also a *sanctuary* and a *daily sacrifice*: and in the midst of it is the *throne of God* and the *ark of his covenant*. In the *temple* moreover are *two olive-trees* and *two candlesticks*, which are the *two witnesses of Christ*.

To understand the import of this imagery, we must consider the nature of the *visible Church of Christ*. Now that *Church* hath ever been of a two-fold nature, comprehending both the *really pious*, and those who, to use the words of Daniel, *only "cleave to it with flatteries,"* or who, in the language of another prophet, *"have a name that they live, and are dead."* The first of these make the word of God alone the standard of their actions: the second are liable to be "carried about with every wind of doctrine," and are therefore peculiarly obnoxious to the danger of heresy and apostacy. The *truly pious* then are the *mystical temple* of God;\* their hearts are his *throne*, inasmuch as they alone really acknowledge his dominion, (all others, whatever profession they may make, being practical atheists; †) and their *prayers*, humbly offered unto the Lord in a reliance upon his covenanted mercies vouchsafed through the sole merits of his Son, are the *daily sacrifice* offered upon the *altar* before the *ark of the covenant*. The *real Church of God*

\* "Know ye not, that ye are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you?" (1 Corin. iii. 16.) "Know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost, which is in you?" (1 Corin. vi. 19.) "What agreement hath the temple of God with idols? for ye are the temple of the living God; as God hath said, I will dwell in them and walk in them; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people." (2 Corin. vi. 16.) "Christ as a son over his own house, whose house are we." Heb. iii. 6.

† Ἀθεοὶ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ. Ephes. ii. 12.

however is not to be confined exclusively to the times of the Christian dispensation ; it had existed from the very beginning of the world in the hearts of the faithful, and had afterwards assumed a definite form in the age of Moses and Aaron. Abraham rejoiced to see the day of his Redeemer ; he “ saw it, and was glad.” Moses esteemed “ the reproach of Christ greater riches than the treasures of Egypt.” The ancient patriarchs “ all died in faith, not having received the promises, but having seen them afar off.” In short, “ although they were not named *Christian men*, yet was it a *Christian faith* that they had ; for they looked for all benefits of God the Father, through the merits of his Son Jesus Christ, as we now do. This difference is between them and us, that they looked when Christ *should* come, and we be in the time when he *is* come. Therefore, saith St. Augustin, *The time* is altered and changed, but not *the faith* ; for we have both *one faith* in Christ.”\* Hence we find in the *mystic temple* two *double symbols* ; namely *two olive trees* and *two candlesticks*. The *first olive tree*, and the *first candlestick*, represent the *Church of God before the incarnation of our Lord* ; and the *second olive tree*, and the *second candlestick*, represent the *Church after the incarnation*. Accordingly the prophet Jeremiah denominates the Levitical Church “ a green olive tree, fair, and of goodly fruit ;”† and St. Paul, adopting the same symbolical imagery, describes the *conversion of the gentiles* by the figure of a *wild olive grafted into a good olive and thus producing valuable fruit*.‡ As for a *candlestick*, our Lord himself declares it to be the type of a *Church*.§ The *temple* then symbolizing the *faithful worshippers of God* ; the *outer court*, which under the Levitical dispensation was set apart for the gentiles, represents those who are only *nominal Christians* ; and the *treading it under foot* signifies the *introduction of heresies and apostacies*, sufficient to deceive even the elect of God, were they not secure within his *holy temple*.|| In a similar manner, the *profanation of the sanctuary*, the *abolition of the daily*

\* 2d part of Hom. of faith.

† Jerem. xi. 16.  
§ Rev. i. 20.

‡ Rom. xi. 17—24.  
|| Matt. xxiv. 24.

*sacrifice* which is offered in form though not in spirit by the tares as well as by the wheat,\* and *the setting up of the abomination of desolation*, which are all images taken from the history of the Jews, and which, as we are taught by our Lord himself, signify *literally* the *sacking of Jerusalem by the Romans* and *the introduction of their abominable idolatry into the very precincts of the temple*. † these images, when taken *symbolically*, mean the *introduction of impious apostates*, and the *abolition, or at least the studied interruption, of divine worship*.

4. *A chaste woman* is a symbol of the *true Church*; which, throughout the whole of Scripture, is considered as the *bride of the Lamb*, and the *mother of his spiritual children*. ‡

On the other hand, a *harlot* is a symbol of an *apostate and idolatrous Church*, *apostacy* and *idolatry* being *spiritual whoredom and adultery*. §

In the *Apocalypse* mention is made of *two women*, but of a very different character from each other. *The former* of them is represented, as being *driven into the wilderness by the persecution of the dragon*: *the latter* is described, as being also in *the wilderness*, but as riding there *triumphantly and joyously upon a scarlet coloured beast*. This symbol of a *wilderness* is manifestly borrowed from the history of the children of Israel, during their sojourn of forty years in the great wilderness; and it denotes a *state of extreme spiritual barrenness and ignorance*. Into such a *wilderness* of religious error *the woman*, who is the symbol of the *true Church*, is *forcibly driven* by the infernal serpent; where, in the midst of surrounding abominations, like Israel in the midst of the gentiles, she is nourished by the grace of God, and miraculously though invisibly upheld by the power of his

\* Matt xiii 38.

† "The Roman army is called *the abomination* for its ensigns and images which were so to the Jews. As Chrysostom affirms, every idol and every image of a man was called *an abomination* among the Jews.—We farther learn from Josephus, that after the city was taken, the Romans brought their ensigns into the temple, and placed them over against the eastern gate, and sacrificed to them there." Bp. Newton's Dissert. XIX.

‡ See the Song of Solomon—Isaiah liv. 5—Jerem. xxxi. 32—Hos. ii. 2, 7—Ephes. v. 32—Rev. xix. 7, xxi.

§ See Ezek. xvi—Jerem. iii—Rev. xvii.

arm, during *the space of 1260 days or three years and a half*; as the Israelites were fed with manna, the type of Christ himself who is the spiritual bread of his church,\* during *their pilgrimage of forty years*. Into *the same wilderness* also of *spiritual barrenness and ignorance* the *great whore*, who is the symbol of *some apostate Church* predicted by St. John, *voluntarily withdraws* herself: where she sits, as a queen, upon *the power* symbolized by *the scarlet beast*; and labours at once to seduce with her blandishments, and to terrify with her threats, the oppressed Church of God.†

5 Another symbol of *the church* is a *vine*. When *the vine is properly cultivated, and yields good fruit*, it is *the true church*; but, when it is styled *the vine of the earth*, and is described as *yielding sour grapes even when they are fully ripe*,‡ it signifies an *apostate church*. This being the case, *gathering the clusters of the vine of the earth, and treading the wine-press*, denote *the just wrath of God poured out upon apostates and corrupters of his word*.

6. One of the most striking hieroglyphics however, among those which are used in the writings of Daniel and St. John, is that of *a wild beast*.§ Several different

\* John vi 31—58. Rev. ii. 17.

† Mr Sharpe has very injudiciously, I think, followed Sir Isaac Newton in confounding these *two women* together. It is true, that *the great whore* was once *the chaste wife* of the Lamb; but, by her withdrawing into *the wilderness*, she became an essentially different character, leaving that of *the real wife* of the Lamb to those who *protested against her fornications*, and whom in return she persecuted and trod under foot. The prophetic account indeed of *the two women* sufficiently shews, that they cannot be esteemed *the same person* without the most palpable contradiction; for *the ten-horned beast*, upon which *one of the women* triumphantly rides, is the agent and instrument of *the very ten-horned Dragon*, which is so violent a persecutor of *the other woman*. (Sir Isaac Newton's Observ. p. 279—Append. to Sharpe's three tracts p. 121, 122.) Mr. Galloway is guilty of the same error of supposing, that *the flight of the woman into the wilderness* means *her apostacy* (Comment p. 131.) Bp Newton most justly adopts the contrary opinion. "When *the woman, the true Church*, was persecuted and afflicted, she was said to fly into *the wilderness*: and, in like manner, when *the woman, the false Church*, is to be destroyed, the vision is presented in *the wilderness*. For they are by no means, as some have imagined, *the same woman* under various representations. They are totally distinct and different characters: and drawn in contrast to each other; as appears from their whole attire and behavior, and particularly from these two circumstances; that, during the *1260 years*, while *the woman* is fed in *the wilderness*, the *beast* and the *scarlet whore* are reigning and triumphant; and, at the latter end, *the whore* is burnt with fire, when *the woman*, as his wife, hath made herself ready for the marriage of the Lamb" Bp. Newton's Dissert. in loc.

‡ See Isaiah v. xxvii.

§ It may not be improper to observe, that a different word is used by St.

animals of the rapacious kind are introduced for this purpose; and occasionally the strict laws of nature are departed from, and a *beast* is described as compounded of *several other beasts* in order to convey more accurately the import of the prophecy.

In a *temporal sense*, a *wild beast* is used to symbolize a *large empire professing and acting upon principles adverse to the Church of Christ*. And here I would particularly insist upon *one point*, namely, that a *beast* never means a *single kingdom* considered as co-existing with *other kingdoms* all jointly in opposition to the *Church*; such, for instance, as *any one of the ten kingdoms* into which the *Roman empire* was divided: but always an *universal empire*, that is to say, *universal so far as the Church is concerned*.\* A *temporal beast* then importing an *universal empire*, its *heads*, if it be represented as having *more than one*, sometimes mean *different forms of government* under which the empire in question has subsisted, and sometimes *different kingdoms* into which it has been divided.† *Horns* likewise mean *different kingdoms*, which have branched out from the *imperial head* of a *once universal monarchy*, and which are all subsisting at the same time: and the *tail*, which is the meanest part of the body, signifies the *antichristian superstition of the beast*, the cause by which he is rendered so utterly offensive in the eyes of God.‡ *The dominion of a beast* is his *power of persecution*: the *life or vital*

John to express the *four cherubic animals* who join with the twenty-four elders in praising God, and the *two persecuting beasts of the sea and the earth*; the former are termed ζῴα or *living creatures*; and the latter, θηρία, or *wild beasts of prey*.

\* Other *beasts* or *large empires*, like those of *China* and *Hindustan*, never having had any connection with the affairs of the *Church*, are for that reason left unnoticed by prophecy. Of the *beasts* or *empires* against which the *ram* pushed with so much success, one was the *lion* or the *Babylonian monarchy*, and the others were states with which the *Church* had no connection, such as the *kingdom of Ceresus*. That of *Egypt*, which was conquered by *Cambyses*, the second king of the *ram*, is perhaps the only exception to the rule of a *beast* meaning an *universal empire so far as the Church is concerned*, having existed along with the *Babylonian empire*, and having, like it, been much connected with the *Jews*; yet even *Egypt* is not a perfect exception, having been once subdued, and made, during the space of three years, a province of the *Babylonian monarchy*, by *Esar-haddon*. Chron. Tab. to Univ. Hist. p. 54.

† I only recollect a single instance, in which *heads* mean *different kingdoms*. See Dan vii. 6.

‡ “The Lord will cut off from Israel *head* and *tail*, branch and rush, in one day. *The ancient and honourable*, (that is, the governing power) he is the *head*, and the *prophet that teacheth lies*, he is the *tail*.” Isaiah ix. 14, 15.

principle of a beast, that is to say, the principle which causes him to be a beast is his idolatry or apostacy: and the death of a beast is the destruction of this vital principle. Hence, when a beast is said to exist or to live, the meaning is, that the empire typified by the beast is devoted to idolatry and superstition. When he is said to cease to exist or to be slain, the meaning is, not that his temporal authority is destroyed, but that he has put away his abominations; the retaining of which was the sole cause of his being a beast, and consequently the resignation of which is equivalent to his ceasing to be a beast. When he is said to exist afresh or to revive, the meaning is, that he has either resumed his old abominations, or adopted fresh ones equally hateful to God; thereby again acquiring the bestial character, which he had before happily laid aside. And, when his dominion is said to be taken from him, the meaning is that he is deprived of his power of persecuting the Church. In this last idea the loss of lawful temporal authority is not necessarily included. The dominion of the little horn of the Roman beast has already begun to be taken away by the withdrawing of many of its former supporters from the communion of the Church of Rome; and eventually it shall be deprived of the remainder of its dominion, and of its temporal authority likewise by the death of its colleague and supporter the secular ten-horned beast: yet we are not to suppose, that, when the secular beast ceases to exist as a beast, all government will cease within the limits of what was once his empire.\* So again: though the little horn will be deprived both of its dominion and its temporal authority, since the two ideas are not necessarily connected, it does not therefore follow, that, because the other beasts are to be deprived of their dominion, they shall also be deprived of their temporal authority. On the contrary, the taking away of their dominion while their lives are prolonged means, not that the pagan nations, which shall co-exist with the Church during the millennium, shall possess no temporal power within their proper territories, but only (like the empire of China for instance) that they shall possess no

\* Dan. vii. 11, 26.

*power of persecuting the Church.\** This is sufficiently manifest from the state of those nations at the close of the millennium, as it is described both by Ezekiel and St John. In the writings of those two prophets, they appear as a regularly organized body of men, making no attempt upon the pious Christian governments, which jointly constitute *the fifth great monarchy, or spiritual empire of the Messiah*, during the space of a thousand years; but at the end of those years assailing them at the instigation of Satan with the utmost rancour, and perishing in consequence of it. Hence it may be collected, that, when *their dominion* is said to be taken away, the meaning must be, not *their temporal dominion within their own limits*, but *their power of injuring the Church.†*

In a *spiritual or ecclesiastical* sense, a *beast* is a *superstition affecting universal dominion*: for *universality* as I have already observed, is the *peculiar* characteristic of a *beast*, as opposed to *the horn of a beast*. On the same grounds, a *horn*, in an *ecclesiastical* sense, is a *spiritual kingdom*: and, as such, it may be represented, either as springing out of a *secular beast*, or out of an *ecclesiastical beast*. In the former case, its geographical origin is pointed out; in the latter case, its connection with, and subserviency to, a *spiritual empire*. An *ecclesiastical kingdom* however may increase into an *ecclesiastical empire*, and it may then have *ecclesiastical kingdoms* subservient to it. Hence, what is symbolized in one prophecy by *the horn of a secular beast*, may hereafter in another prophecy be symbolized by a *distinct spiritual beast*, having a *proper head or supreme governor* and *proper horns or ecclesiastical kingdoms of its own*. There is only *one such beast* mentioned in the whole Bible: and he supplies the place of what in a collateral prediction had been represented by *a little horn gradually acquiring unlimited power*: while, to prevent the possibility of mistaking his character, he is expressly denominated a *false prophet.‡*

These *beasts* have both a *natural* and a *spiritual* origin. Hence *the same beast* is sometimes said to arise both out

\* Dan. vii. 12.

+ Ezek. xxxviii. xxix. Rev. xx. 1—10.

‡ Compare Dan. vii. 7, 8, 11, 20, 21, 24, 25 with Rev. xiii. 1, 11, 16 and xix. 20. The specific character of the two apocalyptic beasts will be discussed at large hereafter.



of *the sea*, and out of *the bottomless pit* ; the former expression denoting *his physical birth out of contending nations*, and the latter *his infernal extraction*.

The sovereign and instigator and spiritual parent of the various *beasts* or *idolatrous empires*, that have persecuted the Church, is *the dragon* or *serpent*. This fierce and noxious reptile, when *simply* mentioned, is *the devil*, that *old serpent* which deceiveth the whole world, poisoning the principles of its inhabitants, and introducing death both temporal and eternal : but, when described as being connected with certain *other marks or symbols*, it is *the devil considered as acting through the instrumentality of the power or powers thus marked or symbolized*. Accordingly *the great red dragon* of the Apocalypse is, as we are repeatedly assured by St. John, *the devil* : and, inasmuch as he is said to have *seven heads and ten horns*, he can only be thus described, because he acts through the instrumentality of *the seven-headed and ten-horned beast* ; to whom he is said to have given his power, and his seat, and great authority.\*



### CHAPTER III.

*Concerning the scriptural phrases of the latter days, the last days, and the time of the end.*

FOR the right understanding of prophecy it is necessary to ascertain the meaning of *certain phrases*, which are used by the inspired writers to describe *different future periods*. The phrases, to which I allude, are *the latter times* or *days*, *the last times* or *days*, and *the end* or *the time of the end*.

Bp. Newton remarks, that *the two former* of these phrases “ signify primarily *any time yet to come* ; but denote more particularly *the times of Christianity* :” and

\* Rev. xiii. 2.

he adds, that sometimes this phraseology relates, not only to *the whole period of the Christian dispensation*, but likewise to *the latter or last days of the latter or last times*.\*

In this observation there is much that is true : but I cannot think, that it is by any means stated so accurately as it might have been.

Throughout the *Old Testament*, the two apparently different phrases of *latter days* and *last days* never once in reality occur. *The single expression*, which our translators thus variously render *comparatively* and *superlatively*, (as if there were *two different expressions* in the original,) is simply אַחֲרֵית הַיָּמִים, *the end of days*. Consequently, *the latter days* and *the last days* of our present translation of the *Old Testament* must mean *the very same period*, whatever that period may be ; because they are each equally a version of *one and the same phrase*, which literally and properly ought to be rendered *the end of days*.

*The end of days* means primarily, as Bp. Newton very justly remarks, *any time yet future* : † but I much doubt, whether it ever signifies *the whole period of the Christian dispensation*. On the contrary, whenever it is not used in its primary sense, I believe it exclusively to relate to *that portion of time, which begins at the termination of the great Apostacy of 1260 years, and which expires at the end of the Millennium and at the consummation of all things*. This great period Mr. Mede styles *the kingdom of the mountain* in opposition to *the kingdom of the stone* : in other words, *the triumphant reign of Christianity after the 1260 years*, in opposition to *its depressed state before the expiration of that term*. *The end of days* therefore includes not only *the millennium*, but *the 75 years* which will intervene between *the end of the 1260 years* and *the proper commencement of the Millennium* ; which 75 years will be occupied in the res-

\* Dissert. iv.—Dissert. xxiii. 3. See also Mede's *Apostacy of the latter Times*, Part I Chap. 11.

† In this case, perhaps it might more properly be translated *the succession of days*, as denoting what Mr. Mede calls a *continuation or length of time* : for אַחֲרֵית signifies either *the whole length of any period*, or *the end of that period*.

*toration of the house of Israel, and in the destruction of God's enemies.\**

\* See Dan. xii. 6, 7, 11, 12, whence it appears, that, between *the expiration of the three times and a half or the 1260 years, and the commencement of the season of blessedness at the end of 1335 years, just 75 years intervene. The three texts, which Bp. Newton cites to shew that the phrase of the latter or last days or the end of days denotes the times of Christianity, seem to me plainly to relate to the millennian period, or the reign of the mountain.*

“And it shall come to pass *in the last days, or at the end of days,* that the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills; and all nations shall flow unto it.” Isai. li. 2.

“But, *in the last days, or at the end of days,* it shall come to pass, that the mountain of the house of the Lord shall be established in the top of the mountains, and it shall be exalted above the hills; and people shall flow unto it.” Micah iv. 1.

“But this is that, which was spoken by the prophet Joel; And it shall come to pass *in the last days* (saith God) I will pour out of my Spirit upon all flesh.” Acts ii. 16, 17.

With regard to *the two first* of these texts, let any person compare them with Dan. ii. 34, 35, 44, 45, and he will be satisfied, that they relate exclusively to *the kingdom of the mountain, or the millennium:* which was not to commence, as we are plainly informed by Daniel, till *after* the destruction of the feet of the image, or the ten-horned Roman beast; that is to say, they relate to *the kingdom of Christ,* when no longer symbolized by a stone, but when it shall have become a *great mountain* filling the whole earth.

As for *the last* of them, it is undoubtedly applied by St. Peter to the miraculous effusion of the Holy Ghost upon the day of Pentecost; yet it is as undoubtedly cited by him *only in the way of application.* The whole prophecy, of which that text forms a part, relates to *the ravages of some fierce and lawless people symbolized by a flight of locusts, the restoration of the Jews, the overthrow of Antichrist and his congregated vassals between the two seas in the valley of concision, and the glorious rest of the people of God during the blessed days of the Millennium:* consequently it can only have been applied by St. Peter to the times of *the first advent* of our Lord, as typical in some measure of the times of his *second advent.* It ought to be observed, that, although in his citation of the text the Apostle introduces the phrase of *the last days,* (which undoubtedly in his application of it means *the times of Christianity*) the phrase does not occur in the original text of Joel: no argument therefore can be drawn from this circumstance to prove, that the Old Testament phrase of *the end of days* is equivalent to the New Testament phrase of *the last days.* (See Joel ii. iii. for the whole prophecy; and Joel ii. 28, for the text.)

*The end of days* then, I conceive, when not used in its primary sense of *any time yet future,* denotes the end of the present order of things, the end of the reign of the two little apostate horns, the end of the tyranny of Antichrist; in short, the whole time of the end as the great day of the Lord's controversy is styled by Daniel, and the whole period of the Millennium. (See Hosea iii. 5.)

Instead of this phrase, Ezekiel, in a single instance, uses another; which is precisely equivalent to it. Speaking of the attack, which should be made by Gog and Magog upon the Jews, now restored to their own country, he indifferently predicts, that it should take place at *the end of years,* and at *the end of days.* (See Ezek. xxxviii. 8, 16.) Now St. John specially informs us, that this invasion of Gog and Magog shall not be till the end of the Millennium; and Ezekiel, in perfect harmony with him, asserts, that it shall be directed against the Jews a considerable time after their return, when dwelling in Palestine in unsuspecting security. (See Rev. xx. 7, 8. and Ezek. xxxviii. 8, 11, 12, 14.) Since then the expedition of Antichrist and the expedition of Gog and Magog are both to take place at the end of days, and since the one expedition is to be at the beginning of the Millennium and the other at the end of it, it is evident that the

In *the New Testament* on the other hand, there is a real difference between the two phrases of *the latter days*, and *the last days*; a difference, carefully observed by the inspired writers, and with much judiciousness as carefully attended to by our translators. *The latter times* is the strict literal translation of ὅσπερος καιρῶν; and *the last days* is the strict literal translation of ἑσχατῶν ἡμερῶν; the one phrase is *comparative*, and the other is *superlative*: and *these two phrases* are never confounded together.

Whenever the phrase of *the last days* is used *declaratively*, and not *prophetically*, by the evangelical writers, it means *the whole period of the Christian dispensation*, as contradistinguished from *the former days of the Patriarchal and Levitical dispensations*. In this sense it is applied by the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews. "God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in *time past* unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in *these last days* spoken unto us by his Son."\* It is used in a similar manner by St. Peter. "Christ verily was fore-ordained *before the foundation of the world*, but was manifest in *these last times* for you."† It is used also in the same manner by St. John. "Little children, it is *the last time*: and, as ye have heard that the Antichrist shall come, even now are there many antichrists; whereby we know, that it is *the last time*."‡

But, whenever the phrases of *the latter days*, and *the last days*, are used *prophetically*, and not *declaratively*, by the evangelical writers, they never mean *the whole*

*end of days or the end of years reaches from the termination of the 1260 years to the termination of the Millennium.*

On the other hand, when Daniel informs Nebuchadnezzar, that "God maketh known to him what shall be in *the latter days*, or at the *end of days*," it is manifest, that *futurity in general*, not *the Millennium in particular*, is there intended by the expression: because the king's dream reaches from *his own reign to the very commencement of the kingdom of the mountain*. (Dan. ii. 28 29) Such also, as Bp Newton justly remarks, is the meaning of the phrase in Gen. xlix. 1 Numb. xxiv 14. and Deut. xxxi. 29. (See Dissert. iv.) Such likewise is its meaning in Dan. x. 14 The context indeed, as in the present cases, will usually shew, with abundantly sufficient clearness, *which of these two significations* the Hebrew phrase of *the end of days* ought to bear in the different passages, wherein it occurs.

\* Heb. i. 1, 2.

† 1 Peter i. 20.

‡ 1 John ii. 18. The phrase of *the latter times or days*, is never used in the New Testament, like the phrase of *the last times or days*, in the sense of *the whole period of the Christian dispensation*.

.....

*period of the Christian dispensation, but always two distinct and successive parts of that dispensation.* Here I am compelled entirely to differ from Bp. Newton and Mr. Mede. Both these eminent expositors suppose, that the two phrases are *synonymous* and *equally* mean *the latter times of the last times*, which are the times of *the little horn*; who should arise *during the latter part of the last of the four kingdoms*, and should be destroyed together with it, after having continued *a time, and times, and half a time* :”\* whereas I am persuaded, that in the New Testament they are *not synonymous*, but that they relate to *two entirely different periods*, which are *never* confounded together by any of the apostolical prophets.

The *whole duration* of the times of Christianity under the *reign of the stone*, exclusive of the *Millennium*, or the *reign of the mountain*, is considered in the evangelical predictions as divided into *three periods*.

1. *The first is that of primitive Christianity*; which was not to expire till the commencement of the *great Apostacy*, although the divine truths of the Gospel would be gradually corrupted during its continuance. Its history, as connected with that of the *Roman empire*, is detailed under the *six first apocalyptic seals*, and the *four first apocalyptic trumpets*.

2. *The second is that of the great Apostacy, during its flourishing state.* The history of *this period* is detailed under the *two first woe-trumpets*; but the *Apostacy itself* will not be completely overthrown till towards the *end of the third woe-trumpet*.

3. *The third is that of the reign of Antichrist*, whose distinguishing badge should be a denial both of the Father and the Son. The power was not to be revealed till some time *after* the *Apostacy* had commenced: and was to be contemporary with it during the *latter part* of its existence, during its allegorical *old age*. The history of *this third period*, which comprehends both the *reign of Antichrist* and the *decline and fall of the contemporary Apostacy*, is detailed under the *third woe-trumpet and its seven vials*.

\* Bp. Newton's Dissert. xxiii. 8.

The second and third of these periods, the history of which constitutes the *three apocalyptic woes*,\* make up jointly the grand period of 1260 years. The *Apostacy* itself continues to tyrannize the whole length of the 1260 years: but the reign of *Antichrist* is contemporary with the apostacy only during a certain space at the last end of those years; and this space, we are informed, will be short, compared with the entire duration of the 1260 years, or the 42 prophetic months.†

The second then of these three periods, comprehending the rise and flourishing state of the *Apostacy*, is termed by the prophets of the New Testament the *latter times* or *days*; as being *latter* when compared to the days of *primitive Christianity* or the *first period*.

And the third of the three periods, or the peculiar reign of the *atheistical Antichrist*, is distinguished by the appellation of the *last times* or *days*; as being *last*, when compared to the days of *primitive Christianity*, and to the *latter days* of the *first and second vœ-trumpets*, or the *peculiar reign of apostate superstition*.

Accordingly, we shall invariable find, that every apostolical prediction, relative to the *latter days*, speaks of certain *superstitious practices* introduced by the *little horn of the fourth beast* during the *flourishing period of the Apostacy*; but never alludes to *Atheism*, and the monstrous brood of vices engendered by it: and, on the other hand, that every apostolical prediction, relative to the *last days*, speaks of *Atheism* and its *kindred sins*; but never alludes to the *superstitious practices of the Apostacy*.

*Prophecies relative to the latter days, or the superstitions of the Apostacy.*

“Now the Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the *latter times* some shall depart‡ from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils;§ through the

\* Rev. viii. 13.

† Rev. xii. 12.

‡ Gr. ἀποστῆναι, shall apostatize. It is the very same mode of expression as that used by St. Paul, when he is predicting the falling away or apostacy, (Gr. ἀποστασία) which was to take place from primitive Christianity. 2 Thess. ii. 3.

§ Or, more properly, demons or mediating spirits. As Bp. Newton justly remarks, “doctrines of demons, are doctrines about and concerning demons. This is therefore a prophecy, that the idolatrous theology of demons, professed by the gentiles, should be revived among Christians—Demons, according to the

hypocrisy of liars, having their consciences seared with a hot iron, forbidding to marry, and commanding to abstain from meats, which God hath created to be received with thanksgiving of them which believe and know the truth—Refuse profane and old wives' fables; and exercise thyself rather unto godliness: for bodily exercise profiteth little.”\*

“The time will come, when they will not endure sound doctrine: but after their own lusts shall they heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears; and they shall turn away their ears from the truth, and shall be turned unto fables.”†

“And the rest of the men, which were not killed by these plagues,” (namely, those which took place under *the first and second woe-trumpets*, and consequently during the period, which, as I conceive, the apostolical prophets denominate *the latter days*,) “yet repented not of the works of their hands, that they should not worship devils,‡ and idols of gold, and silver, and brass, and stone, and of wood: which neither can see, nor hear, nor walk: neither repented they of their murders, nor of their sorceries, nor of their fornication, nor of their thefts.”§

“Let no man beguile you of your reward, in a voluntary humility and worshipping of angels, intruding into those things which he hath not seen, vainly puffed up by his fleshly mind, and not holding the head—Which things have indeed a shew of wisdom in will-worship, and humility, and disciplining of the body; not in any honour to the satisfying of the flesh.”||

theology of the gentiles, were middle powers between the sovran gods and mortal men—These demons were regarded as mediators and agents between the gods and men—Of these demons there were accounted two kinds. One kind of demons were the souls of men, deified or canonized after death—The other kind of demons were such as had never been the souls of men, nor ever dwelt in mortal bodies—The latter demons may be paralleled with angels, as the former may with canonized saints.” Dissert. xxiii. 2.

\* 1 Tim. iv. 1.

† 2 Tim. iv. 3.

‡ That is, *demons* or *mediating spirits*, as before. St. John uses the very same word *δαίμονα* or *demons*, that St. Paul does. (1 Tim. iv. 1.)

§ Rev. ix. 20.

|| Coloss. ii. 18, 19, 23. The express phrase of *latter times* or *days* only occurs in *one* of these prophecies; but the purport of the rest, relating as they all do to the very same superstitious practices as those stigmatized in the first, sufficiently shew that they must all be referred to the same period, whatever that period may be.

.....

*Prophecies relative to the last days, or the atheism of Antichrist.*

“This know also, that in *the last days* perilous times shall come. For men shall be lovers of their own selves, covetous, boasters, proud, blasphemers, disobedient to parents, unthankful, unholy, without natural affection, truce-breakers, false accusers, incontinent, fierce, despisers of those that are good, traitors, heady, high-minded, lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God; having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof: from such turn away. Of this sort are they, which creep into houses and lead captive silly women, laden with sins, led away with divers lusts, ever learning, and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth. Now, as Jannes and Jambres withstood Moses, so do these also resist the truth; men of corrupt minds, reprobate concerning the faith. But they shall proceed no further; for their folly shall be manifest unto all men, as theirs also was.”\*

“Knowing this first, that there shall come in *the last days* scoffers, walking after their own lusts, and saying, *Where is the promise of his coming; for, since the fathers fell asleep, all things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation.* For this they willingly are ignorant of, that by the word of God the heavens were of old, and the earth standing out of the water and in the water; whereby the world that then was, being overflowed with water, perished.†

“But there were false prophets among the people, even as there shall be false teachers among you, who privily shall bring in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that bought them, and bring upon themselves swift destruction. And many shall follow their pernicious ways; by reason of whom the way of truth shall be evil spoken of. And through covetousness shall they with feigned words make merchandise of you; whose judgment now of a long time lingereth not, and their

It is worthy of remark, that in a Popish tract republished so late as *the year 1798*, the editor defends the worship of the Virgin Mary on the very ground predicted by the Apostle, *the plea of humility and having a just sense of our own unworthiness.* See Whitaker's Comment. on Rev. p. 315—318.

\* 2 Tim. iii. 1.

† 2 Peter iii. 3.



damnation slumbereth not—The Lord knoweth how to deliver the godly out of temptations, and to reserve the unjust unto the day of judgment to be punished. But chiefly them that walk after the flesh in the lust of uncleanness, and despise government. Presumptuous are they, self-willed, they are not afraid to speak evil of dignities—These, as natural brute beasts, made to be taken and destroyed, speak evil of the things that they understand not, and shall utterly perish in their own corruption, and receive the reward of unrighteousness, as they that count it pleasure to riot in the day time. Spots they are, and blemishes, sporting themselves with their own deceivings while they feast with you. Having eyes full of adultery, and that cannot cease from sin; beguiling unstable souls; an heart have they exercised with covetous practices: cursed children—These are wells without water, clouds that are carried with a tempest: to whom the mist of darkness is reserved forever. For, when they speak great swelling words of vanity, they allure, through the lusts of the flesh, through much wantonness, those that were clean escaped from them who live in error.\* While they promise them liberty, they themselves are the servants of corruption: for, of whom a man is overcome, of the same he is brought in bondage. For, if, after they have escaped the pollutions of the world through the knowledge of the Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, they are again entangled therein and overcome, the latter end is worse with them than the beginning. For it had been better for them not to have known the way of righteousness, than, after they have known it, to turn from the holy commandment delivered unto them. But it is happened unto them according to the true proverb. The dog is turned to his own vomit again, and the sow that was washed to her wallowing in the mire.†

“There are certain men crept in unawares, who were before of old ordained to this condemnation, ungodly

\* The error, here spoken of, is the *Apostasy of the latter days*. Many, who had seen and rejected its absurdities, were, notwithstanding, to be deceived by the wiles of Infidelity.

men, turning the grace of our God into lasciviousness, and denying the only Lord God, and our Lord Jesus Christ. I will therefore" (namely, with a view to account for this spirit of infidelity,) "put you in remembrance, though ye once knew this, how that the Lord, having saved the people out of the land of Egypt, afterward destroyed them that believed not. These filthy dreamers defile the flesh, despise dominion, and speak evil of dignities. These speak evil of those things which they know not: But what they know naturally, as brute beasts, in those things they corrupt themselves. Woe unto them! for they have gone in the way of Cain, and ran greedily after the error of Balaam for reward, and perished in the gainsaying of Core. These are spots in your feasts of charity, when they feast with you, feeding themselves without fear; clouds they are without water, carried about of winds; trees whose fruit withereth, without fruit, twice dead, plucked up by the roots; raging waves of the sea, foaming out their own shame; wandering stars, to whom is reserved the blackness of darkness for ever. And Enoch also, the seventh from Adam, prophesied of these, saying, Behold, the Lord cometh with ten thousand of his saints, to execute judgment upon all, and to convince all that are ungodly among them of all their ungodly deeds which they have ungodly committed, and of all their hard speeches which ungodly sinners have spoken against him. These are murmurers, complainers, walking after their own lusts; and their mouth speaketh great swelling words, having men's persons in admiration because of advantage. But beloved, remember ye the words which were spoken before of the Apostles of our Lord Jesus Christ; how that they told you there should be mockers in *the last time*, who should walk after their own ungodly lusts. These be they who separate themselves, sensual, having not the Spirit."\*

"As ye have heard that the Antichrist shall come, even now are there many Antichrists—Who is the liar, but he that denieth that Jesus is the Christ? This is the Antichrist, that denieth the Father and the Son.—Every spirit,

\* Jude 4—17.

.....  
 that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh, is not of God: and this is that spirit of the Antichrist, whereof ye have heard that it should come, and even now already is it in the world.”\*



Let any one attentively compare together the two preceding sets of prophecies relative to *the latter days*, and *the last days*, and he will be convinced, that they cannot both relate to the same persons; and consequently that *the latter days* and *the last days* must be two *entirely distinct* periods of time. All the prophecies, as I have already observed, that relate to *the latter days*, speak of a *great prevalence of superstition*, as being the distinguishing feature of *this period*; while all the prophecies, that relate to *the last days*, speak of a *great prevalence of blasphemous infidelity*, as being equally the distinguishing feature of *that period*. In the account indeed which St. John gives of the principles of *Antichrist*, he uses *the last time* in the sense of *the whole period of the Christian dispensation*, because he uses it declaratively; but the reason of this will sufficiently appear, if we consider the import of the passage in which he describes the character of that great opponent of the Messiah.

Dr. Whitby supposes, that *the Jews*, who rejected the promised Saviour, are meant by *Antichrist*. Others have applied the character to *Cerinthus* and the *Manichæans*; and others, to *the imposter Barchochebas*.† From the language however of St. John, who is the only inspired writer that uses the term, I am much inclined to think, that *Antichrist*, strictly speaking, is a sort of generic name, including all persons who answer to the description given of that character. Now the special badge assigned to the character is *a denial of the father and the Son*: a denial of the Son *positively*, a denial of the Father either *positively* or *by implication*. All therefore, who answer to this description, are members of *Antichrist*. The existence of his blasphemous *principles* is commensurate with *the whole period of the Christian dispensation*; but

\* 1 John ii. 18. 22. iv. 3.

† See Pol. Synop. in loc.

his *peculiar reign*, his *open developement*, is confined to *the last days of the last time*. St. John tells his disciples, "ye have heard that the *Antichrist* shall come." This opinion that has ever prevailed in the Church respecting the manifestation of some great opponent of the Messiah at an era far remote from the days of the Apostle,\* an opinion founded no doubt upon the prophecies of Daniel, he by no means controverts: he warns them however to be upon their guard; inasmuch as there were many even then in the world, who were tainted with the *principles of Antichrist*, namely a *denial of the Father and the Son*. The harmony of the apostolical writers upon this point is very remarkable. St. John declares, that the *spirit of Antichrist* or *Infidelity* was already, even in his days, in the world; although it was not yet *revealed*, or exhibited to mankind in an *embodied* form. Daniel had given a description of the monster in his *mature* state, as a *king* or *power* that magnified himself above every god and spoke marvellous things against the God of gods; and St. John adds, that his detestable *principles* were already working, and would continue to work through the whole *period of the last time*, as meaning *the Christian dispensation*, though they would not be developed till *the last days of the last time*. In a similar manner, both St. Peter and St. Jude represent persons of the same principles as those which should be openly avowed and acted upon in *the last days*, as intruding into the feasts of charity usual among the primitive Christians, and consequently as contemporary with themselves.† Events have amply shewn the accuracy of these declarations. The *opinions of Antichrist* were secretly lurking in the Church even in the earliest ages: it has been our lot to behold them

\* "The idea, which the early Christians in general formed of *Antichrist*, was that of a power to be revealed in distant times, after the dissolution of the Roman empire: of a power to arise out of the ruins of that empire." (Bp. Hurd on Prophecy, p. 221.) To this we must add the declaration of St. John, that *the power in question* should deny both the Father and the Son; and we shall then perceive, that the *Antichrist*, about to be revealed in distant times, about to arise out of the ruins of the old Roman empire, is certainly not *the Papacy*, as Bp. Hurd supposes, but a *tyrannical state* of a very different nature. *The Papacy* arose out of the ruins of the Empire, but it never denied either the Father or the Son. *Antichrist* is likewise to arise out of the ruins of the Empire, and is to be known by his denial both of the Father and the Son.

† See the preceding citations.

embraced *without disguise* by a whole nation. "The beginning of the monster was in the apostolic age: for it were easy to trace the pedigree of French philosophy, Jacobinism, and Bavarian illumination, up to the first heresies. But it is now we see his adolescence."\*

As for *the papacy*, it answers in no particular to the character of *Antichrist* as delineated by St. John.† The

\* Bp. Horsley's Letter on Isaiah xviii.—See this matter shewn at large in the Abbè Barruel's Mem. of Jacobinism

† The title of *Antichrist* has usually been applied to *the Pope* by protestant expositors, and by the Waldenses and Albigenses before the era of the *Reformation*: but I cannot find, that they have any warrant from *Scripture* for so doing. The corruptions of *the Papacy* are largely indeed predicted under the name of an *Apostacy*; which was to consist partly in the superstitious will-worship of Saints, partly in the persecution of the pious, and partly in the exercise of a catholic tyranny over the Church: and *the Papacy* itself is described under the symbols of a *little horn*, a *harlot*, and a *two-horned beast*; but *the Pope* is no where, that I have been able to discover, termed *Antichrist*; for he never denied either *the Father* or *the Son*. The identity of *Antichrist* and the *little horn* has been rather assumed, than proved

Since this was written, my opinion that *the Pope* cannot be *the Antichrist* described by St. John has been strenuously though (I think) very unsuccessfully opposed by Mr. Whitaker. As my sincere desire is that the point may be thoroughly discussed, I shall subjoin the substance of my answer to him.

The statement of the whole question is simply this. St. John assures his disciples, that, at the very moment when he was writing, there were *many Antichrists* already in the world: and he afterwards speaks singularly of *one Antichrist*, whom, by way of eminence, he styles *the liar*, and whose leading characteristic should be a *denial of the Father and the Son*. Here then we have *many Antichrists* and *the Antichrist*; and the former are declared to be contemporary with the Apostle. Now we know, that when St. John lived, there was not in existence *any embodied power*, either the papal or any other power, that could in its corporate capacity be styled *the Antichrist*. Hence we may conclude, that his contemporaries, *the many Antichrists*, were *detached individuals*, professing some characteristic opinion which was the cause of their being so named; and, on the other hand, that *the Antichrist* is no individual, but a *collective body of individuals*. The question then is, What *was* the opinion of the *many Antichrists*? Was it the same, or was it not the same, as that of *the Antichrist*, according to St. John's description of it? Does the Apostle give us any clue to ascertain this point? He explicitly declares, as if to prevent the possibility of error, that "every spirit, which confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh, is not of God; and this is that *very essence or spirit* of the Antichrist, which ye have heard shall come, and indeed even now is in the world." Thus it is plain that what St. John calls *the spirit of the Antichrist*, is a *denial that Jesus Christ is the promised Messiah manifested in the flesh*. But, if this spirit, which is the spirit of *the Antichrist*, were in the world when St. John wrote, and if *many individual Antichrists*, were likewise in the world at the same time; I know not what we can conclude but that *these individual antichrists* were men animated by the spirit of *the antichrists*, or *the liar*, which we are unequivocally told is a *denial of the Son*, and thence by implication a *denial of the Father* also. Accordingly St. Paul, St. Peter, and St. Jude, all concur in asserting, that men, possessed by such a spirit as St. John calls *the spirit of the Antichrist*, even the very spirit which we have seen embodied in these last days, had at that early period insinuated themselves into the Church. How then can any thing that St. John here says prove *the Pope* to be *the Antichrist*, namely *the Antichrist whose spirit was then in the world*? All that the

superstition of *that great apostacy* is indeed to continue to the very end of the 1260 days, and is therefore to be

Apostle teaches his disciples is, that, since the delusive spirit of the *Antichrist* was already working, they might be sure that they were living in the *last time*, or under the *last dispensation*, and need not look for any further dispensation. As yet however, although there were many individual antichrists in the world, the great *Antichrist* himself, whose special badge should be a denial of the Father and the Son, was not manifested. His spirit indeed was already working in the children of disobedience, but *he himself* was not as yet revealed: nor does the Apostle give us the slightest intimation, that his appearance would be connected either with the taking away of that which prevented the development of the *papal man of sin*, or with the commencement of the 1260 years. On the contrary, wherever he mentions the *Antichrist*, he studiously and almost anxiously tells us, that his badge is a denial of the *Messiahship of Jesus Christ*.

Mr. Whitaker however argues, that, since I allow the *man of sin* to be the *Pope*; since the *man of sin* is said to oppose and exalt himself above every one that is called *god* or that is worshipped; and since the word, which St. Paul uses to express this opposition, is *anticimenus*: therefore, because the *man of sin* is *anticimenus*, or one that opposeth himself against all that is called *god*, he must be *antichristus*. This whole argument is founded on a misconception of the text. *The gods*, that the *man of sin* was to oppose, were mere earthly gods; in other words, *kings and emperors*. He was to oppose himself to every one that is called *god*, and to every thing august and venerable; to every *sebasma*, in allusion to *sebastus* or *augustus* the title of the Roman emperors. (See Bp. Newton's Dissert. on the *man of sin*.) Hence it is plain, that an opposition of this nature will not constitute the *Pope Antichrist*. Impiously as the Bishops of Rome have sat in the temple of God, shewing themselves that they are God, this has been done rather in conjunction with God, than in opposition to him. In the height of their profane madness they never thought of *denying* either the Father, or the Son; but rather affected to act by their commission and under their authority, considering themselves as a sort of God upon earth, and claiming to be the sole vicars of Christ. In short, the prophecy respecting the *man of sin* has been exactly accomplished in the *Popes*: but St. John's definition of the *liar*, or the *Antichrist*, whose spirit was even then in the world, is by no means applicable to the *Popes*; because their characteristic mark as a body was not a denial either of the Father or of the Son.

If indeed we chose arbitrarily to annex some other idea to the word *Antichrist* than St. John has taught us to annex to it, I have no objection in this sense to say that the *Pope* is an *antichrist*, because he has ever shewn himself a most notorious enemy to the pure religion of the Gospel: so likewise has *Mohammed*, who comes much nearer to the character of St. John's *Antichrist* than the *Pope*, though even he never denied the *Messiahship of Jesus Christ*. But, so long as I acknowledge the authority of the epistles of St. John, I must peremptorily deny that the *Pope* is the *Antichrist*: both because I am plainly taught, that the spirit of that liar was working even in the apostolical age, which the spirit of the *Papacy* was not; and because I am no less plainly taught, that, whenever the monster should be publicly revealed, he should be known by his denial of the Father and the Son.

Dr. Doddridge attempts to explain away this natural objection to the application of the character of *Antichrist* to the *Pope*; but in a manner, that to myself at least appears nothing better than a mere quibble. He says, that "*Papery* is an usurpation entirely inconsistent with a due homage to Christ," and therefore that the *Papacy* is *Antichrist*. But what has this to do with an express denial of Christ? It is surely a most unsatisfactory answer to those, who as he himself observes "have argued, that the *Pope* cannot be *Antichrist*, because he confesses Christ, and that it must necessarily be some entirely opposing person or sect, and which does not bear the christian name." (Paraphr. 1 John iv. 3.) As little satisfactory to me is Pyle's gloss. (Preface to 1 John

contemporary during the latter period of its existence with *the reign of Antichrist*: but the domination of that *infidel tyrant* is so strongly marked by *atheism, insubordination, and a total want of all the kinder affections of our nature*; that, for a season, till he has united himself with *the man of sin* the domineering head of the *apostacy*, the abominations even of *the papal superstition* are scarcely visible near the infernal glare of *avowed Antichristianity*.

It requires some degree of circumspection clearly to ascertain the meaning of the phrase of *the end* or *the time of the end*, קץ or קץ עת, so frequently used by Daniel. To myself it certainly appears to mean *the termination of the whole 1260 days*; the conclusion of *the great drama of the two-fold apostacy and the reign of Antichrist*. I conceive *the time of the end* to commence, so soon as *the 1260 days* expire; and to extend through *the 75 years*, which intervene between *the end of the 1260 days*, and *the beginning of the season of millenarian blessedness*. I believe it in short to be the awful period, during which the judgments of God will go abroad through all the earth, and during which his great controversy with the nations will be carried on.\*

Before I attempt to shew that such is the import of the phrase, it will be proper for me to observe, that a very different interpretation of it has been given by Mr. Mede, in which he has been followed by Bp. Newton. Instead of supposing it to mean *the termination of the 1260 days*, he conceives it to denote *the latter days of the Roman empire, or the whole duration of the 1260 days.*†

\* *The time of the end, or at least the first portion of it, which contains 30 years, (Dan. xii. 11,) synchronizes with the last apocalyptic vial, which will begin to be poured out so soon as the 1260 days shall have expired.*

† Yet it is worthy of notice, that in two places Bp. Newton understands the phrase precisely as I do, namely, as denoting not *the continuance*, but *the termination of the 1260 years*. Commenting upon Dan. xi. 35, he observes, "These calamities were to befall the Christians to try them, and purge, and make them white, not only at that time, but even to *the time of the end*, because it is yet for a time appointed: and we see, even at this day, not to allege other instances, how the poor protestants are persecuted, plundered, and murdered, in the southern parts of France." (Dissert. XVII. in loc.)

To the same purpose is his comment on Daniel xii. 9. It is indeed no wonder that we cannot fully understand and explain these things; for, as the angel said to Daniel himself, though *many should run to and fro, and should inquire and examine into these things, and thereby knowledge should be increased*; yet the full understanding of them is reserved for the time of the end, *the*

In support of this opinion, I cannot find however, that he brings forward any argument, excepting one which is built upon his own exposition of the question and answer recorded by Daniel: "Until how long shall be the end of the wonders? It shall be until a time and times and a half."\* Now the import of this passage Mr. Mede supposes to be, that the period, styled *the end of the wonders*, or (as he translates it) *the latter end of the wonders*, shall be in length *three times and a half* or 1260 years. Whence he argues, that, since such is to be the length of this *latter end*, *the time of the end* must denote *the whole period of the 1260 years*.†

Were such an exposition of the passage allowable, it would at least render it *ambiguous*; for we should not be absolutely obliged to concede, that, because *it* was allowable, no *other* was allowable: but it appears to me to be by no means allowable; and I believe that our common English version has accurately expressed the sense of the original, although it doubtless is not quite literal.

If we consider the general context of the passage, Daniel first speaks of *the end of certain wonders*, and immediately afterwards of *the finishing of these things*. Now *these things* plainly appear to be the same as *the wonders*. But if *these things* be the same as *the wonders* (which I suppose will scarcely be denied;) it seems most natural to conclude that *the finishing of these things* is the same as *the end of the wonders*. *The finishing of these things* however is plainly *the absolute termination of them*, and it is declared moreover to be contemporary

*words are closed up and sealed till the time of the end*.—As Prideaux judiciously observes, it is the nature of such prophecies not to be thoroughly understood, till they are thoroughly fulfilled." (Dissert. XVII. in loc.) In both these passages, unless I greatly mistake their import, Bp. Newton considers *the time of the end* as being yet future, and as commencing so soon as *the men of understanding or the witnesses* shall have ceased to prophesy in sackcloth, that is to say, at *the end of the 1260 years*.

\* Dan. xii. 6 7.

† Mede's Works, B. iv. Epist. 54.—B. v. Chap. 9 Both Mr Mede and Bp. Newton make a very important use of the sense which they annex to the phrase *of the end* or *the time of the end*. They suppose, that *the kings of the south and the north* mentioned by Daniel as attacking *the wilful king*, are *the Saracens and the Turks*. Now, whatever powers these *kings* may be, their wars are said to begin at *the time of the end*. But, if *the time of the end* denote *the expiration*, and not *the continuance*, of the 1260 years, they certainly cannot be *the Saracens and the Turks*. This subject will be resumed hereafter.



with the restoration of the Jews; the end of the wonders therefore must at once be the termination of the wonders, and must synchronize with the restoration of the Jews. Hence the end of the wonders cannot denote the whole period of the 1260 years, but must, on the contrary, denote the termination of it; because the restoration of the Jews, even according to Mr. Mede's own opinion,\* will synchronize with the downfall of the papal Roman empire, and that downfall will not take place till after the expiration of the 1260 years.

This however is by no means the only objection to the exposition in question. Mr. Mede translates the original passage, not *the end of the wonders*, but *the latter end of the wonders*; evidently with a view to excite the idea, that of a certain period, considered by Daniel as the period of wonders, (suppose for instance the whole duration of his last vision,) the latter portion is contradistinguished from the former portion, and that this latter portion is termed, by way of distinction, the latter end of the wonders, in opposition to the first part of the wonders. In order to appreciate the solidity of this exposition, it will be necessary to descend to verbal criticism. Two words† are used in Hebrew to express the end, *Aarith* and *Ketz* together with its cognates *Ketzah* and *Miket-zath*. Now the former of these denotes either the continuance of a period or the termination of a period, for it is derived from a root which signifies *after*; and it is obvious, that both the successive parts of a period and the absolute termination of it are alike after its commencement: hence the Old Testament phrase of the end of days, which I last considered, denotes either futurity, that is a succession of time in general, or the end of the present order of things and the duration of the Millennium in particular. Whereas the latter, unless I be quite mistaken, never denotes the continuance of the period of which it speaks, but always the termination of it; for it is derived from a verb which signifies to cut off or to cut short:

\* Mede's Works, B. v. Chap. 8.

† I do not mean to say, that no more than two words are used; but that these are the two words with which the present discussion is chiefly concerned. Daniel sometimes uses the Chaldaic *Sepha* instead of *Ketz*, which signifies precisely the same.

whence Buxtorf with much propriety observes, that it denotes *the end*, “quasi *præcisum* dicas; ubi enim res *præciditur*, ibi ejus finis est.” This *latter* word, not the *former*, is used by Daniel, both in the present passage, and in every other passage where *the time of the end* is spoken of.\* *The end of the wonders* therefore, when it is considered what word is used in the original to express *the end*, cannot, as it appears to me, denote either *the whole period during which these wonders were transacting*, or *the latter part of that period*; but must, on the contrary, denote *the absolute cutting off or termination of the period of the wonders*.†

*The end* then, or *the time of the end*, must, agreeably to the import of the original word, signify *the termination of some period or another*: the question is, what period? Daniel informs us, *the period of the wonders*: for, since he speaks of *the end of the wonders*, *the end* can only mean *the termination of that period which comprehends the wonders*. Still the question will occur, what is *the period of the wonders*? Is it *the whole period of Daniel's last vision*, or is it *the particular period of the 1260 years*? This question appears to me not very difficult to be answered. In the earlier part of Daniel's last vision, which treats of the wars between the kings of Syria and Egypt, there is nothing that peculiarly deserves the name of *a wonder*. *The age of wonders*, on which both Daniel and St. John dwell with so much minuteness and astonishment,‡ is undoubtedly *the great period of 1260 years*; during

\* Excepting those in which he uses *Supha*.

† It is observable, that, whenever Daniel uses the cognates of *Ketz* to mark time, he invariably uses them in the sense of *the termination of the period* concerning which they speak, never in the sense of *its continuance*; a sense indeed of which I believe them to be incapable; insomuch that, if by *the time of the end* and *the end of the wonders* he means either *the whole* or *a part of the period of those wonders*, he entirely departs from the sense which he elsewhere annexes to these cognate words. (See Dan. i. 5, 15, 18. iv. 29. See also Gen. iv. 3. margin trans.) There is one passage, in which Daniel plainly appears to me to use the words *Aarith* and *Ketz* in direct opposition to each other. “I will make thee know what shall be in the latter end of the indignation; for it (the vision) shall be until the appointed time of the end.” (Dan. viii. 19.) Here the *latter end*, or rather *the continuance*, (*Aarith*) of the indignation, denotes *the whole period of the tyranny of the he goat's little horn*, or in other words *the whole period of the 1260 years*; while the *end* (*Ketz*) to which the vision is to reach, denotes *the expiration of the 1260 years* or *the end of the period of the wonders*, which therefore synchronizes with *the expiration of the 2300 years*, to which the vision is likewise to reach. Dan. viii. 13, 14.

‡ See Dan. vii. 8, 15, 19—22, 28. viii. 9—14, 27. Rev. xi. xii. xiii. xvii. 5, 7.

which the world was destined to behold the wonderful sight, a *two-fold apostacy* from the pure religion of the Gospel, and of the developement of a *monstrous power* that set the Majesty of heaven itself at defiance. Hence *the period of the wonders* can surely be only *the period of the 1260 years*; for let us attentively peruse the writings of Daniel and St. John, and see whether we can discover another period to which we can with the slightest degree of propriety apply the title of *the period of the wonders*. But a yet more positive proof, that *the period of the 1260 years* is *the period of the wonders*, may be deduced from the very passage, which Mr. Mede uses to establish his own exposition, by assigning to the word *Ketz* a sense which it is incapable of bearing.

“And one said to the man clothed in linen, which was upon the waters of the river, until how long shall be the end (that is, *the termination*) of the wonders? And I heard the man clothed in linen, which was upon the waters of the river, when he held up his right hand and his left hand unto heaven, and swear by him that liveth for ever, that it shall be until a time and times and a half; and, when he shall have finished to scatter the power of the holy people, all these things shall be finished. And I heard, but I understood not. Then said I, O my Lord, what is the end of these things? And he said, Go thy way Daniel; for the words are closed up and sealed till the time of the end.”

A question is here asked, how long a time shall elapse before *the end of the period of wonders* arrives? The answer is, *three times and a half* or *1260 years*: and it is further declared, that, when *the Jews* shall begin to be restored, *all these things*, namely *all the wonders which were to come to an end at the expiration of the 1260 years*, shall be finished. Upon this Daniel enquires, what is *the end* of them: but the only reply given him is, that the words are sealed till *the time of the end*, or that his prophecies shall not be fully understood till *the end of the wonders* arrives.

Now, if *1260 years* are to elapse before *the end of the wonders* arrives, and if *all these things*, that is to say, *all the wonders*, are to be finished contemporaneously with

*the restoration of the Jews* ; it will both follow that *the period of the wonders* must exactly comprehend 1260 years, and that *the restoration of the Jews* will commence at the expiration of that period. In other words it will follow, that *the period of the wonders* is the same as *the period of the 1260 years* ; and consequently that *the end of the period of the wonders, or the time of the end*, denotes the termination, not the continuance, of the period of the 1260 years.

This will yet further appear from comparing together what Daniel says relative to *the time of the end* and what he says relative to *the expiration of the 1260 years*.

If *all the wonders* are to be finished at *the close of the 1260 years*, and if they are likewise to be finished at *the time of the end* ; it is manifest that *the time of the end* must so synchronize with *the expiration of the 1260 years*, that it must commence exactly when *the 1260 years* terminate.

Accordingly we shall find, that *the wonders* which are generally declared to be finished at *the close of the 1260 years* are severally declared to be likewise finished at *this very time of the end*. Thus *the vision of the ram and the he-goat*, which comprehends *the wonders of Moham-medism*, or a portion of *the wonders of the 1260 years*, is to reach unto *the time of the end*.\* Thus *the reformation from the great apostacy*, or *the prophesying of the two witnesses*, is to continue in a progressive state to *the time of the end*.† Thus *the little horn* is to have *the saints* given into his hand during the space of *three times and a half* : and, although his dominion is to *begin* to be taken away before the expiration of that period, even at the era of *the Reformation*, yet it will not be completely consumed till *the end*.‡ Thus *the war of the atheistical king with the kings of the south and north*, his *invasion of Palestine and Egypt*, and his *subsequent destruction between the seas*, are at once to take place at *the time of the end*, and to synchronize with *the restoration of the Jews* ; which will commence at *the expiration of the 1260 years*, or at *the time when all the wonders are finished*.§ Thus the

\* Dan. viii, 17

† Dan. xi. 35.

‡ Dan. vii. 25, 26.

§ Compare Dan. xi. 40—45. with xii. 1, 6—9.

prophecies of Daniel are to be sealed, or, in other words, not receive their full accomplishment so as to be completely understood, till *the time of the end*.\* And thus the prophet himself is commanded to wait patiently till *the end*, with an assurance that he shall stand in his lot at *the end of the days*.†

In absolute strictness of speech, then *the end* is the very moment when *the 1260 years* expire : but Daniel teaches us to extend it somewhat more widely. He styles *this termination* both *the end of the wonders* and *the time of the end* ; by which it appears we must understand *the time at or about the end or the cutting off of the 1260 years* : for he informs us, that both *the two little horns* will be destroyed, and that the whole expedition of *the wilful king* will take place, at this *time of the end* ; events of such magnitude, that, although they may commence at *the end of the period of the wonders*, they plainly cannot be finished in a single *day* or a single *year*. He does not indeed acquaint us what precise length of time will be occupied in the full accomplishment of these important events, but he teaches us that *75 years* will elapse between *the termination of the 1260 years* and *the commencement of the time of blessedness or the Millennium*.‡ Hence it seems most reasonable to conclude, that these *75*

\* Dan. xii. 4, 9.

† Dan. xii. 13. "The end (*Ketz* not *Aarith*) of the days." This curious passage both shews plainly, that *the end* or *the time of the end* cannot mean *the whole period of the 1260 years* : and gives some warrant to Mr Mede's opinion, that *the first resurrection*, which immediately precedes *the Millennium*, and which consequently takes place during the lapse of that *intermediate period* which I believe to be styled *the time of the end*, will be a *literal resurrection of the saints and martyrs*. Daniel will certainly not stand in his lot during *the 1260 years* ; but he is directed to wait for that purpose till *the end* ; therefore *the end* cannot mean *the 1260 years*.

Much the same argument may be deduced from the time specified for the unsealing of Daniel's prophecies. If they are to remain sealed till *the time of the end*, and if *the time of the end* denote *the whole period of the 1260 days*, as Mr Mede supposes ; then they will be opened either at the beginning, or during the lapse, of *the 1260 years* : but we know, that even now they are not perfectly opened, and moreover that they will not be perfectly opened till after *the overthrow of the Antichristian confederacy* at Armageddon, which takes place subsequent to *the expiration of the 1260 years*, and at some era during the lapse of *the 75 years* which intervene between *the end of the 1260 years* and *the beginning of the Millennium* : therefore *the time of the end* cannot denote *the whole period of the 1260 years*, but must denote *the intervening period of 75 years*, in the course of which the now partly sealed prophecies of Daniel will be completely opened ; that is to say, so fully accomplished as to be completely understood.

‡ Dan. xii. 11, 12.

years constitute what Daniel styles *the end* or *the time of the end*; as being that short portion of intermediate time, which *cuts off* and *divides* the great period of 1260 years from the great period of *the Millennium*.



#### CHAPTER IV.

*Concerning the two first prophecies of Daniel and the little horn of the fourth beast.*

*THE prophetic dream of Nebuchadnezzar, and the vision of the four beasts, equally predict, that, from the era of the Babylonian monarchy to the commencement of the Millennium, there should be four, and no more than four empires, universal so far as the Church is concerned.*

*The first or Babylonian empire, is symbolized by the golden head of the image; and by the lion with eagle's wings.*

*The second, or Medo-Persian empire, is symbolized by the silver breast and arms of the image; and by the bear with three ribs in its mouth.*

*The third, or Macedonian empire, is symbolized by the brazen belly and thighs of the image; and by the leopard with four wings and four heads.*

*And the fourth, or Roman empire, is symbolized by the iron and clayey feet of the image, branching out into ten toes; and by the fourth beast diverse from all the others, being compounded of the three preceding symbols, a lion, a bear, and a leopard,\* and having ten horns.*

The accuracy, with which *the three first sets* of these double hieroglyphics describe *the three first great monarchies*, has been so amply shewn by writers upon the prophecies, that it is superfluous for me to discuss the subject afresh: I shall therefore confine myself to the history of *the fourth empire*, symbolized by *the feet of the image* and by *the ten-horned beast*.

\* See Rev. xiii. 2.

The account of *this fourth empire* in *Nebuchadnezzar's dream* is simply, that it should be as strong as iron, and break in pieces and bruise *the three preceding empires*; but that it should afterwards be divided into *ten kingdoms*, answering to *the ten toes of the image*, which, like a mixture of clay and iron, should not be equally powerful, but partly strong, and partly weak: that the sovereigns of these different kingdoms should be perpetually contracting matrimonial alliances with each other, but that nevertheless they should not cohere together the better on that account;\* for, although one or two of the kingdoms might be thus united together under a single government,† yet that the principle of adhesion should be so completely destroyed, that there never should be a *fifth universal monarchy like the four preceding ones*: on the contrary, that *the only fifth empire* should be of a *spiritual nature*, which was to break in pieces and consume all the other kingdoms, and stand, itself, for ever.

To see how exactly the whole of this prophecy has been accomplished, excepting the last particular which is still future, we need only read the modern history of Europe.

The account of *the fourth empire*, in *the second prophecy of Daniel*, varies from that, in *the dream of Nebuchadnezzar*, only by the introduction of *another power*, not mentioned before among *the ten sovereigns*, which is termed a *little horn*. The description given of *this eleventh power* is, that it came up among *the other ten horns*: that *three of the first horns* were plucked up before it: that it had eyes like the eyes of a man, and a mouth speaking great things: that its look was more stout than its fellows: and that it “made war upon the saints, and prevailed against them, until the Ancient of days came,

\* “Whereas thou sawest iron mingled with miry clay, they shall mingle themselves with the seed of men; but they shall not cleave one to another, even as iron is not mixed with clay.” (Dan. ii. 43.) The interpretation of this passage, which I have adopted, seems to me by much the most simple and natural. (See Bp. Newton's Dissert. in loc.)

† *The empire of Charlemagne* forms a seeming exception to this statement; but, as we shall hereafter see, *that empire* is predicted under the symbol of *the last head of the great Roman beast*, a head that should be commensurate with *the whole beast*. After the death of Charlemagne, his vast dominions soon fell asunder, and *the Roman empire* again returned to its divided state.

and judgment was given to the saints of the Most High, and the time came that the saints possessed the kingdom." Upon Daniel's inquiring the meaning of *this symbol*, he is informed by the interpreting angel, that it represents *a power*, which was to rise up behind *the ten kings*, and was to *subdue or depress three of them*: that it was, in some respect or another, to be different from all the rest of the kings: that it was to speak great words by the side of the Most High: that it was to wear out or persecute the saints of the Most High: that it was to change times and laws: and that it was to continue in the possession of a tyrannical authority until *a time, and times, and the dividing of time*, or *three prophetic years and a half*; in other words, till the commencement of *the time of the end*, which ushers in *the reign of the saints* or *the apocalyptic millennium*: for, since *the little horn* was to prevail both to *the beginning of this reign of the saints*, and to *the end of the three years and a half*, it is manifest, that, when *the three years and a half end*, the *reign of the saints will be about beginning*.\* Exactly at the same time, *the Roman beast*, or *the fourth great empire*, from among whose *ten horns the little horn* was to arise, will be slain; and *that* on account of the sin which he has contracted by tolerating and sanctioning the great words spoken by *his little horn*: † for *the Roman beast* in *his revived state*, ‡ and *his little tyrannical horn*, are each to continue in power during the very same period of *three years and a half* or *42 months*; consequently they are to *begin and end* their career together. §

At the termination then of this period, *the fourth beast* and his *little horn* will be utterly destroyed, and given to the burning flame; and *the triumphant reign of Christ*, or *the kingdom of the mountain*, will commence. ||

\* Compare Dan. vii.—21, 22 with Ver. 25, 26.

† "I beheld then, because of the voice of the great words which the horn spake; I beheld, even till the beast was slain." Dan. vii. 11.

‡ This *revived state of the Roman beast* is expressly mentioned by St. John, though not particularly noticed by Daniel. (See Rev. xiii. 1. and xvii.—8, 11.) The subject of his *revival* will be resumed hereafter.

§ Dan. vii. 25—Rev. xiii. 5.

|| I may here repeat, what I have already observed, that, after the expiration of *the 1200 years*, God's controversy with the nations, in the course of which *the beast* and his *little horn* will be destroyed, will occupy a period of at least



But the three other beasts, namely the Babylonian, the Medo-Persian, and the Macedonian, which were all idolatrous beasts, as contradistinguished from an apostatically idolatrous one, although their dominion or their power of oppressing the Church be taken away, will have their lives or idolatrous principles prolonged for a season and a time: that is, prolonged, after the utter destruction of the revived fourth beast and his apostatical principles, and consequently during the reign of the saints; which, as we have seen, is to commence at the death of the fourth beast.

The lives however of the three beasts are only to be prolonged for a season. Unreclaimed by the glorious manifestations of God in favour of his millenarian Church, they will still persevere in their idolatry; and, at the close of the thousand years, will arrive at such a pitch of daring impiety as to make an open attack even upon the beloved city. But fire from the Lord will consume them; and the Church of Christ will be finally translated from earth to heaven.\*

No doubt has been entertained by most commentators upon the prophecies, that Daniel's fourth beast is the Roman empire; † nor by most protestant commentators, that the ten horns of the beast are the ten independent kingdoms into which that empire was finally divided. But there has not been quite the same unity of opinion, at least not of late, respecting either the character of the little horn or the three kings whom it was to subdue.

50 years; consequently, in absolute strictness of speech, they will not be destroyed precisely at the end of the 1260 years; but only the judgments of God will then begin to go forth against them.

\* Compare Dan. vii. 13. with Rev. xx. Both St. John and Ezekiel agree in calling the nations, which will continue unreclaimed during the Millennium, Gog and Magog. See Ezek. xxxviii and xxxix.

+ "All ancient writers, both Jewish and Christian, agree with Jerome in explaining the fourth kingdom to be the Roman. Porphyry, who was a heathen, was the first who broached the other opinion; which, though it hath been maintained since by some of the moderns, is yet not only destitute of the authority, but is even contrary to the authority, of both scripture and history. It is a just observation of Mr. Mede, who was as able and consummate a judge as any of these matters; *The Roman empire to be the fourth kingdom of Daniel, was believed by the Church of Israel both before and in our Saviour's time; received by the disciples of the Apostles, and the whole Christian Church, for the first 304 years, without any known contradiction. And I confess, having so good ground in Scripture, it is with me tantum non articulus fidei, little less than an article of faith.*" Bp. Newton's Dissert. in loc.

Mr. Kett supposes, that the history of *the little horn of the fourth beast* is “an epitomè of the whole history of *Antichrist* ;” \* who, according to his scheme, is a *triple monster*, compounded of *Popery*, *Mohammedism*, and *Infidelity*. † Hence he conjectures, that *the little horn of the he-goat* ‡ is nearly allied to *the little horn of the fourth beast*, and in some measure even the same : for as *the eastern little horn* is upon his plan primarily *Mohammedism*, and ultimately *Infidelity* : so *the western little horn* is primarily *Popery*, and ultimately *Infidelity* likewise. Nay, it is even more : for, if I rightly understand Mr Kett, it is also to include *Mohammedism* : inasmuch as Daniel’s account of it “is to be considered as an epitomè of the *whole* history of *Antichrist*,” that is, of *Antichrist* in *every one* of the *three forms* which Mr. Kett ascribes to him. “In the main points of opposition to Christ,” says he, “and of persecution of his servants, *all the branches* of *Antichrist* must necessarily agree ; but the marks, which distinguish *these confederate powers* from *each other*, appear to me very strongly discriminated in *these different visions* of Daniel. *All* foretell the power of *Antichrist*, and contain allusions perhaps to *all* the different forms of that power : but *each* vision seems to describe *one* of these forms with *peculiar distinctness*, while it points to *some* circumstances which strongly characterize *that* power, which was to arise the *last* ; and, if we rightly conjecture, will prevail the *most*, and which are not easily appropriated to either of the other. § The symbol of a *little horn* is applicable to *Antichrist* in the *beginnings* of all its forms, *Papal*, *Mohammedan*, and *Infidel*. *The power of Antichrist* is still *the little horn* : but, *as exerted in Greece and the East*,

\* Hist. the Interp. Vol. 1. p. 340. † Ibid. p. 309. ‡ Dan. viii. 9.

§ I have not been able clearly to discover, which of the three visions Mr. Kett supposes to describe with *peculiar distinctness* the *infidel Antichrist*. According to his plan, *the little horn of the fourth beast* is primarily the *Papacy*, secondarily *Mohammedism*, and ultimately *Infidelity* ; (Hist. the Interp. Vol. 1. p. 378 et infra) *the little horn of the he-goat* or *the third beast* is primarily *Mohammedism*, and ultimately *Infidelity*, (Ibid. p. 355. et infra) and *the king, predicted in Daniel’s last vision*, is both the *Papacy*, in which case his antagonists, the *king of the South*, and the *king of the North*, are the *Saracens* and the *Turks* ; (Ibid. p. 368.) and he is likewise a *double type* of *Antichrist*. (Ibid.) In the *table of contents* indeed prefixed to his second volume, he speaks of *the little horn of the fourth beast* as being solely the *infidel power* ; but the table itself by no means quadrates with the contents of either volume.

it is described as *the little horn of the he-goat or the third empire*, and this even to the present hour; for the seat of the Mohammedan empire is Grecia, or what was called the *Greek empire*. As exerted in *Italy and the West*, it is described as *the little horn of the fourth beast or the fourth empire*. But it is remarkable, that in those predictions, which the angel expressly declares will be accomplished towards the end of the appointed time, this distinction of *East and West* seems to be lost, both in this of *the Ram and the He-Goat*, and in the following vision, (which I conceive intended *particularly* to describe *the Mohammedan and Papal powers*;) and *Antichrist* appears with all the subtlety and fury and universally extended tyranny, with which we find him delineated in *the Revelation* under the symbol of *the second beast*, and which corresponds with *the little horn* in the vision of *the four beasts*, which is to be considered as an *epitomè of the whole history of Antichrist*.\* And this circumstance, I apprehend, intimates the *general apostacy and persecution* which is to take place under *the infidel power*, which was to succeed the violence of *the two former*, and be an instrument of punishment to their adherents, and of trial to the church of Christ."†

What *the three horns or kingdoms* are which the prophet beheld plucked up before *the little horn*, Mr. Kett does not himself attempt to decide; but agreeably to his supposition, that *this little horn* is a symbol of *Antichrist in all his three forms*, he seems to think that *every one of these three forms* will respectively depress *three kingdoms*. "When we consider *the vision of the beasts*, and *the little horn which rose among or after the ten horns*, it was observed, that this vision probably contained a description of *the whole of Antichrist*. The *distinct pictures*, which we have since seen of *the Mohammedan and papal forms* of this power, appear to confirm this idea. And, when we reflect upon the superior solemnity of the conclusion of *this first vision*, it will, I

\* Mr. Kett means, that *the little horn*, not *the vision of the four beasts*, is the *epitomè of the whole history of Antichrist*. "This account of *the little horn*," says he, "I consider as an *epitomè of the whole history of Antichrist*." Vol. 1. p. 340.

† Hist. the Interp. of Proph. Vol. 1. p. 347

think, seem probable, that in this general description the *last* of the forms it was to assume would be the *most* particularly noticed, if any were particularized above the rest. We shall find, I think, upon examination, that this was really the case. These *ten kingdoms* do not necessarily appear to belong to the *western* division of the empire;\* and it seems clear that this broken form is to remain till the judgment is set. We are therefore at liberty to suppose, that *this little horn*, which is *Antichrist*, represents both *the Mohammedan power in the east*, and *the papal power in the west*; which were in fact raised up nearly together: and, if the description of *this horn* be found fairly applicable to *another power* which was to arise afterwards, within the bounds of the ancient Roman empire, (as we gather from the consideration of other prophecies,) we may as naturally conclude, that it was designed to represent *that power also*. If this be granted and surely it can hardly be denied, the different opinions of commentators respecting *this horn*, so far from being discordant, will be found in unison, and more loudly sound the harmony of prophetic truth.† Those,

\* It will hereafter be shewn, that they *do* necessarily belong to the western division of the empire.

† This method of shewing the concordance of commentators, and the harmony of prophetic truth, would, I fear, have but very little weight with a captious infidel. Such a person would naturally say, "If a single symbol may at once represent so many different powers, it is impossible that there should be any certainty in prophecy. A symbol must typify some one specific power to the exclusion of all others; or else it may be made to signify just what the commentator pleases. In one age it may be convenient to apply it to Mohammedism; in another, to Popery, in a third, to Infidelity; Mr. Kett informs us, that it represents them all: a succeeding writer may apply it to a power not yet arisen; what opinion can we form of so very ductile a prophecy as this?" These objections I am unable to answer upon Mr. Kett's plan; but nothing is more easy if we adopt the simple and reasonable scheme of "utterly denying the possibility of a chronological prophecy being capable of receiving more than one completion; and of allowing no interpretation of it to be valid, except the prediction agree with its supposed accomplishment in every particular." On these principles, the answer would be sufficiently obvious. There is a certain power, which perfectly accords with this symbol of the little horn both chronologically, locally, and circumstantially: therefore the symbol must relate to this individual power, and to none else; to none either of those which preceded it, or which hereafter may succeed it. History undeniably shews us, that the power in question does agree in all these points with the symbol: we know that Daniel flourished long before this power arose: we know that in his days no human wisdom could have foreseen that it would arise; how then are we to account for this exact correspondence between the symbol and the power except by allowing the divine inspiration of him, to whom the mystic vision of the four beasts was so accurately revealed, and to whom at the same time a literal interpretation of it was prophetically detailed?"

who see the *Mohammedan power* in the *little horn* which arose from the *fourth beast*, generally suppose *Egypt, Asia, and Greece*, to be the *three horns* plucked up by the roots before it. Bp. Newton, in his application of this prophecy to the *papal power*, considers them to be the *exarchate of Ravenna, the kingdom of Lombardy, and the state of Rome*; and observes, that the *Pope* hath in a manner pointed himself out for the person described, by wearing the triple crown. We can at present form no opinion concerning the *three horns*, which are to be eradicated by the *infidel power*; whether absolutely *kingdoms* be meant, or whether *independent states* may be considered as a sufficient explanation: but posterity may be enabled to decide upon this subject perhaps more clearly than the partial fulfilment of this prophecy has hitherto enabled us to do, respecting the conquests of the *Mohammedan and papal powers*.\*

The foregoing plan of Mr. Kett appears to me much too complicated and intricate to be probable. If *one and the same horn* is to symbolize *three different powers*, there certainly cannot be any precision or definiteness in the prophecy; for it must be *mere conjecture* to attempt to determine, *what part* of the history of the *little horn* belongs to *one of the three powers*, and *what* respectively to the *two others*. From the language of Daniel himself no such system can be fairly deduced. Throughout the whole vision of the *four beasts*, the *little horn* is described as strictly and simply *one power*, uniform and consistent in its conduct, performing a certain number of clearly defined actions, and continuing in the exercise of a tyrannical authority the precise term of *three prophetic years and a half*. It is surely then highly improbable, and extremely unlike the usual method of Daniel's writing, to suppose, that, while in the exuberance of his symbolical imagery he gives *two* several hieroglyphical descriptions of the *first and fourth empires*, and no less than *three* such descriptions of the *second and third empires*; † he should nevertheless be suddenly reduced to such a poverty of imagination as to represent

\* Hist. the Int. of Proph. Vol. i. p. 376.

† Dan. ii. vii. viii.

*three very different powers by one and the same symbol*, thereby involving the history of *those powers* in the most impenetrable obscurity and the most perplexing uncertainty. To repeat an observation which I have already made, if *various symbols* be used to represent the *same thing*, we shall be in no danger of mistaking the prophet's meaning, provided only we can ascertain the import of *each individual symbol*; but, if, on the contrary, in the course of a single passage, *the same symbol* be used to express *many different things*, it will be impossible to understand a prophecy couched in such ambiguous terms, because we can never be sure, when we proceed to consider the prophecy article by article, to *which* of those different things *each article* is to be referred. On these grounds I feel myself compelled to reject Mr. Kett's interpretation of the history of *the little horn*, as resting upon no solid foundation, and receiving no warrant from the plain language of Daniel.

Mr. Galloway, avoiding the perplexity introduced by Mr. Kett, supposes, that *the little horn* is *one*, and only *one*, power; which power he conjectures to be *revolutionary France*. Many however are the difficulties which must be overcome, before such an opinion as this can be satisfactorily established. The difficulties are these. *The horn* is termed by the prophet *a little horn*, and is represented as *a distinct power* from *the other ten horns*; whereas *France* is not only *one* of these *ten horns*, but *the very largest* of them all: and *this little horn* is to *subdue three of the first kings*, to *wear out the saints of the Most High*, and to *continue in power during the space of a time, and times, and the dividing of time*; whereas *none of these marks* appear, at the first sight, to be at all applicable to *revolutionary France*.

With regard to the epithet *little*, Mr. Galloway will not allow it to be taken in the literal and most obvious sense. "It cannot," says he, "be *little* in respect to strength and power; but he is, in the sense of the prophet, as I humbly apprehend, *little*, and of no weight, in the scale of virtue and religion, and of *little* or no account in the sight and estimation of God. He is *little* and worthless, because he is to exceed in wickedness all be-

fore him. In this sense the word is used in many passages of Scripture.\* Moreover his power, however great for a time, is *little*, because it is to continue but a *little* time when compared with other prophetic periods; and it is *little* indeed when compared with the power of Christ, who, according to St Paul, *shall consume it with the spirit of his mouth, and destroy it with the brightness of his coming*. With this sense of the word *little* all its other tropes, as we shall presently find, are in perfect agreement; and therefore we may conclude it is the true literal sense.† *The three kingdoms, which the little horn was to subdue, Mr. Galloway conjectures to be the kingdom of France, the Stadholderate of Holland, and the Helvetic union or Swiss confederacy.‡ And the saints of the Most High, whom it was to wear out, he supposes to be the popish clergy of France and such of the laity as adhered to them.§—*The prophet however asserts, that *the little horn was to wear out the saints during the space of three years and a half*. These years have been usually thought to be *prophetic years*, in which case they would be the same period as *the forty-two prophetic months, or the twelve hundred and sixty prophetic days*: but Mr. Galloway maintains, that they are mere *natural or solar years*; and cites, in proof of his supposition, the history of Nebuchadnezzar, whose madness was to continue *seven times, or seven natural years, not seven prophetic years*.|| *The three times and a half* then, during which *the horn was to wear out the saints*, are, according to Mr. Galloway, *the three natural years and a half*, during which Christianity was formally suppressed by law in France. “Taking,” says he, “certain late events, which have come to pass in France, as my guide, I am led to interpret these numbers into *three (literal) years and a half*: a construction, not only justified by the text, but clearly supported by the events. For, if we date the beginning of this period, at the time of the last dreadful decree for the exile of the clergy, and its murderous execution; and its end, at the time of the decree

\* The texts, which Mr. Galloway cites in favour of this interpretation, are the following: 1 Sam. xv. 17—Nehem. ix. 32—Isaiah xl. 15—Micah v. 2.

† Comment. p. 401.

‡ Ibid. p. 419.

§ Ibid. p. 417.

|| Ibid. p. 413—417.

granting to the Christians, who remained in France, and had, through the mercies of God, been wonderfully preserved, a free toleration of their religion : we shall find it *a time, times, and the dividing of time*, or exactly *three years and a half*. The decree for the exile of the clergy passed *the 26th of August 1792*, but the murderous execution of it was not finished until *the latter end of the following month*. From that time no person in France dared to mention the name of God, or of his blessed Son Jesus Christ, but with disrespect and contempt ; or, if he did, he was scorned and insulted, and put to death as a fanatic. This is therefore a proper epoch, from whence to date the giving up the saints into the hands of *the little horn*, or *the then horrible government of France*, whose power was then styled *the reign of terror and of death*. As to the end of this prophetic period, the event is equally demonstrative of it. For from *the end of September 1792*, when the clergy were imprisoned and massacred, (for they were not permitted even to go into exile) the distressing state of the Christians in France surpasses description. Death, the most horrible, was continually staring them in the face. The guillotine, the cannon, musket, and national baths, were in constant exercise ; and the minds of every man, woman, and child, professing Christianity, were smitten with the dread of immediate death. In this dreadful state (a state in which, according to the literal sense of the text, they were *given into the hand of the French government*) they remained until *the latter end of March 1796* ; when, glutted with Christian blood, the atheistical demagogues passed a decree, granting a full toleration of all kinds of religion, which virtually repealed all the decrees against fanatics, and delivered the Christians out of their hands. Now, if we calculate the time between *the latter end of September 1792*, and *the latter end of March 1796*, we shall find it, in the language of prophecy, *a time, times, and a dividing of time* ; which, when interpreted, is exactly a period of *three years and a half*.\*

This hypothesis of Mr. Galloway is, I fear, no better founded than that of Mr. Kett.

\* Comment. p. 417.



Whatever the epithet *little* may signify in other parts of Scripture,\* the context sufficiently shews, that, when applied to *the eleventh horn of the Roman beast*, it simply means *small in point of size*. There is a very sensible rule, that words used *in the same passage* antithetically or relatively must bear *the same kind of signification*. Thus, when Ezekiel, in one continued clause, speaks of a *righteous* man turning from his *righteousness* to *iniquity*, and of a *wicked* man turning from his *wickedness* to *righteousness*: no one can reasonably doubt, that the *righteousness*, which the one has forsaken, is the very *righteousness*, which the other has attained; or that the *iniquity*, which the one has plunged into, is no less an aberration from the will of God, (though it may not be precisely the same *mode* of aberration,) than the *iniquity*, which the other has happily forsaken. Unless this be allowed, the antithesis and relation of the words *righteous man* and *wicked man*, and *righteousness* and *wickedness*, are entirely destroyed; and the whole passage is consequently deprived of all definiteness of meaning. If then we advert to the context of the passage, wherein *the little horn* is mentioned, we shall find, that the prophet beheld four *great beasts* coming up from the sea;

\* I am not perfectly clear, that the word *little* ever occurs in Scripture in the sense of *morally worthless*. The passages, cited by Mr Galloway in support of this interpretation of the word, afford it no support whatsoever. In all of them, without exception, the epithet *little* is used in the sense of *worthless or trifling in point of value or consequence*, not in that of *worthless in point of religion and morality*. It is superfluous to observe, that there is a most essential difference between *these two kinds of worthlessness*. Cruden, than whom few men were better acquainted with the bible, does not mention the sense of *morally worthless* among the different scriptural significations which he supposes the word *little* to bear: and Parkhurst only gives three meanings of the radical עָלַ, here used by Daniel, namely *small in point of size, time, and quantity*. The matter, after all, is reducible to this. We are not concerned with what the *English* word *little* may mean, when it occurs in Scripture; but with what the *Hebrew* word עָלַ, which occurs in this particular passage, means. Let the reader then turn to *Calasio's Heb. Concordance*, and he will soon be satisfied, that the word עָלַ never signifies *morally worthless*. Mr. Galloway does not seem to have been aware, that this word עָלַ is not used in *any one* of the passages to which he refers in proof of his interpretation. Consequently, even if our *English* translation *little* had signified *morally worthless* in all of them, he would have been no nearer to the establishing of his opinion. In one of them indeed the cognate word עָלַ is used; but this no more bears the sense of *morally worthless* than עָלַ. In the three others, three entirely different words are employed; all of which are alike translated *little*.

† Ezek. xviii. 26, 27.

and that one of these *great* beasts had a *little* horn, which sprung up among his other ten *larger* horns. In a similar manner, if we advert to the context of the passage, wherein *the little horn of the he-goat or third great beast* is mentioned,\* we shall find, that this *he-goat* is said to have had one *great* horn; from the broken stump of which came up four *notable* horns, and also a *little* horn which came forth out of one of the four *notable* horns.† With such a *double* context then before us, is it reasonable to suppose, that *the four great beasts, and the great horn*, mean literally *four beasts, and a horn, large in point of size*; but that *the little horn* does not mean literally *a horn small in point of size*, but figuratively *a morally worthless horn*? To make the two passages at all consistent, the same *kind* of signification must be borne by the word *great*, as by the word *little*: consequently, if a *little horn* mean *a morally worthless state*, a *great horn*, and a *great beast* will mean *a morally worthy state or empire*. But, since this conclusion is a manifest absurdity, and since *a great horn* and *a great beast* certainly mean *a large state or empire*, a *little horn* must necessarily mean *a small state*. *France* however is both *a large state*, and *one of the ten horns*; and *the little horn*, whatever it may be, is both *a small state*, and *not one of the ten horns*: *France* therefore most undeniably cannot be symbolized by *the little horn*.

Having thus shewn, that *the little horn* cannot be *France*, it may seem almost unnecessary to prosecute the matter any further; for, if *the horn* itself be not *France*, none of the *particulars* which are predicated of *the horn* can be applied to *that country*. Nevertheless, in order that the non-identity of *France* and *the little horn* may be the more satisfactorily established, I shall likewise consider the other points wherein Mr. Galloway thinks that he has discovered an agreement between them.

*The little horn is to depress three of the first ten horns.* These, according to Mr. Galloway, are *the monarchy of*

\* *The he-goat symbolizes the same power as the leopard in the preceding vision of the four beasts.*

† Dan. viii. 8, 9.

*France, the Stadholderate of Holland, and the Swiss confederacy*—The first objection, that an *historical* student would make to such a mode of interpretation, is obviously this: Daniel declares, that three of the *first* ten horns should be plucked up before *the little horn*: now, upon adverting to the list of the ten *primary* Gothic sovereignties into which *the Roman empire* was *originally* divided, we shall find it a vain labour to discover among them those two completely *modern* states, *Holland* and *Switzerland*. One only of the *first* ten horns was in existence when the French revolution broke out, *the ancient kingdom of the Franks*:\* hence it is plainly impossible, that the prophecy should receive its accomplishment in the *present* day. If it has not been *long since* fulfilled, it *now* never can be fulfilled—The next objection is, that *France* cannot, with any shew of probability, be reckoned at once both *the little horn which subdues*, and *the horn which is subdued*. I am aware, that Mr. Galloway supposes *the little horn* to be *revolutionary France*, and *the other horn* to be *regal France*; but the language of prophecy knows no such distinctions. It considers *states*, rather than *revolutions* of states; though it will frequently mark, with wonderful accuracy, even those very revolutions. *The Roman empire*, or *the fourth beast*, under *all its seven different heads* or *forms of government*, is still considered as only *one power*. The destruction of its *regal head* by *the consulate*, and of its *consular head* by *the emperorship*, is not represented under the image of *its being attacked by another beast*: *Rome* is never said by the prophet to subdue *Rome*. In

\* In strict propriety of speech, *the original kingdom of the Angels* cannot be considered as being at present in existence, the line of succession having been broken both by the Danish and Norman conquests: *one* only therefore of the ten *primary* kingdoms, *that of the Franks*, remained at the era of the revolution. *The kingdom of the Huns* indeed still exists *nominally*, but its *independence* is no more. It is swallowed up in the superior power of *Austria*, in the same manner as *the primitive kingdom of Burgundy* is lost in *that of the Franks*. There is moreover another reason, why *the modern kingdom of Hungary* can scarcely be considered the same as *the primitive kingdom of the Huns*. "Hungary," says Mr. Gibbon, "has been successively occupied by three Scythian colonies; the Huns of Attila (who constituted *the primitive kingdom*;) the Abares, in the sixth century; and the Turks of Magiars, A. D. 889. the immediate and genuine ancestors of the modern Hungarians, whose connection with the two former is extremely faint and remote." Hist. of Decline and Fall, Vol. vi. p. 38.

a similar manner. *France*, whether under the government of the *Merovingians*, the *Carlovingians*, or the *Capets*: whether oppressed by the diabolical tyranny of the *republican faction*, or tamely submitting to the degrading usurpation of the upstart family of *Buonapartè*: *France*, however circumstanced in point of legislature, is still *France*, still one of the original *ten horns of the Roman beast*. Hence surely it cannot be at once both *the horn that subdues*, and *the horn that is subdued*: *France* is never said by the prophet to subdue *France*.

*The little horn is further to wear out the saints of the Most High*—These saints Mr. Galloway supposes to be the *papist clergy of France*, and such of the *laity* as were unwilling to give up the Christianity of the *Church of Rome* for the blasphemous atheism of the *mock republic*. That there have been many sincere Christians in the midst of all the voluntary humility and superstitious worship of the *mystic Babylon*,\* I am by no means disposed to deny. To adopt the words of the excellent Hooker, “Forasmuch as it may be said of the *Church of Rome*, she hath yet a little strength, she doth not directly deny the foundation of Christianity; I may, I trust, without offence, persuade myself that thousands of our fathers, in former times living and dying within her walls, have found mercy at the hands of God.† Nevertheless, though I readily make this concession to the *pious papist*, I cannot quite so easily bring myself to think, that the members of an idolatrous and persecuting Apostacy, when spoken of collectively, would be called by the Holy Spirit of God the saints of the Most High. They, who as a body, are represented as worshippers of mediating demons, and idols of gold and silver and brass and stone and wood; as murderous persecutors, sorcerers or jugglers, spiritual fornicators, and thieves:‡ they, who bear

\* Coloss. ii. 18—23.

† Discourse of Justification, Sect. 17. Hooker however guards, with his usual wisdom, against any misapprehension or perversion of these words. “Many in former times, as their books and writings do yet shew, held the foundation, to wit, salvation by Christ alone, and therefore might be saved. God hath always had a Church amongst them, which firmly kept his saving truth. As for such as hold with the *Church of Rome*, that we cannot be saved by Christ alone without works; they do, not only by a circle of consequence, but directly deny the foundation of faith; they hold it not, no not so much as by a thread.” Ibid. Sect. 19.

‡ Rev. ix. 20, 21.

such a character in one part of Scripture, can never surely be honoured with the title of *saints of the Most High* in another part. Even Mr. Galloway himself, though he supposes *the popish clergy of France* to be *the saints worn out by the tyranny of the little horn*; yet, in another part of his work thinks, that *the second vial* of the wrath of God is to be poured out upon *papal Rome*, “as a just judgment for her abominable idolatry, for her artful seduction and unrelenting and bloody persecutions of the Church of his blessed Son, and for her daring impiety in the assumption of his divine attributes.”\* Now, although *the French clergy* did not quite so implicitly submit to the unqualified claims of the pretended successors of St. Peter as those of *Spain, Portugal, and Italy*: yet I never heard, that they had in any degree renounced their heretical opinions, their blasphemous idolatries, and their ridiculous mummeries; or that any of them felt a single scruple of conscience respecting the execrable oath, exacted by *the Pope* from all whom he consecrates bishops, *that they will, as far as in them lies, persecute and oppose all impugnors of the authority of the see of Rome*. This being the case, let *the little horn* be what power it may, the bigoted adherents of that sanguinary hierarchy cannot surely be styled, by a divinely inspired prophet, *saints of the Most High*.†

\* Comment. p. 235.

† The reader will find a very full and satisfactory statement of the pernicious maxims of *Popery* in the able strictures on *Plowden's Historical Review of Ireland*, commencing in *the Anti-Jacobin Review* for Nov 1804. He will likewise do well to peruse a tract published at Cambridge in the year 1746, intitled *The true spirit of Popery displayed*. And, if he require a yet more circumstantial detail of the principles and practice of *the Church of Rome*, he will find it in Mr. Whitaker's well-timed *Commentary on the Revelation*. To these writers I beg to refer him, if he wish for any further confutation of Mr. Galloway's opinion, that *the popish clergy and royalist laity of France* are *the saints of the Most High worn out by the tyranny of the little horn*.

Mr. Kett's conjecture, that *the little horn* ultimately typifies *the Infidel power of France*, and that *the beast of the bottomless pit* which slays *the apocalyptic witnesses* is *French Infidelity*, must necessarily lead him to adopt Mr. Galloway's sentiments respecting *the saints of God* mentioned by Daniel, and *the witnesses* mentioned by St. John: (Compare Hist. the Interp. Vol I p. 321, with p. 413, 419.) nay, his scheme is perplexed with more irreconcilable contradictions than even that of Mr. Galloway. When *the little horn*, in its primary sense, means *Popery*; then *the saints worn out by it* must of course mean *all those holy men who protested against its corruptions*. But, when *the little horn*, in its ultimate sense, means, *the Infidel power of France*; then *the saints worn out by it* must mean *the Popish clergy and Royalist laity*. Thus it is evident, that upon Mr. Kett's plan, *the saints* sometimes mean *the persecuted protestants*, and at

Lastly, *the little horn is to continue in power three years and a half*—These years Mr. Galloway decides to be *natural years*, and pronounces them to be *the three years and a half*, during which *atheism* was established by law in *France*. Upon this point, I cannot see, that the argument, which he brings from the term of Nebuchadnezzar's madness, is at all conclusive. Because the word *time*, when it occurs in a prophecy relative to a single individual, manifestly signifies a *natural year*; other times *the persecuting papists*; while *the little horn*, with equal flexibility, sometimes means *the persecuting church of Rome*, and at other times *the French Republic*, which in its turn persecuted the members of that persecuting Church. Or, to state the matter somewhat differently, *the little horn* in its *ultimate* sense, persecutes *the little horn*, in its *primary* sense; while *the saints*, in their *ultimate* sense, are *the very set of men who persecuted the saints*, in their *primary* sense; in other words, *the saints*, in their *ultimate* sense, and *the little horn*, in its *primary* sense, equally symbolize *the Church of Rome and her members*. Such is the strange confusion that results from Mr. Kett's scheme of primary and secondary interpretations of the same prophecy.

Dr. Zouch's sentiments on this point so perfectly accord with my own, that I cannot resist the pleasure of transcribing them. Speaking of those interpretations which apply the character of *the little horn* to *the French Republic* and the character of *the saints worn out by it* to *the Popish clergy*, he observes: "An indiscriminate massacre of more than two millions of the human race sufficiently indicates a most savage and relentless power, but by no means attaches to it the peculiar attribute of *wearing out the saints of the Most High*: a character this strongly expressive of spiritual tyranny, of persecution exercised upon others merely for their religious opinions, and truly appropriate to *the Church of Rome* which punishes good men as being heretics; professing enmity against them as such; regardless of the atrocity of guilt, however notorious, in her own followers, while those, who dissent from her, become the victims of her inexorable rage. A serious protestant, conversant in those inspired writings in which the portrait of *Antichrist*" (bad as *the Papacy* is, I can see no just warrant by the way for applying *this* title to it) "is delineated as with a pencil of light, will hesitate to pronounce the members of the church of Rome *the saints of the Most High*. Without violating the law of Christian charity, he must consider them as professors of a religion perfectly abhorrent from the purity of the Gospel, as involved in idolatrous and superstitious practices, as men who have not repented of the works of their hands, *that they should not worship devils and idols of gold and silver and brass and stone and wood, which neither can see nor hear nor walk; neither repented they of their murders nor of their sorceries, nor of their fornication, nor of their thefts*. The blood of such men has been prodigally shed: and it is very remarkable, that the French anarchists have introduced the horrors of war principally into popish countries, as if those nations, which profess the purity of the protestant religion, were providentially preserved from danger." (Zouch on Prophecy, p. 61.) The unerring voice of prophecy many ages ago predicted this last circumstance, which Dr. Zouch justly styles *a remarkable one*. *The viols of God's wrath* were to be poured out, not upon *the mystic witnesses*, but upon those "which had the mark of the beast and worshipped his image," upon those "who had shed the blood of saints and prophets," and along with them upon those daring infidels, whether apostate protestants or renegade papists, "who blasphemed the name of God and repented not to give him glory." As for those who hearkened to the gracious invitation, "Come out of Babylon, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues;" they have not received of her plagues, they have been "providentially preserved from danger."

it does not therefore follow, that the same word, when it occurs in a prophecy relative to a *state* or *kingdom*, must necessarily signify a *natural year* in that case also. The probability rather lies on the contrary side; more especially when we consider the context both of Daniel and St. John. Daniel speaks of a *power*, that was to persecute *the saints* during the space of *three years and a half*: St. John represents *the Church*, under the symbol of a *woman*, as being persecuted *1260 days\** by the *devil acting through the instrumentality of the Roman beast*; and he afterwards adds, *in the very same chapter*, that she was nourished from the face of the *persecuting serpent* for a *time, times, and half a time*, or *three years and a half*.† Now, when we find, that *three years and a half* precisely contain *1260 days* at the rate of *360 days to the year*; that Daniel limits a persecution of *the saints* to *three years and a half*, that St. John, apparently at least, uses the two expressions of *twelve hundred and sixty days* and *three years and a half* as synonymous, for in one place he says that *the woman is fed in the wilderness 1260 days*, and in another place that *she is nourished in the wilderness three years and a half*: it is surely only reasonable to conclude, that *the two expressions* mean *one and the same period of time*, whatever that period may be. But that *the 1260 days* mean *years*, no one doubts: consequently *the three years and a half* must mean *years of years*; or, in other words, *prophetic years*, not *natural ones*, as Mr. Galloway supposes—*Again*: Daniel, in his last chapter, speaks of *three* different periods: *the time times and a half*, which he had already mentioned when treating of the little horn; *twelve hundred and ninety days*; and *thirteen hundred and thirty five days*. Now, if *these days* be *years*, *the three years and a half* must be *years of years*: otherwise Daniel uses *two different modes* of computation in *the same passage*, and thus involves his meaning in needless uncertainty—*Further*: we may fairly conclude, that, as a prophet expresses a *given period* of time in *one place*; so he would express the *same period* in *another place*, if he should have occasion to notice it again. But St. John, when *really speaking of*

\* Rev. xii. 6.

† Ver. 14.

*three natural years and a half*, terms them *three days and a half* ;\* consequently, if he had wished to inform us that *the woman* was to be nourished in the wilderness *three natural years and a half*, he would surely have called that period *three days and a half*, not a *time times and half a time*—Once more, and the subject shall be dismissed: Daniel has given us a special mark, whereby we may know when *the three years and a half*, during which *the little horn* was to wear out *the saints* of the Most High, shall have expired. “And one said to the man clothed in linen, which was upon the waters of the river, Until how long shall be *the end of the wonders*? And I heard the man clothed in linen, which was upon the waters of the river, when he held up his right hand and his left hand unto heaven, and sware by him that liveth for ever, that it shall be until *a time, times, and a half*; and, when he shall have finished to scatter the power of the holy people, all these things shall be finished.”† It appears then, that *the three years and a half* were to expire, when God should have ceased to scatter *the Jews*, whose restoration Daniel had predicted at the beginning of the chapter, and when *the period of the wonders* should be finished: in other words, when *the three years and a half*, whether natural or prophetic, shall have expired, *the restoration of the Jews* will commence, and all the wonders comprehended within the period of *the 1260 years* will be accomplished. Now, from the termination of *the three years and a half*, during which religion was put down by law in France (that is to say, from *the latter end of March 1796*, when *those three years and a half* expired) full *eight years* have elapsed at the moment that I am now writing: consequently, if *those three years and a half* were *the three years and a half* intended by Daniel, *the restoration of the Jews* would have commenced, and the series of events, predicted under *the seventh vial* and at the close of *the 11th chapter of Daniel*,‡ as leading to the destruction of *the two little horns* (one of them upon Mr. Galloway’s scheme *revolutionary France*) and of *some kingdom* notorious for magnifying itself above every god, would have begun to be accomplished, exactly

\* Rev. xi. 9.

† Dan. xii. 6, 7.

‡ Dan. xi. 40—45.



when *those three years and a half* expired.\* None of these great events however took place in *March 1796*: it follows therefore, as a necessary consequence, that *the three years and a half of legalized French atheism*, horrible as were the enormities of the then miscreant rulers of the infidel republic, cannot be *the time, times, and a half*, during which *the little horn* was to wear out *the saints of the Most High*.

Having now sufficiently pointed out what I conceive to be the errors of Mr. Kett and Mr. Galloway, I shall endeavour to ascertain the true interpretation of the history of *the little persecuting horn*, which was to spring up out of *the fourth or Roman beast*.

Upon this subject I heartily agree *in the general* with Sir Isaac Newton, Mr. Mede, and Bp. Newton; though I cannot entirely assent to *their precise mode* of exposition. The points, wherein I differ from them, are these; their supposition, that *the little horn means the temporal kingdom of the Papacy*: and their respective interpretations of that part of the prophecy which relates to *the eradication of the three horns before the little horn*.

In the figurative language of Scripture, the same symbol, as I have already abundantly shewn, represents both *temporal* and *spiritual* things, provided only those things are connected with each other by a common leading idea. Thus a *star* typifies either a *prince* or a *minister of religion*, the one being in *the state* what the other is in *the church*: whence we are accustomed familiarly to style both a *king* and a *priest*, in their different capacities, a *shepherd of the people*. In a similar manner, a *beast* means an *empire*, either *secular* or *ecclesiastical*: and a *mountain* denotes a *kingdom* either *temporal* or *spiritual*.† By a parity of reasoning therefore the present symbol, a *horn*, signifies either a *temporal* or an *ecclesiastical kingdom*. Those three eminent commentators, Sir Isaac Newton, Mr. Mede, and Bp. Newton, adopt the former of the two significations; and suppose *the little horn of*

\* That *the seventh vial* did not then begin to be poured out, is manifest indeed from this circumstance. *The sixth vial*, which will produce the downfall of the Ottoman empire, remains even yet to be poured out; consequently *the seventh vial*, which succeeds it, cannot have begun to be emptied in *the year 1796*.

† Compare Jeremiah li. 25. with Dan. ii. 35.

the *Roman beast* to mean the *temporal kingdom of the Papacy*, that Italian principality which bears the general name of *The States of the Church*, or *St. Peter's Patrimony*. They further conceive, that the *Papacy* was not a *little horn* till it acquired this principality; and that it became a *horn* by the subversion of *the three horns* which were destined to fall before it.

To this scheme there appear to me to be insuperable objections: it will not accord with the prophecy itself; and therefore, as we might naturally expect, it will not accord with the events.

1. The actions, ascribed to *the little horn*, were never performed by *the Pope*, as *a temporal horn*, as *the sovereign of his Italian principality*, but as *an ecclesiastical power*.

2. *The little horn* is represented by the prophet as being *already in existence* previous to the eradication of *the three horns*: but the scheme at present under consideration supposes, that the *Papacy* became a horn by such eradication. Now, if the *Papacy* only became a horn by the eradication of *the three horns*, how can it be said that *those three horns*, were plucked up *before it*, or that *the power* typified by *the little horn* should subdue *the three powers* typified by *the three horns*, when at that very period, according to the scheme, the *papal horn* was not as yet in existence? The prophecy places the rise of the *little horn* *before* the eradication of *the three horns*: the scheme supposes it to rise *in consequence* of that eradication. Hence it is manifest, that the scheme makes *the horn* both to exist and to act, previous to the supposed date of its existence.

3. The contradiction becomes more glaring and the difficulties increase, when we begin to consider the period of *three times and a half* or *1260 years*. Daniel teaches us, that *the saints* should be given into the hand of *the little horn* during that space of time: whence we may naturally conclude, that they were given into his hand both by some formal deed, and by some specific person. Now Mr. Mede supposes (with what propriety we shall hereafter consider,) that *the first of the three horns* was plucked up in *the year 727*, when *the Pope* caused the *Italians* to revolt from *the Emperor Leo*: yet

he hesitates whether to date *the 1260 years* from *the year 365*, when the Goths began to invade the Empire ; from *the year 410*, when Alarac sacked Rome ; or from *the year 455*, when Valentinian died, whom he makes to be *the last Emperor of the West*.<sup>\*</sup> Independent of the confutation which all these opinions respecting the date of *the 1260 years* have received from the event, independent of its being impossible to shew how *the saints* were given into the hand of *the Pope* at any one of those eras, who can avoid observing the palpable contradictoriness of such a scheme ? According to Mr. Mede, *the little horn* began to exist in *the year 727* : but *the saints* were given into the hand of *that little horn* about the year 455 (for *that* is the date which he seems to prefer) : in other words, *the saints* were given into his hand near *three centuries* before he began to exist. The scheme of Bp. Newton leads him into the very same contradiction, though he rejects all Mr. Mede's dates, having seen his theory confuted by the event. He supposes, that *the first of the three horns* was plucked up in *the year 755*, when *the Pope* became master of the *Exarchate of Ravenna*, and consequently that *the little horn* then began to exist : yet he is inclined to date *the 1260 years* from *the year 727*.<sup>†</sup> Thus he, like Mr. Mede, dates *the 1260 years* from an era, when, by his own account, *the little horn* was not yet in existence : and from an era likewise at which it would be impossible to shew how *the saints* were given up to *the little horn*, even supposing *the little horn* had then first begun to exist.

On these grounds I am rather inclined to think, that *the little horn* typifies, not *the temporal*, but *the spiritual kingdom of the Pope* ; that tyrannical ecclesiastical domination, which at first was only *a small and harmless kingdom*, but which afterwards became a *pretended cath-*

<sup>\*</sup> The reason, why Mr. Mede dates *the 1260 years* so early, is, because he imagined that the rise of *the man of sin* was *immediately* to succeed the downfall of *the Western empire*, or that which letted. *The little horn* indeed began to arise along with the incursions of the northern nations ; but it did not become *the apostate man of sin* till *the saints* were delivered into its hand. Accordingly we are taught by Daniel to date *the 1260 years*, not from *the rise of the little horn*, but from *the commencement of its spiritual catholic tyranny*. See Mede's *Apostacy of the latter Times*, Part I. Chap. 14.

<sup>†</sup> Dissert. XXVI. 3.

*olic empire*, symbolized in the Apocalypse by a *two-horned beast* rising up out of *the earth* or *Roman empire*, as *the little horn* rises up out of *the ten-horned beast*. In short, I conceive, that *the little horn* and *the two-horned beast* represents *the very same ecclesiastical power*: the one symbolizing *that power at its first rise*, and describing it as afterwards having a look more stout than its fellows and as influencing the actions of *the whole ten-horned beast*;\* the other symbolizing it, when it had grown up into a *catholic empire* by having had *the saints* delivered into its hand. Hence we find, that Daniel, who largely describes *the little horn*, makes no mention of *the two-horned beast*: while St John, who as largely describes *the two-horned beast*, styling him a *false prophet*, makes no mention of *the little horn*.

I have asserted, that *the little horn*, at its first rise among *the ten other horns*, was harmless. This appears both from the prophecy, and from the accomplishment of the prophecy. *The little horn* was already in existence when *the saints* were delivered into his hand: but *the apostacy* of *the 1260 days* did not commence in its dominant state till the era of their being so delivered: consequently *the little horn* was already in existence before the beginning of *the apostacy*: that is to say, it existed as a *horn* previous to its existence as an *apostate horn*. *The spiritual kingdom of the Pope* sprung up after the empire had become Christian, or during the period of what St John styles *its non-existence as a beast*.† When *the ancient pagan beast*, that had been wounded to death by the preaching of the Gospel, revived, and set up an idolatrous spiritual tyrant in the Church by constituting Boniface the third *Universal Bishop*; then were *the saints* delivered into the hand of *the little horn*; then did *the little horn* begin to have a look more stout than his fellows; then did *the universal spiritual empire of the Pope* commence. This happened in *the year 606*: consequently I esteem this year the most probable date of *the 1260 days*.

\* "I beheld then because of the voice of the great words which the horn spake; I beheld even till the beast was slain." Dan. vii. 11.

† "The beast, that was, and is not, and yet is." (Rev. xvii. 8.) *The death and revival of the Roman beast* will be discussed at large hereafter

The errors, that have arisen from not attending to the plain language of Daniel relative to the date of that period are almost endless. Scarcely any commentator has paid the least regard to the special badge of the date: on the contrary, most have wearied themselves with seeking for some imaginary period of *the rise of the little horn* \* Daniel however explicitly informs us, that we are to date *the 1260 days* from no one era but this: the year, in which *the saints* were given into the hand of *the little horn* then already in existence.† Now *the giving the saints into his hand* by no means implies, that he *immediately*, began to persecute them, but only that the *power of persecution* was then conferred upon him, that he was

\* The falsehood of many of these computations has been already shewn by the event; had the plain language of Daniel been attended to, they would never have been made see Mede's Works Book III Chap. 10

† I am aware that Sir Isaac Newton supposes, that it was not *the saints* who were delivered into the hand of *the little horn* during the 1260 years, but *the times and laws*. Now it is not only impossible to point out any specific season when *the times and laws* were delivered formally into his hand, which the passage obviously requires; but such an opinion is totally irreconcilable with the parallel context of the Revelation. *The saints*, mentioned by Daniel, are manifestly the same as *the apocalyptic witnesses* and as *the persecuted Church in the wilderness*. But *the apocalyptic witnesses* were to prophesy in sackcloth, and *the Church* was to flee from the attack of *the dragon*, each during the period of 1260 years: hence it is clear, that *the saints*, not *the times and laws*, were to be given into the hand of *the little horn* during the very same space of *three prophetic years and a half*. The identity of the numbers sufficiently shews that they refer to the same persons; but *the apocalyptic 1260 years* refer to *the calamitous prophesying of the witnesses* and *the desolation of the true Church*; therefore *the three times and a half of Daniel* must refer to *the wearing out of the saints*, not surely to *the changing of times and laws*. In short, *the delivering of the saints into the hand of the little horn during three prophetic years and a half* is clearly the same event, as *the causing of the witnesses to prophesy in sackcloth by giving the outer court of the temple and the holy city to the gentiles* (or those Christians who had relapsed into the idolatrous abominations of gentilism) *during 42 months*. *The regenerate church* however, and along with it *the faithful witnesses*, were then first given into the hand of *the little horn*, when *the Pope* was declared to be *Universal Bishop and Supreme Head of the Church*. It is almost superfluous to remind the reader, that *three years and a half, 42 months, and 1260 days*, are all the same period. (Compare Dan vii 25, with Rev. xi. 2, 3, xii 6, 14, and xiii 5, 7.) I may properly add, at the conclusion of this note, that, even if Sir Isaac Newton's supposition be adopted, the dates fixed upon by Mr. Mede and Bp. Newton for the commencement of the 1260 years will be equally irreconcilable with their opinion that the Papacy became a horn by the eradication of *the three horns*. *The times and laws* could no more be delivered into the hand of *the little horn* previous to the period of its beginning to exist, than *the saints* could. I write this however not as in the least hesitating respecting what I have said of Sir Isaac's acceptance of the passage in question. Since *the apocalyptic witnesses* are manifestly the same as *the saints* mentioned by Daniel, and since *those witnesses* were to prophesy in sackcloth 1260 days; what was delivered into the hand of *the little horn* during the self-same space of *three years and a half* must undoubtedly be *the saints*, not *the times and laws*.

constituted *their universal spiritual superior*. Hence it is evident, that, would we know the date in question, we must learn in what year *this ecclesiastical power* was formally conferred upon *the little horn*. It certainly cannot be said to have been conferred either by the downfall of *the Western empire*, by the revolt of *the Pope* from *the Greek Emperor*, or by his acquisition of *the Exarchate*. In all these events we can discover nothing like any delivering of *the saints* into his hand. But, when we find, that in *the year 606* Phocas, the usurper of the Constantinopolitan throne, constituted him *Universal Bishop and supreme head of the Church*, declaring that in spirituals all the churches were subject to him, we can clearly see that at that particular era *the saints* were subjected to an imperious master, that they were given into the hand of *the little horn* now become a *great empire*. If then *the saints* were given into his hand at that particular time, (and I know not any more *probable\** era than this that can be pitched upon for such an event,) *the little horn* must at that time have been already in existence; but, if we suppose that this symbol denotes *the temporal kingdom* of the Papacy, *that* was not as yet in existence, for *the Pope* had not then either thrown off his allegiance to *the Greek Emperor*, or acquired *the Exarchate of Ravenna*. *The little horn* however, according to the prophecy, was not merely to *begin* to exist when *the saints* were given into his hand, but was *already* to have been in existence an indefinite period of time. Such being the case, it certainly cannot symbolize *the temporal kingdom of the Papacy*: and, if it do not symbolize its *temporal kingdom*, I know not what it can symbolize except its *spiritual kingdom*.

We have seen, that *the little horn* was to arise previous to the commencement of *the Apostacy of 1260 years* when *the Roman beast* revived, and therefore that it was to arise during the time that *the beast* lay dead.

\* There is another era, which is *possible*, though (I think) not *probable*: namely, *the year 787*, when the supremacy of *the Pope* was acknowledged by the second council of Nice. This matter will be discussed more largely hereafter; meanwhile I wish it fully to be understood, that I pitch upon *the year 606*, only as appearing to me the most *probable* date: The event alone will enable us to attain to absolute *certainty*.

Daniel accordingly teaches us, that it was to come up among *the ten first horns* into which the empire should be divided by the incursions of the northern nations. Now *the first* of these kingdoms, *that of the Huns*, arose about *the year 356* ; and *the last* of them, *that of the Lombards*, about *the year 483* in the north of Germany, and about *the year 526* in Hungary. We must look therefore for the gradual rise of *the little horn*, by which I think we are obliged to understand *the spiritual kingdom of the Pope*, between *the years 356* and *526*. As for *the temporal kingdom of the Pope*, it did not come up among *the first ten horns*, as Bp. Newton himself allows, who is thence obliged to construct a catalogue of *ten kingdoms*, not suited to *the primitive division of the Empire*, but to *the eighth century* : *the temporal kingdom of the Pope* therefore cannot be intended by *the little horn*. But *the spiritual kingdom of the Pope* arose precisely at this period. In the primitive Church, the authority of the *Bishops of Rome* extended not beyond their own diocese : precedence only was allowed to them in general councils by reason of the imperial city being their see. This precedence of honour was gradually enlarged into a precedence of authority. Still however no direct right could be claimed, for the Church was not as yet supported by the secular arm. But, after the conversion of the Empire to Christianity, great privileges were conferred upon the more dignified sees, especially upon that of Rome. Sir Isaac Newton has given a very minute detail of the gradual rise of this spiritual power ; and the first special edict, that he mentions as being made in its favour, bears date either the end of *the year 378*, or the beginning of *the year 379*. This edict gives *the Church of Rome* the right of deciding appeals in all doubtful cases that concerned the western bishoprics. Sir Isaac accordingly dates very properly the commencement of *the Pope's spiritual jurisdiction* from it. This power however constituted but *a very small kingdom* compared to that which was afterwards erected upon its foundations. The irruption of the northern tribes, which at first seemed likely to involve every thing in ruin and confusion, and the previous transfer of the

seat of government from Rome to Constantinople, jointly contributed to increase the authority of the *Roman Bishop* "While this ecclesiastical dominion was rising up," says Sir Isaac, "the northern barbarous nations invaded *the Western empire*, and founded several kingdoms therein of different religions from *the Church of Rome*. But these kingdoms by degrees embraced the Roman faith, and at the same time submitted to the Pope's authority. The Franks in Gaul submitted in the end of *the fifth century*; the Goths in Spain, at the end of *the sixth*; and the Lombards in Italy were conquered by Charles the great in *the year 774*. Between the *years 775 and 794*, the same Charles extended the Pope's authority over all Germany and Hungary as far as the river Theysse and the Baltic sea. He then set him above all human judicature; and at the same time assisted him in subduing the city and dutchy of Rome."\* The manner, in which *the little horn* almost insensibly arose, after the transfer of the seat of government, and during the dark period of Gothic invasion, is similarly described by Machiavel. Having shewn how *the Roman empire* was divided by the incursions of the northern nations, he observes, "About this time *the Bishops of Rome* began to take upon them, and to exercise greater authority than they had formerly done. At first, the successors of St. Peter were venerable and eminent for their miracles, and the holiness of their lives; and their examples added daily such numbers to the Christian Church, that, to obviate or remove the confusions which were then in the world, many princes turned Christians: and *the Emperor of Rome* being converted among the rest, and quitting Rome to hold his residence at Constantinople, *the Roman empire* began to decline, but *the church of Rome* augmented as fast."† After this he shews how *the Roman empire* declined, and how the power of *the Church of Rome* increased, first under the Ostrogoths, then under the Lombards, and lastly under the Franks. I have borrowed the preceding very apposite citation from Bp. Newton, who, somewhat singularly, according to his

\* Observ. on Dan. Chap. viii.

† Hist. of Florence, B. 1. p. 6. cited by Bp. Newton.



scheme, adduces it to shew the springing up of *the little horn* among *the ten other horns*; and yet, after having adduced it, declares no less singularly, so far as the propriety of the citation is concerned, that *the Bishop of Rome* did not become *a horn* till he became *a temporal prince*. Now, if *the Bishop of Rome* did not become *a horn* till he became *a temporal prince*, the citation, which speaks of *the fourth fifth, sixth, and seventh centuries*, certainly cannot shew *the rise of a horn*, which, according to his Lordship's scheme, did not *begin* to exist till *the middle of the eighth century*: but, if we consider *the little horn* as typifying *the spiritual kingdom of the Papacy*, nothing can be more to the point than the citation from Machiavel; for it decidedly shews, that *such a kingdom* arose from very small beginnings among *the ten horns*, precisely at the time when Daniel had predicted that it should arise. I shall conclude this account of the rise of *the papal horn* with Mr. Gibbon's description of its state at the close of *the sixth* and at the beginning of *the seventh century*, immediately before *the ecclesiastical kingdom* became *an ecclesiastical catholic empire*. "The pontificate of Gregory the great lasted thirteen years, six months, and ten days—In his rival, the patriarch of Constantinople, he condemned the Antichristian title of *Universal Bishop*, which the successor of St. Peter was too haughty to concede, and too feeble to assume; and the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of Gregory was confined to the triple character of *Bishop of Rome, Primate of Italy, and Apostle of the West*.—The bishops of Italy and the adjacent islands acknowledged *the Roman pontiff* as their special metropolitan. Even the existence, the union, or the translation, of the episcopal seats, was decided by his absolute discretion: and his successful inroads into the provinces of Greece, of Spain, and of Gaul, might countenance the more lofty pretensions of succeeding Popes. He interposed to prevent the abuses of popular elections; his jealous care maintained the purity of faith and discipline; and the apostolic shepherd assiduously watched over the faith and discipline of the subordinate pastors. Under his reign, the Arians of Italy and Spain were reconciled to the

catholic church ; and the conquest of Britain reflects less glory on the name of Cesar, than on that of Gregory the first. Instead of six legions, forty monks were embarked for that distant island ; and the pontiff lamented the austere duties, which forbade him to partake the perils of their spiritual warfare. In less than two years he could announce to the Archbishop of Alexandria that they had baptized the king of Kent with ten thousand of his Anglo-Saxons, and that the Roman missionaries, like those of the primitive Church, were armed only with spiritual and supernatural powers.\* Such was the power of *the little horn* immediately previous to its apostacy in *the year 606*, when it was declared to be *an universal empire under a Bishop of bishops*, and when *the saints* were thus formally delivered into its hand. How great, even before the commencement of *the 1260 days*, was its authority become, compared with what it had been, when *the Pope* was only *Archbishop of the neighbouring Italian bishops*, and *ecclesiastical judge* in cases of appeal from the other bishops of *the Western empire* ! As yet however *the man of sin*, the head of *the great Apostacy*, was not revealed. Gregory equally abhorred idolatry, persecution, and the proud claim of universal episcopacy : and it was left to his successors formally to re-establish the worship of images, to wear out the saints of the Most High, and to assume the metropolitanship, not only of Italy and the West, but of the whole world.† Though tinctured with the growing superstition of the age, his piety was fervent and sincere : and this last of the primitive bishops of Rome was snatched away to a better world, ere *the monstrous two-fold dominant Apostacy of the East and the West* had commenced. His death was, as it were, the signal for its developement.

Thus we have seen, that *the little horn* cannot typify *the temporal kingdom of the Pope*, because it is presented as springing up, as existing, and as acting, *previous* to the time when *the three horns* were eradicated before it, and consequently *previous* to the time when it acquired

\* Hist. of Decline and Fall, Vol. VIII. p. 164—167.

† This subject will be resumed hereafter.

by their fall *St. Peter's patrimony*. Its acquisition of *temporal authority* is indeed distinctly predicted in that part of the prophecy which relates to *the subversion of the three horns* : but this is mentioned as it were only by the bye, only as a mark whereby we might certainly know the power typified by *the little horn*. The power in question was gradually to arise during the turbulent period of Gothic invasion : and, *after* it had existed an indefinite space of time, the prophet teaches us that *three horns* should be plucked up before it, by the fall of which it should acquire *temporal dominion*. Hence it is plain, that, since *the little horn* was to be in existence *previous* to its acquisition of temporal dominion by the successive eradication of *the three horns*, it cannot have been designed to symbolize, as Sir Isaac Newton, Mr. Mede, and Bp. Newton, suppose, *the Papacy considered as a secular principality*.

This will appear yet more evident, when we examine the prophetic character of *the little horn* article by article.

1. *The little horn was not only to be a small kingdom at its first rise, but it was to be different from all the other horns*—Accordingly every one of the *ten kingdoms*, founded by the northern nations, were *temporal sovereignties* : but *the papal horn* was a *spiritual sovereignty*. And afterwards, when it had acquired a *secular principality* by the fall of *three of the ten temporal horns*, it still continued to differ essentially from them, being an *ecclesiastical and spiritual*, as well as a *civil and temporal power*.

2. *The little horn had eyes like the eyes of a man*—This particular, like the former, serves to shew, that a *spiritual*, not a *temporal*, kingdom was intended by the symbol. “By its eyes it was a seer ; and by its mouth speaking great things and changing times and laws it was a prophet—A seer, *Επισκοπος*, is a bishop in the literal sense of the word ; and this church claims the universal bishopric.”\* At its first rise indeed, it presumed not to make so bold a claim : still nevertheless it was equally a seer, or a bishop, within its own proper diocese and metropolitanship.

3. *The little horn had a mouth speaking great things*—

\* Sir Isaac Newton's Observ. on Dan. Chap. 7.

In his pretended capacity of a *prophet* and *vicar of Christ*, and in the plenitude of his usurped power, *the Bishop of Rome* has at various times anathematized all who dared to oppose him, has laid whole kingdoms under an interdict, has excommunicated kings and emperors, and has absolved their subjects from their allegiance.

4. *The little horn had a look more stout than his fellows*—*The popes* have claimed an unlimited superiority over other bishops their equals, in spiritual matters; and have affected greater authority than even sovereign princes, in temporal matters. “Pope Paul the fourth,” says the historian of the council of Trent, “never spake with ambassadors, but he thundered in their ears, that he was above all princes, that he would not that any of them should be too domestical with him, that he could exchange kingdoms, that he was successor of him who had deposed kings and emperors, and did often repeat that he had made Ireland a kingdom.”\* *The Popes* indeed have pretended, that the dominion of the whole earth belonged to them: and, strictly acting up to this claim, they have gone so far as to divide all new discovered countries between Spain and Portugal, assigning to the one the western, and to the other the eastern, hemisphere.

5. *The little horn spake great words by the side of the Most High, affecting an equality with God*—So *the Popes* have not scrupled to lay claim to infallibility, an especial attribute of God; and have sometimes blasphemously assumed even the name of God himself, and as such have impiously received divine honours. Accordingly they are not offended at being styled, *Our Lord God the Pope; another God upon earth; king of kings, and lord of lords*; nor do they disapprove of the impious flattery, which tells them, that *the same is the dominion of God and the Pope*; that *the power of the Pope is greater than all created power, extending itself to things celestial, terrestrial, and infernal*; and that *the Pope doeth whatsoever he listeth, even things unlawful, and is more than God*: nor yet do they refuse, on the day of their election, to receive the adoration of their

\* Cited by Dr. Zouch, p. 176.

cardinals on the very altar, and in the midst of the temple, of the Lord of hosts.\*

\* Bp. Newton's Dissert. xxii. 3. The other divine titles, by which *that man of sin, the apostate Bishop of Rome*, suffers himself to be hailed, are *Our most Holy Lord ; our Lord God the Pope ; his divine Majesty ; the victorious God and man in his see of Rome ; Deus optimus maximus and Vice-God ; named God by the pious emperor Constantine, and adored as God by that emperor ; the Lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the world ; the most holy who carrieth the most holy.* (Whitaker's Comment. p. 304.) Lord Lyttelton observes of the age of Henry II. that " those times thought it no blasphemy to give to the Pope the honour of God ;" and he instances it in a curious letter of the turbulent Becket, Archbishop of Canterbury, wherein he implores the aid of the Pope in phrases of Scripture appropriated to God. " Rise, Lord, and delay no longer ; let the light of thy countenance shine upon me ; save us for we perish ; not unto us, O Lord, not unto us, but in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ make unto thyself a great name." (Ibid. p. 302, 303.) A singular story is told by Baronius respecting the idolatry thus paid to the person of the Bishop of Rome. In the year 1162, " when Pope Alexander made his first entrance into Montpellier, among the Christian nobility that attended him on his way in a solemn procession there was a Saracen prince or emir, who reverently came up to him, and kissed his feet, he being on horseback ; then knelt down before him, and bowing his head adored him as the holy and good God of the Christians. He does not tell us, that Alexander in any manner reproved him for his blasphemous error ; but, on the contrary, takes notice that he shewed him extraordinary kindness ; and adds, that all who saw it, were filled with great admiration, and applied to the Pope the words of the prophet David ; *All the kings of the earth shall worship him, and all nations shall serve him.* Thus, in that age of ignorance and credulity did superstition even deify the Bishop of Rome : but it is a still more shocking impiety, that a learned cardinal, who lived in the 17th century, should relate such a fact without expressing the least disapprobation of it ; nay, rather with an air of complacency and applause." (Ibid. p. 273, 274.) " Even to this day the Romanists continue the blasphemous practice of calling the Pope *the Lord God*, as appears from a confession of faith found in the pocket of a priest during the late rebellion in Ireland, and reported by Sir R. Musgrave " (Ibid. p. 337.) In short, the sentiments which the Romanists entertain of their idol *the Pope*, and the manner, in which he speaks great words by the side of the Most High, affecting an equality with God, are shewn very remarkably by a print in the Roman Breviary published by the authority of the council of Trent, and printed at Antwerp in the year 1698. In this print, which is placed opposite to p. 413. of the Breviary, " there is a representation of heaven opened to full view, in which, seated upon a cloud, appeareth *the Pope* with his triple crown upon his head. *The Pope's* head is irradiated with a triangular, not a circular, glory, (expressive no doubt of the Trinity in Unity ;) the dove is hovering over the heads of him and our Saviour, but more inclined toward the Pope. *The Pope sits upright upon the Globe of the earth, with his feet full upon it. Our Saviour is seated upon his right hand, pushed as it were from off the earth, whereby he is obliged to sit sideways in order to reach his feet to it ; and round our Saviour's head is only a small circular glory.* Beneath, on one side, next to our Saviour in heaven, is the Virgin Mary, whom *the Pope* deifies upon earth, praying to her. Next to the Virgin Mary is represented St. Peter : and close by him, upon a level, is St. Paul sitting and leaning upon a sword. In the middle are little Cherubim, and behind them a palm-bearing company. On the right hand is a smaller group of palm-bearers, seemingly employed in carrying messages. Beneath, on the earth, are represented warriors on the one hand, and on the other the elders of their church. In the middle standeth one bearing a palm, conversing with another before whom the triple crown is placed, deeply shaded, and only a few rays of light descend upon the top of it. This is the political representation of the idol of Rome, *the Pope*, in the plenitude of his power, as given to its votaries, and authorized

6. *The little horn thought to change times and laws*—So *the Popes* have perpetually changed the calendar by the canonization of new saints, and have departed from the original simplicity of the Gospel by the introduction of an infinite number of superstitious laws and observances; “instituting new modes of worship, imposing new articles of faith, enjoining new rules of practice, and reversing at pleasure the laws both of God and man.”\* They have even dared to strike the second commandment out of the decalogue, because it so plainly reproved them for their multifarious idolatry. In short, “the wisest and most impartial of the Roman catholic writers do not only acknowledge, but are even at pains to demonstrate, that, from the times of Louis the meek, who died in *the year* 840, the ancient rules of ecclesiastical government were gradually changed in Europe by the counsels of the court of Rome, and new laws substituted in their place†.”

7. *The little horn was to wear out the saints of the Most High, who were to be given into his hand by a formal grant of the secular power during the space of three years and a half, or 1260 prophetic days*; that is to say, during the same space of time, that *the two apocalyptic witnesses* were to prophesy in sackcloth, and *the persecuted Church* was to be nourished in the wilderness.‡—Accordingly, when *the Pope* was constituted *Universal Bishop and Supreme head of the Church* by the grant of the tyrant Phocas, *the saints of God* were delivered into his hand and placed under his control. They were no longer, as in the primitive Church, subject, and that for conscience sake and for the real edification of their souls, only to their respective diocesans: but they were now made the spiritual vassals of *the man of sin*, and were in consequence of it soon reduced by him to a state of worse than Egyptian bondage. By the instrumentality of *the secular beast*,§ he has already, for by far the greater part of the predicted period, incessantly persecuted and worn out, (so far as this present life is concerned)

by the council of Trent, and confirmed by several Popes of Rome” Burton’s Essay on the numbers of Daniel and St. John; Supplement; p. 96, 97.

\* See Mosheim’s Eccles. Hist. Vol. iii. p. 260—264.

† Zouch on Prophecy, p. 51.

‡ Rev. xi. 3. xii. 6.

§ Rev. viii. 5, 7.

those faithful servants of God, who protested against his corruptions, and refused to partake of his idolatries. These persecutions indeed, like the more ancient persecutions of Paganism, have not always been universal, nor have they always raged with equal violence; they have been moreover greatly checked by the influence of the Reformation, and by the consequent waning of *the Papal power*: nevertheless *the witnesses* are still more or less prophesying in sackcloth; they are still, throughout popish countries, in a degraded and lumbled state; and in this state they will continue, in one part or other of the world, to the end of *the 42 months*.\*

8. Lastly, *the little horn* was to *subdue or depress three out of the ten kings*; or, as it appears from the corresponding action of the symbols, *three of the first ten horns were to be eradicated before it*—Respecting the interpretation of this part of the prophecy, I am compelled to differ both from Mr. Mede, and from Sir Isaac and Bp. Newton.

Mr. Mede, who may justly be styled *the father of prophetic interpretation*, supposes, that *the three symbolical horns* which appeared to Daniel to be plucked up by the roots before *the little horn*, were those whose dominions extended into Italy, and so stood in the light of *the little horn*.† “First, *that of the Greeks*, whose emperor Leo Isaurus for the quarrel of image worship he excommunicated, and made his subjects of Italy revolt from

\* The indulgences, which *the French protestants* have obtained under *the present usurper*, are evidently granted merely upon a political principle. *The Capets* persecuted them, and therefore *Buonapartè* favours them. It remains however to be seen, what he will do when he shall once have firmly established himself. His late restoration of *popery* as a convenient engine of state, and his total disregard of every obligation moral and religious, shew plainly that *the protestants* will be protected only so long as it suits his interest. In the eyes of a tyrant, a refusal to worship the image which he has set up will probably be considered as a secret mark of disaffection, though it may not be convenient for him immediately to notice this want of compliance on the part of *the protestants*.

—————Incedunt per ignes  
Suppositos cineri doloso.

† In this particular Mr. Mede seems to me to be perfectly right. *The three horns* were to fall “before the little horn,” or in his immediate presence: hence they cannot have been plucked up any where but in Italy. Their dominions however were not merely to “extend into Italy,” an expression which implies that *the horns* themselves were seated out of Italy; but *the sovereignty itself* of *the three horns* must have been fixed in that country.

their allegiance. Secondly, *that of the Longobards*, (successors to the Ostrogoths) whose kingdom he caused, by the aid of the Franks, to be wholly ruined and extirpated, thereby to get the exarchate of Ravenna (which since the revolt from the Greeks the Longobards were seized on) for a patrimony to St. Peter. Thirdly, *the kingdom of the Franks itself*, continued in the empire of Germany; whose emperors, from the days of Henry the fourth, he excommunicated, deposed, and trampled under his feet, and never suffered to live in rest, till he had made them not only to quit their interest in the election of Popes and investiture of Bishops, but that remainder of jurisdiction also in Italy, wherewith, together with the Roman name, he had once infeoffed their predecessors. These were the kings, by displanting, or (as the Vulgar hath) humbling, of whom *the Pope* got elbow room by degrees; and advanced himself to that height of temporal majesty and absolute greatness, which made him so terrible in the world.”\*

Sir Isaac and Bp. Newton, though they disagree in the catalogues which they respectively give of *the ten kingdoms*, concur in proposing a scheme different from that of Mr. Mede so far as *the three horns* are concerned. They each conjecture, that *the three eradicated powers* were *the Exarchate of Ravenna, the kingdom of the Lombards, and the state of Rome*.†

Both these modes of interpretation appear to me objectionable in almost every point of view.

With regard to Mr. Mede's scheme it may be remarked, that, if by *the Greeks* and *Franks* he intends *the Constantinopolitan* and *Carlovingian empires*, neither of those monarchies ever *was* plucked up by the roots before *the little horn*; and if, on the other hand, by *the Greeks* and *Franks* he intends only *the Greek* and *Germanic provinces in Italy*, those, being *mere provinces*, cannot, with any propriety, be esteemed *horns*, or *independent kingdoms*. So that, take the scheme in what light we may, it will prove equally untenable. Whatever inroads *the Popes* might make upon the authority of *the Con-*

\* Mede's Works B. iv. Epist. 24.

† Observ. on Dan. p. 74, 75, 76.—Dissert. xiv.



.....  
*stantinopolitan* and *German emperors* in the detached provinces of their respective dominions, I know not how it can be said, that by such encroachments two out of the ten horns were plucked up by the roots before them.\*

With regard to the scheme of Sir Isaac and Bp. Newton, the first objection that occurs is their supposition that the *Exarchate of Ravenna* was one of the ten horns.

The *Exarchate* was not, like each of the monarchies founded by the northern nations, a horn or independent kingdom; but, on the contrary, a mere dependent province of the Greek empire, governed, like its other provinces, by a deputy: hence it can no more be esteemed a horn, than any of the other Greek provinces.† The prophet simply asserts, that the *Roman beast*, when his empire was divided, should put forth ten horns: he does not give us the least reason to suppose, that there should be any essential difference in the political constitution of the horns. What one therefore of the ten horns was, that all the others must have been:‡ for, unless we completely violate the harmony of symbolical language, we can never allow, that some of the horns represent sovereign states, and others of them mere provinces of sovereign states.

The next objection is, that, even allowing the *Exarchate* to be a horn, neither it nor the state of Rome occur in the true list of the ten primary kingdoms. The Bishop agrees with Sir Isaac, that the *Exarchate of Ravenna*, the kingdom of the Lombards, and the state of Rome, are the three horns; but he censures him for his inconsis-

\* Mr. Mede reckons up the ten kingdoms, as follows: "1 The Britons; 2 The Saxons in Britain; 3 The Franks; 4. The Burgundians in France; 5. The Visigoths in the South of France and part of Spain; 6 The Sueves and Alans in Galicia and Portugal; 7. The Vandals in Africa; 8. The Alemans in Germany; 9 The Ostrogoths whom the Longobards succeeded, in Pannonia, and afterwards in Italy; 10. The Greeks in the residue of the empire." In addition to the foregoing observations I shall hereafter shew, that the eastern empire cannot be reckoned one of the horns of the beast, all of which must be sought for in the West.

† "The throne of the Gothic kings," says Mr. Gibbon, "was filled by the exarch of Ravenna, the representative in peace and war of the emperor of the East."

‡ The prophet, by declaring that the little horn should be different from all the rest, necessarily leads us to conclude that the ten horns should not be different from each other.

tency in supposing *those* powers to be *the three horns*, while he presents us nevertheless with such a catalogue of *the ten kingdoms* as does not include the names of *all* those three powers.\* The censure is just, for the prophet expressly asserts, that three of the *first* horns were to be plucked up before *the little horn*; yet while he blames Sir Isaac for this manifest flaw in his interpretation, he does not seem conscious that much the same censure attaches to himself, notwithstanding his attempt to parry it. *The three horns* are certainly to be sought for among the ten *original* kingdoms into which the empire was divided, and among *no other* kingdoms whatever: nothing can be more definite and precise upon this point than the language of Daniel. We ought therefore first to learn, what these ten *original* horns were, and next to inquire whether *three of them* were ever plucked up to make room for an *eleventh little horn* perfectly distinct from them all; not surely first to fix upon *three states*, which we conceive *may* answer to the character of *the three horns*, and then contrive such a list of *ten kingdoms* as may include these *three states*. Yet such is the plan, which Bp. Newton adopts. Perfectly aware that it would be a vain labour to seek either for *the Exarchate of Ravenna* or for *the state of Rome* among the ten *primary* kingdoms, he most unwarrantably sets aside the *real* list of those kingdoms, and substitutes a list of his own; into which he introduces *the petty state of Rome*, and *the Greek province of Ravenna*, evidently for no other purpose than to give a colour of probability to his predetermined interpretation. Hence his catalogue does indeed contain *the three states*, which he supposes to be *the three horns* plucked up before *the little horn*; but it is certainly not the more on that account a faithful catalogue of the ten *original* kingdoms. Accordingly, the Bishop himself confesses, (a confession which alone is sufficient to invali-

\* Sir Isaac gives us the following catalogue of the ten kingdoms: "1. The kingdom of the Vandals and Alans in Spain and Africa; 2. The kingdom of the Suevians in Spain; 3. The kingdom of the Visigoths; 4. The kingdom of the Alans in Gallia; 5. The kingdom of the Burgundians; 6. The kingdom of the Franks; 7. The kingdom of the Britons; 8. The kingdom of the Huns; 9. The kingdom of the Lombards; 10. The kingdom of Ravenna." In this catalogue *the state of Rome*, which Sir Isaac supposes to be *one of the three horns*, does not occur.

date his whole plan of interpretation) that it is a catalogue calculated for *the eighth century*, not for *the period in which the Roman empire was originally divided* \*

The result of the whole is, that, since *the Greek province of Ravenna* cannot be esteemed a *horn* or *independent kingdom*; and since, even if it could, neither *it*, nor *the state of Rome*, are to be found in the true list of the *ten original kingdoms*: they cannot be *two of those three primary horns* which the prophet beheld plucked by the roots before *the little horn*.

Having now stated my objections to the two preceding modes of interpretation, I shall endeavour to ascertain the *three primary kingdoms*, which were destined to fall before *the eleventh different and little kingdom of the Roman empire*. For this purpose it will be necessary, *first* to inquire into the import of the prediction concerning their fall, and *secondly* to learn from history the names of the *ten original kingdoms* among which they are to be sought.

1. The overthrow of *the three horns* is described in three different parts of the vision of *the four beasts*.

“ I considered the horns, and, behold, there came up among them another little horn, before whom three of the first horns were plucked up by the roots.”

“ Then I would know the truth of the fourth beast,—and of the ten horns that were in his head, and of the other which came up, and before whom three fell.”

“ The ten horns out of this kingdom are ten kings that shall arise: and another shall rise behind them; and he shall be diverse from the first, and he shall depress three kings.”

\* “ We would, for reasons which will hereafter appear to the attentive reader,” (namely, in order that his Lordship’s catalogue might be made to contain the *three states*, which he supposes to be *the three horns* plucked up before *the little horn*,) “ fix these *ten kingdoms* at a different era from any of the foregoing; and let us see how they stood in *the eighth century*. The principal states and governments then were—1. Of the Senate of Rome, who revolted from the Greek emperors, and claimed and exerted the privilege of choosing a new western emperor; 2. Of the Greeks in Ravenna; 3. Of the Lombards in Lombardy; 4. Of the Huns in Hungary; 5. Of the Alemanes in Germany; 6. Of the Franks in France; 7. Of the Burgundians in Burgundy; 8. Of the Goths in Spain; 9. Of the Britons; 10. Of the Saxons in Britain.” (Bp. Newton’s Dissert. XIV.) Thus does the Bishop confessedly adapt his catalogue to *the three supposed horns*, instead of seeking for *the three horns*, where the prophet directs us to seek them, among the *ten first horns*.

These different passages all describe the same circumstance: consequently, whatever is the import of the one, must likewise be the import of both the others.

With respect to the vision, the appearance, which presented itself to Daniel, seems to have been this. While the prophet was contemplating *the ten horns of the beast*, he beheld *an eleventh little horn* gradually, and as it were by stealth, springing up among them.\* As *this little horn* was slowly arising, *three of the first ten horns*, which were "before it" or in its immediate vicinity, so as by their position to obstruct its growth, were successively eradicated, and fell prostrate at its feet. Every obstacle being thus removed, *the little horn* attained its full growth; and occupied the place, which had been before occupied by *the three eradicated horns*.

Such apparently was the action of the symbols; upon which the interpreting angel observes, that *an eleventh kingdom* should arise behind *the first ten kingdoms*, and should depress *three of them*. Now, since it is said, in one passage, that *the three horns* were plucked up before *the little horn*; in another, that they fell before *the little horn*; and in a third that *the power represented by the little horn* should depress *the power represented by the three horns*: a question arises, which can only be determined by the event: namely, whether *this smaller power* should depress *three of the first powers immediately or mediately*, by *his own proper exertions* or by *the instrumentality of others*? History is ever the best interpreter of prophecy; and by its decisions we may always safely abide. Daniel specially informs us, that *three of the first ten kingdoms*, into which the empire should be divided, were to be plucked up before *the little horn*. Hence it is evident, that we must look for the completion of the prophecy among the ten *first* kingdoms, and among those *only*. Now we do not find, as it shall be presently shewn from history, that *any three* of the ten *original*

\* He seems to have overlooked *the little horn* at first, owing to its diminutive size, and to its springing up behind *the other horns*; and to have fixed his attention entirely upon *the ten horns*; till it was diverted from them by the increasing size of *the little horn*.

kingdoms\* were ever literally depressed by *the immediate exertions of an eleventh smaller kingdom*: but we do find that precisely *three* of them were eradicated by *the instrumentality of each other, of the Greeks, and of the Franks, before an eleventh little horn*, which had been gradually rising in the midst of troublesome times, and which at length occupied the place of *its three depressed predecessors*. Thus does history at once interpret the prophecy, and undeniably point out to us *the power* intended by *the little horn*

2. As *the three horns* are to be sought for among the ten *first horns*, we must obviously learn what those ten *first horns* are, before we can inquire with any prospect of success for *the three* which were to be eradicated before *the little horn*. The historian Machiavel, whom I cannot but consider as the best, because the most unprejudiced, judge, of the manner in which *the Roman empire* was divided, very undesignedly, and (as Bp. Chandler remarks) little thinking what he was doing, reckons up *the ten primary kingdoms* as follows: 1. The Ostrogoths in Mesia; 2. The Visigoths in Pannonia; 3. The Sueves and Alans in Gasgoigne and Spain; 4. The Vandals in Africa; 5. The Franks in France; 6. The Burgundians in Burgundy; 7. The Heruli and Turingi in Italy; 8. The Saxons and Angles in Britain; 9. The Huns in Hungary; and 10. The Lombards, at first upon the Danube, afterwards in Italy.† The self-same catalogue is exhibited by that excellent chronologer Bp. Lloyd, who adds the dates when *these ten kingdoms* arose: 1. The Huns about A. D. 356; 2. The Ostrogoths, 377; 3. The Visigoths, 378; 4. The Franks, 407; 5. The Vandals, 407; 6. The Sueves and Alans, 407; 7. The Burgundians, 407; 8. The Heruli and Rugii, 476; 9. The Saxons, 476; 10. The Longobards in the north of Germany, 483; in Hungary, 526.‡

These then, upon the concurring testimony of an historian and a chronologer, are *the ten kingdoms* into which

\* In fact, we do not find that *any* three kingdoms were subdued by the *immediate force of the Papacy*. The Pope *himself* neither subdued the kingdom of the Lombards, the state of Rome, nor the Exarchate.

† Bp. Newton's Dissert. XIV.

‡ Ibid.

the Roman empire was originally divided, and consequently they are the *ten first horns* of which we are in quest. Hence, if ever *three kingdoms* were plucked up before a *little kingdom* which arose imperceptibly among the *ten primary kingdoms*, they must be *three*, the names of which occur in the preceding list of Machiavel and Bp. Lloyd. Accordingly we shall find, that the *kingdom of the Heruli*, the *kingdom of the Ostrogoths*, and the *kingdom of the Lombards*, were successively eradicated before the *little papal horn*, which at length became a *temporal* no less than a *spiritual* power at the expence of these three depressed *primary* states.

1. In the year 476, Odoacer, king of the *Heruli*,\* put an end to the *western empire*, and caused himself to be proclaimed *king of Italy*. By this conquest he stood "before," or in the way of, the *papal horn*; whence it was necessary, that his *regal horn* should be plucked up in order to make room for the future aggrandisement of the *spiritual kingdom of the Pope*. This was effected, in the year 493, by Theodoric king of the *Ostrogoths*. Leading his hardy troops from their original settlement in Mesia and the neighbourhood of Constantinople, he descended from the Julian Alps, and displayed his banners on the confines of Italy. Victory crowned his enterprise; from the Alps to the extremity of Calabria Theodoric reigned by right of conquest; and he was accepted as the deliverer of Rome by the Senate and the people.

2. This *second of the three horns* however, standing equally in the way of papal aggrandisement, was destined, like its immediate predecessor, to fall before the *little*

\* Disputes have arisen respecting the proper name of Odoacer's subjects, but they are disputes which are of little consequence to the completion of the prophecy. Machiavel styles his kingdom, *that of the Heruli and Turingi*; Bp. Lloyd, *that of the Heruli and Rugii*; and Mr. Gibbon asserts, that his immediate and hereditary subjects were the tribe of the *Scyri*, while the Italian kingdom which he founded was composed of various clans of Gothic mercenaries, among which the names of the *Heruli*, the *Scyri*, the *Alani*, the *Turcilingi*, and the *Rugians*, appear to have predominated. Be this as it may, the kingdom, which he did found, was one of the *ten primary kingdoms*; whence, if its history correspond with the prophecy, it is certainly capable, in its capacity of a *primary kingdom*, of being reckoned *one of the three horns*. The accurate particularising of the tribes which composed it cannot make it either more or less a *primary kingdom*. All possibility of dispute might be avoided, if, in the catalogue of the *ten kingdoms*, it were styled, *the kingdom of Odoacer in Italy*, instead of the *kingdom of the Heruli and Turingi in Italy*, or the *kingdom of the Heruli and Rugii in Italy*.

*horn.* After the kingdom of the Ostrogoths had subsisted in Italy its allotted time, it was attacked by Bellisarius; and at length was utterly eradicated by Narses the lieutenant of the Eastern emperor, and his auxiliaries the Lombards.

3. Italy now became a province of the Constantinopolitan empire, and was governed by an imperial officer, who bore the title of *Exarch of Ravenna*. Scarcely however was the *Exarchate* established,\* when the Lombards, who had lent their assistance to Narses in his attack upon the kingdom of the Ostrogoths, began to meditate the conquest of Italy for themselves. Narses was engaged in the settlement of that country under the government of the Constantinopolitan emperors from the year 554 to the year 568; and it was in the year 567, that Alboin, king of the Lombards, undertook the subjugation of it. Descending from the same Julian Alps that his Gothic predecessor Theodoric had done, he became, with ut a battle or a siege, master of Italy from the Trentine hills to the gates of Ravenna and Rome.

The *exarchate of Ravenna* still feebly subsisted, but it was at length completely subdued by the Lombardic monarch Aistulphus about the year 752. This conquest however was only the prelude to the utter eradication of the third and last horn, which interfered with the aggrandisement of the *Papacy*, and which was therefore to be plucked up by the roots before it. Alarmed at the growing power of Aistulphus, the Pope applied for assistance to Pipin king of France; who, in the course of two successive expeditions into Italy, wrested from that prince the whole district of the *Exarchate*, and bestowed it in perpetual sovereignty upon the *Bishop of Rome*. "After this double chastisement, the Lombards languished about twenty years in a state of languor and decay. But their minds were not yet humbled to their

\* "The destruction of a mighty kingdom established the fame of Alboin—But his ambition was yet unsatisfied; and the conqueror of the Gepidæ turned his eyes from the Danube to the richer banks of the Po and the Tiber. Fifteen years had not elapsed, since his subjects, the confederates of Narses, had visited the pleasant climate of Italy; the mountains, the rivers, the high-ways, were familiar to their memory; the report of their success, perhaps the view of their spoils, had kindled in the rising generation the flame of emulation and enterprise. Their hopes were encouraged by the spirit and eloquence of Alboin." *Hist. of Decline and Fall*, Vol. viii. p. 122, 123.

condition ; and, instead of affecting the pacific virtues of the feeble, they peevishly harassed the Romans with a repetition of claims, evasions, and inroads, which they undertook without reflection, and terminated without glory." Charlemagne had now succeeded his father Pipin, and like him assumed the character of *the champion of the Church*. At the request of *the Pope* he formally undertook his cause ; entered Italy at the head of a large army ; completely eradicated *the horn of Lombardy* ; and bestowed great part of its dominions upon the successors of St. Peter.\*

Thus were *three of the first horns* plucked up by the roots before *an eleventh little horn*, which silently arose among them, till it had supplanted *the three horns*, that stood in its way and prevented its full expansion.†

\* Mr Sharpe briefly observes, that *the three horns*, eradicated before *the little horn*, were "the three Gothic kingdoms," or "the three distinct national governments of Gothic kings, seated successively in Rome itself;" and he adds, that *the three kingdoms* constituted *the short-lived seventh head of the beast* mentioned in the Apocalypse : that *the last of them* was wounded to death by the sword of Justinian in the hand of Belisarius ; and that *the whole period of their joint dominion* amounted not to more than 70 years. (See Append. to three Tracts, p. 43—An Inquiry into the description of Babylon, p. 8, —and Append to Inquiry, p. 3, 4, 5.) *What three Gothic kingdoms* Mr. Sharpe alludes to, I cannot imagine from his chronological and circumstantial description of them. I am only aware of *the three following Gothic kingdoms* having been ever seated in Italy : that of the *Heruli* ; that of the *Ostrogoths* ; and that of the *Lombards*. Of these Justinian only subverted that of the *Ostrogoths* : as for that of the *Lombards*, it continued many years after the termination of his reign ; and, after overturning the government of the Greek Emperors in Italy it was in its turn destroyed by Charlemagne. So again Mr. Sharpe speaks of *three Gothic kingdoms* seated in Italy *previous* to the reign of Justinian, and jointly continuing about 70 years. Upon adverting to history, we shall find, that the *two Gothic kingdoms of the Heruli and the Ostrogoths* continued something more than 70 years ; and that *the last of them* was subdued by Justinian : but it will prove a vain labour to look for a *third*, the duration of which jointly with that of the other two shall amount to about 70 years. The whole duration of *the three kingdoms of the Heruli, the Ostrogoths, and the Lombards*, comprehends a space, not merely of 70 years, but of little less than *three centuries* : for *the kingdom of the Heruli* was erected in the year 476, and *the kingdom of the Lombards* was subverted by Charlemagne in the year 774. As for *these three kingdoms*, they cannot be at once both *three horns* and *the seventh head of the self-same beast at the self-same time* and in *the self-same capacity* : both because such an opinion is a palpable contradiction, confounding together in a strange manner *the different members of the beast* ; and because 298 years, the period of their joint duration, can scarcely be called so *very short a time*, compared with the duration of any of *the other heads*. It is to be wished, that Mr. Sharpe had explicitly said what three Gothic kingdoms he intended.

† Bp Newton's Dissert on Rev. xiii. and vii—Hist. of Decline and Fall, Vol. vi. p. 226—37—*Ibid* Vol. vii. p. 11—15, 214—257, 353—398—*Ibid*. Vol. viii. p. 122, 136, 127, 145, 147—*Ibid*. Vol. ix. p. 145—150, 156—159—Bp. Newton's Dissert. XIV.



It is curious to observe the gradual rise of papal domination during the turbulent age, in which *the three horns* were successively eradicated. Under *the reign of Odoacer*, the Bishops of Rome had acquired so much influence, that even the victorious Theodoric found it prudent to pay court to them. Though he assumed the supremacy of the Church, he was not ignorant of the dignity and importance of *the Roman pontiff*. "The peace or the revolt of Italy might depend on the character of a wealthy and popular Bishop, who claimed such ample dominion both in heaven and earth."\* Accordingly we find, that, toward the close of the Ostrogothic sovereignty, *the Pope* took a leading part in the revolution which once more brought Italy under the sway of the emperors. "The deputies of *the Pope* and clergy, of the senate and people, invited the lieutenant of Justinian to accept their voluntary allegiance, and to enter the city, whose gates would be thrown open for his reception."† And afterwards, when *the Ostrogothic monarchy* for a short time recovered itself previous to its final subjection, the emperor Justinian was roused from his slumber "by *the Pope Vigilius* and the Patrician Cethegus, who appeared before his throne, and adjured him, in the name of God and the people, to resume the conquest and deliverance of Italy."‡

At this period, as Machiavel very justly remarks, *the Papacy* was greatly assisted in its acquisition of temporal authority by the circumstance of Theodoric king of *the Ostrogoths* making Ravenna his metropolis;§ for, "there being no other prince left in Rome, the Romans were forced for protection to pay greater allegiance to *the Pope*."

During the struggles between *the Lombards* and *the imperial lieutenants at Ravenna*, the power of *the Popes* continued gradually on the increase. Availing them-

\* Hist. of Decline and Fall, Vol. vii. p. 57.

† Ibid. p. 223

‡ Ibid. p. 378.

§ Ravenna was the metropolis likewise even of *the Western empire* itself some years previous to its fall. Honorius first fixed his residence there in the year 404, as a place of security against the inroads of the northern nations. (Hist. of Decline Vol. v. p. 207.) Thus was *he who letted gradually taken out of the way*, to make room for *the Apostacy* and the full revelation of *the man of sin*.

selves of those turbulent and unsettled times, and finding that their influence was sufficient to turn the scale whichever way they pleased, they began, as Machiavel observes, to treat and confederate, sometimes with *the Imperialists* and sometimes with *the Lombards*, "not as subjects, but as equals and companions."

In short, throughout a period of anarchy, when the minds of men were kept in a constant ferment by the frequency of political changes, "the want of laws among the Romans could only be supplied by the influence of religion; and their foreign and domestic counsels were moderated by the authority of *the Bishop*. His alms, his sermons, his correspondence with the kings and prelates of the West, his recent services, their gratitude, and oath, accustomed the Romans to consider him as the first magistrate or prince of the city. The Christian humility of *the Popes* was not offended by the name of *Dominus* or *Lord*; and their face and inscription are still apparent on the most ancient coins. Their temporal dominion is now confirmed by the reverence of a thousand years; and their noblest title is the free choice of a people whom they had redeemed from slavery."\*

Such was the state of *the Papacy* immediately before the subversion of *the kingdom of the Lombards*, the last of *the three horns* which stood in its way, and which was therefore destined to fall before it. When *this horn* was completely eradicated, *the eleventh little horn* attained to its full growth in temporalities, by the acquisition of *the exarchate* and a considerable part of *the kingdom of Lombardy*, and by the complete subjugation of *Rome*. It had already become *a spiritual empire*, when in the year 606 the saints were delivered into its hand.

Here then we behold *a little horn* springing up among and behind *the first ten horns*, and advancing itself upon the ruins of *three of those horns*, which were successively eradicated before it. No other *power* but *the Papacy* arose under similar circumstances, no other corresponds in every respect with the character of *the little horn*: whence it is concluded, that the symbol of *the lit-*

*the horn* is designed to typify *the Papacy* and *nothing but the Papacy*. It is in vain, that the Romanists would persuade us, that *the little horn* is *Antichrist*, and that his reign is still remote. Since *three* of the *first* horns, into which *the Roman empire* branched out, were to fall before *the little horn*; if the prophecy has not been *already* accomplished, it is *now* impossible that it ever should be accomplished. From the various political changes which have taken place in the course of the last twelve centuries, the ten *primary* horns can no longer be pointed out; consequently no *three* of them can *now* be plucked up before *any little horn*, which the Papi ts may fancy will hereafter arise. By attending however to the voice of history we find, that it *has* been the fate of *three* of the *primary* horns successively to quit their original settlements for the purpose of fixing themselves in Italy, so as to stand "before" *the Papacy*: and we further find, that it *has* been the fate of *exactly these three*, and *no more*, to be completely eradicated "before" the growing power of *the Bishops of Rome*. *None*, except *these three*, were ever plucked up under such circumstances: that is to say, *none* except *these three*, ever fell "before" *an eleventh power* perfectly distinct and perfectly different from the ten *primary* kingdoms. *Exactly three* however of the ten *primary* kingdoms *did* fall "before" *the Papacy*: it is incumbent therefore upon the votaries of *the Church of Rome* to shew, why we are not to conclude *these three kingdoms* to be *the three horns of the beast* and *the Papacy* to be *the eleventh little horn*, before they can expect a protestant to believe that the reign of *this little horn* is still remote.

The preceding catalogue of *the ten primary kingdoms*, which is given us by Machiavel and Bp Lloyd, very properly omits, as we have seen, *the Greek province of Ravenna*, and at the same time places *all the ten kingdoms* in *the western parts of the Roman empire*. Here therefore it may perhaps be asked, "Why must *all the horns* be sought for in the *West*? Although *the exarchate* cannot be esteemed a *horn*, why may not *the Constantinopolitan monarchy*?" The reason is this. *That empire*, after the downfall of *the Western empire*, still

constituted under the government of its emperors, *the sixth head of the beast* ;\* consequently it cannot be *at once*, and in *the self-same capacity*, both a *head* and a *horn* of *the self-same beast*. In this particular there is a striking difference between the political character of *the ancient Roman emperors*, and that of *the modern emperors of the West* whose dignity commenced with Charlemagne. The title of *the ancient emperors* was attached to their territorial possessions ; whereas that of *the modern emperors* is entirely distinct : so that Charlemagne was *emperor in one capacity*, and *king of France in another* ; in the same manner as the present head of the house of Austria would be *king of Hungary and Bohemia*, whatever family might be elected to *the imperial dignity*. On these grounds *the Emperor of Constantinople* cannot be esteemed *one of the ten horns*, without a manifest violation of the harmony of the prophetic vision ; although, inasmuch as he was *the sixth head*, his dominions must be reckoned as *part of the Roman empire*, the *whole* of which is represented in the Apocalypse under the symbol of *the earth* : and, on the same grounds, *all the ten horns of the beast* must be sought for in *the West* ; where accordingly Machiavel and Bp. Lloyd have found precisely that number of *original Gothic kingdoms*.†

I am aware, that both Sir Isaac Newton, and Bp. Newton, are of opinion, that *the eastern half of the empire* is not to be accounted *a part of the body of the fourth beast* : but I much doubt, whether this opinion rests upon any solid foundation : for it neither agrees with the Revelation of St. John, which predicts the fortunes of *the entire Roman empire* as well *eastern as western*, and which describes it as *one great whole* by the symbol of *the earth* ; nor does it even quadrate with the scheme upon which it is founded. Sir Isaac argues, that “ *the nations of Chaldea and Assyria* are still *the first beast* ; those of *Media and Persia* are still *the second beast* ; those of *Macedon, Greece, Thrace, Asia Minor,*

\* Rev. xvii. 10.

† “ Ubinam hi decem reges querendi sunt ? Non in Oriente : neque enim Imperium Græcum seu Orientale unum e decem cornibus erat, ut apparet, quia hæc dimidia pars fuit capitis sexti sive Cæsaream a Constantino bipartiti.” Excid. Antic. apud Pol. Synop. in loc.

*Syria, and Egypt, are still the third; and those of Europe, on this side Greece, are still the fourth. Seeing therefore the body of the third beast is confined to the nations on this side the river Euphrates, and the body of the fourth beast is confined to the nations on this side Greece: we are to look for all the four heads of the third beast, among the nations on this side the river Euphrates; and for all the eleven horns of the fourth beast, among the nations on this side of Greece. And therefore, at the breaking of the Greek empire into four kingdoms of the Greeks, we include no part of the Chaldeans, Medes, and Persians, in those kingdoms, because they belonged to the bodies of the two first beasts. Nor do we reckon the Greek empire, seated at Constantino-ple, among the horns of the fourth beast, because it belonged to the body of the third.”\**

I fully agree with Sir Isaac Newton, though for a different reason which I have already stated,† that the eleven horns of the fourth beast must all be sought for among the nations on this side Greece, and that the Constantinopolitan empire cannot be esteemed one of those horns; but his scheme of excluding that empire from the body of the fourth beast is manifestly inconsistent with itself. Sir Isaac maintains, that the four heads of the third beast are to be looked for in the countries on this side the Euphrates; namely, in those of Macedon, Greece, Thrace, Asia Minor, Syria, and Egypt: for he affirms, that these regions form the proper body of the third beast, in the same manner as those westward of Greece form the proper body of the fourth beast, and constitute his ten horns. The four heads of the third beast are undoubtedly to be sought for in the regions which he specifies, but certainly not for the reasons which he assigns: for the countries of Asia Minor, Syria, and Egypt, cannot be considered as forming an exclusive part of the body of the third beast, because they were originally provinces belonging to the second beast. This will necessarily follow from Sir Isaac’s own scheme. If, as he supposes, Greece and its de-

\* Observ. on Daniel, p 31, 32.

† Namely, because the Roman emperor of Constantinople was the sixth head of the beast, and consequently cannot be esteemed one of his horns likewise.

pendent provinces must not be esteemed a part of the body of the Roman beast, because they originally belonged to the Macedonian beast: then, in order that the scheme may be consistent with itself, *Asia Minor, Syria, and Egypt*, must not be esteemed a part of the body of the Macedonian beast, because they previously belonged to the Medo-Persian beast. Or, to state the same argument in a somewhat different form: if the body of the Medo-Persian beast is to be confined within the strict limits of *Media and Persia properly so called*, as Sir Isaac supposes; then, in a similar manner, the body of the Macedonian beast must be confined within the limits of *Macedon and Greece*; and the body of the Roman beast, within those of *Italy*: in which case it will be a vain labour to look either for the four heads\* of the third beast, or for the ten horns of the fourth beast. The truth is, no less than two out of the four heads of the third beast, namely, the Syrian kingdom of *Seleucus* and the Egyptian kingdom of *Ptolemy*, sprung up within the limits of the Persian empire, after it had been subdued by Alexander: consequently, if a part of the Persian empire is to be included in the body of the third beast, forming his two most powerful heads; there cannot be assigned any reason, why a part of the third beast, namely *Greece and the eastern provinces*, which afterwards constituted the Romano-Constantinopolitan empire, should not be included in the body of the fourth beast. Hence I am reluctantly constrained to assert, that the scheme of separating the eastern empire from the body of the fourth beast, laid down by Sir Isaac Newton and adopted by Bp. Newton, must necessarily be erroneous: because, if allowed to be just, it will force us, in order to preserve the consistency of prophecy, to separate from the body of the Macedonian beast his two eastern heads of *Syria and Egypt*; inasmuch as both those countries were provinces of the Medo-Persian empire, before they became heads of the Macedonian empire.

In preference then to Sir Isaac's scheme, I am rather

\* It is almost superfluous to remind the reader, that the four heads of the third beast in the vision of the four great beasts are the same as the four horns of the he-goat in the vision of the ram and the he-goat.

inclined to think, that *the four beasts* are *the four great empires*, considered as respectively extending to their several utmost limits: so that *the Medo-Persian empire* comprehends not only *Media and Persia*, but likewise *Chaldea, Assyria, Asia Minor, Syria, and Egypt*: *the Macedonian empire*, not only *Greece*, but likewise *the former empire of Persia*: and *the Roman empire*, by a parity of reasoning, not only *Italy and the West*, but likewise *Greece, Egypt, and Asia as far as the Euphrates*.\*

As for specifying *what powers* are now the *ten horns*, I cannot but consider it as absurd to attempt it. History has decidedly shewn, that *the kingdoms*, into which *the Roman empire* was divided, never continued long in the same state: nor is it at all necessary for the completion of the prophecy, that they should have done so. *Two of the horns of the Macedonian he-goat* were soon swallowed up by the most powerful of *the other two horns*: and *the great Latin city*, exclusive I apprehend of those protestant powers which have come out of it, will eventually be divided into no more than *three parts*.† Still however *the Roman beast* is symbolically represented as having *ten horns*,‡ because such was the *original number* into which his empire was divided; as *four* was the *original number* into which the empire of *the he-goat* was divided. “Though the kingdom of Alexander,” says Bp. Newton, “was divided into *four principal parts*, yet only *two of them* have a place allotted in Daniel’s last prophecy of *the things noted in the Scripture of truth, Egypt and Syria*. These *two* were by far the greatest and most considerable: and these *two* at one time were in a manner the only remaining kingdoms of *the four*: *the kingdom of Macedon* having been conquered by Lysimachus and annexed to *Thrace*; and Lysimachus again having been conquered by Seleucus,

\* This will shew us the reason why *the Roman beast* is represented as being compounded of a *lion, a bear, and a leopard*. (Re. xiii. 2) His empire comprehended the greatest part of the dominions of the *Babylonian lion, the Medo-Persian bear, and the Macedonian leopard*; in addition to which he had *ten horns* or kingdoms in his peculiar sovereignty in the West.

† See Rev. xvi. 19. Concerning this earthquake more will be said hereafter.

‡ See Rev. xvii. 16.

and the kingdoms of Macedon and Thrace annexed to Syria."\* Such being the fate of two out of the four horns of the he-goat, I know not why some expositors should apparently think themselves bound to labour to discover ten horns for the Roman beast at any other period except that when his empire was originally divided.† Machiavel, as we have seen merely as a political historian, and without the least intention of supporting a favourite system, informs us, that the empire was broken by the northern nations into precisely ten primary kingdoms. This circumstance alone therefore is sufficient for the completion of the prophecy, that the ten horns of the fourth beast are ten kings that shall arise out of his kingdom;‡ just as the division of Alexander's empire into four kingdoms was alone sufficient for the completion of the prophecy, that four kingdoms should stand up out of his nation.§ The special badge of the he-goat is his four horns, and the special badge of the Roman beast is his ten horns; although both these numbers afterwards varied. Hence we may just as reasonably expect, that the Macedonian beast should always have four horns during the whole period of his existence after their rise, because four horns are said to have sprung up out of him when his great horn was broken; as that the Roman beast should always have ten horns during the whole period of his existence after their rise, because when his empire was divided exactly ten kings were to arise out of it. The two symbols are, in fact, each formed from a view of the primary division of the Macedonian and Roman empires; nor was it designed, nor indeed was it possible, that they should be exhibited as perpetually varying with the ever varying revolutions of nations. On these grounds I think it of very little consequence to the completion of the prophecy to have discovered, that there were ten kingdoms in the year 1240 at the time of the diet of Ratisbon; ten likewise at the Refor-

\* Dissert. xvi.

† Sir Isaac Newton very justly remarks, that, "whatever was their number afterwards, they are still called the ten kings from their first number." Observ. on Daniel, C. vi p. 78.

‡ Dan. vii. 24.

§ Dan. viii. 22.



mation; and *ten* also in *the year 1706*.\* *The ten horns of the Roman beast* are certainly the ten *primary* kingdoms enumerated by Machiavel; and, since three of the *first horns* were to be plucked up before *the little horn*, we must seek for *those three horns* among the ten *primary* kingdoms: how the empire was *afterwards* divided is a matter of no great moment; its subsequent political revolutions affect not in the slightest degree the accuracy of the prophecy.



## CHAPTER V.

*Concerning the vision of the ram and the he-goat, and the little horn of the he-goat.*

NEBUCHADNEZZAR's dream of *the image*, and Daniel's vision of *the four beasts and the little horn of the fourth beast*, contain predictions relative to *the four great empires and the domineering tyranny of the Papacy*. These matters, so important to the Church, having been clearly set forth, the Holy Spirit, now purposing to describe the exploits of *another great enemy to Christianity*; recalls, in the vision of *the ram and the he-goat*, the attention of Daniel to *the second and third empires*, whose prophetic history had been already detailed, for the purpose of introducing *another little horn*, which was to come out of *one of the principal horns of the Macedonian beast*, as *the former little horn* sprung up among *the ten horns of the Roman beast*.

In Daniel's vision of *the ram and the he-goat*, *the ram* symbolizes *the same power as the bear* mentioned in the preceding vision; and *the he-goat*, *the same power as the leopard*. *The ram* therefore, standing before the river, is *the Medo-Persian empire*; and *his two horns* are *the two kingdoms of Media and Persia*: *the higher one*,

\* See Bp. Newton's Dissert. xiv.

which came up last, being *Persia*, the head of the empire; and *the lower one*, which came up first being *Media*, united with, though subjected to, *Persia*. *The ram* extended his conquests *westward, northward, and southward*: *westward*, as far as the extreme limits of Asia; *northward*, over Armenia and Cappadocia; and *southward*, over Egypt, and as far as the Persian gulph. *Eastward* he made comparatively but little progress, being stopped by the vast deserts of Tartary, and the mighty empire of Hindostan.

In the plenitude of his power however, and at the very time when no other beast could stand before him, he was attacked by an unexpected enemy, *the he-goat, or the Macedonian empire*. Moving with unexampled rapidity from the West, the founder of this mighty sovereignty soon completely overthrew *the ram*, and broke *his two horns*. After this daring exploit, *the he-goat* "waxed very great," extending his arms even into Hindostan, as well as subjugating Egypt and all the other dominions of *the ram*. But, notwithstanding this sudden and astonishing acquisition of power, *his great horn* was destined to be broken, even in the very height of his strength. Accordingly, the imperial dynasty of *the great horn* lasted no more than fifteen years after the death of Alexander; within which short space of time his successors, Philip Aridæus, Alexander Egeus, and Hercules, were all murdered. After them *the empire* was divided into *four kingdoms*, typified by *the four horns of the goat*, and *the four heads of the leopard* mentioned in the preceding vision. Cassander held *Macedon and Græce*; Lysimachus had *Thrace and Bithynia*; Ptolemy made himself master of *Egypt*; and Seleucus obtained *Syria and the East*. Thus exactly was fulfilled the prophecy, that *four kingdoms* should arise out of Alexander's empire, governed by princes of his own nation, though neither of his own family, nor with power equal to that which he had possessed.

Hitherto all commentators are agreed; but there has been the same discrepancy of opinion respecting *the little horn of the he-goat*, as *the little horn of the fourth beast* whose prophetic history we last considered. Bp. Newton

observes, that the generality of expositors, both ancient and modern, Jewish and Christian, have referred the exploits of *this second little horn* to *Antiochus Epiphanes* ;\* but this opinion has been so amply refuted, both by himself and Sir Isaac Newton, that it would be superfluous for me to do more than barely mention that it *has* existed. I am inclined to think however, that these two eminent writers have been more successful in combating the formerly received interpretation, than in establishing their own. They both contend, that *the little horn*, is *the Roman empire* ; and that it became *the little horn of the he-goat* by subduing *Macedon and Greece* : that this supposition is strengthened by the progress of the Roman conquest from *Macedon* ; which, like those of *the little horn*, extended towards *the south, the east, and the pleasant land* : and that, lastly, it is decidedly established by the circumstance of *the little horn* being represented as *standing up against the Prince of princes*, as *taking away the daily sacrifice*, and as *planting the abomination of desolation in the sanctuary*, which our Lord himself refers to *the conquest of Jerusalem by the Romans*.

I readily allow, that these points of resemblance are very striking ; nevertheless it will be found upon examination, that there are insuperable objections, principally of a chronological nature, to this exposition of the prophecy.

1. *The first objection*, that may be urged against it, is the improbability, that *the same power*, which in the former vision was represented under the symbol of *a great and terrible beast*, should now be described under that of *only a little horn*. In prophetic imagery there is to the full as exact a discrimination of ideas as in ordinary language ; otherwise, as I have already sufficiently proved, there *could* be no definiteness and precision in any of the symbolical predictions. Accordingly we shall find, that *an universal empire* is never symbolized by *a horn*,† but

\* See Bp. Newton's Dissert. xv. and Pol. Synop. in loc.

† It may perhaps be thought, that *the great horn of the he-goat* is an exception to this rule, inasmuch as it represents, not *a kingdom springing out of the Macedonian empire*, but *the imperial dynasty of Alexander*, which presided over the whole empire. This objection however will vanish, when we consider, that, if *a beast* be described with *only one horn*, *that horn* must necessarily be the

always by a *beast*; and, on the other hand, that a *kingdom*, springing out of such an empire, when it comes to be divided, is never symbolized by a *beast*, but always by a *horn*. On these grounds, I can scarcely think it possible, that *the Roman empire* should be represented, in one vision, as a *fourth distinct beast*; and, in another, as only a *little horn of the he-goat*, which typifies the same power as the *leopard*, or *third beast*, of the former vision. I know, that Sir Isaac and Bp. Newton argue, that, when *the Romans* conquered Macedon, they became in that capacity a *little horn of the third or Macedonian beast*; while, in the mean time, so long as we consider them confined to Italy and the West, they are to be accounted a *distinct fourth beast*. But, if this mode of interpretation be allowable, the confusion, which it *must* introduce, will be endless: for, upon the same principle, as soon as *the Greeks* have conquered a *single Persian province*, we must begin, in a similar manner, to reckon them a *horn of the second, or Persian beast*: whence it will necessarily follow, that the two *Greek kingdoms* of Syria and Egypt being originally provinces of *Persia*, must for that reason be accounted horns of the same *second beast*; not, as they are represented by the prophet, horns of the *third, or Macedonian beast*.

2. *Another objection* against it is, that it renders Daniel liable to the charge of unvarying repetition. In *the dream of Nebuchadnezzar*, the history of the *four empires* is simply detailed, without the introduction, if I may use the expression, of any episodic matter. In *the vision of the four beasts*, the history of the same *four empires* is repeated, for the purpose of introducing the exploits of the *little horn of the fourth beast*. In *the vision of the ram and the he-goat*, the history of the *second and third empires* is again repeated, for the similar purpose of noticing in its proper place the tyranny of the

ified with the *beast itself*; because, as the circumstance of there being *more than one* horn shews that the empire is in a divided state, so the circumstance of there being *no more than one* horn shews that the empire is in an undivided state. When a *beast* therefore has *more horns than one*, those *horns* typify *kingdoms*; but, when a *beast* has *no more than one* horn, it is evident, that that *horn* cannot signify a *kingdom* because the empire is yet undivided: it remains consequently, that the *single horn* must be identified with the *beast*, and signify the *dynasty by which he is governed*.

*third beast's little horn.* And, in the last of Daniel's visions, a detailed account is given of *the wars between the Greek kings of Syria and Egypt, and of the Roman conquest, in the East,* in order that we may be conducted in strict chronological succession to the super-eminent wickedness of *the king, who was to exalt himself above every god.* From this statement then it is evident, that, if *the little horn of the he-goat* or third beast be the *Roman empire,* the vision of *the ram and the he-goat* is a mere repetition of the greater part of the vision of *the four beasts;* the only additional circumstance that is mentioned being *the sacking of Jerusalem,* which itself is repeated in the subsequent vision, if we adopt the opinion, that *the abomination or transgression of desolation,* predicted by Daniel in each of these visions, signifies in both cases the *Roman profanation of the Jewish temple.*

3. *The last and most serious objection* however against the interpretation of Sir Isaac Newton and the Bishop is, that *it cannot be reconciled with Daniel's chronological numbers.* The prophet, as I have just observed, mentions *the abomination or transgression of desolation* in *two successive visions;* that of *the ram and the he-goat,* and that of *the things "noted in the Scripture of truth:"\** and he afterwards speaks of it yet *a third time* in connection with certain chronological numbers.† Now our Lord declares, that *the abomination of desolation,* spoken of by Daniel, relates to *the sacking of Jerusalem:* and the authority of such an expositor of prophecy who shall presume to question? The state of the case then is, as follows: the phrase of *abomination or transgression of desolation* occurs *three times* in the book of Daniel: did our Lord mean to intimate, that, *wherever* it occurred in this book, it *always* related to *the sacking of Jerusalem;* or that it was only to be referred to that event in *one* or in *two* instances out of the *three?* This question must be resolved by a careful comparison of these several prophecies of Daniel with each other.

When Daniel speaks of *arms,* like those of a man, (an apt symbol of *a powerful and warlike state,*) *standing up*

\* Dan. viii. 13. and xi. 31.

† Dan. xii. 11, 12.

after the days of the northern king of Syria, polluting the sanctuary, taking away the daily sacrifice, and setting up the abomination that maketh desolate :\* there cannot be a doubt, but that by those nervous and mighty arms the Roman empire is symbolized ; both because the eastern conquests of that republic followed the preceding events in regular succession of time, and because the subsequent events foretold in the prophecy followed the eastern conquests of Rome with the same chronological regularity. Hence we may safely conclude, that the abomination of desolation, there mentioned, is the abomination of desolation which our Lord applied to the Romans.†

Hitherto the subject is sufficiently clear : but we must now endeavour to determine, whether the transgression of desolation, connected with the little horn of the third beast or the he-goat, be the same as the abomination of desolation, set up by the warlike arms of the Roman empire in the temple of Jerusalem.

When Daniel mentions the abomination of desolation the third and last time, he merely attaches to it certain numbers, evidently speaking of it as a thing which he had already noticed in a preceding part of his prophecies. Such being the case, this last mentioned abomination of desolation must be the same as either the abomination of desolation, connected with the little horn of the he-goat ; the abomination of desolation, set up by the arms of the Roman empire ; or, lastly, as both these abominations of desolation, considered as one and the same. Sir Isaac Newton and the Bishop do conceive them to be one and the same : for they maintain, that they both equally relate to the sacking of Jerusalem by the Romans, and their idolatrous worship of their standards within the very precincts of the temple.

If then they be the same, the last mentioned abomination of desolation must be the same likewise : in other words, all the three abominations of desolation, predicted by Daniel, must be equally referred to the sacking of Jerusalem by the Romans ; for we have already seen,

\* Dan. xi. 31.

† The same Roman abomination of desolation is described, along with the destruction of Jerusalem, in Daniel's prophecy of the 70 weeks. See Dan. ix. 24.—27

that *the last mentioned abomination* must be the same as either *the one*, or *the other*, or *both*, of *the two former abominations*. But, if *all the three abominations of desolation* are to be considered as relating to *one and the same event*, namely, *the sacking of Jerusalem by the Romans*; then the chronological numbers, attached to *the last mentioned abomination*, will be found perfectly to harmonize with *the era of the siege of Jerusalem*: for, if they do not harmonize with that era, *the abomination* connected with them cannot possibly relate to that era: and, if *the last mentioned abomination*, connected with those numbers, do not relate to that era, then neither can *one* out of *the two former abominations* relate to that era; inasmuch as *the last mentioned abomination* must be the same as either *the one*, or *the other*, or *both*, of *the two former abominations of desolation*.

These matters being premised, we will next consider how far *the numbers*, attached to *the last mentioned abomination of desolation*, will harmonize with *the era of the siege of Jerusalem*.

We are informed then by Daniel, that, at the end of *a time, and times, and half a time*, or 1260 years, *the restoration of the Jews* will commence; and that all the matters comprehended within *the period of the wonders* will be finished: that “from the time that *the daily sacrifice shall be taken away, and the abomination that maketh desolate set up*, there shall be 1290 years” to some event or another, which however he does not specify: and that “blessed is he, that waiteth, and cometh to the 1335 years” after the time when *the abomination of desolation* shall be set up.\*

Such are the numbers, which the prophet has connected with *the last mentioned abomination of desolation*; numbers, which by no efforts of calculation can be made to harmonize with *the era of the siege of Jerusalem*; The capital of Palestine was taken by the Romans, and *one of the abominations of desolation* spoken of by Daniel was set up by them in the holy place, *in the year of our Lord 70*.† The Jews however were certainly not beginning to be restored to their own country, neither were

\* Dan. xii. 7, 11, 12.

† Chronol. of Univ. Hist. p. 369.

all the matters which are comprehended within *the period of the wonders* finished, in *the year 1330*, or *1260 years* after the sacking of Jerusalem: nor is it easy to say what particular event, to which the prophet might possibly allude, happened *in the year 1360*, or *1290 years* after the same epoch: nor yet shall we be able, without the exertion of extraordinary ingenuity, to point out the peculiar blessedness of living *in the year 1405*, or *1335 years* after the Romans had set up *the abomination of desolation* in the temple and had taken away *the daily sacrifice*.\*

Thus it is abundantly manifest, that *the abomination of desolation last mentioned by Daniel*, cannot possibly be the same as *the abomination of desolation set up by the Romans*, and alluded to by our Lord: that is to say, it cannot be the same as *the abomination of desolation, set up by certain symbolical arms*, which were to invade the East, *after the days of Antiochus Epiphanes*.† But, if it be not the same as *the abomination of desolation set up by the symbolical arms of Rome*, it must be the same as *the abomination of desolation connected with the little horn of the he-goat*: for it is scarcely probable, that Daniel should speak of *some third abomination of desolation*, entirely distinct from the two former ones; and yet should give us no sort of intimation by whom *this supposed distinct third abomination* should be set up. If then *the last mentioned abomination of desolation* be the same as *the abomination of desolation connected with the little horn of the he-goat*, (and there is no other mentioned in the whole book of Daniel, excepting this, with which it can be identified) it will necessarily follow, that *the little*

\* The computation will answer no better even if it be made from *the year 136*, when Jerusalem was finally destroyed by Adrian. *This* event however certainly cannot be alluded to by our Lord; both because he declares that *the abomination of desolation* spoken of by Daniel should stand in the holy place before that generation had passed away, and because he warns his disciples to flee from Jerusalem when they beheld it compassed with armies. Jerusalem accordingly was sacked before that generation *did* pass away; and the Christians, profiting by the prediction of their master, saved their lives by flight. These circumstances decidedly prove, that our Lord's prophecy relates to the Days of Titus. See Matt. xxiv. 15—19, 34. and Luke xxi. 20—24, 32.

† Bp. Newton very justly applies the three verses immediately preceding the mention of *the symbolical Roman arms* to the history of *Antiochus Epiphanes*: consequently *the abomination, set up by these arms*, must of course be *posterior* to the days of that tyrant. (See Dissert. xvii.) “And after him (Antiochus) some shall stand up.” Dan. xi. 31.



*horn's abomination of desolation* must be something *entirely distinct* from the *abomination of desolation set up by the symbolical arms*: consequently, since the *abomination of the little horn* is not the same as the *abomination set up by the arms*, the *little horn itself* must be some power *totally different* from the *power symbolized by the arms*: but the *arms* are allowed by every commentator to symbolize the *Romans*, and no one ever yet doubted that the *abomination* which they set up is the *very abomination alluded to by our Lord*: therefore, finally, since the *little horn* is not the same as the *symbolical arms*, it certainly cannot be the same as the *Roman empire in the East*.

On these grounds, which to myself at least appear satisfactory, I am obliged to dissent *in toto* from the interpretation proposed by Sir Isaac and Bishop Newton. *The eastern conquests of the Romans* are very fully predicted in the *eleventh chapter of Daniel's prophecies* ;\* but they cannot, for the preceding chronological reasons, be at all alluded to in the *twelfth chapter* and in the *history of the little horn of the he-goat*.

Before I dismiss this part of my subject, I cannot refrain from observing, that the force of Daniel's chronological numbers, which I have so largely insisted upon, has in a manner compelled Bp. Newton, notwithstanding his previous interpretation of the vision of *the ram and the he-goat*, to notice, among various other conjectures, what I am persuaded is the true exposition of the *abomination of desolation connected with the little horn*, as contradistinguished from the *Roman abomination of desolation*. "*The setting up*," says he, "*of the abomination of desolation* appears to be a general phrase, and comprehensive of various events. It is applied by the writer of the *first book of Maccabees* to the *profanation of the temple by Antiochus*, and his *setting up the image of Jupiter Olympius upon the altar of God*.† It is applied by our Saviour‡ to the *destruction of the city and*

\* Ver. 30, 31.

† 1 Mac. i. 54.

‡ It is more than merely applied: our Lord expressly pronounces, that the *approaching profanation of the temple by the Romans* was the event intended by some one of the *abominations of desolation* mentioned by the prophet Daniel. *The abomination to which our Lord alluded, is, as we have seen, that predicted in Dan. xi. 31.*

*temple by the Romans, under the conduct of Titus, in the reign of Vespasian.\* It may for the same reason be applied to the Roman Emperor Adrian's building a temple to Jupiter Capitolinus, in the same place where the temple of God had stood; and to the misery of the Jews, and the desolation of Judæa, that followed. It may with equal justice be applied to the Mohammedans invading and desolating Christendom, and converting the churches into mosques: and this latter event seemeth to have been particularly intended in this passage.† If this interpretation be true, the religion of Mohammed will prevail in the East the space of 1260 years: and then a great and glorious revolution will follow; perhaps the restoration of the Jews, perhaps the destruction of Antichrist: but another still greater and more glorious will succeed; and what can this be so probably as the full conversion of the gentiles to the Church of Christ, and the beginning of the millennium or reign of the saints upon earth? For, blessed is he, that waiteth and cometh to the 1335 days."‡*

Mr. Kett, in his exposition of the vision of *the ram and the he-goat*, supposes *the little horn of the he-goat* or *Macedonian empire* primarily to mean *the Mohammedan Apostacy of the East*, and ultimately *the Gallic Infidelity of the West*. This opinion however he maintains, without wishing to invalidate the former applications of the prophecy both to *Antiochus Epiphanes*, and to *the Romans*. In short, unless I have entirely mistaken his meaning, *the little horn of the he-goat* was designed by the prophet to typify no less than *four distinct powers*; *Antiochus Epiphanes*, *the Roman empire in the East*, *the Mohammedan superstition*, and *the infidel republic of France*.§ Had Mr. Kett confined the application of this symbol to *the false religion of Mohammed*, I could have given my hearty assent to his scheme: but unfortunately he has marred his whole exposition, by involving the prophecy respecting *the little horn of the he-goat* or *third beast* in the same perplexing confusion of *primary* and *secondary* and *ultimate* accomplishments, as he had previously done

\* Matt. xxiv. 15.

+ Dan. xii. 11.

‡ Dissert. xvii

§ Hist. the Inter. Vol. 1. p. 346—359, 360.

that respecting *the little horn of the fourth beast*. So lax a mode of interpretation as this ought ever to be warmly protested against, because it utterly destroys all definiteness and precision in the sacred oracles. If *the same prophecy* may be construed to relate to *so many totally different periods and events*, we must bid an everlasting farewell to all certainty of exposition. So far as any knowledge is concerned that we can derive from a prophecy of such a nature, it must, so long as this world endures, remain to us a sealed book. Sir Isaac Newton and the bishop have amply refuted the opinion, that *the little horn of the he-goat is Antiochus Epiphanes*: and, how far *their* application of it to *the Roman empire* be tenable, the reader must judge for himself from what has been said upon that subject. As for Mr. Kett's conjecture, that it relates *ultimately to the infidel power of France*, it will be sufficient to observe respecting it, that *a horn*, which was to spring up *in the East*, can never be designed to typify *a power*, which has arisen *in the West*. In the right interpretation of prophecy it is not enough to discover mere *partial* resemblances, and thence to infer that *such a symbol* belongs to *such an event*: before we venture to decide, we ought to point out a *perfect* similitude between *the type* and *its antitype*, a similitude of such a nature as utterly to exclude *all events* which will not tally *in every respect* with the symbolical history under consideration. Thus, in the present instance, *Antiochus Epiphanes* has some features which very much resemble those of *the little horn*; but the period of his persecution cannot be accommodated either to *the 2300 days* mentioned in the vision of *the ram and the he-goat* or to *the three prophetic periods of 1260, 1290, and 1335, days*, specified towards the conclusion of Daniel's last vision, even if those days, contrary to the whole method of prophecy, be computed as *natural* ones: therefore *the little horn* cannot be *Antiochus Epiphanes*. So again: *the Romans* have many features in common with *the little horn*, insomuch that the grand characteristic of both is designated by the very same phrase of *setting up the abomination of desolation*; yet the era of the sacking of Jerusalem can in no wise be reconciled

with *the periods of 1260, 1290, and 1335, years* : therefore *the little horn* cannot be *the Roman empire* \* Lastly, *the impious wretches, who converted France into an atheistical democracy*, have doubtless, like *the little horn*, waxed great against the host of heaven, have magnified themselves even against the prince of the host, and have cast down the truth to the ground ; nevertheless, these hardened miscreants, *Voltaire and his associates*, did not arise in *the East*, but in *the West*, and the period of *the French Revolution* can as little be accommodated to *the prophetic numbers* as either of the two foregoing periods : therefore *French Infidelity* cannot be *the little horn*.

I shall now endeavour to ascertain, what *that power* is, which *alone* is designated by *this symbol*.

Daniel informs us, in his account of the vision of *the ram and the he-goat*, that he heard a certain saint inquiring, " For how long a time shall the vision last, the daily sacrifice be taken away, and the transgression of desolation continue, to give both the sanctuary and the host to be trodden under foot ? " The answer made to this question was, " Unto two thousand and three hundred days ; " or, as the Seventy read, " two thousand four hundred days ; " or as certain copies mentioned by Jerome read, " two thousand two hundred days : then shall the sanctuary be cleansed." Bp. Newton doubts, whether *these prophetic days* are to be calculated from *the establishment of the Persian empire*, from *the invasion of Asia by Alexander*, or from *the beginning of the history of the little horn*. Whatever doubt there may be upon this point, and whatever difficulty there may be in ascertaining *which of the three readings is the true one*, I cannot but think it sufficiently evident, both that *the 1260 days* are a certain part of *the 2300 days*, and that *these two periods* exactly terminate together *in the self same year*. We are expressly told, that the vision of *the ram and the he-goat*, whenever it *begins*, reaches to *the time of the end* : †

\* I have already assigned other reasons, besides this *chronological* one, why it is scarcely probable, that *the he-goat's little horn* should have been assigned to symbolize *the Romans*.

† " Understand, O son of man, for the vision shall reach even unto the time of the end—it shall reach even to the appointed time of the end." Dan. viii. 17. 19.

and we are no less expressly informed, that *to the end of the period of the wonders*, there shall be *three times and a half* or 1260 days :\* hence it necessarily follows, that, since *the period of 2300 days, and the period of 1260 days*, both equally reach *to the time of the end, or to the end of the period of the wonders*, they both exactly terminate together. Thus it appears, that *the period of 1260 days* is in fact *the latter part of the greater period of 2300 days*. This opinion perfectly harmonizes with what we are repeatedly told, both by Daniel and St. John, respecting *the termination of the 2300 and the 1260 days*. We are informed, for instance, that the sanctuary, which had been polluted by *the abomination of desolation connected with the little horn of the he goat*, shall be cleansed *at the end of the 2300, the 2200, or the 2400 days*,† whichever of these three be the proper reading :‡ that *the saints* are to be delivered into the hand of *the little horn of the fourth beast*, which has been shewn to be *the Papacy*, until *a time, times, and the dividing of time*, or 1260 days ; consequently that they are to be freed from his tyranny *at the end* of that period :§ that *the Jews* shall begin to be restored *at the end* of the same *time, times, and a half*, or 1260 days :|| that *the king, who is to magnify himself above every god*, shall come to his end contemporaneously with the restoration of the Jews ; and consequently *at the end* of the same 1260 days :¶ that *the court of the temple, and the holy city*, shall be trodden under foot of the gentiles during *the same space of 42 prophetic months*, or 1260 days ; and consequently that they shall cease to be trodden under foot *at the end* of that period :\*\* that *the ten-horned beast* shall practise prosperously in his revived state, during *the same space of 42 months*, or 1260 days ; and con-

\* “ Until how long shall be the end of the wonders ?—It shall be until a time and times and a half ; and, when he shall have finished to scatter the power of the holy people, all these things shall be finished. And I heard, but I understood not : then said I, O my Lord, what is the end of these things ? And he said, Go thy way, Daniel, for the words are closed up and sealed till the time of the end.” Daniel xii. 6—9.

† I shall hereafter shew, that *the sanctuary*, which was to be cleansed at the end of this prophetic period, was *the spiritual sanctuary of the Christian Church*, not *the literal sanctuary of the Jewish temple*. (See Rev. xi. 1, 2.) This *spiritual sanctuary* will be cleansed by the overthrow of *the two little horns of the third and fourth beasts*.

‡ Dan. viii. 14. § Dan. vii. 25. || Dan. xii. 7. ¶ Dan. xi. 45. xii. 4. \*\* Rev. xi. 2.

sequently shall cease to practise prosperously *at the end* of that period :\* that *the witnesses* shall prophesy in sackcloth during *the same 1260 days* ; and consequently shall cease to prophesy in sackcloth *at the end* of that period :† and lastly, that *the symbolical woman, or the spiritual church*, shall be driven into the wilderness during *the same space of 1260 days, or three prophetic years and a half* ; and consequently that she shall be delivered from her thralldom *at the end* of that period.‡

We are likewise taught, that *the end* of these two conterminating periods of 2300 and 1260 *days* will be marked by a wonderful display of the power of God. *At the end* of the 2300 *days, the little horn of the he-goat* will be broken without hand :§ *at the end* of the 1260 *days, the judgment will sit, and the dominion of the papal horn or the little horn of the fourth beast, will be utterly destroyed by the Son of man* :|| *at the end* of the same 1260 *days, the king, who magnified himself above every god, will undertake the expedition which will terminate in his destruction* ; and at that very time *the restoration of the Jews* will commence :¶ *at the end* of the same 1260 *days, the ten-horned beast, which was to practise prosperously in his revived state 42 prophetic months, and along with him his false prophet, will be ultimately, that is, at the end* of those 42 months, defeated in a great battle with the personal Word of God ;\*\* and lastly, *the man of sin will finally, and therefore at the end* of the same 1260 *days, be consumed with the spirit of the mouth of the Lord, and destroyed with the brightness of his coming*.††

From an attentive consideration of all these different

\* Rev. xiii. 5.

+ Rev. xi. 3.

‡ Rev. xii. 6, 14. Throughout the whole of this statement, the reader will of course understand me to mean, not that *the sanctuary* will be perfectly cleansed, or that *the beast and the king and the horns* will be perfectly overthrown ; but only that those great events will then *begin* to take place, that God's controversy with the nations will then *commence*. Matters of such moment may *begin*, but cannot be *accomplished*, in a single day. Accordingly we have reason to believe from Daniel, that the whole length of *God's controversy* will be no less than 30 years.

§ Dan. viii. 14, 25.

|| Dan. vii. 25, 26.

¶ Dan. xi. 40. xii. 1, 7.

\*\* Rev. xix. 19, 20.

†† 2 Thess. ii. 8. The reader will here again understand me to mean, that these events will *begin* to take place at the end of the two conterminating periods

passages, and from the plain declaration of the angel both in the vision of *the ram and the he-goat*, and in *the last chapter of Daniel's prophecies*, it must, I think, undeniably follow, that *the 2300 days*, and *the 1260 days*, terminate together: that, in the course of the memorable period which commences at the termination of these days, *the papal horn, the little horn of the he-goat, the ten horned beast or revived Roman empire, the king who magnified himself above every god, and the man of sin*, (whatever powers they may severally prefigure) will all be overthrown, in *some manner or another, natural, or supernatural*, by the victorious Word of God: and that in the course of the same memorable period, *the abomination of desolation connected with the he-goat's little horn*, will be removed; *the sanctuary of the spiritual temple* be cleansed; and *the Jews* be restored to their own land.

It has been shewn, that the period, whence *the 1260 days* ought apparently at least to be computed, is *the year 606*; because in that year *the saints* were given into the hand of *the papal little horn*. Having therefore ascertained this period, as far as matters of this nature can be ascertained, we shall now be able both to point out *the power* symbolized by *the little horn of the he-goat*, and to determine whether *2200, 2300, or 2400 days*, be the proper reading of *that greater number*, of which *the 1260 days* constitute *the last part*.

Since the angel informs Daniel, that *all the wonders* shall be finished *at the end of 1260 days*; and afterwards computes *two other periods*, namely *1290 and 1335 days*, (the one period reaching *30 days*, and the other *75 days*, beyond *the 1260 days*;) from the setting up of *the abomination of desolation*: it is manifest, that *this abomination* which I have shewn to be *the abomination connected with the he-goat's little horn*, was set up at the beginning of *the 1260 days*; for, since *all the wonders* were to be finished *at the end of the 1260 days*, *the pollution of the sanctuary by the abomination connected with the he-goat's little horn* was likewise to be finished at that period, and therefore *its cleansing* was to begin at that same period; and, since Daniel dates *1290 and 1335 days* from *the abomination of desolation*, (the first of these numbers

reaching 30, and the second 75 days, beyond the 1260 days, when all the wonders were to be finished, and therefore among the other wonders the pollution of the sanctuary,) it is plain, that, between the setting up of the abomination and the incipient cleansing of the sanctuary, there were to be precisely 1260 days; in other words, the date of the setting up of the abomination, and the date of the 1260 days, is the same.

This being the case, it seems almost necessarily to follow, that the tyranny of the little horn of the Roman beast will continue the very same length of time as the tyranny of the desolating transgression connected with the little horn of the Macedonian beast; for we are specially informed, that the saints should be delivered into the hand of the papal little horn during the space of three times and a half, or 1260 prophetic days: and, since the tyranny of each is apparently to finish at the end of the same 1260 days, the tyranny of each must in that case begin at the commencement of the same 1260 days. Hence, in the very year that the already existing papal little horn was to commence its tyrannical career of 1260 days, the desolating transgression connected with the little horn of the he-goat, which was shortly to give both the sanctuary and the host to be trodden under foot, was first to be set up. Bp. Newton accordingly very justly observes from these premises, which certainly seem to be undeniable, that, whatever power be meant by the last mentioned abomination of desolation, that power will prevail for the space of 1260 years; let it be Mohammedism, or let it be any other power.\*

The 1260 days then of the desolating transgression connected with the he-goat's little horn are precisely the same period as the 1260 days during which the saints were to be given into the hand of the fourth beast's little horn: consequently they are the same period also as the 42 months, during which the ten-horned beast was to flourish in his revived state. Thus it appears, that the beast

\* The abomination of desolation "may with equal justice be applied to the Mohammedans invading and desolating Christendom, and converting the churches into mosques: and this latter event seemeth to have been particularly intended in this passage. (Dan. xii. 11.) If this interpretation be true, the religion of Mohammed will prevail in the East the space of 1260 years." Dissert. XVII.



was to revive at the very time when *the saints* were given into the hand of his *little horn*. Whence we must almost necessarily conclude, that the revival of *the beast* is so closely connected with the giving of *the saints* into the hand of *the little horn*, that in some sense or another he revived by committing the sin of thus giving *the saints* into the hand of his *little horn*. Here therefore it will be proper to consider the meaning of this *revival*.

“*A beast*,” as it is most truly remarked by Bp. Newton, and as I have very fully stated in a preceding chapter, “*A beast*, in the prophetic style, is a *tyrannical idolatrous empire*: the *kingdom of God and of Christ* is never represented under the image of a *beast*.” This being the case, an empire is said to *continue in existence as a beast*, so long as it is a *tyrannically idolatrous empire*: when it puts away *its idolatry and tyranny*, and turns to the God of heaven, *the beast*, or those qualities whereby the empire *was a beast*, *ceases to exist*, though the empire itself may still remain as a body politic of faithful worshippers: and when it *resumes its tyranny and idolatry*, though they may not perhaps bear precisely the same names as *its old tyranny and idolatry*, it then *revives*, it then once more *recommences its existence in its original character of a beast*. To this description the character of *the ten-horned or Roman beast* exactly answers. That empire *was originally a beast by its profession of paganism*: it *ceased to be a beast by its embracing Christianity* under Constantine: and it *once more became a beast by its setting up a catholic spiritual tyrant*, and by *its persecuting, at his instigation, all who refused to own his supremacy, and to embrace his new idolatry*. On these grounds, St. John informs us, that *the ten-horned or Roman beast* “*was, and is not, and yet is.*” *It was*, while in its original pagan state: *it is not*, while in its Christian state under Constantine: *it is*, while supporting papal tyranny and idolatry. In *this last of its three states*, St. John beheld it rise from *the sea* of Gothic invasion: and in *this last state* it is to practise prosperously, as he carefully informs us, *42 months, or 1260 days*. The same duration is assigned to the tyrannical reign of *its own little horn, or the Papacy*; and for this plain reason: the em-

pire revived, or once more became *a beast*, by giving up *the saints* into the hand of *its little horn*: and this it assuredly did, not by increasing the territorial possessions of *the horn* (for partial temporal dominion does not confer the power of general persecution,) but by conferring upon him spiritual supremacy. Precisely at the time then when *the papal horn* was declared to be *universal bishop* and *supreme head of the Church*, the *saints* were given up into his hand. He then first acquired the power of general persecution. Though he might not immediately begin to exercise that power by wearing out *the saints of the Most High*, it was then undoubtedly first conferred upon him.

The true key then to fixing the date of *the 1260 years* is that furnished us by the prophet himself. We have neither to concern ourselves with *the rise of the papal horn* abstractedly, nor yet with *its attaining to the summit of its temporal power*: we have simply to inquire when *the saints* were first given up into his hand, and when *the old pagan beast* revived by setting up *a catholic spiritual idolatrous tyrant* in the Church.

In the West, *the year 604* beheld the death of Gregory the Great, Bishop of Rome. The pontificate of this good man, for I cannot but consider him as a good man, tinctured as his piety was with the growing superstition of the age,\* was remarkable for his protestation against *universal episcopacy* by whomsoever assumed, and for his censure of *the idolatrous veneration of images* then creeping fast into the Church. Great as the power of the Roman archiepiscopal see then was, the sentiments of Gregory on the important question of *catholic supremacy* are worthy of our particular attention, inasmuch as they differ so very essentially from those of his successors.

\* See the testimony born to his virtues even by Mr. Gibbon, though he feebly attempts to ridicule his piety on account of the superstition with which it was undoubtedly alloyed. (Hist. of Decline and Fall, Vol. VIII. p. 168, 169.) It may not be improper here to observe, that *much real piety* may subsist, both along with *the will-worship of superstition*, provided it grow not to such a height as utterly to choke the good seed of the word; and along with *the eccentric reveries of enthusiasm*, provided they do not exchange their harmlessly ridiculous cast of countenance for the Satyr's mask of avowed licentiousness and open profaneness. But the co-existence of *religion* and *infidelity* is impossible; *a religious infidel* is a contradiction in terms.

“ I speak it confidently,” says he, “ that, whosoever call-  
 eth himself *universal bishop*, or desireth to be so called,  
 in the pride of his heart he doth forerun *Antichrist*.”\*  
 Accordingly, when the Bishop of Constantinople accept-  
 ed this presumptuous title, which in *his* case was a mere  
 title, never acted upon, the observation made by Gregory  
 respecting it was, “ By this pride of his what thing else  
 is signified, but that the time of *Antichrist* is now at  
 hand ?”† Respecting *the introduction of images into*  
*churches*, which proved at length the fruitful source of  
 popish demonolatriy, Gregory’s conduct shews indeed,  
 that his judgment in that particular was erroneous ; but  
 effectually demonstrates nevertheless, that he expressly  
 reprobated *the idolatrous veneration of saints and angels*.  
 Serenus of Marseilles, finding that some of the people  
 had begun to adore the images which were originally  
 placed in the churches merely as memorials, very wisely  
 broke them in pieces: but this laudable action of his  
 gave so much offence to the superstitious part of his con-  
 gregation, that many of them withdrew from his com-  
 munion. Gregory, hearing of the unhappy dissension,  
 wrote to Serenus, advising him to conciliate the affections  
 of the people by permitting them to retain their images,  
 which might (he observed) be considered as a sort of in-  
 structive books for the illiterate ; but, at the same time,  
 along with this permission to caution them most serious-  
 ly against paying the least adoration to them. Events  
 have shewn, that the Bishop of Marseilles judged more  
 wisely than Gregory : but it is evident, that *image-wor-*  
*ship* had not in his time been formally established by the  
 authority of the Roman pontiff.

Gregory was succeeded by Sabinianus, whose short

\* Ergo fidenter dico, quod quisquis se *universalem sacerdotem* vocat, vel vocari desiderat, in elatione sua Antichristum præ currit. (Lib. vi. Epist. 30. cited by Bp. Newton.) The accuracy of this declaration of Gregory is not unworthy of our notice. He does not say, that the person, who assumes the title of *Universal Bishop*, is *Antichrist himself* : but only that he is *the precursor of Antichrist*. Gregory then conjectured, and he conjectured rightly, that the assumption of *universal episcopacy* was the leading badge of *the commencement of the little horn’s tyranny* ; but, not attending to the prediction that this tyranny should continue 1260 years, he fancied that the reign of *Antichrist* was close at hand. Hence he both wrote, preached, and (we may add) lived, under the firm persuasion that the end of the world was fast approaching.

† Ex hac ejus superbia quid aliud, nisi propinqua jam esse Antichristi tempora, designatur ? Lib. iv. Epist. 34. cited by Bp. Newton.

pontificate was remarkable only for rapine and extortion, for a systematic grinding of the faces of the poor, and for mean abuse of the memory of his liberal predecessor. But, though the *individual* Sabinianus was a wicked man, *the saints* were not as yet formally delivered into the hand of *the little horn*, nor was idolatry as yet openly established in the Church: consequently *the 1260 days* had not then commenced, nor had *the Roman beast* revived by publicly relapsing into the abominations of paganism.

Upon the death of Sabinianus, Boniface the third ascended the papal throne, in the beginning of *the year 606*: and one of his first acts, an act which took place in *this very year 606*, was to procure from the tyrannical usurper Phocas a grant of the title of *Universal Bishop and Supreme Head of the Church*; the identical title, which Gregory only a few years before, and that in the lifetime of Boniface himself, had stigmatized as a badge of *the precursor of Antichrist*.\*

\* Bp. Newton's Dissert.—Milner's Eccles. Hist.—Bowyer's Lives of the Popes.—The account, which Cardinal Baronius gives of this grant, is interesting, because it tallies so exactly with the prophecy. In the spirit of a true Papist he maintains, that *de jure* the Pope was always *the universal bishop*, and that Phocas did not so much *confer* upon him what he did not possess already, as *sanction* by his imperial authority the undoubted right of the Pope, thus constituting him *universal bishop de facto* as well as *de jure*. Now what is this, but, in the language of the prophet, *giving the saints into his hand*; that is to say, decreeing him by imperial authority to be a spiritual sovereign over all *Christians*, or (as they are constantly termed in the New Testament) *saints*? “Anno Christi 606 to, indictione nona, decimo quinto calendas Martias, ex diacono Pontifex Romanus creatus est Bonifacius ejus nominis tertius—Quo tempore intercesserunt quædam odiorum fomenta inter eundem Phocam imperatorem atque Cyriacum patriarcham Constantinopolitanum—Hinc igitur in Cyriacum Phocas exacerbatus in ejus odium imperiali edicto sancivit, nomen *Universalis* decere Romanam tantummodo ecclesiam, tanquam quæ caput esset omnium ecclesiarum; solique convenire Romano Pontifici, non autem episcopo Constantinopolitano qua sibi illud usurpare præsumeret. Quod quidem hunc Bonifacium Papam tertium ab imperatore Phoca obtinuisse, cum Anastasius bibliothecarius, tum Paulus Diaconus (De gest. Longobard. L. 4.) tradunt—Sed, quod ad Phocæ edictum attinet, haud eo quidem ipse (quod garriunt novatores) hoc tribuit privilegium ecclesiæ Romanæ, ut in catholica primatum ageret; hunc enim jam ipsam babuisse, semperque exercuisse, ab ipso sui principio, non solum super omnes alios patriarchas orientales, sed et multo magis super omnium novissimum Constantinopolitanum, quam plurimus est superius locis latissimè demonstratum: nec in eo fuit aliquando cum episcopis Constantinopolitanis controversia, quippe qui nunquam eundem primatum in dubium revocârunt: sed in eo tantum, quod ipsi nuper titulum sibi *Œcumenici* usurpâssent (quod Romanis Pontificibus cum ab aliis, tum ab ipsis Œcumenicis synodis, jure tributum vidimus), et reclamantibus licet iisdem Romanis Pontificibus, conservâssent hactenus favore Mauritiî imperatoris. Hanc igitur causam sententia sua Phocas decidens, eam adjudicavit Romano Pontifici, ut ipse solus, non etiam Constantinopolitanus, diceretur *Œcumenicus*.” Baron. Annal. Eccles. A. D. 606.

From *this year* then it seems most natural to date the 1260 days: for, when the Roman Bishop was appointed Supreme Head of the Church, and when all the churches

Some, I believe, have doubted whether such a grant was ever made by Phocas; but, as it appears to me, without much reason. We know how severely the title of *Universal Bishop* was reprobated by Pope Gregory at the end of the sixth, and at the beginning of the seventh, century: we know likewise, that the title was borne not long afterwards by the Roman Pontiff, and that it was formally confirmed to him by the second council of Nice in the year 787. Hence we are certain, that it cannot have been assumed very late in the seventh century. Now Baronius tells us, that it was assumed in the year 606, giving for his authorities Anastasius and Paulus Diaconus; the former of whom flourished in the ninth, and the latter in the eighth, century; and I can see no reason why we should refuse to credit an assertion, which places the assumption of the title *about* the very time when we must *unavoidably* suppose it to have been assumed. In short, if the account be nothing more than a forgery, it is both one of the most unnecessary and one of the most ill-contrived forgeries that ever was executed; unnecessary, because the Pope had been solemnly declared *Universal Bishop* by the second council of Nice in the year 787; ill-contrived, because the wily defenders of the Papacy must have departed very far from their wonted subtlety to deduce *falsely* the grant in question from such an infamous monster as Phocas. Had it never been made by *any* emperor, and had they been disposed to *forge* it for the purpose of aggrandizing the Papacy, they would surely have pitched upon a more reputable patron than Phocas; and would have ascribed it (as they did to Constantine, the original grant of St. Peter's patrimony) not to a murderous usurper, but to some emperor, whose character stood high in the christian world. On these grounds, I give credit to the assertions of Paulus Diaconus and Anastasius, neither of whom lived very long after the time when the grant is said to have been made; and probably on the same grounds, "the most learned writers, and those who are most remarkable for their knowledge of antiquity," as it is observed by Mosheim, "are generally agreed," that the title of *Universal Bishop* was formally conferred by Phocas upon Boniface. Eccles. Hist. Vol. II. p. 169.

The general agreement of various writers on this point, and the grounds which the Romanists take, are well stated by Dr. Brett from Bp. Carlton's book of jurisdiction, regal, episcopal, and papal, cap. vi p. 82, 83. "Phocas," says he, "fixed Boniface, the third Pope of that name, in that universal pastorage, which the Roman see claims and exercises over the other sees of Christendom at this day; and this, as Baronius and Estius, so these following Historians assert.—I will begin with Paulus Diaconus, who saith, *Phocas statuit sedem ecclesie Romanæ ut caput et omnium ecclesiarum*. Abbas Usburgensis says the same; to wit, that *Phocas ordained, that the see of the Roman apostolical church should be the head of all churches*. Platina says, that Boniface III. agrees with them herein, though he declares it in different words; *Bonifacius obtinuit a Phoca, ut sedes beati apostoli, quæ est caput omnium ecclesiarum, ita diceretur et haberetur ab omnibus*. Blondus saith, *Phocas antistitem Romanum principem episcoporum omnium constituit*. And Naclerus saith, *Phocas ad universum orbem, dimissa sanctione, constituit, ut Romanæ ecclesie, Romanoque Pontifici, omnes vber ecclesie obedirent*. And now our Romanists believe, as others have declared before them, that the Roman chair had this primacy by divine right, antecedent to Phocas's decree, by which he only engaged to make it law in the empire." (Independent power of the Church not Romish, p 262, 269, 270.) This opinion, which (as I have already observed) exactly accords with the prediction, that the Roman beast should deliver the saints or Christians into the hand of his little horn, is thus stated by Estius the schoolman. *Nec aliud a Phoca imperatore impetravit Bonifacius tertius, quam ut cathedre Romanæ preematum, qui ei jure divino competeat, imperiali potestate tueretur contra præsumptionem Episcopi Constantinopolitani, qui se pulchrum in suis literis Universalis*

were declared to be subject to him in spirituals, *the saints* were undoubtedly delivered into his hand. Hitherto they had not been necessarily or universally subject to him; henceforth his merciless tyranny armed the secular power against them, and pursued them with implacable animosity to the very ends of the earth. I mean not indeed to say, that he *immediately* began to exercise this unchristian authority; but now it certainly was, that *the saints* were delivered into his hand, and placed under his control.

In order, as it were, more decidedly to shew that at this eventful era *the 1260 days* commenced, and *the Roman beast* revived, scarcely had a year elapsed from the establishment of this sacerdotal empire, when the very idolatry, which had so lately been opposed by the zeal of Serenus and censured by the piety of Gregory, was publicly authorized by the sovereign pontiff. The ancient Pantheon, formerly the general sink of all the abominations of paganism, was now restored, though under a different name, to its original destination.\* The mediatory demons of corrupted Christianity occupied the vacant places of the mediatory demons of the gentiles; and, instead of Jupiter and his kindred deities, the virgin-mother of Christ and all his martyred saints received the blind adoration of *the revived ten-horned beast*.† The *holy city* was now trodden under foot by a new race of

Episcopum scribebat. (Comment. in senten. I. iv. § 9 Tom. iv. Pars Post. cited by Brett, p. 264.) Protestants have frequently urged to Papists the disgraceful manner in which this grant was made; but they never, on that account, ventured to exchange their patron Phocas for one that would have done them more credit. Thus, when Illyricus maintained against Bellarmine, that *Antichrist* was born, when Phocas, in *the year 606*, granted to the Roman Pontiff, that he should be called *the head of the whole church*; the Cardinal readily allowed the truth of the premises, but denied the validity of the conclusion. See Brightman cont Bellarm de Antichris. Cap. 3 Fol. 297.

\* “Annus Christo 607 cœptus est ab indictione 10 ma Quo Bonifacius—ex presbytero ordinatus est, ejus nominis quartus, Pontifex Romanus die 18 va Sept.—A Phoca Augusto impetravit Pantheon,---Jovi vindicæ consecratum, quod adhuc intactum remanserat a demolientibus demonum sedes Romanis Christianis; illudque expurgatum ab antiquæ sordibus idololatriæ, in honorem Dei-generatricis Mariæ et omnium sanctorum martyrum consecravit. Narrat hæc Anastasius. quorum etiam meminit B da” Baron Annal Eccles. A. D. 607.

† Dr Maclean, in the chronological table affixed to Mosheim's Ecclesiastical History, describes this event in the following words. “Here (in the Pantheon) Cybele was succeeded by the Virgin Mary, and the Pagan deities by Christian martyrs. Idolatry still subsisted; but the objects of it were changed.”

gentiles, differing from their pagan predecessors in name rather than in nature; and *the witnesses* began to prophesy in sackcloth during the long period of 1260 years, the same period in short as that during which *the saints* were given into the hand of *the little horn*.\*

Not but that *the Apostacy*, as I have already observed, had long since *individually* commenced. *The forbidding to marry, the abstaining from meats, the excessive veneration of supposed mediatory saints and angels*, began to creep into the Church even in *the fourth century*: but no date can be affixed to *individual* criminality.† In the strictly chronological prophecies of Daniel and St. John, periods of years are always computed from some specific and definite action either of a community or of the head of a community; not from the unauthorized deeds of individuals, the commission of *the first* of which deeds can only be known with absolute certainty by God himself. Hence we find, that in the *unchronological* prophecy of St. Paul‡ some of the leading features of *the Apostacy* are marked out in *general* terms, the prophecy itself affecting *every individual* to whom the description applies: while, in the *chronological* prophecies of Daniel and St. John relative to *the same Apostacy*, since the divine wisdom thought proper to specify a certain term of years for *the tyrannical reign of the man of sin*, it was necessary to date those years not from general acts of *individual* criminality, but from some overt and conspicuous act of *the head of a community, of the man of sin himself*. This act is determined to be *the delivering of the saints of God into the hand of the little horn, the commencement of the treading of the holy city or the Church under foot by the new gentile members of the revived beast, and the beginning of the faithful witnesses to prophesy in sackcloth*. Now it will be difficult to pitch upon any era for the date of this sufficiently conspicuous act except *the year 606*: for in this and in the following year, *the saints* were formally given into the hand of *the*

\* Rev. xi. 2, 3.

† During this period, *the Roman beast* may be considered as gradually rising out of *the sea*, and as coming to life again.

‡ 1 Tim. iv. 1, 2, 3, 7, 8.

*little horn*; and the *Apostacy of individuals* became the embodied and established *Apostacy of a spiritual catholic empire* over which the *man of sin* presided.

When a *spiritual universal tyrant* then was set up in the *Church*, and when *idolatry* was (immediately upon his being thus set up) openly authorized and established by him; the afflicted woman, the *true Church*, seems to have fled into the *wilderness* from the pollution of the *holy city* by the new gentilism of *Popery*, and the *witnesses* appear to have begun to prophesy in sackcloth. Not that an *incessant* persecution was to be carried on against them throughout the whole term of the 1260 *years*: but that they should continue so long to prophesy in sackcloth, or, in other words, to profess the fundamental truths of the Gospel in a depressed and afflicted state. Accordingly, as Bp. Newton well observes, and afterwards satisfactorily proves, “there have constantly been *such witnesses* from the seventh century” (the century in which the *Apostacy*, considered as the *open act of a community under its proper head*, commenced,) “down to the Reformation, during the most flourishing period of *Popery*.”

Thus it appears, that the tyrannical reign of the *fourth beast's little horn*, and consequently the *prophetic period of 1260 days*, are most probably to be dated from the year 606, and will therefore, upon such a supposition, terminate in the year 1866. Let us next turn towards the East, and see whether we cannot discover, in *this same year 606*, any marks of the rise of that *transgression of desolation*, which is so closely connected with the *little horn of the he-goat*, and which is to continue during the same period of 1260 *days*.

In the East, the year 606 beheld the crafty imposter *Mohammed* retire to the cave of *Hera* to consult the spirit of fraud and enthusiasm, and to fabricate that false religion, which soon after darkened the whole oriental world.\* Having fully digested his plan in the solitude

\* The coincidence of *The rise of Mohammedism, and the commencement of Popery, properly so called*, is thus stated by Mr. Whitaker. “Daniel states the *rise of Mohammed* as to take place when the transgressors are come to the full. St. Paul says, that, *the delusion of the man of sin* shall be sent as a punishment, because men believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness; where



of the desert, he began at first only privately to preach his heterogeneous system of theology about *the year* 608 or 609. Mecca was the theatre of his first labours; and his earliest converts were his wife, his servant, his pupil, and his friend. At length, by the persuasion of Abubeker, ten of the most respectable citizens of Mecca were introduced to the private lessons of the Islam; the prophet persevered ten years in the now more public exercise of his mission; and the religion, which has since overspread so large a portion of the globe, advanced with a slow and painful progress within the walls of his native town.\*

Here then we behold *the desolating abomination connected with the he-goat's little horn* springing up at the very time when we were taught by prophecy to expect that it would spring up, namely *at the beginning of the 1260 days*. Small as it was at first, it soon waxed exceeding great; and, in a very short space of time succeeded in completely polluting *the spiritual sanctuary* of the eastern church. The exact resemblance between *this desolating transgression* and *the religion of Mohammed*, in all other respects as well as in their chronological correspondence with each other, shall presently be shewn: I shall first however try to ascertain the period, from which *the 2200, 2300, or 2400, days*, mentioned in the prophecy of *the ram and the he-goat* are to be dated; and, if *that* can be in a measure ascertained, *the proper reading of the number* will be ascertained likewise.

Although it certainly is a matter of doubt from what precise era this period ought to be dated, and although (as Bp. Newton justly observes) the event alone can *positively* determine the point, it seems to me most naturally *the same period* (that in which the sins of the people call for judgment) is characterized by *the rise of these two powers*. Now St. John ascribes to each of them *the same duration*, and speaks of *the time of their end* as *the same*, and consequently in his account they must *begin at the same time*; in exact correspondence with each of the separate declarations of the two former writers. Such coincidences in prophecy, of which the holy penmen themselves do not seem aware, prove, like the same in history, that the writers drew originally from one source, with this only difference, that in the former case their information must have more than a human origin, even the operation of that self-same spirit, who divideth to every man severally as he will." General View of Proph. p. 95, 96, 97.

\* Prideaux's Life of Mohammed p. 16—49—Hist. of Decline and Fall. Vol. 9, p. 282—285.

ral to compute it from some time or another during *the settled existence* of the Persian empire. The prophet represents *the two-horned Medo-Persian ram*, not as *rising from the sea*, but as *standing by his river*: in other words, he does not speak of *the origin* of the united monarchy, which is a fixed determinate period; but of some period, which he does not specify, in the course of its *regular and settled government*.\* Now *the Medo-Persian ram rose out of the political sea of nations* in the year A. C. 536, when *the two kingdoms of Media and Persia, the two horns of the ram*, were united under the single government of Cyrus; whence that year is termed *the first year of Cyrus* † but he continued *standing upon the bank of his symbolical river*, till *the he-goat* “smote him, and brake his two horns, and cast him down to the ground, and stamped upon him.” This happened, in the year A. C. 330, when the unfortunate Darius, after the last decisive battle of Gaugamela, was basely murdered by Bessus, and the Persian empire thus completely extinguished. *The ram* therefore continued standing from the year A. C. 536 to the year A. C. 330: but he continued standing *undisturbed* only till the year A. C. 334, when *the Macedonian he-goat* began to smite him by invading his territories, and by gaining his first victory over him at the River Granicus. ‡ If then we ought to seek the date of the vision during *the standing of the ram*, or *the settled existence of the Persian empire*, it will be found somewhere between the

\* *The ram*, or, as he is termed in the former vision, *the bear*, is said, in the prophetic language, to *arise out of the sea*; to denote the rise of the Persian empire amidst wars and tumults: but, when Daniel beheld him in his present vision, he was *standing by the river*; to denote, that the Persian empire had already *arisen*, and was then *standing* in a tranquil, regular, and firmly established, state (See the preceding remarks upon the *two symbols of the sea, and a river*, in the 2d chapter of the present work.) To *rise out of the sea*, and to *stand upon the bank of a river*, certainly denote, according to the analogy and precision of symbolical language, *two very different states* of an empire, the one *posterior* to the other. *The river Ulai*, near the palace Shushan, is here used as a symbol of the *Persian monarchy*, in the same manner as *the apocalyptic Euphrates* represents the *Turkish empire*. Rev. ix. 14. and xvi. 12.

† Anno A. C. 536. Cyrus, Cambyse pater in Persia et Cyaxare Socero in Media vita functis, Orientis monarchia potitus est: a qua et αχχρ: illius annos septem, in 8<sup>o</sup> πικδισσε ipsius dinumerat Xenophon: et primum illius annum, ex ipsis Medorum et Persarum archivis, sacra deducit Scriptura. Usser. Annal. p. 146

‡ Usser. Annal. p. 285, 286, 312, 321, 323, 324.

year A. C. 536, when the ram began to stand, and the year A. C. 330, when he was completely overthrown.\*

Now, if I be right in dating the 1260 days from the year 606, the year in which the Mohammedan abomination of desolation commenced, the year in which the Roman beast revived, the year in which the saints were given into the hand of the papal little horn; the 1260 days will expire in the year 1866. These 1260 days, as we have already seen, synchronize with the last 1260 days of the 2200, 2300, or 2400, days, whichever of these numbers be the proper reading; because, as we are expressly informed by the two interpreting angels, the 2200, 2300, or 2400, days, and the 1260 days, both equally bring us down to the time of the end, and consequently terminate together. This being the case, we have only to compute backward 2200, 2300, and 2400, years from the year of our Lord 1866; and, according to the epochs to which they respectively lead us, we shall be able to decide with some degree of probability which of those three numbers is the true reading, and consequently from what era we are to date the vision of the ram and the he-goat.

If then we compute backward 2200 years from the year of our Lord 1866, we shall arrive at the year A. C. 334: if 2300 years from the same period, at the year A. C. 434: and if lastly 2400 years, at the year A. C. 534. All these three dates, namely the years A. C. 334, 434, and 534, fall within the period, during which the ram continued standing upon the bank of his river; for he stood there, as we have seen, from the first year of Cyrus, or the year A. C. 536, to the murder of Darius, in the year A. C. 330, when the Persian monarchy was dissolved: we must be guided therefore by circumstances in making our choice among them. The year A. C. 534, to which we are led by adopting the reading of the Sev-

\* The Persian monarchy is not reckoned to have ended till the death of Darius; so long therefore the ram may be considered as standing; for, although the he-goat began to "smite" him in the year A. C. 334, he had not finally "cast him down to the ground" till the year A. C. 330. Hence Abp Usher observes from Justin, that Darius was seized by Bessus in Thara or Dara, a town of the Parthians, as if it had happened by a kind of fatality, that the empire of the Persians should end in the hand of those, who were destined hereafter to be their successors.—Fato quodam factum hoc fuisse, ut in terra eorum, qui successuri imperio erant, Persarum regnum finiret. Usher. Annap. p. 321.

enty or 2400 days, is the third year of Cyrus; a year, in which nothing very remarkable happened, and from which therefore we can scarcely suppose the vision to be dated.\* The year A. C. 434, to which we are led by adopting *the reading of the Hebrew* or 2300 days, is equally devoid of any striking incident that peculiarly affected the empire of *the ram*; from this year therefore we can with as little reason suppose the vision to be dated as from the former year. But the year A. C. 334, to which we are led by adopting *the reading mentioned by Jerome* or 2200 days, is big with events most materially important to the Persian monarchy: for, in this very year, *the Macedonian he-goat* “came from the West on the face of the whole earth, and touched not the ground;” in this very year, he first “ran unto *the ram* in the fury of his power;” and smote him upon the banks of the river Granicus:† hence I cannot refrain from thinking it most probable, that the year A. C. 334, in which *the he-goat* began to attack *the ram* as he was standing in the hitherto undisputed possession of his authority, is the real date of the vision; and consequently that *the number 2200* is the true reading.‡

\* It was in this year that Daniel saw the vision with which his book concludes; but it seems harsh, merely on *that account*, to date from it the *present* vision, which he saw in the third year of Belshazzar, or in the year A. C. 538. Had he seen them *both* in the third year of Cyrus, I should have thought the year A. C. 534 a probable date.

† Alexander, says Dean Prideaux, “flew with victory swifter than others can travel, often with his horse pursuing his enemies upon the spur whole days and nights, and sometimes making long marches for several days one after the other, as once he did in pursuit of Darius of near forty miles a day for eleven days together. So that by the speed of his marches he came upon his enemy before they were aware of him, and conquered them before they could be in a posture to resist him. Which exactly agreeth with the description given of him in the prophecies of Daniel some ages before, he being in them set forth under the similitude of a *panther* or a *leopard with four wings*; for he was impetuous and fierce in his warlike expeditions, as a panther after its prey; and came on upon his enemies with that speed, as if he flew with a double pair of wings. And to this purpose he is in another place of those prophecies compared to a *he-goat* coming from the West with that swiftness upon the king of Media and Persia, that he seemed as if his feet did not touch the ground. And his actions, as well in this comparison as in the former, fully verified the prophecy.” (Cited by Bp. Newton) So astonishingly rapid indeed was the progress of Alexander, that, between the years A. C. 334 and 330, he began and completed the conquest of the whole Persian empire.

‡ It is rather a curious circumstance, that *this very year*, to which I have been led by *calculation*, is one of the three years, which Bp. Newton *conjectured* to afford *probable* dates for the commencement of the period of 2300, 2200, or 2400, years. See Dissert. xv.

The sum of what has been said respecting the date of *the 1260 years* amounts then to this. Since *the desolating transgression of Mohammedism* is to flourish 1260 years, since *the scint* is to be delivered into the hand of *the papal little horn* for the space of 1260 years, since *the Roman beast* is to practise prosperously in his revived state during the same space of 42 *prophetic months*, and since *the two horns* and *the beast* are all to perish together at *the time of the end*, which commences at the termination of *the 1260 years*; it seems necessarily to follow that the date of those years can only be an era marked by the following triple coincidence:—*the rise of the desolating transgression of Mohammedism*:—*the commencement of the papal little horn's spiritual universal empire*;—and *the revival of the Roman beast by conferring upon his little horn that spiritual universal empire, or, in the language of prophecy, by giving the saints into his hand*. If therefore we pitch upon any era not marked by this triple coincidence, we shall have reason to suspect that it cannot be the true date of *the 1260 years*; because, since *the 1260 years of Mohammedism*, *the 1260 years of the papal horn*, and *the 1260 years of the revived Roman beast*, all apparently terminate together at *the time of the end*, they must in that case all necessarily begin together.

This however is not *the only test* which the prophet has given us to ascertain the true date of *the 1260 years*. He has *checked* (if I may use the expression) this period by another larger period, which comprehends it, and which terminates along with it. This larger period is stated by three different readings to be 2200, 2300, or 2400 years.

Thus it appears, that, after we have discovered an era for the date of *the 1260 years* marked by the triple coincidence of *the rise of Mohammedism*, *the giving up of the saints into the hand of the papal little horn*, and *the revival of the Roman beast by thus giving up the saints*: we must next examine, whether a computation deduced from this era will make *the larger period of 2200, 2300, or 2400 years*, and *the smaller period of 1260 years*, rightly correspond together. This must be done by first

computing forwards 1260 *years* from the date which we have pitched upon, and afterwards by computing backwards 2200, 2300, and 2400, *years* from the era to which the first computation brought us down: for, since this era is equally the supposed termination of both the periods, it is evident, that, if we compute backwards from it the number of years which compose the larger period, we shall arrive at the beginning of that period. Three different numbers of years however are assigned by three different readings to the larger period. If then the second computation backwards from the era, to which the first computation forwards brought us down, bring us, through the medium of any one of the three numbers mentioned by the three different readings, to an era from which the vision of *the ram and the he-goat* may be reasonably dated; we shall have attained to a very high degree of probability, both that that reading is the true one, and that we have pitched upon the right date of *the 1260 years*, because the two periods, larger and smaller, are found upon trial exactly to *check* each other. But if, on the contrary, the second computation backwards from the era, to which the first computation forwards brought us down, does *not* bring us, through the medium of any one of the three numbers mentioned by the three different readings, to an era from which the vision of *the ram and the he-goat* may be reasonably dated; we may then be morally certain, that we have *not* pitched upon the right date of *the 1260 years*, because the two periods, larger and smaller, are *not* found upon trial to *check* each other.

Now I am strongly inclined to believe, that *the year of our Lord 606* is the only era which answers to both these tests. It was in this year that *the Mohammedan abomination of desolation* was set up; and it was in this year that *the Roman beast* revived by giving *the saints* into the hand of *the little papal horn*. Moreover, if we first compute forwards from this era 1260 *years*, we shall arrive at *the year 1866*, the supposed termination both of the larger and the smaller period; and, if we next compute backwards 2200 *years* from *the year 1866* in order to arrive at the commencement of the larger period, the computation will bring us to the year A. C. 33½,

which is one of the most probable dates that could have been assigned even *a priori* to the larger period, for it was in this very year that *the he-goat* began to smite *the ram* as he was standing upon the bank of *his river*.

The propriety of fixing upon *the year* 606 as the date of *the 1260 years* will be yet further manifest, if it be shewn that, to all appearance at least, no other era whatsoever can answer to the tests furnished by the prophet. Mr. Mede supposes, that *the 1260 years* ought to be dated from *the year* 455 or 456, when the power of Rome was completely broken by the Vandals though the name of *Emperor* was yet continued.\* Independent however of this opinion's having been confuted by the event,† the erroneousness of it might easily have been detected even when it was first advanced. *The year* 456 was neither marked by the rise of *any power* which answers to the description of *the desolating transgression connected with the he-goat's little horn*, nor by any formal giving up of *the saints* into the hand of *the papal horn*: nor yet, when it is checked by the larger period according to any one of its three readings; will it bring us to an era from which the vision of *the ram and the he-goat* can be reasonably dated. Bp. Newton seems to hesitate between *the year* 727, when *the Pope and the Romans* finally broke their connection with *the Eastern Emperor*; *the year* 755, when *the Pope* obtained *the Exarchate of Ravenna*; *the year* 774, when he acquired, by the assistance of Charlemagne, the greatest part of *the kingdom of Lombardy*; and *the year* 787, when the worship of images was fully established, and the supremacy of *the Pope* acknowledged by the second council of Nice: of these different dates however he is inclined to prefer the first.‡ Now, upon examination, not one

\* At least he seems to hesitate between *this year*, and *the year* 365 and 410. He was induced to look to so early a period from an idea that, as soon as he that *letted* was taken out of the way, *the man of sin* should immediately be revealed. St. Paul however does not specify any precise time. He only intimates, in general terms, that *that Wicked One* should not make his appearance till after the removal of *him that letted*. See Apostacy of latter times Part I. Chap. 13, 14.

† If *the 1260 years* be dated from *the year* 456, they will expire in *the year* 1716. That year however has certainly not been "*the time of the end*" Both *the little horns* are still in existence, and *the Jews* are yet scattered over the face of the earth.

‡ Bp. Newton's Dissert. xxvi. 3.

of them will be found to answer to the tests furnished by the prophet. In none of these years, except the last, were *the saints* given into the hand of *the papal horn*; and, as for the acknowledgment made by the council of Nice, it was only a repetition of the grant already made by *the sixth head of the beast*: in none of them did *any abomination of desolation connected with the little horn of the he-goat* arise: and none of them will bear to be checked by the larger number according to any one of its three readings. There is yet another date fixed upon by Mr. Mann, which *prima facie* was more probable than any of the preceding ones. About *the year 533* or 534,\* the Emperor Justinian declared *the Pope* to be *the head of all the churches*: whence it seemed not unlikely, that *the 1260 years* ought to be dated from that era.† This opinion however, like that of Mr. Mede, has both been confuted by the event,‡ and might have

\* Mr. Sharpe asserts, that this happened in *the year 540*. (Append. to three Tracts on the Hebrew pronunciation p. 30.) Exactly the same objections apply to this year as to either of the others.

† Sec Bp. Newton's Dissert. on Rev. xiii.

‡ If we compute *the 1260 years* from *the year 533* or 534 we shall arrive at *the year 1793* or 1794, when neither the series of events (Dan. xi. 40—45. Rev. xvi. 17—21. xviii. xix.) which terminate in the destruction of *Popery* and *Mohammedism* had commenced, and when *the restoration of the Jews* was still future. The remarkable events, which lately took place in *the year 1798*, led many to suppose, that *Popery* was then overthrown, and consequently that *the 1260 days* must be expired. Hence Dr. Valpy and Mr. King named *the year 538* as the era from which that period ought to be dated. Much the same opinion was entertained by the Archdeacon of Northumberland and Archdeacon Daubeny. I need not therefore be ashamed to mention, that I also had once adopted a similar opinion. Our error arose from not sufficiently attending to the general tenor of prophecy. The expiration of *the 1260 years* is to usher in, not only *the downfall of Popery*, but likewise *the subversion of Mohammedism*, *the overthrow of the Infidel tyrant*, and *the commencement of the restoration of the Jews*. These events moreover, or at least the greater part of them, are to take place in Palestine, not in Europe. Hence it is manifest, that *the 1260 years* have not yet expired. I cannot refrain from transcribing the judicious remarks of Dr. Zouch upon this subject. "Though the reduction of Rome in 1798, and the consequent subversion of the papal power in that city, have been declared to be events which determine the final accomplishment of the prophecies relative to the fall of Antichrist, it should be remembered that similar events have occurred in former times. Rome has been frequently taken and plundered by a foreign enemy; and perhaps the late conquest of it was attended with less atrocious acts of rapine and horror, than those which history records, as the dreadful concomitants of its former subjugations. The historian thus describes the enormities committed at Rome, when it was laid waste in 1527. *Quanta fuerit malum Germanorum ac Hispanorum atrocitas et violentia Rome, verbis explicari vix potest. Nam præter horrendas lanienas, direptiones, libidines, devastaciones, contumeliæ ac tulibrii genus nullam in Pontificem Cardinalesque reliquamque turbam prætermissum fuit.*" (Preface to Zouch on Prophecy.) When Dr. Zouch wrote, Cardinal Chiaromonte had been elected *Pope* in *the year 1800*,



been confuted before the event. Mr. Mann's assertion I do not contradict, but I doubt whether he has not greatly mistaken the nature of Justinian's grant. Phocas declared *the Pope* to be at once *head of all the churches*, which is a title of dignity, and *sole universal bishop*, which is a title of authority: whereas Justinian conferred upon him only the first of these titles, styling at the very same time the patriarch of Constantinople *head of all other churches*.\* A comparison is accordingly drawn very judiciously by Brightman between the grant of Justinian and the grant of Phocas; in which he states, that the former only gave *the Pope* precedence over all other bishops, and did not, like the latter, *exclusively*, constitute him *Universal Bishop*.† Upon examining the passage in *the Novellæ* to which he refers, I find him perfectly accurate. The Emperor is simply laying down the precedency of the different patriarchs and prelates throughout his dominions. Of these, the patriarchs come first; next, the archbishops; and last, the bishops; and, of the patriarchs, the first place is assigned to Rome; and the second, to Constantinople.‡ Thus it appears, that the supposed grant of *universal episcopacy* dwindles into a mere question of *empty precedency*. Indeed had Gregory himself borne the title of *Universal Bishop*, or had it been generally borne by his predecessors, he could not, in common decency, have cen-

but had not yet been enthroned at Rome; we have since beheld *Papery* formally re-established in France, and a compact entered into between the present usurper of the throne of the Bourbons and the sovereign pontiff.

\* "Omnium aliarum caput." This plainly shews, that in the mind of Justinian both the titles were mere titles *Head of all the churches*, and *Head of all the other churches*, remind one of *Primate of all England*, and *Primate of England*. The two first as little confer *universal episcopacy* in the Roman empire, as the two last do in our own country. Nay, even the title of *Ecumenical* seems to have been borne both by the patriarch of Constantinople and by the other eastern patriarchs; and consequently, when borne by *more than one*, was a mere title. Phocas was the first, who gave it *exclusively* to *the Pope*, and forbid all other prelates to assume it.

† "Anno 606 to. — hic (Phocas) Bonifacio III concessit, ut Romanis *Universalis Episcopus* haberetur; non solum ut ordine ac honore reliquos antecederet, ut decrevit Justinianus primatum sacrarum synodorum definiens, sed cuitotus orbis sua diæcesis foret." Apoc. Apoc. Fol. 205.

‡ "Sancimus, secundum earum (scil. sacrarum synodorum) definitiones, sanctissimum senioris Romæ Papam primum esse omnium sacerdotum; beatissimum autem archiepiscopum Constantinopoleos novæ Romæ secundum habere locum post sanctam apostolicam senioris Romæ sedem; aliis autem omnibus sedibus præponatur." Justin. Novell. Tit. 14. Constitut. cxxxi. Cap. 2.

sured his Byzantine brother as *the precursor of Antichrist* for assuming it. In addition to this reason, the prophetic tests afford the same insurmountable objection to the date proposed by Mr. Mann as they have already afforded to those proposed by Mr. Mede and Bp. Newton. *No desolating transgression connected with the little horn of the he-goat arose in the years 533 and 534*; nor will either of those years bear to be checked by any of the numbers which the different readings assign to the larger period. It is somewhat remarkable, that, although Bp. Newton acknowledges that "*the religion of Mohammed will prevail in the East for as long a period of time as the tyranny of the little horn in the West*," and although he is struck with the wonderful coincidence of "*Mohammed's having first contrived his imposture in the year 606, the very same year wherein the tyrant Phocas made a grant of the supremacy to the Pope*;" yet he is unwilling to date *the 1260 years* from that era, merely because *the Pope* did not attain to the height of his temporal dominion till *the eighth century*.\* *The saints* however were given into his hand, not surely by the grant of *the Exarchate and the kingdom of Lombardy*, which in itself conveys not an atom of *catholic spiritual power in the Church*, but by constituting him *supreme in ecclesiastical matters*, by making him *a Bishop of all other Bishops*: and the prophet expressly informs us, that *the 1260 years* are to be dated from the era, when *the saints* were thus given into his hand.†

\* Dissert, xvii. "*A time times and a half are three prophetic years and a half*; and *three prophetic years and a half* are *1260 prophetic days*: and *1260 prophetic days* are *1260 years*. The same time therefore is prefixed for the desolation and oppression of *the eastern church*, as for the tyranny of *the little horn in the western church*; and it is wonderfully remarkable, that the doctrine of Mohammed was first forged at Mecca, and the supremacy of the Pope was established by virtue of a grant from the wicked tyrant Phocas, in the very same year of Christ 606" Ibid.

† Mr. Bicheno has proposed a scheme differing both from mine, and from those of all the preceding authors—He supposes, that *the 1260 years* are to be computed from the year 529, when the code of Justinian, which he styles *the strong hold of clerical tyranny*, was first published. They terminated consequently in the year 1789, when the French revolution took place.—To the 1260 years thus commencing he adds 30 years, in order to complete Daniel's 1290 years. This second operation brings us down to the year 1819; at which period he conceives that *the antichristian powers* (against whom the judgments of God began to go forth at the close of *the 1260 years* in the year 1789) will be finally broken, and that *the restoration of the Jews* will commence.—From

The result of the whole is, that, since *the year 606* is the only era which perfectly answers to the prophetic

*the year 1819*, when *the sanctuary* will be completely cleansed by the overthrow of *the Papacy*, which he assumes to be *the desolating transgression* mentioned in Dan. viii. 13. and xii. 11 he next computes backwards 2300 years, in order to arrive at the beginning of the vision of the ram and the he-goat. This third operation brings us to *the year A. C. 431*; at which period Xerxes set out to invade Greece, for Mr. Bicheno supposes that the wars of that prince are foretold in Dan. viii. 4, 20—Lastly to *the 1290 years*, terminating in *the year 1819*, he adds 45 years, in order to complete Daniel's 1335 years. This final operation brings us down to *the year 1864*: when *the restoration of the Jews* (to which he assigns the space of 47 years) will be completed, and when the distant heathen nations will be converted to Christianity. (Signs of the times Part 1 p. 5.—61.)

I feel some degree of unwillingness to urge any objections against this scheme of Mr. Bicheno; because so very short a space of time, about 13 years only, will either practically demonstrate it to be right (at least so far as *the restoration of the Jews* is concerned,) or effectually preclude the necessity of any verbal confutation. With my present views of the subject, it certainly appears to me erroneous in every point; and it is my firm belief that the rapidly approaching year 1819 will prove it to be so.—I first object to the era, from which the 1260 years are computed. *The Justinian code*, says Mr. Bicheno, *granted vast powers and privileges to the clergy, and perfected the union between things civil and ecclesiastical*. All this may be very true; but how can a grant of privileges to the clergy in general, both in the east and in the west, be a delivering of the saints into the hand of the papal horn in particular, whose jurisdiction was confined to the patriarchate of the West? Mr. Bicheno replies, *If Justinian did not declare the Pope head of all the churches in the year 529, he certainly did as early as the year 534*. Now, even supposing that Justinian had conferred the power of Universal Episcopacy upon the Pope, which he certainly did not, for he granted him nothing more than an empty precedence over all other patriarchs, what has this to do with the date which Mr. Bicheno has chosen? If the 1260 years be computed from the year 534, they carry us beyond the year 1789; and an error of five years as effectually invalidates a numerical calculation as an error of five centuries: if they be not computed from the year 534, but from the year 529, they will no doubt bring us exactly to the year 1789; but in that case, what can an event which happened in the year 534 have to do with a date which is declared to be the year 529?—I next object to the supposed termination of the 1260 years. Though I think Mr. Bicheno perfectly right in supposing that the judgments of God will begin to go forth against his enemies at the end of the 1260 years, and that 30 years will elapse before those enemies are finally destroyed: I believe him to be quite mistaken in assigning the termination of those 30 years as the proper date of the commencement of the restoration of the Jews. Daniel plainly teaches us that the Jews will begin to be restored, not at the end of the 30 years, but at the beginning of them; that is to say, not at the end of the 1290 years, but at the end of the three times and a half or the 1260 years. (Dan. xii. 6, 7.) Accordingly, after having described the expedition and overthrow of the king, who magnified himself above every god as taking place at the time of the end or at the termination of the 1260 years, he adds, that at that same time the nation of the Jews should be delivered. (Dan. xi. 40—45. xii. 1.) What probably led Mr. Bicheno into his mistake was his referring the expression *at that time* (xii. 1.) to the overthrow of the king (xi. 45.) instead of referring it (as he ought to have done) to the beginning of the king's expedition or the commencement of the time of the end. (xi. 40.) That the latter reference is the proper one, is manifest both from the subsequent declaration of Daniel (xii. 6, 7.) and from the unvarying tenor of all the prophecies which speak of the restoration of the Jews. They unanimously represent them as being expelled in their own land, and even besieged in their own capital city, by the antichristian em-

tests, there is at least a *very high degree of probability* that it is the true date of the commencement of *the 1260*

*federacy*: hence it is plain, that their restoration must have commenced, not *contemporaneously* with the overthrow of that confederacy, but some time *previous* to its overthrow; otherwise how can the various matters, which are predicted respecting them, receive their accomplishment? How long indeed before this overthrow their restoration will commence, the unchronological prophets nowhere tell us. but Daniel, as we have seen, amply makes up their deficiency by informing us, that they will begin to be delivered at the time of the end or at the close of the 1260 years, when all the predictions relative to the wonderful events comprehended within the *three times and a half* shall have been fulfilled. On these grounds we may safely, I think, conclude, that the 1260 years did not expire in the year 1789 because the Jews did not then begin to be restored: and, even if their restoration should commence in the year 1819, as Mr. Bicheno expects, such an event would be no demonstration of the rest of his system: on the contrary, it would confute it, because it would prove that the 1260 years, instead of expiring in the year 1789, expired in the year 1819.—I *thirdly* object to his computing the 1290 years and the 1335 years from the year 529, on the ground that the *abomination of desolation*, mentioned in Dan. viii. 13 and xii. 11, is the *Papacy*. That these two periods are to be dated from the same era as the 1260 years, cannot, I think, be reasonably doubted; in this point therefore Mr. Bicheno and I perfectly agree. We both likewise agree, that all the three periods are to be dated from the setting up of the *abomination of desolation*: for neither can this position be reasonably doubted. We lastly agree, that one and the same *abomination of desolation* is spoken of both in Dan. viii. 13 and in Dan. xii. 11; and that this *abomination* cannot be referred to the pollution of the literal temple by the Romans as predicted (according to our Lord's own exposition) in Dan. xi. 31, because the numbers connected with it render such a reference impossible. Thus far we are perfectly agreed; but here we begin to differ. Mr. Bicheno maintains, that the *desolating transgression*, connected with the *little horn of the he-goat* and with the numbers 1290 and 1335, is the *Papacy*, which he contends was set up by the code of Justinian in the year 529; I, on the contrary, most explicitly deny that this *desolating transgression* is the *Papacy*. Let the *little horn of the he-goat* be Antiochus Epiphanes, the Roman empire, or any other power; it certainly cannot be the *Papacy*, because the *Papacy* never was a *horn of the he-goat*, or *Macedonian empire*. Hence it is evident, that the *desolating transgression* connected with the *Macedonian little horn*, which was to take away the daily sacrifice and to give both the sanctuary and the host to be trodden under foot, cannot be the *Papacy*: and, if it be not the *Papacy*, we have no right to date the 1260 years the 1290 years and the 1335 years from the year 529, unless it can be shewn that some *desolating transgression*, which afterwards became a *horn of the he-goat* and which fully answers to the prophetic description of it, arose in the year 529. This however Mr. Bicheno will find it no very easy matter to do; therefore the three periods cannot be dated from the year 529. Here I might stop; for, if Mr. Bicheno's foundation give way, his superstructure falls to the ground of course: yet I cannot refrain from noticing the strange era which he has pitched upon as the proper date of the larger number 3600, and consequently of the *vision of the ram and the he-goat*. A computation deduced, not from the end of the 1260 years as it ought to have been, but from the end of the 1290 years (that is to say, from what he supposes to be the end of the 1290 years), brings him to the year A. C. 481, in which Xerxes set out to invade Greece; and this famous expedition he affirms to be specially predicted under the imagery of the *pushing of the ram*. Never surely was history more injudiciously brought forward as the interpreter of prophecy. Daniel tells us, that the *pushing of the ram* was so irresistible, that no beast could stand before him, and that none could deliver out of his hand, but that he did according to his will, and became great. Herodotus assures us, that the huge unwieldy armament of Xerxes was totally discomfited by the Greeks, and that the king

days.\* In this year, *the saints* were given into the hand of *the papal horn* : in this year *the Mohammedan transgression of desolation*, which shortly after its rise became by the conquest of Syria *a horn of the he-goat*, was set up; † and a computation, deduced from this year, brings us precisely to the very year in which Alexander invaded Asia, one of the most proper dates that could have been assigned even *a priori* to the vision of *the ram and the he-goat*. Positive certainty indeed in such matters is the high privilege of God alone : yet a triple coincidence is not, I think, to be slighted. According to what is called *the doctrine of chances*, the improbability of an accidental *triple* coincidence bears a much higher ratio to the improbability of only an accidental *double* coincidence, than the number *three* does to the number *two*. ‡

himself was compelled to flee with disgraceful precipitancy into Asia. In fact, *the pushing of the ram* related almost exclusively to *the victories of Cyrus*, which were achieved long before Xerxes came to the throne.

My general conclusion is this ; that Mr Bicheno's scheme, though not deficient in ingenuity, rests upon no solid foundation. A very few years however, as I have already observed, will irrefragably decide the question between us.

\* Mr. Fleming fixes the rise of *Popery properly so called*, that is to say, the commencement of *the spiritual empire of th. Pope*, to "that memorable year 606, when Phocas did in a manner devolve the government of the West upon Boniface the third, by giving him the title of *supreme and universal Bishop*;" yet he afterwards, with an inconsistency similar to that of Bp Newton, dates *the 1260 years* from the year 758, when he supposes the Papacy to have been established. His own expression, "by steps he hath been raised up, and by steps must he be pulled down," might have shown him, that *the tyrannical reign of the papal horn* ought to be dated, not surely from the era of its meridian splendor, but from the very first year that it commenced, from the time when the saints were *first* given into the hand of *the horn*. We date the age of a man from the day of his birth, not from the period of his adolescence : why then must a different mode be adopted in computing *the duration of a spiritual catholic empire*? Besides this objection to dating *the 1260 years* from the year 758, that era is equally unable to bear the tests proposed by the prophet as every other era which has been pitched upon, one only excepted, *the year 606*, which has been found exactly to answer to those tests, and which I have therefore concluded to be the true date of *the 1260 years*. Mr. Galloway adopts the first conjecture of Mr. Fleming, rejecting very judiciously his subsequent inconsistency. (Comment. p. 38, 129.)

† The extreme accuracy of the prophet is highly worthy of our notice. He does not direct us to date *the 1260 years* from the *rise of the he-goat's little horn*, but from *the incipient pollution of the spiritual sanctuary and the setting up of that desolating transgression* which afterwards became a *horn of the he-goat*. (Dan. xii. II.) Had we been directed to date them from the *rise of Mohammedism as a horn of the he-goat*, we must have dated them some years later than the year 606.

‡ What I mean is this, if the gravity of my subject will permit me to use such a mode of exemplification. *A double coincidence* I compare to *throwing two aces with two dice*; a *triple coincidence*, to *throwing three aces with three dice*. Now it is well known, that the chance against throwing the latter is, to the chance against throwing the former, much more than *three to two*.

I shall now proceed to compare the character of *the he-goat's little horn* with the character of *Mohammedism*, in order that their identity may be proved as well by circumstantial as by chronological correspondence.

I. "For how long a time shall the vision last, the daily sacrifice be taken away, and the transgression of desolation continue, to give both the sanctuary and the host to be trodden under foot?"

I. We have seen, that *the power symbolized by the little horn of the he-goat*, whatever power it may be, is to flourish 1260 years, computing from its rise in the character of a *desolating transgression*; and therefore that *the prosperous duration of this power* is to be exactly contemporary with *the tyrannical reign of the papal little horn*. We have likewise seen reason to believe, that *that tyrannical reign* commenced in *the year 606*, when *the saints* were delivered into the hand of *the Bishop of Rome*; and consequently that we must look for the rise of *the power symbolized by the he-goat's little horn* in that same year. Accordingly, upon turning our eyes to *the East*, we found that *Mohammedism* arose in that very year; and we know, that no other power did then arise, which either afterwards became *a little horn of the he-goat*, or which at all corresponds with its prophetic character: whence we concluded from this chronological coincidence, that *that horn* was designed to symbolize *Mohammedism*. Such being the case, our first inquiry must be, in what sense *Mohammedism* can be symbolized by *a horn*.

I have already shewn, that the language of symbols allows the same hieroglyphic to bear both a *temporal* and a *spiritual* signification. Thus we find, that *a mountain* is used to typify both *the temporal kingdom of Babylon*, and *the spiritual kingdom of Christ*:\* thus likewise *a beast* indifferently represents *a secular and an ecclesiastical empire*: and thus, arguing from analogy, *a horn* denotes either *a temporal* or *a spiritual kingdom*.

Now we have seen, that *the little horn of the Roman beast* typifies *the spiritual kingdom of the Papacy*, which, small as it was at first, in process of time became *a great*

\* Jerem. li. 25. Dan. ii. 35.

*empire* symbolized in the Apocalypse by a *two-horned beast*. Such being the case, even if we had not been assisted by chronological computation in our inquiries, we should naturally have been led, merely by the analogy of symbolical language, to conclude, that *the little horn of the Macedonian beast* typified a *spiritual kingdom* likewise: for it seems by no means agreeable to the strict accuracy of that language to suppose, that *the Roman little horn* means a *kingdom of one kind*, and that *the Macedonian little horn* means a *kingdom quite of another kind*.\*

So again, with regard to local situation: since the *little horn of the Roman beast* is to be sought for in *the West*, we may naturally, not to say necessarily, conclude, that *the little horn of the Macedonian beast* is to be sought for in *the East*.

Thus we find, that chronological computation, symbolical analogy, and local situation, all lead us to suppose that *the religion of Mohammed* is typified by *the little horn of the Macedonian beast*. We must next consult history.

Accordingly, as history, when viewed in connection with prophecy, has shewn us, that *the little horn of the Roman beast* means *the spiritual, not the temporal, kingdom of the Pope*; so history will likewise shew us, when viewed in connection with prophecy, that *the little horn of the Macedonian beast* means *the spiritual, not the temporal, kingdom of Mohammed*.

*The desolating transgression*, which Daniel identifies with *the he-goat's little horn*, was to rise in the year 606, at the commencement of *the 1260 years*, during which it was to flourish, and during which *the Roman little horn* was to reign over *the saints*. No power did then arise in *the East* except *the religion of Mohammed*; and *the religion of Mohammed* arose in that very year. As for the *secular authority* of that impostor, either without or within the limits of *the he-goat's late empire*, it did not commence till several years afterwards. Hence we may conclude, agreeably to the analogy of symbolical language, that *the horn* denotes not *the temporal domin-*

\* This affords another argument to shew, that *the little horn of the he-goat* cannot be *the Roman empire* or *the fourth great beast*, as Sir Isaac and Bp. Newton suppose.

ion, but *the religion of Mohammed*. This conclusion, I allow, does not quite *necessarily*\* follow from the premises: but mark the sequel. *The power symbolized by the horn*, after it had arisen in *the year 606*, was to continue *1260 years*. Consequently, as this date, and this period of years, exclude Antiochus Epiphanes and the Romans from having any connection with *the horn*; so do they equally exclude *the temporal kingdom* erected by Mohammed. That kingdom, instead of being set up in *the year 606*, which the prophecy requires, did not commence, according to Sir Isaac Newton, till *the year 637*: and, after it had commenced, it lasted no more than *300 years*: or, if we date its rise somewhat earlier in the life-time of Mohammed when he became prince of Medina in *the year 622*, still it will not have commenced in *the year 606*, and still its duration will scarcely amount even to *one quarter of 1260 years*. On the other hand, *the religion or spiritual kingdom, of Mohammed* arose precisely in *the year 606*; has already continued nearly twelve centuries; and has every appearance of continuing, in some one of the countries where it is professed, to the very end of *the 1260 years*. At its first rise it was to be little, comprehending two or at the most only three persons, namely Mohammed and his two apostate associates:† but it was not long to remain so. The prophet informs us, that, small as it originally was, it soon “waxed exceeding great toward the South, and toward the East, and toward the pleasant land” *Mohammedism* accordingly, though it made its first appearance at Mecca, soon invaded the territories of *the Syrian horn of the he goat*, thus becoming (agreeably to the prediction) *a horn of the he goat*; and afterwards, exclusive of its propagation in other regions, spread itself over

\* Because my first argument only proves, that *the desolating transgression* must be a spiritual power, not that *the little horn* must, with which it was afterwards identified. It is almost superfluous to observe, that a power may be at once both spiritual and temporal. My second argument therefore goes on to prove, that *the desolating little horn* must itself be a spiritual power.

† The Rabbinical tales, with which the Koran is so largely embellished, Mohammed is supposed to have learned from a Persian Jew; and for those parts of his multifarious work, which touch upon Christianity, he is thought to have been indebted to the Nestorian monk Sergius or Bahaira. All the rest he himself was amply qualified to supply. See Prideaux's *Life of Mohammed*, p. 45—49.



*the whole Macedonian empire*, in the same manner as *the little horn of the Roman beast* extended its influence over *the whole Western empire*. Thus did *the great double Apostacy* set its two feet upon *the East and the West* in the self-same year: and thus hath it ever since continued to trample upon all true religion. At the end however of *the 1260 years*, the judgments of God shall surely go forth against it, and the long polluted spiritual sanctuary shall begin to be thoroughly cleansed.

2. *The false religion of Mohammed*, symbolized by *the little horn of the he goat*, and stigmatized by Daniel as being a *desolating transgression*, was a medley of corrupted Christianity furnished by an apostate monk, of Talmudical Judaism contributed by a renegade Jew, and of Arabian superstition purified of its idolatry by Mohammed himself: whence it may justly be termed, as it is represented by St. John,\* *an apostacy from the pure faith of revelation*. Mohammed taught, that the several prophets, Adam, Noah, Abraham, Moses, Christ, and himself, rose in just gradation above "each other; and that whosoever hates or rejects any one of them is to be numbered with the infidels." For the great author of our faith especially the Mussulmans were required to entertain a high and mysterious veneration. "Verily," says he, "Christ Jesus, the son of Mary, is the apostle of God, and his Word which he conveyed unto Mary, and a spirit proceeding from him: honourable in this world, and in the world to come; and one of those who approach near to the presence of God."† Agreeably to these declarations, Mohammed acknowledged the divine authority of the Pentateuch, the Psalms, and the Gospel;‡ but required that the Koran should be received along with them, or rather should supersede them. Such was the nature of that *desolating transgression*, which set itself in direct opposition to *the prince of the host*, and which stood up against *the prince of princes*.

3. When the Arabian pseudo prophet first retired to

\* *A fallen star*, when taken in a spiritual sense, is the symbol of *an apostate Christian pastor*. Such a star was Sergius, who opened the bottomless pit and let out the false religion of Mohammed. Rev. ix. 1.

† Koran. C. 3 and C. 4

‡ Sale's Prelim. Discourse, p. 100—Decline and Fall. Vol. ix. p. 261—266.

the cave of Hera to fabricate the Koran, this being the first overt act of his imposture, we may consider *that transgression of desolation*, which afterwards caused *the daily sacrifice* to cease, and which gave both *the sanctuary* and *the host* to be trodden under foot, as being then first set up. *This sanctuary is the spiritual sanctuary of the Christian church, not the literal sanctuary of the Jewish temple*, as will sufficiently appear from the following considerations.

According as *the temple* and *the sanctuary* are to be taken in a *literal* or a *figurative* sense when mentioned in the prophecies of Daniel and St. John, all other things connected with them must be taken in a *literal* or *figurative* sense likewise. Thus, when it is said, that *the Roman arms* should stand up after *Antiochus*, that they should pollute *the sanctuary of strength*, that they should take away *the daily sacrifice*, and that they should set up *the abomination of desolation: the temple*, which they polluted, being *the literal temple of Jerusalem*, *the daily sacrifice taken away by them* will of course mean *the literal daily sacrifice*, and *the abomination of desolation set up by them* will signify *the literal abomination of desolation* which they set up when they worshipped their standards within the precincts of the sanctuary. On the other hand, when St. John is directed by an angel to “measure *the temple* of God, and *the altar*, and *them that worship therein*; but to leave out, and not to measure *the court without the temple*, inasmuch as it is given to the gentiles, who are to tread *the holy city* under foot *forty and two months*,” or 1260 natural years: *the temple*, here mentioned, being *the spiritual temple of God*, or *the Church*; its *altar*, its *daily sacrifice*, its *outer court*, the *holy city* in which it stands, the *gentiles* who are to tread it under foot 1260 years, and the *witnesses* who are to prophesy in sackcloth during precisely *the same period of time*, must all be taken in a *figurative* sense; that is to say, they must all be referred not to *the temple of Jerusalem*, but to *the Church of Christ*. Now we have seen, that *the transgression, or that desolating transgression connected with the goat a little horn* which was to take away *the daily sacrifice* and to pollute *the sanctuary*, was

to flourish during the very same period as *the treading under foot of the apocalyptic holy city by the gentiles*; that is to say, during *the space of 1260 years*. Since then *the Mohammedan transgression*, which was destined in the course of its desolating progress to take away the daily sacrifice and to pollute the sanctuary, is to flourish 1260 years: and since *the outer court of the apocalyptic temple* is to be trodden under foot during the same period of 1260 years: it will necessarily follow, that *the sanctuary* mentioned by Daniel is the same as *the temple* mentioned by St. John: in other words, that it is *the Church of Christ*. This supposition is decidedly established by the particular era when the desolating transgression of *Mohammedism* first made its appearance. The era in question is the year in which *the Roman beast* revived, or *the year of our Lord 606*: at this era, *the literal sanctuary of the Jewish temple* was no longer in existence, having been utterly destroyed by the Romans several centuries before; consequently, *the Jewish temple* cannot be *the sanctuary* which *the little horn* was to pollute: but, if it be not *the literal Jewish temple*, it can be nothing else but *the Christian spiritual temple*. On these grounds then I conceive, that *the pollution of the sanctuary by the eastern little horn* is *the establishment of the Mohammedan Apostacy* upon the ruins of the Greek church: and that *the treading under foot of the outer court of the temple by the gentiles* is *the subjugation of the Latin church by the Papal Apostacy*. We shall find, that the declaration of prophecy concerning these matters precisely accords with the event. The Latin church was to be trampled under foot during the whole period of *the 1260 years*; but the sanctuary and the host of the Greek church were not to begin to be trodden under foot till some time after the rise of *the Mohammedan little horn*, in short, not till after it had waxed exceeding great.\*

\* Compare Rev. xi. 2. with Dan. viii. 9—12. It might at first be thought indeed from Dan. xii. 11, that *the daily sacrifice* should begin to be taken away so soon as *the abomination of desolation* should be set up: but the preceding context of Dan. viii. 9—12. sufficiently shews, that *those 1290 days* are to be computed, not from *the taking away of the daily sacrifice*, but from *the setting up of the desolating abomination*, which in the course of its triumphant progress should take away *that daily sacrifice* and pollute *the sanctuary*. *The Mohammedan little horn* was to wax exceeding great: and, in the course of

Accordingly the Latin church was subjugated by *the papal horn in the year 606*: but, although *Mohammedism* arose in the same year, it did not immediately begin to trample upon the Greek church, nor did it finally complete the pollution of *the eastern sanctuary* till the crescent triumphed over the cross in the very midst of Constantinople.

Here we cannot but observe the strict accuracy of expression used both by Daniel and St. John. *That desolating transgression, the religion of Mohammed*, is represented as *putting an end to the daily sacrifice* of spiritual praise and thanksgiving, and as *treading the sanctuary itself under foot*. But *the tyrannical superstition of Popery* is described as only *treading under foot the ou'er court of the Gentiles and the holy city*; being unable to injure "*the temple or sanctuary of God, and the altar, and them that worship therein.*" Such accordingly has been the event. Although the skeleton of the Greek church has been suffered to exist, yet we hear not of any spiritual worshippers that it has produced since the establishment of *Mohammedism*. Its *sanctuary* has been trodden under foot, no less than its *ou'er court*; and its *altar* has ceased to send up any grateful incense to the God of heaven. Plunged in the same superstitious observances as the Latin church, though resolutely denying its supremacy, it has not, like the Latin church, retained within its bosom a hidden seed, a chosen generation, who, in the midst of its corruptions should still continue to worship in *the spiritual temple*, and to serve at the *spiritual altar*. In the western world we have never ceased to behold *the witnesses* prophesying in sackcloth; and we of this kingdom have especially to bless their pious labours for that pure and apostolical branch of the church established among us: but in vain do we inquire for any reformation in the eastern world; *no witnesses* there have raised their warning voice;

its thus waxing great, not at its first rise, it was to cause *the sanctuary* to be polluted. Such is the order of events in the prophecy, and exactly such has been their order in the completion of it. At the time when *the desolating transgression* was first set up, *the pollution of the sanctuary* was only in an incipient state; for the first only of that series of events had then taken place which afterwards led to its complete pollution.

*The sanctuary itself* is polluted, and will continue in that deplorable state to the very end of *the 1260 years*. Still, at the expiration of twelve centuries, are the Greek churches overwhelmed with the same vanities of superstition and idolatry that pulled down the wrath of God upon them. They made no effort to purify themselves; whence they have, more or less, during the greatest part of that long period, been harassed and oppressed by the iron rod of Mohammedan despotism.

II. "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. And out of one of them came forth a little horn, which waxed exceeding great, toward the south, and toward the east, and toward the pleasant land."

The angel interprets this passage as follows. "The rough goat is the king of Grecia: and the great horn, that is between his eyes, is the first king. Now, that being broken, whereas four stood up for it, four kingdoms shall stand up out of the nation, but not in his power. And, at the end of their kingdom, when the transgressors are come to the full, a king of fierce countenance, and teaching dark sentences, shall stand up."

1. *The king, or kingdom, symbolized by the little horn, was to stand up at the end of the four Greek kingdoms, and out of one of them*—We may here note the different manner in which *the two little horns* are introduced. *The papal horn* was to arise among *the ten horns of the Roman beast*, and to be contemporary with them: *the Mohammedan horn* was to come out of the ruins of *one of the four Greek horns of the Macedonian beast*, as *they four* had arisen out of the ruins of *the one great imperial horn*, and not to be contemporary with any of them, for it was to stand up at the end of their kingdom. Such accordingly was the event. When *all the four Greek kingdoms* had come to their end, *the religion of Mohammed* made its appearance, agreeably to the prediction, in *the year 606*, at the beginning of *the 1260 years* during which it was to flourish contemporaneously with *the Papacy*. Mecca was the first theatre of its actions: but, in a very short period of time after its rise,

it invaded Syria, and thus accomplished its prophetic character of being *a little horn of one of the four subverted horns of the he-goat*.\*

• The first war between the Saracens and the Romans took place in the year 629 and 630; and between the years 632 and 639 the whole of Syria was conquered by them (Hist. of Decline, Vol. ix p. 31., 379—421) Dr. Zouch, in his work on prophecy, objects, that *the little horn of the he-goat* cannot be Mohammed. Mr. Whitaker, whom he is opposing, ought rather to have said *Mohammedism*, for a *horn*, in the language of symbols, does not mean an *individual*, but a *power*; because that impostor sprung up in Arabia, which was never subject to *the Syrian horn*: whereas *the little horn* was to come out of *one of the four notable ones of the he-goat*. Hence he prefers the interpretation of S. Isaac and B. New on: and supposes with them, that *the little horn* is *the Roman power* which first penetrated into the East by way of Macedonia, one of *the four horns or kingdoms of the Greek empire*—When Dr. Zouch made this objection, he certainly was not aware, that it applies with equal force to his own system, as to that which supposes *Mohammedism* to be *the little horn*. *The Roman power* sprung up no more within the territories of any of the *four Greek horns* at its first rise, than the reign of *Mohammed*. Consequently, if *the one* must not be esteemed *the little horn*, because it originated in *Arabia*, neither must *the other*, because it first arose in *Italy*; and, on the contrary, if *the one* may be esteemed *the little horn*, because it became a *power within the limits of the he-goat's empire* by the conquest of Macedonia; so likewise may *the other* with equal propriety, because it became a *power within the limits of the same empire* by the conquest of Syria—The fact is, Dr. Zouch's objection is one of those, which, by proving too much, prove nothing. *A horn*, in the language of prophecy, is indifferently said to spring from *the head of a symbolical beast or empire*, whether it be *one of the kingdoms* into which that empire has been divided by its own grandees, or whether it be *one of the kingdoms* which have been formed out of the empire in question by the successful inroads of foreigners. Thus the ten Gothic kingdoms of the Western Roman empire, although founded by nations that did not spring out of the empire, but on the contrary *invaded it*, are represented by Daniel as being *the ten horns of the fourth beast*; no less than the four Greek monarchies, which literally sprang out of *the Macedonian empire*, we described by him as being *the four horns of the he-goat*. Yet if Dr. Zouch's objection be valid, *not one of the ten Gothic kingdoms* must be esteemed a *horn of the fourth beast*; because *not one of them*, so far as its primitive origin is concerned, arose out of *the Roman empire*, any more than either *the Roman empire itself* or *Mohammedism*, whichever of these powers be intended by *the little horn of the he-goat*, arose out of *the Greek empire*. The 1260 days, must be dated from the time when the *sanctuary* were given into the hand of *the papal horn*, or the year 606; consequently the rise of *Mohammedism*, or the setting up of the *desolating transgression*, must be dated from the same era; but *Mohammedism* itself did not become a *horn of the he-goat*, or a *spiritual power within the limits of the Greek empire* till the Saracens invaded Syria.

Dr. Zouch further objects to the long period of time, which intervened between the downfall of the four Greek kingdoms and the rise of Mohammedism: conceiving, that, if *the little horn* had been designed to symbolize that *postivity*, some of the intermediate events would have been noticed by the prophet—This objection appears to me very unreasonable. Daniel had already recapitulated the whole of *Nebuchadnezzar's dream* in his vision of *the four beasts*, for the evident purpose of introducing *the little horn of the fourth beast*, which had not been noticed in the dream of the Babylonian prince: he now recapitulates the history of *the second and third empires*, for the similar evident purpose of introducing *the little horn of the he-goat* which answers to *the third beast* of the preceding vision. Had he therefore again recapitulated the conquests of the Romans, he would not only have introduced much superfluous matter, but would have involved his whole prophecy in confusion; for, in that case, we should have been led erroneously to imagine, that *both the little horns* sprung

2. *The horn was first to be small and afterwards to be great in a southern, eastern, and northern\* direction—The religion of Mohammed was originally small in the number of its proselytes; but it soon waxed exceeding great, and that in the very line marked out by the prophecy. Its conquests extended southward over the peninsula of Arabia; eastward, over Persia, and in after ages over Hindostan; and northward, over Palestine, Asia Minor, and Greece. Some conquests it likewise made westward; but they were neither so permanent, nor so considerable, as its other acquisitions. Spain soon threw off its tyranny; and the piratical states of Barbary are not worthy to be mentioned with the spiritual sovereignty of Greece, Persia, Syria, Asia Minor, Hindostan, and Arabia. Hence the prophet truly remarks, that the principal theatre of its greatness should be the North, the South, and the East.†*

out of the Western part of the empire: instead of, what is now abundantly manifest, the one out of the Western part, and the other out of the Eastern part or the original body of the third beast. Accordingly we find, in the following vision, that Daniel does there actually recapitulate a part of the Roman history, because he wishes to conduct us to the tyrannical reign of the atheistical king, who, like the papal horn, was to arise, not in the East, but in the West. (See Dan. xi. 30—40.) In order then, I conceive, to preserve that perspicuity, which is so necessary for the right understanding of his prophecies, Daniel here simply tells us that some time after the downfall of the four Greek kingdoms, the little horn should make its appearance in the late territories of one of them. The precise time however, when the power which was destined to become this little horn should arise, he does not mention, leaving us to collect it from certain numbers which he has given us. From these numbers the time has been collected; and that time, as we have seen, is the very year in which Mohammed commenced his imposture.

Lastly, Dr Zouch objects, that the king typified by the little horn was to be a king of a fierce countenance; whereas Mohammed, according to the traditions of his companions, was distinguished for his commanding presence, his majestic aspect, his piercing eye, his gracious smile, his countenance that painted every sensation of the soul, and his gestures that enforced each expression of the tongue—To this objection the answer is sufficiently obvious. Daniel is not describing the aspect of a man, but the nature of a religion: the antitype of the little horn is not an individual king, but a spiritual kingdom. And this spiritual kingdom or religion is to remain 1260 years, and at length to be broken without hand. Consequently it cannot be any single individual. Whatever then the countenance of Mohammed may have been, his sanguinary superstition, avowedly propagated by the sword, may, with the utmost propriety, be described as a king of fierce countenance. See Zouch on Prophecy, Chap. 8.

\* The expression toward the pleasant land, when joined with the preceding phrase toward the South and toward the East, and when considered with a reference to the native country of Mohammed, evidently means toward the North. It is a mode of speech perfectly familiar in the Hebrew language. Thus, from the relative position of the Mediterranean sea to Palestine, the Jews were wont to express the West by the phrase toward the sea.

† Under the last of the Omniades, the Arabian empire extended two hun-

3. *The king was to arise when the transgressors were come to the full*—The Christian churches began very early to degenerate from their primitive purity, and to apostatize in the manner predicted by St. Paul. *The Apostacy* however was long confined to individuals; nor did the transgressors come to the full, until it was publicly authorized and upheld by the spiritual head of the catholic church. But in *the year 605*, when *the saints* were delivered into the hand of *the Papal horn*, the *Apostacy* became an embodied system: for immediately afterwards idolatry was openly and shamelessly established by the sovereign pontiff. In this year then, when *the 1260 days* commenced, the transgressors came to the full: consequently in this year we must look for the rise of *the king*. Accordingly *the Mohammedan apostacy* commenced in the East, in the self-same year that *the Pope* was constituted *Bishop of bishops* and *supreme head of the Church* in the West: insomuch that Dr. Prideaux, struck with this wonderful chronological coincidence, could not refrain from exclaiming, “that *Antichrist* seemed at that time to have set both his feet upon Christendom together, the one in the East, the other in the West.”\*

dred days journey from East to West, from the confines of Tartary and India to the shores of the Atlantic Ocean. And, if we retrace *the sleeve of the robe*, as it is styled by their writers, the long and narrow province of Africa.” (that is to say, the petty western conquests of the Mohammedan religion, which were not worthy to be mentioned along with its empire in the East, the North, and the South, and which are therefore left unnoticed by the prophet,) “the solid and compact dominion from Fargana to Aden, from Tarsus to Surat, will spread on every side to the measure of four or five months of the march of a caravan.” (Hist. of Decline and Fall, Vol. ix. p. 301.) To this vast territory, which acknowledged Mohammed as the prophet of God, the Turks afterwards added Greece and Asia Minor in the North. The progress of the Saracens, in the very direction marked out by the prophet, is even *verbally* noticed by Mr. Gibbon. After detailing the history of their conquest of Arabia in the South, he observes, “To the North of Syria they passed mount Taurus, and reduced to their obedience the province of Cilicia with its capital Tarsus, the ancient monument of the Assyrian kings. Beyond a second ridge of the same mountains, they spread the flame of war, rather than the light of religion, as far as the shores of the Euxine and the neighbourhood of Constantinople. To the East they advanced to the banks and sources of the Euphrates and Tigris: the long disputed barrier of Rome and Persia was for ever confounded, the walls of Edessa and Amida, of Dara and Nisibis, which had resisted the arms and engines of Sapor or N. shirvan, were levelled in the dust: and the holy city of Abgarus might vainly produce the epistle of the image of Christ to an unbelieving conqueror. To the West the Syrian kingdom is bounded by the sea.” In this direction Mr. Gibbon notices only the picaresque excursions of the Saracens. (Hist. of Decline, Vol. ix. p. 309, 423, 424.)

\* Prideaux's life of Mohammed, p. 16.



4. *The king was moreover to be fierce of countenance, and a teacher of dark sentences*: that is to say, *the little horn* was to be a *spiritual power* upheld by force of arms; it was to be a *religion*, not mild and gentle like that of the Lamb, but partaking of the fierce and unrelenting nature of the dragon—The word, which is here rendered *dark sentences*, primarily means *enigmas*: and, as the oriental enigmas were usually couched in sublime and poetical language, it is used in Scripture to express *the sublime spiritual enigmas or mysteries of religion*. Thus the Psalmist, when about to treat of *the deep mysteries of redemption*, and *the wonders of the resurrection*, summons all the inhabitants of the world to give him their earnest attention. “My mouth,” saith he, “shall speak of wisdom; and the meditation of my heart shall be of understanding. I will incline mine ear to a parable: I will open my *dark sentence* upon the harp.”\* *The dark sentences* then, or *spiritual enigmas*, taught by *the little horn*, are manifestly *that pretended revelation of Mohammed, the Koran*; a work written in a kindred language to that of the Jewish Scriptures, and replete with those poetically metaphorical turns of expression so peculiarly grateful to an oriental ear. “The substance of the Koran, according to Mohammed or his disciples, is uncreated and eternal; subsisting in the essence of the Deity, and inscribed with a pen of light on the table of his everlasting decrees—In the spirit of enthusiasm or vanity, the prophet rests the truth of his mission on the merit of his book; audaciously challenges both men and angels to imitate the beauties of a single page; and presumes to assert, that God alone could dictate this incomparable performance. This argument is most powerfully addressed to a devout Arabian, whose mind is attuned to faith and rapture, whose ear is delighted by the music of sounds, and whose ignorance is incapable of comparing the productions of human genius. The harmony and copiousness of style will not reach, in a version, the European infidel: he will peruse with impatience the endless incoherent rhapsody of fable, and precept, and declamation; which seldom excites a sen-

\* Psalm xlix. 3, 4.

timent or an idea, which sometimes crawls in the dust, and is sometimes lost in the clouds. The divine attributes exalt the fancy of the Arabian missionary; but his loftiest strains must yield to the sublime simplicity of the book of Job, composed in a remote age, in the same country, and in the same language."\* Such are *the dark sentences* of the Koran; and the religion, which it inculcates, may well be described as "fierce of countenance," when the avowed maxim of its founder was to use no other engine of conversion than the sword.

III. "And it waxed great even against the host of heaven; and it cast some of the host and of the stars to the ground, and stamped upon them. Yea, it magnified itself even against the prince of the host; and by it the daily sacrifice was taken away, and the place of his (the prince's) sanctuary was cast down. And the host was given up unto it by reason of transgression against the daily sacrifice; and it cast down the truth to the ground; and it practised and prospered."

Of this passage the following explanation is given by the angel. "And the power of the king 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 people of the Holy Ones. And through his policy also he shall cause erait to prosper in his hand; and he shall magnify himself in his heart; and he shall destroy many while in negligent security: he shall also stand up against the prince of princes; but he shall be broken without hand."

1. *The little horn was to cast the stars of heaven to the ground, and stamp upon them*—The religion of *Mohammed* has professedly set itself up against *the symbolical host and stars of heaven, or the bishops and pastors of the Christian Church*; numbers of whom in the eastern part of the empire it cast down to the ground, compelling them either to apostatize, or stamping them as it were under its feet with all the fury of brutal fanaticism.

2. *The little horn was to magnify itself against the prince of the host and to cast down the truth to the ground*—Accordingly *Mohammed* did openly magnify

\* Hist. of Decline and Fall, Vol. ix. p. 267, 268, 269.

its founder against the divine author of the Christian religion. The impostor allowed Jesus the Son of Mary to be a prophet; but he maintained that he himself was a greater prophet, and that the Koran was destined to supersede the Gospel. He taught his infatuated disciples, that "the piety of Moses and of Christ rejoiced in the assurance of a future prophet, more illustrious than themselves: and that the evangelic promise of the Paraclete or Holy Ghost, was prefigured in the name, and accomplished in the person of Mohammed, the greatest and last of the Apostles of God."\* Thus destroying the mighty hosts of the rival nations of Rome and Persia, murdering and harassing the now degenerate people of the Holy Ones, taking away the daily sacrifice of prayer and praise, polluting the spiritual sanctuary,† and magnifying itself even against the prince of princes, *the little horn of Mohammedism* cast down the truth to the ground, and waxed exceeding great.

3. *The strength of the little horn was to be mighty, but not by its own strength*—The power, here spoken of, being a spiritual one, *its strength* will mean *that commanding influence which religion exerts over the soul of man*. Thus the mighty efficacy of the Gospel is described by the Apostle as "quick, and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and

\* Hist. of Decline and Fall, Vol. ix. p. 267.

† Mr. Kett, although he supposes *the little horn* to relate in part to *Mohammedism*, very inconsistently takes *the sanctuary* in a literal sense; and thence argues, that "Jerusalem is designated as the principal scene or object of the tyranny of *this horn*." He is led into this error by his system of *doubt interpretations of the same prophecy*: for he adds, "first, during the Jewish, and lastly during the Christian dispensation." *The little horn* therefore, according to his system, first polluted *the sanctuary* in the days of *Antiochus*: secondly, in the time of *the Romans*; thirdly, under *Mohammed*; and lastly, will pollute it by the arms of *professed infidels*—Now, though the *literal sanctuary* was polluted by *Antiochus* and *the Romans*, (neither of whom by the way can have the slightest connection with *the little horn*;) it certainly was not by *Mohammed*; and for this very substantial reason; in *his days* it was no longer in existence—As for *Jerusalem*, it was no more the principal scene of *Mohammedan triumphs*, than *Persia*, *Greece*, *Arabia*, or *gypt*: nor has *the sanctuary*, which was to be polluted by *the little horn*, any reference whatsoever to *the temple*—(See Hist. the Interp. Vol. I. p. 350, 351, 359) *The infidel power*, or *Antichrist* will indeed plant the curtains of his pavilions between the seas in *the glorious holy mountain*, at the era of *the restoration of the Jews*: but this exploit is certainly not foretold in the present prophecy, which treats of quite a *different power*.

is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart.\*† The Gospel accordingly, when preached to the heathen world, shewed by its successful progress, that it was not only mighty, but mighty by its own divine strength. It required not the assistance of the temporal arm; but, on the contrary, prevailed over all the persecutions that could be raised against it. Hence its illustrious founder is prophetically addressed by the Psalmist, "Gird thy sword upon thy thigh, O *most mighty*, with thy glory and thy majesty. And in thy majesty ride prosperously because of truth and meekness and righteousness; and thy right hand shall teach thee terrible things."† And hence the propagation of the Gospel in the primitive ages is described by St. John in the same sublime strain of allegory: "And I saw, and, behold, a white horse: and he that sat on him had a bow; and a crown was given unto him: and he went forth conquering and to conquer."‡ But *Mohammedism*, strong as it afterwards became, and great as was the influence which it possessed over the minds of its votaries, was not mighty by *its own natural strength*. It avowedly relied, not upon the still small voice of reason and argument, and evidence; not upon the louder claims of miracles, which could neither be denied, nor accounted for on physical principles; not upon its own intrinsic worth and purity, *its own divine unassisted strength*: but upon the enthusiastic valour of its adherents, *the strength of the Saraccenic word*. *Ten years* Mohammed persevered in the exercise of his mis-

\* Heb. iv. 12.

† Psalm xlv. 3, 4.

‡ Rev. vi. 2. I cannot but wonder, how Bp. Newton could think of applying *this symbolical description to the conquests of the Flavian family*. In order that the prophecies of St. John may be consistent with themselves, *the rider upon the white horse*, mentioned in this passage, must be the same as *the rider upon the white horse* celebrated in the nineteenth chapter of the Apocalypse, who is there declared to be *the personal Word of God*. Bp. Newton objects, that no good reason can be given for representing the Church in triumph and glory at a period when she was most grievously persecuted and afflicted. But this objection cannot be esteemed of any weight, when we consider, that the victories of the Church, being purely of a *spiritual* nature, have been usually the greatest, when her *temporal* estate has been the most depressed. Accordingly, when the Church was established by Constantine in great *temporal* prosperity, the Spirit of God sets so light by this *outwardly* glorious event, that it represents it as "holpen with only a *little* help." (Dan. xi. 34.) because as Bp. Newton himself observes, "though it added much to the *temporal* prosperity, yet it contributed little to the *spiritual* graces and virtues of Christians." Mr. Mede justly supposes *the rider upon the white horse* to mean *the Messiah*. Com. Apoc. in Sigil. I.

sion, depending upon *the strength* of his religion *alone*; and during that period, the superstition, which has since overspread the eastern world, “advanced with a slow and painful progress *only within* the walls of Mecca,” for as yet the pseudo-propaet “disclaimed the use of religious violence:”\* *in one day* three thousand were added to the Church by a single sermon of St. Peter; and in *ten years* after the passion of the Messiah, Christianity had been planted in Samaria,† Phœnicia, Cyprus, Antioch,‡ and Etniopia,§ exclusive of Judæa and Galilee.|| Mohammed, finding that he was likely to make but little progress if he relied upon nothing but *the strength* of his cause, after he had made himself prince of Medina, “assumed in his new revelations, a fiercer and more sanguinary tone, which proves that his former moderation was the effect of weakness. The means of persuasion had been tried, the season of forbearance was elapsed, and he was now commanded to propagate his religion by the sword, to destroy the monuments of idolatry, and, without regarding the sanctity of days or months, to pursue the unbelieving nations of the earth—In the first months of his reign, he practised the lessons of holy warfare, and displayed his white banner before the gates of Medina: the martial apostle fought in person at nine battles or sieges; and fifty enterprizes of war were achieved in ten years by himself or his lieutenants.” Hence we may satisfactorily account for the greater rapidity with which his religion spread during these *second* ten years, than during the *former* ten years when he confined himself merely to preaching. “The sword,” said he to his intrepid followers, “is the key of heaven and of hell: a drop of blood shed in the cause of God, a night spent in arms, is of more avail than two months of fasting and prayer: whosoever falls in battle, his sins are forgiven: at the day of judgment his wounds shall be resplendent as vermilion and odoriferous as musk: and the loss of his limbs shall be supplied by the wings of angels and cherubim.”¶ Thus was the power of *Mo-*

\* Hist. of Decl. and Fall, Vol. ix. p. 285, 286.

† Acts viii. 5.

‡ Acts xi. 19—Ac’s xiii.

§ Acts viii. 27.

|| Act. ix. 31.

¶ Hist. of Decline and Fall, Vol. ix. p. 294, 295, 296, 297.

*hammedism* mighty, but not like the Gospel, by its own power: thus did it destroy wonderfully, and prosper, and practise.\*

4. *Another mark of the power, symbolized by the little horn, is, that "through his policy he shall cause craft to prosper in the land:"* whence we must conclude, that *the power*, thus symbolized, was to be no less crafty than warlike—Let us hear the voice of history. "In the exercise of political government, Mohammed was compelled to abate of the stern rigour of fanaticism, to comply in some measure with the prejudices and passions of his followers, and to employ even the vices of mankind as the instruments of their salvation. *The use of fraud and perjury, of cruelty and injustice, were often subservient to the propagation of the faith;* and Mohammed commanded or approved the assassination of the Jews and idolaters who had escaped from the field of battle. *By the repetition of such acts, the character of Mohammed must have been gradually stained, and the influence of such pernicious habits would be poorly compensated by the practice of the personal and social virtues which are necessary to maintain the reputation of a prophet among his sectaries and friends.* Of his last years ambition was the ruling passion: and a politician will suspect, that he

\* I prefer this interpretation of the passage, "his power shall be mighty, but not by his own power," to that adopted by Mr. Kett. "As the kingdoms of the West," says he, "gave their power to the *beast*, or the *papal Antichrist*; so have the kingdoms of the East given theirs to the *Mohammedan Antichrist*. But I conceive this is not all that is here meant. *The dragon* gave his power to the *beast*, and the *angel of the bottomless pit* led on the *Saracenic locusts*; and thus the angel may be understood to say, *The power of this horn shall be not merely that which is common to the conquerors of the East, such as the he-goat or four beasts in the former vision; it is to be directed and supported by super human art and strength; which shall enable it to destroy wonderfully, to prosper and practise.*" (Hist. the Int. Vol. I. p. 336, 337.) *The angel of the bottomless pit*, who was the *king of the Saracenic locusts*, is not, as Mr. Kett supposes, the *devil*, but the *prophet himself*; whose descriptive name *Apollyon*, or the *destroyer*, as Bp. Newton justly observes, "agrees perfectly well with Mohammed and the caliphs his successors, who were the authors of all those horrid wars and desolations, and who openly taught and professed that their religion was to be propagated and established by the sword." The exact coincidence even of expression between Daniel and St. John is well worthy of our notice. Daniel describes *the power* represented by the *little horn* as *destroying* wonderfully, as *destroying* the mighty and the people of the Holy Ones, as *destroying* many in negligent security: St. John styles the author of Mohammedism *Apollyon* or a *destroyer*. Mr. Kett does elsewhere justly consider *Apollyon* to be a descriptive name of Mohammed and his successors (Vol. II. p. 73, 74); which renders his former mistake the more singular.

secretly smiled (the victorious impostor !) at the enthusiasm of his youth and the credulity of his proselytes — In the support of truth *the arts of fraud and fiction* may be deemed less criminal ; and he would have started at *the foulness of the means*, had he not been satisfied of the importance and justice of the end.\* Such is the unwilling confession even of his apologist Mr. Gibbon : nor was *perfidy* the exclusive characteristic of Mohammed alone : his example in this respect has been but too faithfully copied by his numerous votaries. “It is scarcely credible how far the littleness of pride is carried by the Porte, in all their transactions with the Christian princes. To support their faith, and to extend their empire, are the only law of nations which they acknowledge. Their treaties amount only to a temporary remission of that implacable enmity, with which their religion inspires them against every thing not Mohammedan. They consider the most solemn treaties in the light of a truce, which they are at liberty to break, whenever they can more effectually serve the cause of Mohammed. In this they are much assisted by the nature of the Arabic language, which they mix with the Turkish in their public acts, and which, by the various application of its terms, literal and metaphorical, enables them to give whatever interpretation they please, to the contract.”† “In a word, lust, arrogance, covetousness, and the most exquisite hypocrisy, complete their character.”‡

5. *Another characteristic, which the angel gives us of the little horn, is, that “he should destroy many which be in a state of negligent security”*—This peculiarity is remarkably exemplified in the whole progress of the Saracenic arms. “The birth of Mohammed was fortunately placed in the most degenerate and disorderly period of the Persians, the Romans, and the Barbarians of Europe; the empires of Trajan, or even of Constantine, or Char-

\* Hist. of Decline and Fall, Vol. ix. p. 322, 323

+ Eton's Survey of Turkish Empire, p. 106 cited by Kett.

‡ Maundrell's Travels, p. 149 cited by Kett.

§ This declaration of Mr. Gibbon affords another proof that *the power symbolized by the Mohammedan little horn arose when the transgressors were come to the full*, though I conceive *the commencement of the 1260 days to be peculiarly alluded to by this expression.*

lemagne, would have repelled the assault of the naked Saracens : and the torrent of fanaticism might have been obscurely lost in the sands of Arabia. In the victorious days of the Roman republic, it had been the aim of the senate to confine their consuls and legions to a single war, and completely to suppress a first enemy before they provoked the hostilities of a second. These timid maxims of policy were disdained by the magnanimity or enthusiasm of the Arabian caliphs. With the same vigour and success they invaded the successors of Augustus, and those of Artaxerxes ; and the rival monarchies at the same instant became the prey of *an enemy, whom they had been so long accustomed to despise.*\*\*

Let us first observe the effects of this fatal and presumptuous security in the case of *Persia*. The battle of Cadesia determined the fate of that empire. Three days did the encounter continue. On the last morning, “ the clangor of arms was re-echoed to the tent of Rustom, who, far unlike the ancient hero of his name, was *gently reclining in a cool and tranquil shade*, amidst the baggage of his camp, and the train of mules that were laden with gold and silver. On the sound of danger, he started from his couch ; but his flight was overtaken by a valiant Arab, who caught him by the foot, struck off his head, hoisted it on a lance, and instantly returning to the field of battle, carried slaughter and dismay among the thickest ranks of the Persians—After the defeat of Cadesia, a country intersected by rivers and canals might have opposed an insuperable barrier to the victorious cavalry ; and the walls of Ctesiphon or Madayn, which had resisted the battering rams of the Romans, would not have yielded to the darts of the Saracens. But the flying Persians were overcome by the belief, that the last day of their religion and empire was at hand ; the strongest posts were abandoned by treachery or cowardice ; and the king, with a part of his family and treasures, escaped to Holwan at the foot of the Median hills. In the third month after the battle, Saïd, the lieutenant of Omar, passed the Tigris without opposition ; the capi-

\* Hist. of Decline and Fall, Vol. ix. p. 360, 361.



tal was taken by assault; and the disorderly resistance of the people gave a keener edge to the sabres of the Moslems."\*

Let us next consider the effects of the same impolitic security in the case of *the rival empire of Constantinople*. "About four years after the triumphs of the Persian war,† the *repose of Heraclius and the empire* was again disturbed by a new enemy, the power of whose religion was more strongly felt than it was clearly understood by the Christians of the East. In his palace of Constantinople or Antioch *he was awakened* by the invasion of Syria, the loss of Bosra, and the danger of Damascus. An army of seventy thousand veterans, or new levies, was assembled at Hems, or Hemesa, under the command of his general Werdan—During two successive engagements the temperate firmness of Caled sustained the darts of the enemy, and the murmurs of his troops. At length, when the spirits and quivers of the adverse line were almost exhausted, Caled gave the signal of onset and victory. The remains of the Imperial army fled to Antioch, or Cesarèa, or Damascus; and the death of four hundred and fifty Moslems was compensated by the opinion that they had sent to hell above fifty thousand of the infidels."‡—"In the life of Heraclius, the glories of the Persian war are clouded on either hand by the disgrace and weakness of his more early and his later days. When the successors of Mohammed unsheathed the sword of war and religion, *he was astonished at the boundless prospect of toil and danger: his nature was indolent, nor could the infirm and frigid age of the emperor be kindled to a second effort*. The sense of shame, and the importunities of the Syrians, prevented his hasty departure from the scene of action; but the hero was no more; and the loss of Damascus and Jerusalem, the bloody fields of Arzadin and Yermuk, may be imputed in some degree to the absence or misconduct of the sovereign."§

Most of *the smaller conquests of the Saracens* were, in a similar manner, achieved by surprise. "From his

\* Hist. of Decline and Fall, Vol. ix. p. 367, 368, 369.

† Namely, the triumphs of Heraclius over Chosroes.

‡ Hist. of Decline and Fall, p. 388, 390, 391.

§ Ibid. p. 412.

camp in Palestine, Amrou had surprised or anticipated the caliph's leave for the invasion of Egypt. The magnanimous Omar trusted in his God and his sword, which had shaken the thrones of Chosroes and Cesar; but, when he compared the slender force of the Moslems with the greatness of the enterprise, he condemned his own rashness, and listened to his timid companions. The pride and the greatness of Pharaoh were familiar to the readers of the Koran; and a tenfold repetition of prodigies had been scarcely sufficient to effect, not the victory, but the flight, of six hundred thousand of the Children of Israel: the cities of Egypt were many and populous; their architecture was strong and solid; the Nile, with its numerous branches, was alone an insuperable barrier; and the granary of the imperial city would be obstinately defended by the Roman powers. In this perplexity, the commander of the faithful resigned himself to the decision of chance, or, in his opinion, of providence. At the head of only four thousand Arabs, the intrepid Amrou had marched away from his station of Gaza, when he was overtaken by the messenger of Omar. *If you are still in Syria, said the ambiguous mandate, retreat without delay; but if, at the receipt of this epistle, you have already reached the frontiers of Egypt, advance with confidence, and depend on the succour of God and of your brethren.* The experience, perhaps the secret intelligence, of Amrou had taught him to suspect the mutability of courts; and he continued his march till his tents were unquestionably pitched on Egyptian ground. He there assembled his officers, broke the seal, perused the epistle, gravely inquired the name and situation of the place, and declared his ready obedience to the commands of the caliph. After a siege of thirty days, he took possession of Farmah or Pelusium; and that key of Egypt, as it has been justly named, unlocked the entrance of the country, as far as the ruins of Heliopolis and the neighbourhood of the modern Cairo.\*

The conquest of *the African province* soon followed that of *Egypt*. "At the head of forty thousand Mos-

\* Hist. of Decline and Fall, Vol ix p 427, 428, 429.

lems, Abdallah advanced from Egypt into the unknown countries of the West. The sands of Barca might be impervious to a Roman legion : but the Arabs were attended by their faithful camels ; and the natives of the desert beheld without terror the familiar aspect of the soil and climate. After a painful march, they pitched their tents before the walls of Tripoli, a maritime city, in which the name, the wealth, and the inhabitants, of the province had gradually centered, and which now maintains the third rank among the states of Barbary. A reinforcement of Greeks was *surprised* and cut in pieces on the sea-shore : but the fortifications of Tripoli resisted the first assaults ; and the Saracens were tempted by the approach of the prefect Gregory to relinquish the labours of the siege for the perils and the hopes of a decisive action—To the courage and discretion of Zobeir the lieutenant of the caliph entrusted the execution of his own stratagem, which inclined the long-disputed balance in favour of the Saracens. Supplying by activity and artifice the deficiency of numbers, a part of their forces lay concealed in their tents, while the remainder prolonged an irregular skirmish with the enemy, till the sun was high in the heavens. On both sides they retired with fainting steps : their horses were unbridled, their armour was laid aside, and the hostile nations prepared, or seemed to prepare, for the refreshment of the evening, and the encounter of the ensuing day. On a sudden, the charge was sounded ; the Arabian camp poured forth a swarm of fresh and intrepid warriors ; and the long line of the Greeks and Africans was surprised, assaulted, overturned, by new squadrons of the faithful, who, to the eye of fanaticism, might appear as a band of angels descending from the sky—After the fall of this opulent city, the provincials and barbarians implored on all sides the mercy of the conqueror—The western conquests of the Saracens were suspended near twenty years, till their dissensions were composed by the establishment of the house of Ommyyah—The first lieutenant of Moawiyah acquired a just renown, subdued an important city, defeated an army of thirty thousand Greeks, swept away fourscore thousand captives, and enriched with their

spoils the bold adventurers of Syria and Egypt. But the title of *conqueror of Africa* is more justly due to his successor Akbah—The fearless Akbah plunged into the heart of the country, traversed the wilderness in which his successors erected the splendid capitals of Fez and Morocco, and at length penetrated to the verge of the Atlantic and the great desert. The river Sus descends from the western sides of mount Atlas ; fertilizes, like the Nile, the adjacent soil ; and falls into the sea at a moderate distance from the Canary or Fortunate islands. Its banks were inhabited by the last of the Moors, a race of savages, without laws, or discipline, or religion : *they were astonished by the strange and irresistible terrors of the Oriental arms* : and, as they possessed neither gold nor silver, the richest spoil was the beauty of the female captives, some of whom were afterwards sold for a thousand pieces of gold.\*

The same fatality attended *the Gothic kingdom of Spain* : like most of the other conquests of the Saracens, it fell into their hands by indulging in the hollow security of peaceful carelessness. The perfidious count Julian “ revealed, in his epistles, or in a personal interview with the Arab general Musa, the wealth and nakedness of his country ; the weakness of an unpopular prince ; the degeneracy of an effeminate people. The Goths were no longer the victorious barbarians, who had humbled the pride of Rome, despoiled the queen of nations, and penetrated from the Danube to the Atlantic ocean. *Secluded from the world by the Pyrenæan mountains, the successors of Alaric had slumbered in a long peace : the walls of the cities were mouldered into dust : the youth had abandoned the exercise of arms ; and the presumption of their ancient renown would expose them in a field of battle to the first assault of the invaders.* The ambitious Saracen was fired by the ease and importance of the attempt ; but the execution was delayed till he had consulted the commander of the faithful ; and his messenger returned with the permission of Walid to annex the unknown kingdoms of the West to the religion and

\* Hist. of Decline and Fall, Vol. ix. p. 450—453.

throne of the caliphs. In his residence of Tangier, Musa, with secrecy and caution, continued his correspondence, and hastened his preparations. *But the remorse of the conspirators was soothed by the fallacious assurance, that he should content himself with the glory and spoil, without aspiring to establish the Moslems beyond the sea that separates Africa from Europe.*" Musa having at length invaded Spain, its Gothic sovereign and nobility too late perceived the magnitude of the danger. "In the neighbourhood of Cadiz, the town of Xeres, has been illustrated by the encounter which determined the fate of the kingdom. The stream of the Gaudalete, which falls into the bay, divided the two camps, and marked the advancing and retreating skirmishes of three successive and bloody days. On the fourth day, the two armies joined a more serious and decisive issue; but Alarie would have blushed at the sight of his unworthy successor, sustaining on his head a diadem of pearls, encumbered with a flowing robe of gold and silken embroidery, and reclining on a litter or car of ivory drawn by two white mules."\* This battle terminated in the complete victory of the Saracens; "and the remains of the Gothic army were scattered or destroyed in the flight and pursuit of the three following days."† Thus has *the Mohammedan little horn* destroyed many while slumbering in a state of false security; and thus accurately has the prophecy of Daniel been fulfilled.

6. *The only remaining peculiarity, which the angel ascribes to this tyrannical superstition, is still future: it is destined to be broken without hand*—This event is to take place at the close of the 2200 years, which, as we have seen, synchronizes with the termination of the 1260 years; when *the spiritual sanctuary* will begin to be cleansed from *the abominations of the two-fold Apostasy*. In the prediction of Daniel, *Mohammedism* alone is spoken of: its two principal supporters, *the Saracens* and *the Turks*, are not discriminated from each other: a gen-

\* The resemblance between the effeminate and unwarlike habiliments of the Spanish Roderic and the Persian Rustam cannot but have been observed by the reader. Each "was destroyed in negligent security."

† Hist of Decline and Fall, Vol. ix p. 469—474.

eral history of the superstition, from its commencement to its termination, is given, without descending to *particularize* the nations, by which it should be successively patronized. In the Revelation of St. John this deficiency is amply supplied: and we are furnished with two distinct and accurate paintings both of *Saracenic locusts* under their exterminating leader, and of *the Euphratean horsemen* of the four Turkish sultanies.\* “The sovereignty of Arabia was lost,” long before the expiration of *the 2200 years*, “by the extent and rapidity of conquest. The colonies of the nation were scattered over the East and the West, and their blood was mingled with the blood of their converts and captives. After the reign of three caliphs, the throne was transported from Medina to the valley of Damascus and the banks of the Tigris; the holy cities were violated by impious war; Arabia was ruled by the rod of a subject, perhaps of a stranger; and the Bedoweens of the desert, awakening from their dream of dominion, resumed their old and solitary independence.”† *The Turks* at present, jointly with *the Persians*, occupy the place and empire of *the Saracens*; and *the little horn of Mohammedism* has branched out into the rival sects of *the Shiites* and *the Sunnites*. It appears however from the Apocalypse, that *the Ottoman power*, like its predecessor *the Saracenic Caliphate*, will be annihilated previous to the complete expiration of *the 2200 and the 1260 years*, and consequently previous to the downfall of *the Roman beast under his last head* and of *his little horn the papal false prophet*. *The mystic waters of the Euphrates* are to be completely dried up under *the sixth vial*; and by their exhaustion are to prepare a way for *the kings from the East*, and for the gathering together of *the grand confederacy of the beast, the false prophet, and the kings of the Latin earth*, to their destruction at Megiddo: but *the confederacy itself* is not to be destroyed till *the seventh vial* is poured out, and till *the 1260 years* are fully accomplished.‡ *The downfall of the Ottoman empire*,

\* Rev. ix.

† Hist. of Decline and Fall, Vol. ix. p. 353.

‡ Compare Rev. ix. 14, 15, xvi. 12, 13, 14, 15, 16. with xvi. 17—21. and xix. 1—21. These matters will be discussed more fully hereafter.

the prognostics of which are even now sufficiently visible, will greatly weaken *the spiritual horn of Mohammedism*, but certainly not altogether break its strength. *The false religion of the Arabian impostor* will still be professed in Persia, Hindostan, and Barbary; nor will it be finally "broken without hand" till *the 2200 years* shall have expired. What precise idea we are to annex to this phrase, can only be positively determined by the event:\* this however we assuredly know, that *the eastern little horn*, like its *western fellow*, will be for ever broken at the termination of that period. Concerning what is future we cannot venture to go beyond the express declarations of Scripture; but of that which is past we may speak with confidence and precision.

We may see then, *that the little horn of the he-goat or Macedonian empire* answers, in every particular that has hitherto been accomplished, chronological as well as circumstantial, to *the successful imposture of Mohammed*: we have seen, that only *one* particular yet *remains unaccomplished*; and that even *that* has already *begun* to be fulfilled: and we have further seen, that, although the

\*The expression is ambiguous. If conjecture be allowable in such a matter, it may either mean, that *Mohammedism* shall be as it were practically confuted and silenced by the second advent of Christ, against whom the impostor had presumed to stand up (Compare Daniel ii. 34, 35, 44, 45): or it may mean, that it shall gradually fall away to nothing by the desertion of its votaries, and thus die a sort of natural death. *The exhaustion of the Euphrates* will no doubt greatly weaken it: and it is a remarkable circumstance, even in *these* eventful times, that a sect has lately made its appearance in the very country of the false Arabian prophet, which threatens no less than the destruction of his religion itself. *The Wahabees* are infidels; and their numbers are daily increasing. Their opinions have been maintained in secret near *sixty years*; and they at length find themselves strong enough to take up arms in defence of them. It is said, that they occupy the greatest part of the country which extends from Medina to the Euphrates. Their last exploit, of which we have recently received an account, shews their decided hostility to *Mohammedism* in a very striking point of view. Having reinforced their army from the desert, and having overwhelmed the whole adjacent country, they suddenly assaulted and took the city of Medina with infinite bloodshed and devastation. They set fire to it in various places; destroyed the mosques, after having ransacked them of their shrines and treasures; and completely demolished the tomb of the prophet. Some thousands of females of the first rank were carried off by the besiegers into the desert, with a number of the principal male inhabitants. A troop of camels was also sent away with jewels and other treasure to an immense amount. (See Morning Post, Feb. 22, 1806.) Should this sect continue to increase, *Mohammedism* must fall eventually by mere force of opinion. If its votaries continue gradually to abandon it, we may easily conceive, how, at *the time of the end*, it will be *broken without hand*. The reader will of course view the whole that has been said on this point in the light of mere conjecture.

character of *the little horn* agrees in some particulars with those of *Antiochus Epiphanes*, *the Romans*, and *the power of Infidelity*; yet it entirely disagrees with them in others:—the result therefore of the whole inquiry must be this, that the prophet designed to symbolize by *the little horn Mohammedism*, and nothing but *Mohammedism*.



#### CHAPTER VI.

*Concerning Daniel's last vision, and the king who magnified himself above every God.*

DANIEL, having in his *two former visions* predicted *the tyranny of the two-fold Apostacy of Popery and Mohammedism*, proceeds in his *concluding prophecy*,\* to give a most accurate account of the subversion of *the Medo-Persian empire*, the rise of *the Macedonian empire*, its subsequent division into *four kingdoms*, the wars of *the Greek kings of Syria and Egypt*, and *the conquest of Jerusalem by the Romans*. The whole of this, which is only an *enlarged and literal* repetition of his former *brief and symbolical* predictions, serves as a kind of chronological introduction to the history of *the king who was to magnify himself above every god*; in the same manner as the vision of *the four beasts* conducted us to *the tyrannical reign of the papal horn*, and the vision of *the ram and the he-goat* to *the exploits of the Mohammedan horn*.

*The first part* of this wonderful minute prophecy has been so amply and satisfactorily explained by Bp. Newton, that it would be superfluous in me to offer any observations upon it. Suffice it to say, in the words of that excellent commentator, “there is not so complete and regular a series of *the kings of Egypt and Syria*, there is not so concise and comprehensive an account of their affairs, to be found in any author of those times. The prophecy is really more perfect than any history.”

\* Dan. x, xi, xii.



The explanation of *the second part* of this prediction is attended with considerably more difficulties, than that of *the first*. The main question here, which offers itself to our attention, is this: *What power did Daniel mean to describe under the character of the king who was to magnify himself above every god! Are we to suppose, that this part of the prophecy is only a repetition of the history of one of the little horns; or that it is a prediction of some third power distinct from them both!*

Bp. Newton adopts, in *part at least*, the former of these suppositions. He explains *this king* to signify, *primarily*, the *Roman emperors*, after the conversion of the empire to Christianity; and, *secondarily*, to mean at once *the Greek emperors in the East*, and *the Bishops of Rome in the West*, the king consequently, in his latter character, is *the papal little horn* combined, as it were, with the temporal authority of *the Constantinopolitan sovereigns*. Hence he applies some parts of the prophecy to *the Roman emperors, before the division of the empire*, some to *the Papacy in the West*, and some to *the Constantinopolitan emperors in the East*—He conjectures, for instance, that *the king's doing according to his will, his magnifying himself above every god, and his speaking marvellous things against the God of gods*, intimate, “that, after the empire was become Christian, there should spring up in the Church *an antichristian power*, that should act in the most absolute and arbitrary manner, exalt itself above all laws divine and human, dispense with the most solemn and sacred obligations, and in many respects enjoin what God had forbidden, and forbid what God had commanded. *This power* began in *the Roman emperors*, who summoned councils, and directed and influenced their determinations almost as they pleased. After the division of the empire, this *power* still increased, and was exerted principally by *the Greek emperors in the East*, and by *the Bishops of Rome in the West*.\* *The king's disregarding the desire of women* he applies to *monasticism*, whether oriental or occidental, and to *the constrained celibacy of the clergy*; his *veneration of Makuzzim*, or tutelary demi-

gods, to *the idolatrous worship of saints and angels*, first openly established and required by the church of Rome, though prevalent likewise in the Greek church; and *his wars with the king of the south and the king of the north, to the invasion of the eastern empire by the Saracens, and its final subversion by the Turks.*\*

Mr. Kett, adhering to his plan of *primary and secondary completions of the same prophecy*, adopts the latter supposition, yet without excluding the former—"The application," says he, "of this prophecy to *the papal Antichrist; to the conquests of the Saracen king of the south, and the Turkish king of the north, over the holy land and many other countries; the escape of Arabia, and the subjection of Egypt and Barbary*; have been clearly, I had almost said *indisputably*, established by many learned commentators. But, how far this prophecy may be considered as *a double type of Antichrist*, and how much may be supposed to be *yet future*, are questions which can only be decided by a careful comparison with other prophecies respecting the same period, and by the course of events which time shall bring to light."†—He afterwards adds: "The accomplishment, which *the former part of this prophecy*" (concerning *the king who was to magnify himself above every god*) "has received in *the papal power, and in the conquests of the Mohammedan power*, is confessedly accurate: but much remains to be fulfilled; and many reasons might be produced to authorize the conjecture, that even *that part* of the prophecy, which has been so decidedly fulfilled, will hereafter receive a more *full and perfect* accomplishment."‡—He further observes, that "the end of *this king*" (meaning, I apprehend from the context, *the king*

\* Ibid. Dissert. xvii. Dr. Zouch, for any thing that appears to the contrary, applies the prophecy relative to *this king* exclusively to *the Papacy*. He forbears however noticing that part of it, which treats of the wars of *the king with the kings of the North and the South*. Yet these wars constitute so very prominent a feature in the history of *the king*, whatever power he may be designed to represent, that they surely ought not to have been omitted: especially since Dr. Zouch asserts, that, in his character, "we discover a designation of the same power," as that symbolized by *the papal little horn*, "some-what indeed diversified, but not so as to prevent us from acknowledging its identity" (Zouch on Prophecy, p. 163—171.) Mr. Mede's exposition of the prophecy is nearly the same as that of Bp. Newton's. I shall hereafter discuss it conjointly with that of the Bishop.

† Hist. the Interp. Vol. i. p. 368.

‡ Ibid. p. 373.

of the North) “whether Mohammedan or Infidel, is to be exactly similar to the end of the Grecian little horn, and the horn of the fourth beast in the former vision: yet he shall come to his end, and none shall help him.”\*—And he lastly conjectures: “If infidel France be this king of the North, we may presume that it will take possession of the present dominions of the Turkish Mohammedan power.”†—The whole that Mr. Kett has said upon the subject of the prophecy now under consideration, is so extremely obscure, and so widely scattered in different parts of his work, that I greatly fear, lest I should undesignedly be guilty of misrepresenting his meaning. As far however as I am able to collect his sentiments from these several passages when viewed in connection with each other, it appears, that Mr. Kett supposes *the king who magnified himself above every god* to be primarily *the Papacy*: but that he wishes nevertheless this supposition to be adopted without excluding the possibility of his character being designed for a *double type of Antichrist*; that is, I suppose, *Antichrist both Papal and Infidel*, unless indeed Mr. Kett means *Antichrist both Papal and Mohammedan*, for he does not expressly say, in what manner the king is a *double type of Antichrist*. It further appears, that he doubts whether *the king of the North*, the mighty rival of *the king who magnified himself above every god*, be *Mohammedan Turkey*, or *infidel France*.‡ The sum therefore of the whole is, unless I have completely misunderstood Mr. Kett, that *the two potentates*, whom Daniel represents as such bitter enemies to each other, may after all be *one and the same*. As for instance: if *the king who magnified himself above every god* be secondarily *infidel France*, and if *the king of the North* be *infidel France* likewise, these two hostile kings are evidently made to be one power: and, on the other hand, if *the king who magnified himself above every god* be secondarily *Mohammedan Turkey*, and if *the king of the North* be *Mohammedan Turkey* likewise, in this case also the two rivals are equally identified

\* Hist. Interp. Vol. i. p. 374.

† Ibid. Vol. ii. p. 302.

‡ —“*this king*, whether Mohammedan or Infidel”—“if infidel France /—this king of the north?”—

with each other. For it is manifest, that *the king who magnified himself above every god* cannot be, as Mr. Kett supposes, a double type of *Antichrist*, without being secondarily either *Mohammedan Turkey*, or *infidel France*: and, let him be which of these two he may, he will be equally confounded with *the king of the North*, if *the king of the North* may be either *Mohammedan Turkey* or *infidel France* likewise.

With regard to the exposition offered by Bp. Newton, it is liable to a variety of objections.

1. *The first*, which presents itself to the mind, is, that it makes this last prediction of *Daniel* very little more than a mere repetition of a former one. Since the prophet had already described the tyranny of the *Papacy* under the symbol of a little horn, it is scarcely probable that he would resume a subject, which he had previously discussed and dismissed. Yet this superfluous resumption is necessarily supposed by such an exposition.\*

2. *The next objection* is its want of unity and simplicity. Each of the little horns symbolizes one single and distinct power: whence it is but reasonable to conclude, that *the king*, mentioned in the last prophecy of *Daniel*, is one single and distinct power likewise. But the system of Bp. Newton makes him a complex power, exerted first in the empire in general, and afterwards partly in the East, and partly in the West; a sort of compound, in his latter character, of the Greek emperor and the Pope.

\* *Daniel's* frequent recapitulations of the temporal history of the four great empires are, not only not superfluous, but absolutely necessary. The great excellence of his prophecies is, that they are strictly both local and chronological ones. Hence he repeats the substance of *Nebuchadnezzar's* dream of the image in his vision of the four beasts, in order that we may exactly know at what era, and in what empire, to look for the tyranny of the first little horn: and hence, in a similar manner, he recapitulates the history of the second and third empires in his vision of the ram and the he-goat, in order that we may be able precisely to ascertain the age and country of the second little horn. For the same reason, he once more repeats, in his last vision, the history of the second and third empires, and the latter part of the history of the Romans; with a view to conduct us, in a regular chronological series, to the tyranny of the king who regarded not any god. Now, if this king be, in a great measure, the same as the first little horn; it is evident, that the last vision must be almost entirely a mere repetition of the vision of the four beasts; (the first of them alone being excluded) not a studied recapitulation of their temporal history, for the purpose of introducing a new character, different from those of which he had treated before. Consequently, upon such a supposition, the last vision will be a complete repetition, not a partial recapitulation.

This system with some shades of difference has the sanction of the venerable name of *Joseph Mede*. Mr. Mede includes in the character of *the king*, not only *the Pope*, together with *the Eastern and Western Emperors*, but likewise *the pagan Roman state from the time of Antiochus Epiphanes*.\* Such an unwarrantable licence of exposition seems to me to carry along with it its own confutation: for, if *a single prophetic character* may comprehend *so many different persons and things*, the application of the different parts of the prediction must be left entirely to the discretion of the commentator. In the prophecy, *a certain number of actions* are ascribed to *one single and distinct power*. But, if we inquire what is meant by *the king's speaking marvellous things against the God of gods*, Mr. Mede informs us, that it alludes to the crucifixion of our Lord by the Romans. If we next inquire, what is intended by *the king's doing according to his will*, we are taught by Bp. Newton that it relates to *a tyrannical power* exercised in the Church first by *the Christian emperors before the division of the Empire*, and afterwards by *the Greek Emperors in the East and the Popes in the West*. If we again inquire what is meant by *the king's magnifying himself above every god*, we are referred to the prophecy of *the man of sin*, and are told that it alludes to *the Pope*, receiving divine honours in the temple of God. If we further inquire what is meant by *the king's disregarding the desire of women*, we are then carried back to the days of the Emperor Constantine, the rise of monasticism in the East, and its subsequent establishment in the West. If we next inquire what is intended by *the king's honouring a foreign deity and certain Mahuzzim or tutelary gods*, we are referred to the idolatrous veneration of saints and angels which alike infected the rival churches of Rome and Constantinople. And, if we lastly require an explanation of *the wars of the king with the kings of the North and the South*, our attention is then entirely diverted from the Church to the State; and we are taught that they refer, not to any actions of *the Pope*,

\* Apostacy of the latter times, Part I Chap. 16, 17.

but to the wars of the *Eastern Emperor* with the *Saracens* and the *Turks*.

I cannot but think, that such a mode of exposition as this accords very ill with the definite simplicity, for which the prophecies of Daniel are so remarkable. Instead of treading with confidence upon sure ground, I feel myself bewildered in a succession of rapid changes from *Pagan Rome* to *Christian Rome*, from the *Emperors before the division of the Empire* to the *Emperors after its division*, from the *Emperors of Constantinople* to the *Popes of Rome*, from the *East* to the *West* and from the *West* to the *East*, from the *State* to the *Church* and from the *Church* to the *State*, from the *impious adoration paid to the Roman Pontiff* to the *struggles of the Constantinopolitan monarch with the Saracens and the Turks*.

To this objection it would probably be answered, that *the king*, like the *ten-horned beast*, means the whole *Roman state*; and consequently that the different actions, performed by the different members of that state, are all ascribed to *the same king* or *kingdom*.

Such an answer, though perhaps the best that can be given, is to me by no means satisfactory. In the united prophecy of Daniel and St. John relative to the *Roman beast*, their own proper actions are assigned respectively to *his seven heads*, *his ten horns*, and *his little horn*; so that we are in no danger of mistaking either the actions or the persons of some of his members for either the actions or the persons of others of them;\* but, in the prophecy of *the king*, according to the mode of exposition now under consideration, all is confusion and uncertainty; insomuch that even Mr. Mede and Bp. Newton cannot agree as to the precise period of the Roman history when we are to suppose that the prophecy began to be accomplished; the one conceiving *the king* to mean *the Empire from the time of Antiochus Epiphanes*, and interpreting part of the prophecy to relate to the death of our Lord, the other dating the prophecy only from about *the days of Constantine*.

\* The same remark applies to the double prophecy respecting the *Macedonian empire* symbolized both by the *leopard* in one vision and by the *he-goat* in another. It likewise applies to the prophecy of the *Persian ram with two horns*.

3. *The last and most conclusive objection, which I shall urge, is, that such an exposition cannot be made to accord with the chronological series of events as detailed by Daniel, in regular succession, in this his concluding prophecy.*

We have the authority of our Lord for pronouncing, that *the abomination of desolation*, mentioned in the 31st verse of the 11th chapter, is to be referred to *the sacking of Jerusalem by the Romans*. Of this Bp. Newton is sensible; and therefore very justly applies *the two following verses\** to *the pagan persecutions of the primitive Christians*. "The Roman magistrates and officers," says he, "it is very well known, made use of the most alluring promises, as well as of the most terrible threatenings, to prevail upon them to renounce their religion, and offer incense to the statues of the emperors and images of the gods. Many were induced to comply with the temptation and apostatized from the faith, as we learn particularly from the famous epistle of Pliny to Trajan: but the true Christians, the people who knew their God, were strong; remained firm to their religion: and gave the most illustrious proofs of the most heroic patience and fortitude. It may too with strictest truth and propriety be said of the primitive Christians, that, being dispersed every where, and preaching the gospel in all the parts of the Roman empire, *they instructed many, and gained a great number of proselytes to their religion: yet they fell by the sword, and by flame, by captivity, and by spoil, many days*; for they were exposed to the malice and fury of ten general persecutions, and suffered all manner of injuries, afflictions, and tortures, with little intermission for the space of three hundred years."†

*The 31th verse‡* he with equal propriety applies to *the days of Constantine*. "The most natural way of interpretation," he justly observes, "is to follow the course and series of events. The Church had now laboured

\* "And such as do wickedly against the covenant shall he corrupt by flatteries; but the people, that do know their God, shall be strong, and do exploits. And they that understand among the people shall instruct many; yet they shall fall by the sword, and by the flame, by captivity, and by spoil, many days." Ver. 32, 33.

† Bp. Newton's Dissert. xvii.

‡ "Now, when they fall, they shall be holpen with a little help; but many shall cleave to them with flatteries." Ver. 34.

under long and severe persecutions from the civil power—The tenth and last general persecution was begun by Diocletian : it raged, though not at all times equally, ten years ; and was suppressed entirely by Constantine, the first Roman emperor, as it is universally known, who made open profession of Christianity : and then the Church was no longer persecuted, but was protected and favoured by the civil power. But still this is called only *a little help* : because, though it added much to the temporal prosperity, yet it contributed little to the spiritual graces and virtues, of Christians. It enlarged their revenues, and increased their endowments ; but proved the fatal means of corrupting the doctrine, and relaxing the discipline, of the Church. It was attended with this peculiar disadvantage, that *many cleave to them with flatteries*. Many became Christians, for the sake of the loaves and the fishes ; and pretended to be of the religion, only because it was the religion of the Emperor. Eusebius, who was a contemporary writer, reckons, that one of the reigning vices of the time was the dissimulation and hypocrisy of men fraudulently entering into the Church, and borrowing the name of Christians without the reality.”\*

Hitherto the Bishop has very clearly explained the meaning of the prophecy : but in his exposition of the *35th verset* he has not been equally successful. He supposes, that *this passage* relates, in the *first instance*, to the *quarrels of the Christians among each other*. “The Consubstantialists,” says he, “even in the time of Constantine, led the way by excommunicating and banishing the Arians. The latter, under the favour of Constantius and Valens, more than retorted the injury, and were guilty of many horrible outrages and cruelties towards the former.” He afterwards applies *the passage*, in the *second instance*, to the *persecution of the protestants by the papists*. “These calamities were to befall the Christians to try them, and purge, and make them white, not only at that time, but even to the time of the

\* Bp. Newton's Dissert. XVII.

† “And some of them of understanding shall fail,” (that is, *perish*) “in purifying them, and in purging them, and in making them white, even to the time of the end ; because it is yet unto the time appointed” Ver. 35.



*end, because it is yet for a time appointed*: and we see, even at this day, not to alledge other instances, how the poor protestants are persecuted, plundered, and murdered, in the southern parts of France.”\*

The only manner, in which prophecy can be satisfactorily explained is by strictly adhering to its plain unvarnished declarations. It is observable, that in *this verse* the true Church is represented as being *again* in a state of persecution, similar to that which she had *before* endured from the fury of Paganism. As, *in the first persecution*, they, that understood, were to instruct many; and, in consequence of their zeal, to fall by the sword, and by flame, by captivity, and by spoil: so, *in this second persecution*, some of the men of understanding are, in a similar manner, to perish in attempting to bring about a reformation in the now degenerate Christian world. Hence it is evident, that *the men of understanding* must, in both cases, be *men of the same principles*; that is, *men professing and acting up to the pure truths of the Gospel*, in contradistinction to *the heathens in the former instance*, and to *corrupt Christians† in the latter instance*. Such being the plain import of the prophecy, that part of it, which is contained in *the thirty-fifth verse*, certainly can have no relation to *the quarrels of the Consubstantialists and the Arians*. The passage in question describes, not *the variously successful and unsuccessful struggles of two rival parties*; but *the persecution of men, similar to the first martyrs of the Church, on account of their desire to purify their degenerate brethren*. We must look therefore for the accomplishment of the prediction in an age long posterior to that of the Consubstantialists and the Arians.

In our inquiries for this age of persecution we shall be greatly assisted by attending to the very accurate language of the prophet. He tells us, that *these men of understanding* shall continue in a persecuted state *to the time of the end*; because their trials are *yet unto the time appointed*. But *the time of the end* commences at the

\* Bp. Newton's Dissert. XVII.

† These corrupt Christians are styled *Gentiles* by St. John on account of their having relapsed into the old abominations of Gentile idolatry. Rev. xi. 2.

*termination of the 1260 years* : therefore the persecution of the second mentioned men of understanding is to continue to the end of the 1260 years. Hence it is manifest, that this persecution is the same as that which was to take place during the reign of the *papal horn*, represented by St. John under the images of *the witnesses prophesying in sackcloth*, and *the flight of the woman into the wilderness*. Daniel however, I conceive, meant specially to point out a *particular period* in the course of the 1260 years ; a period, which should bear a more striking and definite resemblance to the *period of heathen persecution*, than any other part of the reign of the *horn*. These *second men of understanding* are described by the prophet, as not content with *secretly* holding their opinions, and assembling their congregations, *in the deep recesses of mountains and forests* : but as *boldly* and *openly* coming forward, like the *first men of understanding* ; as labouring to *propagate* their tenets ; and as attempting to *purge, reform, and make white*, a corrupt and degenerate Church. Such a description agrees only with the glorious era of *the reformation*. The unfortunate and much injured Waldenses,\* cooped up in the mountainous regions of

\* The Abbé Barruel, in the true spirit of a determined Papist, has endeavoured to fix the imputation of *Manichæism* upon the Waldenses ; as if, even granting that he had been successful, such a charge would warrant the diabolical cruelties of his corrupt church. Grossly however as these victims of persecution have been misrepresented and vilified by the adherents of *popery*, there are not wanting testimonies in their favour borne even by papists themselves. Bp. Newton cites three of these witnesses, whom, as he justly observes, “both sides must allow to be unexceptionable. *Reinerius, Thuanus, and Mezeray*” The testimony of the last-mentioned author is short, but immediately to the purpose. “They had almost the same opinions,” says he, “as those who are now called *Calvinists*.” Their *real* crime is with much simplicity declared by Reinerius, who flourished about the year 1254, and who has the additional recommendation of being at once a Dominican and an Inquisitor general. “They live justly before men,” says he, “and believe all things rightly concerning God, and all the articles which are contained in the creed : *only*” —*hic niger est, hunc tu, Romane, cave to,*) “*only* they blaspheme the church of Rome, and the clergy,” in whom the multitude of the laity readily place an implicit confidence” (See Bp. Newton’s Dissert. on Rev. xi.) Whether the modern Abbé Barruel, or the ancient Inquisitor general Reinerius, be the most deserving of credit, the candid reader must determine for himself. “As there was a variety of names,” says Bp. Newton, “so there might be some diversity of opinions of them ; but that they were not guilty of *Manichæism* and of *abominable heresies*, which have been charged upon them, is *certain* and *evident* from all the remains of their creeds, confessions, and writings” The Albigenses are frequently considered as a branch of the Waldenses ; but according to Mosheim they were an entirely different people. Of the piety of the Waldenses he speaks in very high terms ; and even the Albigenses he exculpates from

France and Italy, existed indeed like leaven in a mass of bread-corn;\* but are little known except by their patient suffering for the cross of Christ, and by the relentless bigotry of their blood thirsty persecutors: while the martyrs of *the reformation* "have filled the whole world with their doctrine," and have raised an edifice against which the agents of *Papery* have vainly exerted all their powers. *The second persecution* then of *the men of understanding* must be referred in a peculiar, I had almost said *exclusive*, manner to *the reformation of the sixteenth century*. That it has such a reference *in part* at least, Bp. Newton himself allows: but, as if conscious that such an acknowledgment would *chronologically* invalidate his proposed interpretation of the prophecy respecting *the king who was to exalt himself above every god*, he cautiously adds, "the principal source of these persecutions is traced out in *the following verses*." Now, upon examining *these following verses*, we shall not find that they afford us any warrant to suppose, that *the king* was to be at all concerned in *persecuting the men of understanding*. In the whole account, which the prophet gives of his *character*,† not a single hint is dropped, that, like *the little papal horn*, he should wear out *the saints of the Most High*. At *the beginning* of his reign at least, all his exploits are of an entirely *different nature*, and directed to an entirely *different end*. They are exploits purely *atheistical*: for the object of his rancorous aversion, *the God of gods*, is alike venerated by *the adherents* and *the opponents of the Papacy*, by *the persecutors* and *the persecuted*. Toward *the end* of his reign indeed, it appears, that he will league himself with *the false prophet* or *the Papacy*; that they will jointly engage in a bloody war of extermination under the pretext of religion; and that the power of both will be finally broken in Palestine

the charge of *Manichæism*; and seems to think, that their opinions were more nearly allied to a mystical sort of fanaticism, than to heresy. "When we examine matters attentively," says he, "we find that even their enemies acknowledged the sincerity of their piety; that they were blackened by accusations, which were evidently false: and that the opinions, for which they were punished, differ widely from the Manichæan system." See Mosheim's *Eccles. Hist.* Vol. II. p. 580, 581, 583—Vol. III. p. 120—127. See also Mede's *Works*, B. III. Revel. Anichris. p. 722, and Lowman's *Paraph.* p. 152—156.

\* Matt. xiii. 38.

† See Dan. xi. 36—39.

between the two seas.\* But, whether *this religious war* will be undertaken against *the Protestants or the Jew.* or *both*, it is as yet future ; and will not even *commence*, as Daniel carefully informs us, till *the time of the end*, or till *the termination of the 1260 days*. Hence it certainly can have no connection with *the persecutions of the Papacy properly so called* : for *the papal little horn* was to wear out *the saints of the Most High* until *a time and times and half a time*, and *the faithful witnesses* of Christ were to prophesy in sackcloth during *the whole term of the 1260 days* ; whereas *the religious exterminating war of this king*, against whomsoever it may be directed, is not so much as to *begin* till *the very end* of that term. *The men of understanding, or the witnesses*, are to be in an afflicted state till the time of the end ; consequently their appointed period of persecution is *before* the time of the end, and ceases *at* the time of the end. At *this very time of the end* however *the religious war of the king* will be *first* undertaken : that is to say, the war will *commence*, when the persecution of the witnesses shall *cease*. Such being the case, *the war of the king*, if undertaken against *the witnesses*, must prove unsuccessful : and accordingly Daniel specially informs us, that it *will* prove unsuccessful. From this view of the subject we have a right to conclude, that *the sufferings of the men of understanding* are no way connected with *the impious tyranny of the king*. Whence it will of course follow, since *all* Daniel's prophecies are *strictly chronological*, and since *the second persecution of the men of understanding* peculiarly relates to the sufferings of *the protestant reformers*, that we are to look for *the rise of this king* not *before*, but *after*, the era of *the Reformation* : and therefore that *this king*, whoever he may be, cannot possibly be either *the Roman emperor, the Pope, or the impostor Mohammed* ; but must be *some other power* perfectly distinct from them all.

To state the whole argument more briefly ; the events succeed each other in the following order. In *the 31st verse of the 11th chapter*, Daniel predicts the desolation

\* Concerning this religious war more will be said hereafter.

of Jerusalem by the Romans : in *the 32d and 33d verses*, the persecutions of the primitive Christians : in *the 34th verse*, the conversion of the Empire under Constantine : and, in *the 35th verse*, the papal persecutions of *the witnesses*, more especially that which took place at the era of the Reformation.\* After having thus brought us down to *the 16th century*, he next proceeds to describe the character of *some power*, which he represents as a monster of wickedness and impiety. It is manifest therefore from the preceding order of events, that *this power*, whatever state may be intended by it, must be expected to spring up at some indefinite period *after* the Reformation, although *before* the time of the end : † and consequently, that all states, which arose *previous* to the Reformation, are by that very circumstance excluded from having any connection with *the power* in question.

Perhaps however it may be said, that there must be a fallacy in the objections which I have urged, and that they certainly cannot be solid however plausible they may appear, because one part of *the king's* character, *his disregard of the desire of women*, so decidedly proves him to be *that complex power*, which neglected and discouraged marriage both *in the East* and *in the West*, which at first prohibited only the second marriages of the clergy, but in time absolutely restrained them from marrying at all, that it is a vain labour to seek for *any power* that has arisen *after* the Reformation, to which such a description can be in the least degree applicable. “This,” says Bp. Newton, “was evidently not regarding *the desire of wives* or *conjugal affection*—So

\* The 32d, 33d, 34th, and 35th, verses describe *three successive periods of the Church*, which exactly coincide with the *three periods of the life of the Roman beast* after the promulgation of Christianity, *his death*, and *his revival*. The 32d and 33d verses describe the *first period* ; which reaches from the days of the Apostles to the time of Constantine. The 34th describes the *second period* ; during which *the beast* lay dead, and which reaches from the time of Constantine to the commencement of the *1260 years*. The 35th describes the *third period* ; at the commencement of which *the beast* revived by relapsing into his former state of persecuting idolatry, and which reaches from the *beginning of the 1260 years* to the *time of the end*, comprehending *the whole of the 1260 years*, although in treating of it the prophet peculiarly describes its most remarkable era, that of *the Reformation*. We are plainly taught however that it is to extend to the *time of the end*, or the very time when the expedition of *the wild* commences. Comp. Dan. xi. 35, 40.

† See Dan. xi. 35, 40.

much did *the power* here described magnify himself above all, even God himself, by contradicting the primary law of God and nature, and by making that dishonourable, which the Scripture hath pronounced honourable in all.\*

Could it once be satisfactorily proved, that *the disregard of the desire of women*, mentioned by Daniel, means the same thing as *the forbidding to marry*, predicted by St. Paul as one of the subordinate badges of *the Apostacy*,† I should readily allow, that this would be so strong an argument in favour of Bp. Newton's interpretation as justly to warrant a suspicion that there was a lurking fallacy in the objections which I have brought forward: but I can find no just grounds for supposing, that such is really the case. *The desire of women* does not signify *the desire to have women or wives*; but, on the contrary, *that which women or wives desire to have*. That such is the meaning of the expression is sufficiently manifest from the uniform and unvarying phrasology of the whole Hebrew Scriptures: at least I have not been able to discover a single passage in the Old Testament, wherein the word *desire*, when constructed as in the expression under consideration, ever signifies *a wish to have the thing imported by the substantive with which it is so constructed*. Thus *the desire of Israel* does not mean *the wish to have Israel*, but *that which Israel wished to have*, namely *Saul for a king*:‡ *the desire of thy soul* is not *the wish to have thy soul*, but *that which thy soul wishes to have*:§ *the desire of the heart* is not *the wish to have the heart*, but *that which the heart wishes to have*:|| *the desire of the wicked* is not *the wish to have the wicked*, but *that which the wicked wish to have*:||| *the desire of Ezekiel's eyes*¶ is not surely

\* 1 Tim. iv. 3.

† 1 Sam. ix. 20.

‡ 1 Sam. xxiii. 20.

§ Psalm x. 3 xxi. 2.

|| Psalm cxii. 10.

¶ Mr. Mede has been peculiarly unfortunate in his choice of this text to support his opinion, which is similar to that of Bp. Newton. It is true, that *the desire of Ezekiel's eyes* was *his wife*: but this will never prove, that *the desire of women* means *the conjugal state*: rather indeed the very reverse. Had Daniel wished to represent *the King* as disregarding and discouraging marriage, he would not have said (if we may argue at least from analogy) *he shall not regard the desire of women*, because he would have known that such a phrase in his own language conveyed quite a different idea: but, on the contrary, adopting Ezekiel's familiar and natural mode of expression, he would have said, *he shall not regard the desire of men's eyes*. Cicero's affectionate ad

the wish to have his eyes but that which his eyes desired, namely his wife :\* and thus not to weary the reader with a long detail of instances, the desire of all nations is not the wish to be master of all nations, but that which all nations desire, even the promised Messiah.† Arguing then from the analogy of idiom, we must conclude, that the desire of women does not mean, as Bp. Newton and Mr. Mede suppose, the desire of having women or wives, but that which women or wives desire to have ‡ The propriety of such an explanation of the phrase is yet further evident from the very context with which it is joined. Daniel is speaking of objects of religious worship, true and false, all of which this king was alike to disregard : and, among these objects, he was to pay as little regard to one which the prophet intitles the desire of women, as to any of the others. “The king shall magnify himself above every god.” After this general assertion, Daniel descends to particularize and specify what he meant to include under the expression of every god “He shall speak marvellous things against the God of gods ;—neither shall he regard the god of his fathers, nor the desire of women, nor” (a repetition of the first general assertion) “regard any god : for he shall magnify himself above all :” that is, above all the objects of worship which Daniel had just specified ; namely, the God of gods, the god of his fathers, the desire of women, and in short, every god. Such appears to be the natural and obvious meaning of the passage ; and it perfectly accords with the interpretation of the phrase, the desire of women, which I have deduced from the analogy of other similarly constructed phrases.

dress, to his wife, which Mr. Mede likewise adduces, *En mea lux, meum desiderium!* is as little applicable to the case in point as the text from Ezekiel. The desire of Cicero was not his love of himself, but of his wife : she was what his eyes desired, not his own person. See Mede’s Apostacy of the latter times, Part I. Chap. 16.

\* Ezek. xxiv. 16.

† Haggai ii. 7.

‡ The ingenious Mr. Dimock comes so very near the right interpretation of this passage, that it is a matter of wonder to me how he could have missed it. He proposes an alteration of the text ; and, instead of לְאֵלֵינוּ we men, would read לְאֵלֵי הַגּוֹיִם nations ; so that by the desire of nations might be meant Christ. Finding however, that his proposed alteration is unsupported by any authority, he does not venture to insist upon it : but allows, that the present reading is capable of good sense. See Wintle’s Version of Daniel in loc.

The question then is, *what object of religious worship* is pointed out by *the desire of women*? To this I readily answer *the Messiah*; for the title is perfectly applicable to *him*, and totally inapplicable to every *other* person. The original prediction of the promised seed was delivered specially to *Eve*. It was *her* seed, that was to bruise the head of the serpent, not *Adam's*. To the advent of this seed she impatiently looked forward: and, such was her eager desire, that, upon the birth of her first child, forgetting that Cain was Adam's seed no less than her own; she joyfully exclaimed, "*I have gotten a man, even Jehovah himself.*"\* *I hold in my arms the promised Messiah.* To the subsequent limitation of this promise to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, successively, we must attribute *the vehement desire*,† which Sarah, Rebekah, and Rachel, all felt to have children: and the same cause will satisfactorily account for the excessive horror which all the Israelitish women entertained of barrenness. "Let me go up and down the mountains, and bewail my virginity," was the mournful language of Jephthah's daughter, when doomed by her father's vow to perpetual celibacy: "the Lord hath taken away my reproach among men," was the joyful exclamation of Rachel and Elisabeth: "hail thou, that art highly favoured, the Lord is with thee, blessed art thou among women," was the salutation of the angel to the mother of the Saviour of mankind; *the desire indeed of all nations*, but, in a peculiar and mysterious sense, *the desire of women*, inasmuch as he was to be born by the power of the Holy Ghost of a pure virgin.‡

\* Heb. אֵת יְהוָה *the Lord himself*

† It is probably in allusion to this *vehement desire* of the promised seed, that Hosea terms children, מְחֻמְדֵי בָשָׂם *the desirable things of their* (the Ephraimitish women's) *wombs.* Hos. ix. 16.

‡ See *Dr. Allix's Remarks on Scripture.* It is there satisfactorily proved, that it was the studied design of the Almighty, by so frequently preferring the younger brother to the elder, to keep alive the expectation of the world respecting *the desire of all nations*, or, as I conceive Daniel to term the same divine personage, *the desire of women.* To this expectation Dr Allix refers, as I have done after him, *the violent desire* which all the Hebrew women felt to have children: and, upon the same principle he accounts for the premeditated incest of the daughters of Lot, who was of the family of the Hebrews and of the line of Shem.

If it be objected to this interpretation of *the desire of women*, that the phrase occurs *only once* in the whole Bible; and that, if it do mean *Christ*, it stands



It appears then, that *the king's disregard of the desire of women*, so far from proving him to be *the Pope or the Constantinopolitan Emperor*, decidedly shews, that he cannot possibly be either of them: for, amidst all the abominations of *the Papacy*, the fundamental article of *the proper divinity of our Lord* was faithfully preserved; and, although it was impugned in the East by the turbulent and political disciples of Arius, God was pleased to raise up then, as he has since done in these our days, able and resolute defenders of it. Some indeed of *the Eastern Emperors* were infected with *Arianism*: yet I know not how they can be said on that account to have disregarded *the desire of women*. They doubtless held heretical notions respecting him; but they never entirely blotted the very name of *Christ* from their religious creed.

It may perhaps nevertheless be said, that that part of *the king's* character, which respects his paying honour to *a strange God* and to *Mahuzzim* or *tutelary deities*, accords very exactly with *the papal worship of saints and angels*: and Mr. Mede will add, that *the strange or foreign god* is certainly *Christ*, whom the Romans adored, when they had begun to disregard *the false gods of their fathers*. Such an interpretation as this, if we adopt the scheme as proposed by Mr. Mede, is much too vague to be satisfactory. Supposing *the king* to mean *the Roman empire from the days of Antiochus Epiphanes*, the worship of *a foreign god* and *tutelary deities* will be no less characteristic of *pagan*, than of *papal, Rome*. The Roman custom of naturalizing the gods of all the countries which they subdued is well known: how are we to decide then, upon Mr. Mede's scheme, whether *the worship of the foreign god* ought to be explained as relating to *Rome pagan*, or to *Rome papal*? The scheme, as pro-

alone, a solitary and insulated title of the Messiah: I readily answer, that the very same objection applies to the universally received interpretation of the phrase, *the desire of all nations*. This phrase, like its parallel phrase in the book of Daniel, occurs only once in the whole Bible: but its single occurrence was never thought to be any reason, why it should not be descriptive of the Saviour. Haggai speaks of *the desire of all nations* as being a *person*; Daniel also speaks of *the desire of women* as being a *person*, mentioning him among various objects of worship, true and false, all of whom *the king* was alike to disregard. The self-same word *הַמְּדֵרֶת* is used in both passages, and pointed precisely in the same manner. Whence we may naturally suppose, that it is used in the same sense. In short, the two passages appear to me to be perfectly parallel to each other.

posed by Bp. Newton, is not indeed liable to this uncertainty, because he makes the prophecy of *the king* commence with *the age of Constantine*. Nevertheless the coincidence of *the king's* character with that of *the Pope* in this point is not sufficient to establish their identity, when so many objections present themselves to such an opinion. The word *Mahuzzim* means *tutelary devies*; or, as Bp. Newton translates it, "*protectors, defenders, and guardians.*" The term therefore may be used properly enough to describe *saints* and *angels*, when considered in the light that the Papists consider them in: but there is no reason why it should be confined *exclusively* to them: it may equally signify *tutelary demi-gods of any other description*.

I know, that both Mr. Mede and Bp. Newton have maintained, that *the man of sin* is the exact transcript of *the king* predicted by Daniel; and even that St. Paul, when he wrote to the Thessalonians, had this very prophecy in his eye. I can discover however no sort of resemblance between them, either *chronological* or *circumstantial*. It is said indeed, that *the king* should speak marvellous things against the God of gods, and should magnify himself above every god; and it is likewise said, that *the man of sin* should oppose and exalt himself above every one that is called *god*, or that is worshipped: whence it might appear at the first sight, that in *this* particular at least there was a strong resemblance between their characters. But the resemblance is altogether imaginary, and not real. *The king* was to magnify himself above all gods, both true and false: whereas the *men of sin* was only to exalt himself above every one that is called *god* or *august*, in other words (as Bp. Newton justly observes), those mere earthly gods (as they are frequently termed in Scripture), kings and emperors.\* Both *the man of sin* indeed and *the king* were to be notorious enemies of the true God and his religion, a point in which *all* the wicked agree; but they were to be his

\* "He opposeth and exalteth himself above all, ἐπι παντων, above every one, that is called *god* or that is worshipped, ὑπεβουμαζ alluding to the title of the Roman emperors, ὑπεβουλο; *august* or venerable. He shall oppose and exalt himself, not only above inferior magistrates, who are sometimes called *gods* in holy writ, but even above the greatest emperors." Bp. Newton's Dissert. xxii

enemies in two modes as different from each other, as it is almost possible to conceive. *The king* was to speak marvellous things against the God of gods; to magnify himself above every god; to regard neither the god of his fathers, nor the Desire of women, nor any other god. These expressions, than which nothing can be at once more definite and more comprehensive, plainly intimate, that *the king* should make *an open and undisguised profession of atheism*. He should neither regard the true God, not any false god; neither the god of his fathers (whoever his fathers were), nor Messiah the Desire of women, nor any other god: but he should at once speak marvellous things against the God of gods, and magnify himself above all the vanities of the Gentiles. Now it is utterly impossible to conceive, how such strong, such varied, and yet such determinate, language could ever have been intended to describe the conduct of *the Popes*. They doubtless, in strict harmony with the prophecy of *the man of sin*, “did exalt themselves above all laws divine and human, dispense with the most solemn and sacred obligations, and in many respects enjoin what God had forbidden, and forbid what God had commanded.” They have moreover, still in harmony with the prophecy, advanced a step further; have blasphemously assumed the divine titles and attributes; and have sat as God in the very temple of God. But, when we consider *the manner* in which they thus conducted themselves, we shall discover no great resemblance between *their* behaviour and that of *the king* predicted by Daniel. Instead of speaking marvellous things against the God of gods;\* they professed to do all to his honour and glory. Instead of disowning his authority; they affected, with much importunity, to act in his name. Instead of throwing off their allegiance to *the Desire of women*, and totally

\* *The papal little horn* is said in our translation to speak great words *against* the Most High: but, as I have already observed, the passage when rendered literally imports, that *the little horn* shall speak great words *by the side* of the Most High, placing his decrees upon an equality with Scripture, and shewing himself in the temple of God that he is God. *The king*, on the contrary, is represented by Daniel as speaking marvellous things *על אל אלהים* *against, or above*, the God of gods. Thus accurately has Daniel drawn the line of distinction between *these two powers*, by the use of *two entirely different expressions*, which our translators have injudiciously confounded together by rendering them as if they were in the original *one and the same expression*.

disregarding him ; they delighted to style themselves *the Vicar of Christ, the husband of the Church, the representative of God upon earth, the immediate delegate of heaven*. Highly tyrannical as their actions were, and utterly offensive in the eyes of God ; still they were not done *professedly* to affront him to his face. The thin garb of piety with which they were clothed, but ill concealed their native deformity ; yet, throughout all the papal persecutions, the saints of God were never put to death *as the saints of God*, but as his enemies. The preaching of the bloody crusades against the Waldenses was termed, in a perverted sense indeed, *the preaching of the cross of Christ* : Pope Martin the fifth exhorted the Emperor, and the other European sovereigns, to extirpate heretics, *by the wounds of Christ and by the salvation of Christ* : and even the diabolical murders of the Inquisition are dignified with the Christian appellation of *acts of faith*.\*

Let us however compare the character of *the man of sin* with that of *the king*, and we shall find that their imagined resemblance will rapidly fade away, till there be scarcely any similarity between the two portraits.

*The man of sin* was to be revealed, when *he that letted*, by which the general tradition of the Church has always understood *the imperial authority in Rome*, was taken out of the way : *the king* was not to make his appearance till after *the second or papal persecution of the men of understanding* at the time of the Reformation. *The man of sin* was to cause himself to be worshipped in the temple of God : *the king* was to venerate a *foreign god* and along with him *certain tutelary deities* ; no mention is made of his causing *himself* to be worshipped. *The man of sin* was to work pretended miracles : no hint is given, that *the king* should so much as even lay claim to supernatural powers. So again : it is said, that *the king* should divide the land among the champions of *his tutelary deities* for a price : no similar action is ascribed to *the man of sin*, nor was ever performed by *the Pope*.†

\* Auto da Fe.

† Mr. Mede explains *this dividing of the land by the king* to mean, that *his tutelary gods should have different kingdoms assigned to them to preside over*. " St. George shall have England ; St. Andrew, Scotland ; St. Denis, France ; St.

*The king* was to be engaged in wars with *the kings of the South and the North*: here the parallel entirely fails; no similar exploits of *the man of sin* are predicted. Bp. Newton therefore is obliged to have recourse to the expedient of making *the king*, not only *the Western Pope*, but likewise *the Eastern Emperor*. Still however even this sudden transition is insufficient: for the predicted wars, which he applies to the Saracenic and Turkish invasions of the Empire, are to take place at *the time of the end*, or at *the close of the 1260 years*; and that time is not yet come. Surely then, with so great a discrepance of character both *chronological* and *circumstantial*, *the man of sin* can scarcely have been designed to represent *the same power as the king*. *The man of sin* however has, I think, been amply shewn by the Bishop himself to be *the Pope*. The natural conclusion therefore is, that *the king* cannot have any connection with *the Pope*, but must prefigure *some entirely different power*.

*Mr. Kett's mode of interpreting this prophecy* is liable to the very same objection, as *his method of explaining*

James, Spain; St. Mark, Venice; and bear rule as presidents and patrons of their several countries." (Apost. of the latter times Part. I. Chap. xvii.) Bp. Newton rejects this explanation; and supposes (very justly, I think,) that the land was to be divided not among *the Mahuzzim*, but among *the champions of the Mahuzzim*. Conceiving however, agreeably to his general plan of exposition, that *the Mahuzzim* mean the tutelary saints and angels of Popery, he of course understands *their champions* to be *the Romish Hierarchy*. Hence he conjectures, that *the dividing of the land among the champions of the Mahuzzim* means, "that they have been honoured, and revered, and almost adored, in former ages; that their authority and jurisdiction have extended over the purses and consciences of men; that they have been enriched with noble buildings and large endowments, and have had the choicest of the lands appropriated for church lands." (Dissert. xvii.) Both Mr. Mede and Bishop Newton seem to have forgotten a *very material word* in this part of the prophecy. The land was not only to be divided, but it was to be divided *for a price*. Our translation reads *for gain*, but in the margin it retains the proper import of the original, *for a price*. Now, in whatever manner *the Pope* might contrive to divide the land among his adherents, he certainly did not divide it among them *for a price*; that is to say, *having an equivalent paid for value received*. He induced the laity to make large grants of their lands to the Church, and thus in some sort may perhaps be said to have divided the land among *the champions of Mahuzzim*; but I much doubt whether it can be shewn, that he ever received *any price* from those supposed *champions of Mahuzzim* for thus dividing the land among them. The word מוֹחֵר, here used, denotes *something given in exchange, the price or value of a thing*. Hence it is not enough for *the king* merely to have divided the land, if that king mean *the Pope*; it must be shewn that he has divided the land *for value received*. "And the king said unto Araunah, Nay, but, I will surely buy it of thee *at a price*: neither will I offer burnt offerings unto the Lord my God of that which cost me nothing. So David bought the threshing floor and the oxen *for fifty shekels of silver*." (1 Sam. xxiv. 24.) The word, here used to express *a price*, is מוֹחֵר.

*the histories of the two little horns* ; a needless perplexity and confusion. A *chronological* prophecy is, from its very nature, absolutely incapable of a *double accomplishment*. The series of events, which such a prophecy foretells, succeed each other in the same regular order as when subsequently detailed in history : hence it is obviously *impossible*, that any particular link in the chain should be what Mr. Kett terms a *double link*.\* If the *abomination of desolation*, predicted in the present prophecy, relate to the *sacking of Jerusalem by the Romans*, (and that it *does*, cannot be doubted) *every thing*, that is mentioned *after* it, must necessarily be *posterior* to that event ; and, as such, *can* have no *primary* relation, as Mr. Kett supposes, to the *times of the Maccabees and Antiochus Epiphanes*. On the same grounds, we may safely venture to assert, that it is utterly incompatible with the nature of a *professedly historico-chronological prophecy*, that the *king*, predicted in Daniel's last vision, should be not only the *Papacy*, but a *double type of Antichrist*, either *Infidel* or *Mohammedan*, likewise.† Each link in a chain of *historical predictions* must be referred to *one corresponding event*, and *only one* ; each of the *little horns* therefore, and the *king who was to exalt himself above every god*, must be understood as respectively symbolizing a *single power*. I have already endeavoured to prove, that the *two horns* were designed by the spirit of God to typify the *Papal* and *Mohammedan apostacies* : I shall now attempt to ascertain *what state* is predicted under the character of the *king*.

\* Hist. the interp. Vol. i. p. 363.

† I cannot find, that Mr. Kett any where attempts to *show*, that the *king* is a *double type of Antichrist*. He dwells strongly upon his being the *Pope* ; but he advances the idea of his being likewise a *double type*, rather as a random conjecture, than as a fact which he designed to prove. (See Vol. i. p. 368, 374, and Vol. ii. p. 301, 302.) Accordingly, in the table of contents to his second volume, he speaks of the *king* as being *solely the papal power* ; of the *little horn of the he-goat*, as being *solely the Mohammedan power* ; and of the *little horn of the f. with beast*, as being *solely the Infidel power*. I should be sorry to appear captious in these remarks upon Mr. Kett's work, which contains some very valuable and important matter : but I certainly am not conscious, that I have wilfully at least misrepresented the sentiments of its respectable author. An attentive perusal of his treatise, many times repeated, induces me to hope that I have not mistaken his meaning : and, in order that the reader may be able satisfactorily to follow me in my observations, I have carefully given him accurate references to the third edition of that work. The bane of Mr. Kett's interpretation of the prophecies of Daniel is his scheme of primary, secondary,

I. The same chronological series of events, which shewed us, I had almost said *to demonstration*, that *this formidable power* cannot be either *Popery* or *Mohammedism*, will lead us, *in these last days*, to point out with considerable precision *the state intended by it*. We have seen, that we are to look for the rise of this impious tyrant *after the reformation*: and, unless I be much mistaken in the preceding remarks upon *the numbers of Daniel and St. John*, we are now removed but little more than *sixty years* from the end of the great period of *the 1260 prophetic days*: consequently it is but reasonable to conclude, that we are now living, not merely *in the latter times*, but *in the last times*. Existing facts amply tend to prove, that this conjecture is but too well founded.\* The superstition of *the latter days* is now supported, rather from motives of policy, than of religion.† *The distinguishing feature* of the present age is certainly not that of *giving heed to seducing spirits*, and *doctrines of tutelary saints*; of *speaking religious lies in pious hypocrisy*; of *forbidding to marry*, and *commanding to abstain from meats*; of *attending to old wives' fables*, and *bodily mortifications*; of *worshipping idols of gold, and silver, and brass, and stone, and wood*; and of *voluntary humiliation in the worship of angels*. All these mummeries of *the latter days* are indeed still *in existence*, and will continue *to be so* to the end of *the 1260 years*: but they no longer, as formerly, constitute *the distinguishing feature* of the age. It is an equally evident truth, that *the impieties of the last times* have for some years been the *most prominent characteristic* of the present period. *Perilous times are come*: men are now professedly *lovers of their own selves*; insatiably *covetous* of the territories of their neighbours; *boasters, proud, blasphemers*; *disobedient even by system‡ to their par-* and even ultimate accomplishments of one and the same chronological prediction.

\* I mean the conjecture, that *we are living in the last days*. This is proved by existing facts, whether *the year 606* be the proper date of *the 1260 years*, or not.

† Such, I doubt not, will be the case with *the king's holy war* at the time of *the end*. Religion will be the *pretext*; hence his union with *the false prophet*; but the *real cause* will be the crooked policy of an insatiable ambition.

‡ "The command to love one's parents is more the work of education than of nature." Barruel.

ents ; unthankful, unholy, without natural affection ;\*  
 truce-breakers, false accusers,† incontinent, fierce, de-  
 spisers of those that are good ; traitors, heady, high-mind-  
 ed ; lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God ; hav-  
 ing a form of godliness but denying the power thereof ;‡  
 creeping into houses, and leading captive silly women ;§  
 led away with divers lusts ; ever learning, and never able  
 to come to the knowledge of the truth ;|| resisters of the  
 truth ; men of corrupt minds ; reprobate concerning the  
 faith ;¶ scoffers, walking after their own lusts, and say-  
 ing, Where is the promise of his coming ? willingly igno-  
 rant of the tremendous catastrophe of the deluge ;\*\*

\* One of the grand doctrines of *modern philosophy* is, that to a certain *abstract idea*, a sort of *remote political good*, all the feelings of *natural affection* are without scruple to be sacrificed.

† The public papers, which teem with the lying accusations of the French against all whom they cannot subdue, particularly England, are a sufficient proof of the accuracy of *this part* of the description.

‡ See the initiatory discourse of the president of the Illuminati (Barruel, Vol. iii. p. 164. and Kett, Vol. ii. p. 178) "Jesus Christ, *our grand and ever celebrated master*, appeared in an age when corruption was universal—He supported his doctrines by an *innocent life*, and sealed them with his blood" So much for their *form of godliness*. "All ideas of justice, and injustice, of virtue and vice, of glory and infamy, are purely arbitrary, and dependent on custom—conscience and remorse are nothing but the foresight of those physical penalties to which crimes expose us. The man, who is above the law, can commit without remorse the dishonest act that may serve his purpose—The fear of God, so far from being the beginning of wisdom, would be the beginning of folly—Modesty is only an invention of refined voluptuousness—Virtue and honesty, with regard to individuals, is no more than the habit of actions personally advantageous ; and self-interest is the sole scale, by which the actions of men can be measured. Sublime virtue, and enlightened wisdom, are only the fruits of those passions called folly." So much for their *power of godliness*.

§ "There is no way," says the miscreant that founded the diabolical sect of the Illuminati, "of influencing men so powerfully as by means of the women. These should therefore be our chief study. *We should insinuate ourselves into their good opinion*, give them hints of emancipation from the tyranny of public opinion, and of standing up for themselves. It will be an immense relief to their enslaved minds to be freed from any one bond of restraint ; and it will fire them the more, and cause them to work for us with zeal, without knowing that they do so" There was moreover another very weighty reason with that son of perdition for thus labouring to *lead captive silly women* : "This association might serve to gratify those brethren, who had a turn for sensual pleasure"

|| See the various conflicting opinions of those wretched mock philosophers, Hume, Shaftsbury, Bolingbroke, Voltaire, Rousseau, and Frederick of Prussia. Kett. Vol. ii. p. 146, 147, 148, 149.

¶ "We cannot know, whether a God really exists, or whether there is the smallest difference between good and evil, or vice and virtue. The immortality of the soul, so far from stimulating man to the practice of virtue, is nothing but a barbarous, desperate, fatal tenet—Jesus Christ, the son of the true God, was an impostor—Crush the wretch—Human reason is the only supreme God" Barruel *passim*.

\*\* For this purpose the bowels of the earth were industriously ransacked by the pupils of Voltaire ; and various geological systems, rivalling each other



denying the Lord that bought them : inducing many to follow their pernicious ways, by reason of whom the way of truth shall be evil spoken of ; walking after the flesh in the lust of uncleanness ; despising government ; presumptuous, self willed, not afraid to speak evil of dignities ; having eyes full of adultery ; beguiling unstable souls ; speaking great swelling words of vanity ; alluring, through the lusts of the flesh, those that were clean-escaped from the error of the papal Apostacy ;\* promising them liberty, while they themselves are the servants of corruption ; denying both the Father and the Son ; † mockers ; blasphemers of the name of God. Such principles as these existed indeed in the very days of the Apostles : even then the spirit of *Antichrist* was in the world ; and his pernicious maxims were concealed in the bosom of the Church. Both St. Peter and St. Jude complain, that men, tainted with *atheism* and the vain pretensions of a spurious liberty, had insinuated themselves into the primitive feasts of charity, and were labouring to lead weak brethren astray. *Antichrist* however was not to be revealed, in all his undisguised horrors, till the last days ; till there had first been a great Apostacy, till the reign of superstition was nearly over.

At the head of this long and black catalogue of the peculiar vices of the last times, we may justly place *atheism* and *infidelity* : or, as St. John expresses it when speaking of *Antichrist*, a denial both of the Father and of the Son : for, as a belief, that “ God both is, and is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him,” is the root of all religion ; so *atheism* and *infidelity* are equally the root of all irreligion, and of every kind of profligacy of manners. We have seen, that the regular series of events

in laborious absurdity, were published for the perversion both of old and young. A few, and but very few, heathen nations have been involuntarily ignorant of the flood ; but these conceited pretenders to science were willingly so. It is almost superfluous to observe, that scoffing and ribaldry, instead of calm and temperate discussion, have been the favourite arms of modern philosophers. For this it is not difficult to assign a cause. Sober reasoning has always espoused the cause of revelation : but every fool can make a mock at sin ; every fool can say both in his heart, and with his tongue, there is no God.

\* The once protestant countries of Holland and Switzerland were main agents in propagating those pernicious lies, which have now pulled down swift ruin upon their own heads.

† “ The Supreme Being, the God of philosophers, Jews, and Christians, is but a chimera and a phantom—Jesus Christ is an impostor.” Barreuil.

leads us to place *the king*, mentioned by Daniel, *after the reformation* : and we have likewise seen what sins have been predicted to be most prevalent in *the last days* : we have only therefore to study the character of *this king*, and to compare his deeds with the above-recited vices, in order to determine whether we are to look for his manifestation, not only *after the reformation*, but *in that period of the 1260 years* which is *peculiarly distinguished* by the title of *the last times*.

“And a king shall do according to his will; and he shall exalt himself, and magnify himself above every God, and shall speak marvellous things against the God of gods, and shall prosper till the indignation be accomplished: for that, that is determined, shall be done. Neither shall he regard the God of his fathers, nor (*him who is*) the desire of women, nor regard any God: for he shall magnify himself above them all. Yet, when he is established (*in power,*) he shall honour tutelary gods together with a god; even, together with a god whom his fathers knew not, shall he honour them with gold, and silver, and with precious stones, and desirable things: and he shall practise (*prosperously.*) Unto the upholders of his tutelary gods, together with the foreign god whom he shall acknowledge, he shall multiply glory: and he shall cause them to rule over many, and divide the land for a price.”

No person can compare the character of *this king* with the vices of *the last times*, and not be convinced that they are closely connected together. Like *the Antichrist* of St. John, he was to be *a professed atheist*: and, as such, was to speak marvellous things against the God of gods, to disregard the God of his fathers or immediate predecessors, to pay as little respect to that illustrious character who was *the desire of women*, and in short to pay no regard to *any god*. Like the scoffers of *the last days*, he was to be heady and high-minded: for he was to magnify himself above all. And, like the mocking blasphemers of the name of God, he was to deny the Lord that bought him, and contemptuously ask, *Where is the promise of his coming!* In fine, he was not to be revealed till after the period of *the Reformation*, till the

1260 *days* were drawing near to their close. Hence it is manifest, that we are to expect the appearance of *this king in the last times* ; in the times of *the scoffers* ; in the very times in which we are now living.

It is to be observed nevertheless, that *the scoffers* and *the king* are not in *all* respects absolutely and completely *the same*. *The scoffers* and *false teachers*, predicted by the apostolical prophets, are plainly *individuals*, springing up and disseminating their baneful principles in *various parts* of the world : whereas both the appellation of *a king*, which in the prophetic language signifies *a state* or *kingdom*, and the definite political actions, ascribed to *that king*, shew plainly, that he was to be *no individual*, but *a power* or *nation* composed of individuals, who should profess and act up to the impious principles of *the atheistical scoffers*. The people therefore of *the kingdom*, alluded to by Daniel, were *to do according to their will* ; were *to exalt themselves* ; were *to magnify themselves above every god* ; were *to speak marvellous things against the God of gods* ; were alike *to disregard the God of their fathers, the desire of women, and every other god* ; because they were *to magnify themselves above all*. They were moreover to be *traitors, heady, high-minded* ; to deny the existence both *of the Father and of the Son* ; and to be *blasphemers of the name of God*. They were likewise to be *presumptuous, self-willed* ; to be *despisers of government* ; to be *not afraid to speak evil of dignities* ; and to *promise* the universal diffusion of *liberty*, while they themselves were the miserable slaves of *vice and corruption*. In fine they were to be *a pandemonium of licentious anarchists and determined atheists* ; a *wonderful phenomenon both in religion and politics* which should first be developed *after the era of the Reformation* : a phenomenon, such as had never before, in any age whatsoever, made its appearance in the world : inso-much that they might safely be pronounced, whensoever they should start up, to be *the long-expected and late-revealed Antichrist*.

And shall we, while recent events are yet fresh in our memory, find any difficulty in pointing out *the nation* prefigured by *the infidel king* ? Have we not all beheld

a mighty people, *after the period of the reformation*, and *during the last days of open blasphemy and profaneness*, rising up as one man, and throwing off every restraint both civil and religious; disregarding at once the dignity of their sovereign, and the high majesty of heaven; trampling upon the rights both of individuals and of nations with *liberty, humanity, and philanthropy*, ever in their mouths; and professedly rending asunder all the endearments of social life, as if human nature could only be perfected by being previously brutalized! When we consider both the character of *the infidel king*, and the *period which Daniel predicted his manifestation*, we can scarcely hesitate to pronounce him to be *revolutionary France*.\*

Let us proceed however to a more minute examination of his character, in order that this opinion may be satisfactorily established.

As *the king* then was to rise up after *the second persecution of the men of understanding*, or, in other words, after *the Reformation*: so has *the power of infidel France* commenced at this very period. As *the king* was to magnify himself above every god, whether true or false: so has *the atheistical republic*, soaring with a bold flight of impiety above her heathen and papal precursors, openly maintained and supported the most astonishing lie, that was ever embraced by infatuated mortals, *an avowed denial of the very existence of the Deity* †

\* It is almost superfluous to observe, that the circumstance of *this power* being styled *a king* is no impediment to the application of the prophecy to *revolutionary France*. "The Hebrews," as Mr Mede justly remarks, "use *king* for *kingdom*, and *kingdom* for *any government, state, or polity, in the world*." (Apost. of the latter times, p i c. 16.) Upon this principle, I conceive *the infidel king* to be *France*, from *the epoch of the revolution to the end of the 1260 days*, under whatever form of government, whether republican or imperial, it may exist during that period.

† The reader will find ample proofs, if any proofs be wanted, of *French Atheism* in Hist. the interp. of prophecy, Vol. ii. particularly at p. 223, 228, 241, 250.

I love the truth wherever it can be found, whether in the writings of a Papist or of a protestant. While I think the jesuit Cornelius à Lapide quite mistaken in referring the character of *the king* primarily to *Antiochus Epiphanes*, I believe him to be very right in referring it ultimately and properly to *the great Antichrist*. It is a curious circumstance, that long before the *French Revolution* took place (for his Commentary was printed in the year 1634) he pronounced, merely from a view of the prophetic character of *the wolfish king*, that, whenever he should be revealed, he would be an atheist, and would abolish, not only the worship of Christ and the superstitious idolatry of paganism, but even the very name and adoration of the true God. "Ex hoc ergo ver. et ex

Yet, in the midst of undisguised atheism, contradictory as it might appear before this prophecy had received its accomplishment, *the king* was not to be without a god of his own. He was to worship, as soon as he was firmly established, *a certain god* at the head of a host of *Mahuzzim* or *tutelary gods*; *a god*, whom Daniel styles *a strange or foreign god*: *a god*, whom his fathers, superstitious as they had been, never knew. Hence it appears, that the adoration of *this deity* and *his kindred Mahuzzim* was not to be an invention of *the king* himself, but that it should be borrowed by him from the theological code of some other country. *The god* was to be *a foreign god*, whom his immediate predecessors of *the Apostacy*, notwithstanding their idolatrous veneration of saints and angels, had never worshipped.\*

The Romans were, I believe, the only nation that ever expressly deified Liberty, till the worship of it was borrowed from them by the atheists of France.† *A spurious Freedom*, utterly incompatible either with genuine religion or with the real rights of man, was the very soul of the revolution which has since shaken Europe to its centre. *Liberty* and *Equality* were the watchwords of the infidel conspirators: and their boast was, that slavery and superstition should soon be made

ver. præcedente (ver. 37, 38.) colligitur, Antichristum fore atheum, eumque, cum pleno potietur imperio, non tantum Christum et idola, sed et Dei verum nomen et cultum ablaturum” Comment. in loc.)

Such was the language of anticipatory exposition *previous to the French revolution*: let us now attend to the remarkably similar language of applicatory exposition *after the commencement of that awful politico-theological convulsion*. “I fear, I too clearly see the rise, instead of the fall, of *the Antichrist of the West*—who shall be neither a Protestant nor a Papist; neither Christian, Jew, nor Heathen: who shall worship neither God, angel, nor saint—who will neither supplicate the invisible majesty of heaven, nor fall down before an idol.” Bp. Horsley’s Letter on Isaiah xviii p. 105, 106.

\* It is not unworthy of notice, that “the Fathers constantly thought, that under these *Mahuzzim* was some idol meant which *Anti-christ* should worship.” (Apost. of the latter times, Part 1 C 16) The event has shewn, that they were right in their judgment. Jerome observes, that the Jews likewise conceived the character of *this king* to relate to *Antichrist*. Bp. Newton’s Discert. XVII.

† The Greeks had a festival in honour of *Jupiter Æleutherius*, but I am not aware that they ever deified *Liberty* itself. If I am mistaken however in this point, it will not in the slightest degree affect the circumstance of *Liberty* being *a foreign god* considered in relation to France. The boasted *Liberty* of the Romans was not unlike that of their modern apes: as far as I am able to comprehend its nature, it was *a liberty* to quarrel with each other, and to tyrannize over their weaker neighbours.

to vanish from off the face of the earth. *Liberty* in short, according to their definition of the word, that is to say, a *freedom from all restraint both civil and religious*, formed undoubtedly the most prominent feature in all their harangues, and in all their projects. Not satisfied however with merely applauding and imitating the principles and practice of the ancient Roman republicans, they determined likewise to adopt the literal worship of *Liberty*. Accordingly, after abjuring the religion of Christ and declaring him to be an impostor, the Convention, with tumultuous applause, decreed the adoration of *Liberty* and *Equality*; and, in express imitation of the idolatrous Romans, appointed festivals exactly similar to those of paganism, in honour of *Reason, the Country, the Constitution, the Virtues*, and various other allegorical deities.\* *Liberty* then I conceive to be *the foreign god*, so peculiarly venerated by *the infidel king*, and which he placed with such distinguished honour at the head of his inferior *Mahuzzim*. Nor were these allegorical deities his only *Mahuzzim*. One of the tenets of modern philosophy is, “that *tutelary gods*, even dead men, may be canonized, consecrated, and worshipped.” In perfect harmony with this doctrine, *the anti-social republic* formally enrolled in the list of its *Mahuzzim* Voltaire, Rousseau, Mirabeau, Marat, and even the vile assassin Ankerstrom. The church of St. Genevieve “was changed by the national assembly into a repository for the remains of their great men, or rather into a *pagan temple*; and, as such, was aptly distinguished by the name of *the Pantheon*, with the inscription, *Aux grands hommes la Patrie reconnoissante*, on the front.” To this Pantheon, this avowed copy of the ancient Roman Pantheon, this polluted den of foreign idolatry, the remains of Voltaire and Rousseau were conveyed in a magnificent procession: and, as if to insult the Almighty to his face, the bones of Voltaire were placed upon the high altar, and incense was offered to them, the infatuated

\* The late venerable Mr. Jones remarked some years ago the gradual approximation of the present age to paganism. He afterwards lived to see the worship of *strange gods* openly established in France. See his *Reflections on the growth of Heathenism among modern Christians*: Works, Vol. iii. p. 423.

multitude meanwhile bowing down in silent adoration before the relics of this arch enemy of Christ.\* Such have been *the tutelary gods of the infidel king*. Disregarding *the god of his fathers* and *the Desire of women*, he has revived the adoration of *the Mahuzzim of Paganism*; and, although a professed atheist, has prostrated himself before a *foreign god* whom his fathers never knew.†

It is now therefore that we behold *the rise of Antichrist*: for in no particular does *the Papacy* answer to his character, as drawn by the inspired pen of St. John. Plunged as are the adherents of *the Roman see* in the grossest superstitions, they have never denied either the Father or the Son: and consequently we are not warranted in stigmatizing their Church, however corrupt and apostatical it may be, with the appellation of *Antichrist*. The pretended *universal Bishop*, that *man of sin* who sits in the temple of God, shewing himself that he is God, has indeed been *the precursor of Antichrist*, as Gregory justly remarked; but he is not *Antichrist himself*.

To complete the character of *the infidel king*. Daniel adds three other particulars, all of which correspond with the conduct of *atheistical France*, no less than the bolder outlines of his picture.

1. *The king was to cause the upholders or champions of his tutelary deities, together with the strange god whom he acknowledged, to rule over many*—Since the

\* It was in this same Pantheon that a prostitute personated *Honour Reason*, and in that capacity received the worship both of the Convention and of the people. (See Hist. the Intern. Vol. ii. p. 33) It is not unworthy of notice, that the adoration of *Ceres* has been revived even by name; a statue having been erected to her, and a festival appointed in honour of her. Ibid. p. 42.

† It has often been observed, that prophecy is designedly obscure till it receives its accomplishment. This is remarkably the case with the present prediction. It appears perfectly contradictory, that a *power*, which magnified itself above *every god, true as well as false*, should nevertheless venerate a *strange god* and *tutelary deities*; yet such has been precisely the conduct of France. Had the people of that nation adored *their foreign gods*, really believing them to be gods, they would not have fulfilled the prophecy; because it declares, that *the king* should not regard *any god*; yet, if they had not honoured foreign gods in *some manner*, they would equally have failed in accomplishing the prophecy, because it declares that they *should* honour them. What then has been the conduct of France? With professions of atheism in her mouth, she has adored certain deities, whom she nevertheless disbelieves to be deities; and has thus worshipped *foreign gods* without regarding *any god*.

strange god is *Liberty*, and since the other tutelary gods are the various allegorical deities of the infidel republic, their champions must undoubtedly mean the propagators and supporters of those principles upon which the French revolution was founded. These supporters then, together with his favourite idol, *Liberty*, the king was to cause to rule over many. It seems almost superfluous to point out the accuracy with which this part of the prophecy has received its accomplishment. The avowed principle of France has been at once to extend the empire of her turbulent children, those indefatigable champions of her *Mahuzzim*; and to cause the whole world to bow down before the shrine of that imaginary deity, which they misname *Liberty*. "The citizen and the legislator ought to acknowledge no other worship than that of *Liberty*, no other altars than those of their country, no other priests than the magistrates." For the purpose of more widely diffusing this system, a decree of fraternity to all rebels against their lawful sovereigns was formally passed by the national convention:\* and it was determined that the system itself should be extended to all countries occupied by their armies.† Wherever the infidel tyrant has prevailed, he has caused his strange god, and the upholders of his *Mahuzzim*, to rule over many; and, in every region, where he has been victorious, he has uniformly planted the tree of his idol *Liberty*. In short, it was by a war of extermination to the enemies of his plans, that he meant univer-

\* In the sitting of the Jacobins, Aug. 27, 1792, Manuel caused an oath to be taken, that every exertion should be used to purge the earth of the pest of royalty.

† "You talked of nothing but *liberty*, but every one of your actions strove to enslave us. Can you deny it? All your words were orders; all your counsels were the mandates of a despot. We were promised, at least verbally, by the agents of the great nation that no French troops should enter our canton; that not a sou should be demanded of us: yet the very reverse happened. They had the impudence to exact from us three millions of livres; they had the cruelty to march troops into our canton, without the least previous application, to exhaust our poor innocent country. In other words, they forced upon us the liberty of suffering ourselves to be stripped of all rational freedom. Open thine eyes, great nation, and deliver us from this liberty of hell." (Lavater's letter to the Executive directory of the French Republic, dated the first year of Helvetic slavery.) Similar to this was the conduct of France in every country where her arms prevailed. "A la place du supplice, Madame Roland s'inclina devant la statue de la Liberté et prononça ces paroles mémorables: O Liberté! que de crimes on commet en ton nom!" Appel à l'impartialité, cited by Kett.



sally to establish the power of the advocates for democracy and atheism.

The pernicious philosophy, upon which the revolution was founded, affords the only satisfactory key to the actions which it has produced. One of the hidden maxims of that philosophy is, first to gain a firm footing by *fraud*, and afterwards to propagate itself by *brutal force*; adopting the words *reason, toleration, and humanity*, only as a signal and call to arms. Such accordingly are the instructions given to the initiated by the hierophant of the Illuminati. "Serve, assist, and mutually support, each other; augment our numbers; render yourselves at least independent, and *leave to time and posterity the care of doing the rest*. When your numbers shall be augmented to a certain degree, when you shall have acquired strength by your union, *hesitate no longer, but begin to render yourself powerful and formidable to the wicked*.\* The very circumstance of your being sufficiently numerous to *talk of force*, and that you *really do talk of it*, that circumstance alone makes the profane and wicked tremble. *That they may not be overpowered by numbers*, many will become good† of themselves, and will join your party. *You will soon acquire sufficient force to bind the hands of your opponents, to subjugate them, and stifle wickedness in embryo*. Extend and multiply the children of light, *until force and numbers shall throw power into our hands*."‡ So again: "Nations must be brought back to the nomade state, by whatever means are conducive: peaceably, if it can be done; but if not, then by force, for *all subordination must be made to vanish from the earth*."§

These doctrines were faithfully acted up to by the French demagogues, when they had taken the reins of government into their own hands. Such, as refused to subscribe to their diabolical creed, and to worship their *Mahuzzim*, were inhumanly persecuted as fanatics by these philanthropic lovers of toleration; and were adjudged to be worthy of death, because they were *suspected*

\* That is, in plain English, *all who are unwilling to swallow their blasphemous absurdities*.

† Anglice, *atheists*.

‡ Barruel's Mem. of Jacobin.

§ Ibid.

*of being suspicious persons.\** “In different parts of the country, many, who declined taking the oath, were killed at the doors of the churches: and in Brittany several priests are said to have been hunted through the forests; where, after enduring every extremity of hunger and fatigue, they perished miserably; and their mangled carcases were afterwards found torn by briars, and half devoured by beasts of prey.”† It was afterwards decreed, that all ecclesiastics, who had not taken the national oath should be transported, and that, if any commotion be stirred up in favour of fanaticism, all the clergy should be imprisoned. It was further resolved that, since the people of Paris acknowledge no other worship than that of *Reason and Truth*,‡ all the churches and temples of different religions and worship, which are known to be in Paris, shall be instantly shut; and that every person, requiring the opening of a church or temple, shall be put under arrest as a suspected person § In short, “the greatest hostility to the ministers of the church prevailed, to the service of the church, to all celebration of devotion, to any profession of Christianity, or even reverence of the name of the Supreme Being. The churches were plundered; the name of God was blasphemed; the clergy were declared to be capable of every crime, and made responsible for every tumult; and *the will of the e person was ordered to be particularly respected, who renounced all worship except that of the republican virtues.*”|| Not content with exercising this tyranny over her own inhabitants, *France* has bowed beneath the same iron yoke, *Holland, Switzerland, Piedmont, and a considera-*

\* Soupçonnés d'être suspects.

† Hist. the Inter. Vol. ii. p. 229.

‡ The French republicans seem to use *Reason and Truth* much in the same sense as *Liberty*; meaning, I suppose, to insinuate that *their Liberty* was the natural offspring of *Reason*; of *Reason*, as it were, in the concrete. Hence we find it recommended in the Convention with much mock solemnity, that “the will of such sections should be respected, which have renounced all religious worship, except that of *Reason, Liberty, and the Republican Virtues*; in other words, that of *the strange god, and his kindred Mahuzzim.*”

§ Hist. Interp. Vol. ii. p. 234, 239

|| Mr. Kett adduces these facts, to prove, that *infidelity and revolutionary France* are the apocalyptic two-horned beast and his image. Though I cannot think, that either *the beast or his image* has the slightest connection with *French atheism and republican tyranny*; yet the facts are not on that account the less valuable, as facts. Hist. the Int. Vol. ii. p. 244.

ble part of what once was Germany ; perpetually changing, with worse than childish capriciousness, both their religious and their civil establishments : and, if she has failed in executing all the antisocial and antichristian projects of the illuminizd conspiracy, it has rather been from want of power than of will.

Thus has *the king* caused *his tutelary deities* and *their upholders* to rule over many : those deities, whom he himself has honoured instead of the God of heaven.

2. *The king* was moreover to honour his *Mahuzzim*, together with *his foreign god*, with gold, and silver, and precious stones, and desirable things—This part of the prophecy has been accomplished by *Infidel France* both indirectly and directly, both abroad and at home. When Italy was plundered of the finest specimens of the arts by the modern advocates of freedom, and when the decorations of her palaces were transported to France and declared to be the sole property of the sovereign people ; *Liberty* was the deity thus honoured with desirable things, for *Liberty* was that which sanctioned every violation of private rights. When the ornaments of the churches were either confiscated, or rapaciously carried off by the infuriated mob ; *Liberty*, *Reason*, and *the Republican Virtues*, were the *Mahuzzim* thus honoured with gold, and silver, and precious stones.\* When the noble church of St. Genevieve, profusely decorated by all the skill of architecture, was desecrated, under the name of

\* “ By an edict of the constituent assembly, there was a general sale of all ecclesiastical property ; and every kind of property, connected with churches or charities, was confiscated ” (Hist. the Inter. Vol. ii. p. 232, 233.) “ In November, a deputation from the societies of Versailles was admitted to the bar, loaded with chalices, crosses, and other ornaments from their churches. The priest of the Roman church, said they, the Bishop of the department of Seine and Oise, is dead. Will you suffer a new one to be elected ? Will you, who have overturned the throne, suffer the pontifical canopy to remain ? Will you, who have broken crowns and sceptres, preserve their proud rivals, the mitre and the cross ?—The citizen and the legislator ought to acknowledge no other worship than that of Liberty, no other altars than those of their country, no other priests than the magistrates. Do you, legislators, like that of the Hebrews, come down from the mountain, break in pieces the golden calf, and let the ark of the constitution be the only idol of the French ” (Ibid p. 239.) “ The Sans culottes considered themselves as authorized to plunder every place of worship, public and private ; and divided with the Convention large heaps of shrines, figures, and vesseis, hitherto used in the offices of religion, while the commissioners from the Convention aided the sacrilegious pillage.” (Ibid. p 240, 241.) All these enormities have been expressly perpetrated in the name, and for the honour, of *Liberty*.

*the Pantheon*, to the tutelary gods of Infidelity; the triumph of *Liberty* was complete, *the foreign god* and his kindred *Mahuzzim* had received the highest honours which *the atheistical king* had it in his power to bestow.

3. *The king was likewise to divide the land for a price.* He was to take it from its former possessors, and divide it among his adherents, *the champions of his Mahuzzim*, on the consideration of being paid by them a certain price for it.—This peculiarity in his character at once shews that he cannot be either *the Pope* or *the Constantinopolitan Empire*, and points out with singular exactness *the power* which he was designed to prefigure. The conquerors of foreign nations have not unfrequently divided the lands of the conquered among their victorious troops: but *such a division* bears no resemblance to that which *the infidel king* should contrive. Successful invaders rarely sell the lands, which they have seized: but *this kingdom or power* was not merely to divide the land; it was to divide it for a price. It was first to declare the land exclusively its own property, and then to sell it for money to the champions of its Mahuzzim. Exactly such has been the conduct of the atheistical republic: nor will it be easy to point out any state, which ever adopted a similar line of conduct, certainly none since the era of the Reformation, when we are taught by Daniel to expect the appearance of *the infidel king*. The French Revolution has differed from all others, not only in producing a change of government, but likewise in effecting a complete change of landed property. By a deep-laid stroke of policy, and with a view to preclude for ever the possibility of a counter-revolution, the lands, both of the crown, the church, and the nobility, were taken away from their lawful owners, and declared to be the sole property of the nation. This preparatory step having been taken, the lands were next, as it is well known, sold at a low price to the partizans of anarchy and atheism; by which master-stroke of Machiavelian villany an insurmountable barrier was raised against any future attempt to re-establish the Bourbons, for it was made the direct interest of every landholder throughout France to oppose their return.

Since it has been our fate to behold with our own eyes the rise of this wonderful power, it will not be uninteresting to inquire in what manner the way was prepared for its developement. As for the principles of *Anti-christ*, they were working even in the apostolic age: but, would we learn the real cause of his *ultimate* success in propagating so widely his blasphemous opinions, we must turn our eyes to the corruptions of *Popery*. Daniel places *the atheistical tyrant* after the era of *the Reformation*, and consequently after the period of thick intellectual darkness which overspread *the Roman world* during the middle ages. Here then we are to look for the rise of the monster; and history will abundantly point out to us the steps by which he *did* rise. "When the revival of letters enabled men to see the mass of absurdities, contradictions, and impieties, which were taught by the Church of Rome to be essential parts of Christianity, scepticism was the natural result of this discovery. Reason, just risen from her slumber, seized the truths presented to her view with all the eagerness which novelty could excite. Disgusted with surrounding bigotry and superstition, impatient of control, and dazzled with the light though glimmering which now broke through the darkness of the middle ages, she too seldom distinguished religion from the gross corruptions with which it had been loaded; and, usurping the seat of judgment, she often decided upon subjects not amenable to her tribunal."\*

As the period of *the last days* gradually drew nearer, they of *the Apostacy*, utterly ignorant of the genuine Gospel of Christ, and having refused to embrace the blessed truths of *the Reformation*, were fully prepared to be carried about by every wind of doctrine, and to be deceived by those false teachers, who privily† brought in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that bought them. Hence they became the easy dupes of *Anti-*

\* Hist. the Interp. Vol. ii. p. 124.

† No precept is so often repeated by Voltaire, as "Strike, but *conceal* your hand." *Secret societies* were the main engine of the antichristian conspirators. By means of these the pupils of the Illuminati were almost imperceptibly led from one degree of wickedness to another, till at length they were plunged in all the horrors of undisguised atheism. See Kett's Hist. the Interp. of Proph. Vol. II, p. 152—194.

*christ*; and were soon led from scepticism even into absolute atheism. In short, as it hath been most justly observed, "to *Popery*, to the errors and defects of *Pope-ry*, we cannot but impute, in a great degree, the origin of that revolutionary spirit, which has gone so far towards the subversion of the ancient establishments of religion and civil government. I should be sorry to give pain to any one of the unhappy victims of the French revolution: I most truly sympathize with their sufferings; but we must not allow our charity to injure our principles, or to pervert our judgment. The heavy blow, which has been struck at the very existence of Christianity, must be charged, as I said, in a great degree, to many erroneous opinions, and some pernicious institutions of that form of religion, from which the wisdom of our ancestors separated our national church. The maintenance of opinions, unfounded on the authority of the Gospel, and inconsistent with its purity, has given occasion to minds, perhaps naturally averse to religion, to reject the most valuable evidences of Christianity. By the abuses of religion, such minds have been led into all the extravagances of deism and atheism, of revolution and anarchy. They had not the discernment, or the candour, to distinguish between Christianity, and its corruptions. The conspiracy against the religion of Christ, which originated in these delusions, burst on the devoted monarchy of France; and involved that unhappy country in such scenes of blood, rapine, and ungovernable excess, as revolt every principle of justice, every feeling of humanity."\*

What may in some sense be called *the abortive offspring of Popery* has been made an instrument in the hands of God to visit the iniquities of its parent. The blood of those, who repented not of the works of their hands, their idolatry, their murders, their sorceries, their spiritual fornication, their pious or rather impious frauds, "has been prodigally shed: and it is very remarkable, that the French anarchists have introduced the horrors of war principally into popish countries; as if those na-

tions, which profess the purity of the protestant religion, were providentially preserved from danger.”\*

Not that *all* protestant countries have escaped. The mere name of *protestantism* is of little importance, when its *spirit* is no more. They, who have apostatized from the religion of their fathers, must expect to partake of *the vials of God's wrath*. Though *Antichrist* has reared his head in a popish country, and though he has prevailed most in regions once devoted to the papal superstition, yet *the Apostacy* was not to be his *only* stage of action. His principles have tainted numbers even under protestant governments, agreeably to the sure word of prophecy, that the false teachers of *the last day* should “allure through the lusts of the flesh, through much wantonness, those that were clean escaped from them who live in error:” upon which the Apostle remarks, “It had been better for them not to have known the way of righteousness, than, after they have known it, to turn from the holy commandment delivered unto them.”†

II. It will be proper for me now to consider an objection, which may possibly be urged against the foregoing interpretation of the character of *the infidel king*: *The French people have at present thrown aside their atheistical hatred to Christianity, and have once more avowed themselves Papists.*

I. To this it might be sufficient to answer, that, although *Poperly* be once more established in *France*, it is evidently *a mere political puppet*, as little regarded by *the people* as by *their rulers*.‡ The fiat of a convention

\* Zouch on Prophecy, p. 62, 63.

† 2 Peter ii. 1, 18, 21.

‡ We may form a tolerable idea of the present state of religion in France by attending to the *confessed* machinations of the chief of the Illuminati. “All the German schools,” says this indefatigable propagator of Atheism; “and the benevolent Society, are at last under our direction—*Lately we have got possession of the Bartholomew Institution for young clergymen, having secured all their supporters*—Through *this* we shall be able to supply Bavaria with *fit priests*—We must acquire the direction of *education, of church management, of the professorial chair, and of the pulpit*. We must preach the warmest concern for humanity, and make people indifferent to all other relations. We must gain the reviewers, and the journalists, and the booksellers.” (Hist. the Inter. Vol. ii. p. 194, 195.) Accordingly, when Christianity was *nominaly* at least restored in the year 1795 by the repeal of the laws of intolerance, pastoral letters were published by the revolutionary bishops, those direct successors of Judas in the Apostolical college, in which the Gospel is represented as being the original declaration of the rights of man, and in which the union of the throne and the altar is stated to be the most antichristian of political or religious insti-

or of an usurper may set up a *form* of religion; but it is not so easy a matter to eradicate the work of years, to weed out of the minds of the governed those principles of *atheism* and *infidelity* which have long been so industriously disseminated among them.\* Hopeless indeed must be the task of converting a whole nation, when it is undertaken, as at present, by one who has alternately professed himself *an Atheist, a Mohammedan, and a Papist*.

2. Perhaps however a *more weighty answer* than this may be furnished to the objection now under consideration. *Humanly* speaking, and judging from the existing political appearance of Europe, the concurring prophecies of Daniel and St. John, relative to *the duration of the great Apostacy*, would not have received their com-

tutions. "These bishops were commonly *recommended from the great mother club at Paris*" (the united club of atheistical Jacobins and German Illuminati, who had now, according to the wily advice of their founder, *acquired the whole management of the church*, and would doubtless take care to supply France with *fit priests*.) "to the affiliated societies, and by their means elected. Of course the only qualification, regarded in prelates so chosen, was the orthodoxy, not of their religious, but political creed. Very few indeed of the new rectors and vicars were men of character; and as, after all, many were still wanting for the vacant cures, many of the laity were ordained with little or no inquiry. We may judge what a horde of banditti these republican clergy are, since the *constitutional* vicar general to the new Bishop of Perigueux has had the grace to acknowledge that even *he* is ashamed of them. With much truth, I doubt not, he represents them as a set of "vagabonds and libertines, who had not found admittance into civilized society." He seems however for a moment to have forgotten, that such were the fittest subjects for *the recommendation of the great mother club at Paris*, the very men after Voltaire's and Weishaupt's own hearts. Hist. the Interp. Vol. ii. p. 255, 256, 257.

\* Let an eye-witness, and certainly no *prejudiced* eye-witness, be heard upon this point. "When I was myself in France," says the late Dr. Priestley, "in the year 1774, I saw sufficient reason to believe, that hardly any person of eminence in Church or State, and especially in a great degree eminent in philosophy or literature (whose opinions in all countries are sooner or later adopted by others), were believers in Christianity; and no person will suppose, that there has been any change in favour of Christianity in the last twenty years. A person, I believe now living, and one of the best informed men in the country, assured me very gravely, that (paying me a compliment) I was the first person he had ever met with, of whose understanding he had any opinion, who pretended to believe Christianity. To this all the company assented. And not only were the philosophers, and other leading men in France, at that time unbelievers in Christianity or Deists, but Athiests denying the being of a God." (Priestley's Fast Sermon, 1794.) The sect, of which Dr. Priestley was so strenuous an advocate, received as whimsical a *compliment* from Voltaire, as the Doctor himself did from the grave person mentioned by him in the preceding citation. The philosopher of Ferney was willing to tolerate the *Socinians*, during his war with Christ, "*because*," says he, "*Julian would have favoured them; and I hate what Julian would have hated, and despise what Julian would have despised.*"



plete accomplishment, *had not Antichrist become the avowed supporter of it.* If we cast our eyes over a map of the world, we shall perceive, that *protestantism* is securely planted in the North of Europe and America, and in most of the numerous colonies of the English; that *the Greek church*, under the powerful protection of Russia, occupies all the East and North-East of Europe: and that the southern regions of that continent, with their dependent foreign possessions, alone acknowledge the supremacy of *the Pope*. Now it is an undoubted truth, that the whole of those southern regions, with the solitary exception of the Austrian states and *those* debilitated and dispirited by a long and unsuccessful war, are to all intents and purposes mere provinces of France, trembling at her nod and subservient to all her tyrannical schemes of aggrandisement.\* This being the case, where would have been *the papal Apostacy*, had France persevered in her profession of *atheism*: and had she further determined, according to the original plans of the Jacobinical Illuminati, that all her vassals should be atheists likewise? She laboured under no *physical* inability of overturning *the Papacy*, and had once actually to all appearance entirely subverted it; but her blind fury was restrained by *Him*, who with equal ease can calm the troubled ocean, and still the madness of the people. *The end* was not yet: *the 1260 years* had not expired: and *the Apostacy* had to run that part of its career which was contemporary with *the reign of Antichrist*. Hence, rather than one jot or one tittle of all God's word should fail, *the infidel king* has become, by the overruling providence of God, a supporter of the very superstition which he had once laboured to destroy.

3. *The last and most conclusive answer* however, which may be given to the objection is this. When thoroughly examined, the objection in question will be found in reality to afford an argument *for* the present mode of interpretation, instead of an argument *against* it. Unless *Antichrist*, at some period or another of his existence, had actually leagued himself with *the Papacy*, the

\* This observation is even more true at present (March 26, 1806), than when it was originally made.

prophecies, which relate to the great events that are about to take place at the termination of *the 1260 years*, could not have been fully and exactly accomplished. *At the time of the end*, the *infidel king*, as we are taught by Daniel, is to engage in *some war of a religious nature*, is to invade *Palestine*, and is eventually to perish *between the seas*. *At the same time of the end*, a *grand confederacy*, as we are informed by St. John, of *the beast*, *the false prophet*, and *the kings of the earth*, is to be overthrown with dreadful slaughter at *M g'ddo*: which is a town of *Palestine*, situated, agreeably to Daniel's prediction, *between the seas*. St. John further marks the country where this is to happen, by describing it as extending *1600 stadia*, which is found to be precisely the measure of *the holy land*. *At the self-same time of the end* likewise, as we are assured by Joel, *war shall be sanctified*: but the impious wretches, who thus dare to profane the holy name of religion, shall be destroyed *between the seas*. Lastly, at this *very time of the end*, a time of unexampled trouble, *the restoration of the Jews*, as Daniel, Joel, and Zechariah,\* all concur in affirming will commence. Now from comparing these different prophecies together it appears, that *the war of the infidel king in Palestine at the time of the end* must necessarily be the same as *the war of the beast in the same country and at the same period*: and it further appears, that the reason, why this war will be styled by him a *holy war*, will be *his union with the false prophet*: in other words, it will be a war undertaken by him either against the protestants, or the Jews, or both, upon popish principles of extermination; it will be a war begun under the pretence of advancing the honour of religion. Thus it is manifest, that the late re-establishment of *Popery* in France is so far from being any objection to the present mode of interpreting the character of *the infidel king*, that it abundantly confirms the propriety of it: for, unless *the atheistical power*, at some time or another, reunited itself with *the head of the papal Apostacy*, it certainly could not engage in a *holy war* along with *the*

\* Such indeed is the declaration of all the ancient prophets, insomuch that it is impossible to treat of *the restoration of the Jews* without likewise treating of *the destruction of Antichrist*.

*false prophet*, as we are plainly taught that it hereafter shall do at the close of the 1260 years.\*

At present therefore we may pronounce *the king* to be a motley monster, compounded of *Atheism* and *Popery*; inwardly an *atheist*,† outwardly a *papist*; still doing according to his will, and exalting himself; still insulting and tyrannizing over his weaker neighbours; and still scourging the members of that *Apostacy*, which he now professes to venerate and uphold. In this state, or in some state similar to it, he will continue to the end of the 1260 years, and till the commencement of the *restoration of the Jews*;‡ when like his brethern in fraud, violence, and iniquity, “he shall come to his end, and none shall help him.” Meanwhile, whatever may be his ostensible creed, he is still the same tyrant, as when he began his demoniacal career. The laws of nations, and the hitherto universally acknowledged rights of ambassadors, he violates with the same contempt of every

\* This subject will be fully discussed hereafter. We have already had a specimen of the holy zeal with which the present usurper of the throne of France espouses the cause of Popery. From a pious regard no doubt for the soul of his brother, he has caused the sovereign pontiff to pronounce a divorce between him and his wife, on the ground forsooth of her being a *heretic*. What may not be expected hereafter from such an auspicious beginning!

† It is unreasonable to suppose, that all the people of France, even fickle and volatile as they are, should suddenly have turned with sincerity from *Atheism* to *Popery*. From what can be learned of the state of that country, *Atheism* and *Irreligion* seem to be little less prevalent than ever they were.

‡ It is expressly declared, that he shall prosper till the indignation is accomplished, (Dan. xi. 36.) and that at the time of the end he shall undertake the expedition which will terminate in his destruction. Thus is it doubly pointed out, that he shall be permitted to prosper till the end of the 1260 years: for both the time of the end commences, and the peculiar season of the indignation is finished, when those years terminate. Mr. Mede, in a manner not very consistent even with his own interpretation of the prophecy, supposes that the indignation was accomplished when the Roman empire ceased to be pagan under Constantine. (Apost. of latter times, Part I. C 17.) Bp. Newton, on the contrary, very justly thinks, that the indignation will not be accomplished till the Jews begin to be restored, and consequently till the end of the 1260 years: but I much doubt, whether the period of the indignation means, as he supposes, “the last end and consummation of God’s indignation against his people the Jews.” (Dissert. XVII.) It seems to me to be plainly the same as the period of the wonders, which is to end at the expiration of the three times and a half (Dan. xii. 6, 7.): in other words, the same as the period of the 1260 years, which is ever represented as the peculiar season of God’s indignation on account of the apostacy and degeneracy of his Church. Hence the latter part of Daniel’s vision of the ram and the he-goat, which treats of the desolating transgression of *Mohammedism*, during the 1260 years, is represented as likewise treating of the *latter end of the indignation*, or, as it might be more properly translated, the *succession, the continuance, of the indignation*. Dan. viii. 19.

principle of justice and honour, as he heretofore overleaped the laws of his country, and trampled upon the rights of individuals. The privileges of neutral states are disregarded by him, when he conceives that his interests may be promoted by the murder of a Bourbon. In fine, despising the petty villainies of a private robber, he takes a bolder flight of rapacity: and, while with high vaulting ambition he extends on every side the limits of his dominions, he distributes among those, who are base enough to concur with him in his schemes of plunder, whole provinces of a once independent empire under the specious name of *indemnities*.\* But, gigantic as may be his projects of universal domination,† the time is rapidly approaching when “the Son of man will come in the clouds of heaven,” and establish the last universal sovereignty, that of *the symbolical mountain*. Then shall “*the fourth beast* be slain, and his body destroyed:” then shall each of *the little horns* be broken; then shall *the infidel tyrant* “come to his end:” and then shall the victorious Word of God receive from his Almighty Father “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.”

III. It appears from the remainder of the prophecy relative to *the atheistical king*, that toward the close of his career, he should meet with a most powerful opponent in *a mighty king of the North*, and with a less vigorous resistance from *a king of the South*. “At the time of the end shall a king of the South butt at him; and a

\* The dignified and princely conduct of Sweden at the present juncture forms a striking contrast to the pitiful behaviour of most of the continental sovereigns. It is a relief to the mind to turn from the degraded and enslaved South, and to contemplate a line of conduct worthy of better times in the more free and manly North. May, 1805.

Since this note was written, a vast coalition has been formed against France, and has been broken almost as soon as formed. England, Sweden, and Russia, are now the only independent powers of Europe. Every passing event serves to shew that the counsels of God are rapidly hastening to maturity. March 26, 1806.

† It may not be improper to remind the reader, that I speak of the actions of Buonaparté *only* as being a portion of the actions of *the infidel kingdom*. Neither *he*, nor any other *individual*, is intended by *this infidel king* or *kingdom*; but *France alone* from the commencement of the revolution to the termination of the 1360 years and the beginning of *the time of the end*.

king of the North shall come against him like a whirlwind, with chariots, and with horsemen, and with many ships. Yet he shall enter into the countries, and shall overflow, and shall pass over, and shall enter into the glorious land, and many countries shall be overthrown: but these shall escape out of his hand, even Edom, and Moab, and the chief of the children of Ammon. He shall stretch forth his hand also upon the countries: and the land of Egypt shall not escape. But he shall have power over the treasures of gold and of silver, and over all the precious things of Egypt: and the Libyans and the Ethiopians shall be at his steps. But tidings out of the East and out of the North shall trouble him: therefore he shall go forth with great fury to destroy, and under the pretext of religion to devote many to utter destruction. And he shall plant the curtains of his pavilions between the seas in the glorious holy mountain: yet he shall come to his end, and none shall help him. And at that time shall Michael stand up, the great prince which standeth for the children of thy people: and there shall be a time of trouble, such as never was, since there was a nation even to that same time: and at that time thy people shall be delivered, every one that shall be found written in the book."

*North and South* are mere general and relative terms. At the beginning of this last prophecy of Daniel, *the kings of the North and the South* are undoubtedly *the kings of Syria, and Egypt*: but *their* power has long since been broken: consequently *the kings of the North and the South* at the latter end of the prediction are entirely different potentates from those mentioned in the earlier part of it.

Bp. Newton, as we have seen, supposes, that *the king, who was to magnify himself above every god, is the Pope in the West, and the Constantinopolitan Emperor in the East*: and since one error in the exposition of a strictly chronological prophecy necessarily introduces many others, he imagines with Mr. Mede, that *the king of the South and the king of the North are the Saracens and the Turks*.\* Impressed with this idea, he attributes the

\* I cannot refrain from observing, what seems to have escaped the notice of my venerable predecessors, Mede and Newton, that, if the king of the South

conquests of *the infidel king to the northern king of the Turks*; and supposes that it was *he* who was to enter into the glorious land, to stretch forth his hand upon the countries, and to make himself master of Egypt. The fact however is, as the context sufficiently shews, that it is not *the king of the North* who is to invade the glorious land, and the land of Egypt, but his rival *the infidel king*. Daniel is not writing a history either of *the king of the North*, or of *the king of the South*, but of *the king who was to magnify himself above every god*. Accordingly, he faithfully details *the whole of this king's eventful history*, from its *original commencement\** to its *final termination*.† His adversaries, *the king of the North* and *the king of the South*, are only mentioned as *inferior actors* in this great drama. Notwithstanding the rapid attack of *the northern sovereign* and the apparently more feeble efforts of *the southern prince*,‡ this *infidel king* is nevertheless to overflow and pass over, to enter into the glorious land, and to seize upon the land of Egypt. Such appears to me to be the most natural mode of explaining the prophecy: for, unless *all these exploits* be attributed to *the infidel king*, we shall be obliged to acknowledge, that Daniel has given only a very imperfect account of *that power*; an account extremely different from the several histories of *the two little horns*. In both those histories we have a regular and continued narrative, conducting us, step by step, from *the rise to the destruction of each horn*: but *here*, according to the scheme

be the Saracenic empire, it is very singular that so *little* should be said about *him*, and so *much* about *the king of the North* whom they suppose to denote *the Turris empire*. The exploits of *the Saracens* were at least *as wonderful as those of the Turks*; and, in addition to their other amazingly extensive conquests, they likewise, no less than *the Turks*, made themselves masters of the glorious holy land. If then *the kings of the South* and *North* denote *the Saracenic and Turkish empires*, is it not somewhat singular that so *much* should be said about *the latter*, and so *very little* about *the former*? According to the scheme which I venture to oppose, although sanctioned by the eminent names of Mede and Newton, all that is said of *the Saracens* is, "A king of the south shall butt at him:" while *six long verses*, with the exception of these few words (in the original only *four words*), are exclusively devoted to *the Turks*. Whereas, according to *my scheme*, their due degree of importance is given to *the kings of the South and the North*; while *the Infidel king* appears, from beginning to end, the consistent hero of the drama.

\* Ver. 36.

† Ver. 45.

‡ The word, by which the attack of *the southern king* is described, is כָּבַח which signifies *to butt or strike with a ram*.

of Mr. Mede and Bp. Newton, we have only a *mutilated* account of *the infidel king, commencing* indeed, but *abruptly breaking off*: and, instead of teaching us what shall be *the end of that monster*, only informing us of *the destruction of the northern prince*, who had not been previously represented as having committed any particular crime against Heaven, but on the contrary as being laudably engaged in opposing with all his forces the outrageous tyranny of *the atheistical potentate*,

But, even supposing, (what I think the context will by no means warrant) that *the king of the north* and not *the infidel king*, is to invade Palestine; still the chronology of the prophecy will abundantly shew, that the whole interpretation of Mr. Mede and Bp. Newton *must* be erroneous. *The king, who magnified himself above every god*, was to spring up *after the reformation*; consequently all his exploits must be *after the reformation* likewise: but, if his wars with *the kings of the South* and *the North* are to be *after* that period, they cannot allude to the contests of *the Eastern Emperors with the Saracens and Turks*, which were *before it*. So again: the prophet carefully informs us, that all these events are to take place at *the time of the end*, and that they are to be contemporary with *the restoration of the Jews*. But *the time of the end* commences at *the termination of the 1260 years*: consequently, by no ingenuity of interpretation can it be carried back to *the very beginning of those years*; that is to say, to *the year 629*, in which *the Saracens* first attacked *the Roman empire*, and which is no more than twenty three years posterior to *the year 606*, whence, as I have already shewn, *the 1260 years* ought most probably to be dated.\* So far is this period from being *the time of the end*,† the time appointed for *the restoration of the Jews*,‡ that near *twelve centuries*

\* The first war between the Saracens and the Romans commenced in the year 629 Hist of Decline and Fall, Vol. ix. p. 31.

† "At the time of the end a king of the south shall butt at him."

‡ "At that time thy people shall be delivered" (Dan xii 1.) It afterwards appears that *the Jews* will begin to be restored, (so soon as *the three times and a half* shall have expired. "Until how long shall be the end of the wonders?—It shall be until a time and a times and a half: and, when he shall have finished to scatter the power of the holy people, all these things shall be finished." Ver. 5, 6.

have now elapsed from it, and still we behold *the Jews* scattered over the face of the earth.

This however is by no means all. Granting for a moment, merely for the sake of argument, that *the time of the end* means *the whole 1260 years*, that *the king of the North* is *the Turk*, and that the prophecy has been accomplished as far as to the end of the 45th verse, which is all that Mr. Mede and Bp. Newton suppose :\* still the 44th and 45th verses will remain yet to be accomplished, and these never can be accomplished in *the Turk* consistently with another prophecy which foretells his destruction. I will say nothing of the extreme *improbability*, that *the Ottoman power*, now fast verging to destruction, should ever go forth with great fury to devote many to utter extermination on a religious account, should succeed in planting the curtains of his pavilions between the seas in the glorious holy mountain, and should there finally be overthrown : of the utter *improbability* of all this I will say nothing ; because I pretend not to the gift of prophecy, and am not prepared *positively* to assert that such an event is absolutely *impossible*. But *this* I will fearlessly assert, that the time assigned for the destruction of *the power* which (according to Daniel) will come to its end in Palestine, let it be *the one king* or let it be *the other king*, cannot be made to quadrate with the time assigned by St. John for the overthrow of *the Ottoman power* : therefore *the power*, that comes to its end in Palestine, cannot be *the Ottoman power*. Let us compare together the two prophets. “ And *at the time of the end* a king of the south shall butt at him ; and a king of the north shall come against him :—and he shall enter into the countries ;—and he

\* “ It is true, which you guess, that I incline to apply *the king of the north's* going forth (upon the tidings from the east and the north) in a fury to destroy, and to that purpose to plant the tabernacles of his palaces in the glorious mountain of holiness, to the Jews' return, and the expulſion of Gog and Magog into the holy land” (Mede's Works B. iv. Epist. 54.) I think Mr. Mede wrong in his chronology of the *expedition of Gog and Magog*, as I attempt to prove at large in the work which I have now in hand concerning the *Restoration of Israel and the overthrow of the Antichristian confederacy*. but he plainly considers the two last verses of Dan. xi. as yet unfulfilled, which was the purpose for which I made this citation. Bp. Newton is of the same opinion. “ The two next, which are the two last verses of this chapter, I conceive, remain yet to be fulfilled.” Dissert. xvii. in loc.



shall plant the curtains of his pavilions between the seas in the glorious holy mountain: yet he shall come to his end, and none shall help him. And *at that time* shall Michael stand up, the great prince which standeth for the children of thy people: and there shall be a time of trouble such as never was since there was a nation even to that same time: and *at that time* thy people shall be delivered." Here let us pause, and ask, *At what time!* The expression *at that time* can only refer, either to *the time of the end*, or to *the period when the power which had occupied the holy mountain is destroyed*. To the one, or the other, it must refer. I believe it myself to refer to *the time of the end*; because I believe *the time of the end* to commence, when *the 1260 years terminate*. To the present argument however this is immaterial: and, since Mr. Mede and Bp. Newton of course will not refer it to *the time of the end*, they must refer it to *the time when the power in question perishes*\*. This power they suppose to be *the king of the North*, who according to their idea is *the Ottoman empire*. Therefore *the Ottoman empire* will perish at the time when Michael stands up, and when the people of Daniel or *the Jews* begin to be delivered. *The Jews* however, as Daniel afterwards informs us, will cease to be scattered when all *the wonders of the 1260 days* shall be finished: but all those wonders, he says, will be finished at the end of *the three times and a half*: therefore *the Jews* will cease to be scattered, or begin to be restored, at the same time. But we had already arrived at the conclusion, that *the fall of the Ottoman empire* and *the restoration of the Jews* were to be contemporary. Therefore *the fall of the Ottoman empire*, if the principles of Mr. Mede and Bp. Newton be just, which I deny, must take place at the end of *the three times and a half*, or *the 1260 years*. And how does this accord with St. John! He teaches us, that *the confederacy of*

\* So accordingly Mr. Mede *does* refer it. See the last citation from him. Bp. Newton does the same. "Between the seas in the glorious holy mountain must denote some part of the holy land. There the Turk shall encamp with all his power, yet he shall come to his end, and none shall help him. The same times and the same events seem to be presignified in this prophecy, as in that of Ezekiel concerning Gog of the land of Magog—He shall come up against the people of Israel in the latter days after their return from captivity—He shall also fall upon the mountains of Israel." Dissert. XVII in loc.

*the beast, the false prophet, and the kings of the earth*, shall be broken at Armageddon, in Palestine, or the land which extends 1600 furlongs, under *the seventh vial*, which plainly begins to be poured out at *the end of the 1260 years*.\* And he likewise teaches us, Mr. Mede himself being the interpreter, that *the waters of the Euphrates* shall be dried up, or that *the Ottoman empire* shall be overthrown under *the sixth vial*, at some indefinite period, before *the confederacy* begins to be even gathered together to Armageddon, and consequently much more at some indefinite period before that *confederacy* is destroyed at Armageddon. According to the scheme then which I am opposing, St. John tells us, that *the Ottoman empire*, under the name of *the Euphrates*, will be subverted at some indefinite period *before* the expiration of *the 1260 years*, and consequently *before* the commencement of *the restoration of the Jews*, but a period long enough to allow of the gathering together of *the bestial confederacy* and their subsequent expedition into Palestine: while Daniel tells us, that *the Ottoman empire*, under the name of *a king of the North*, will be destroyed in Palestine *after* the expiration of *the 1260 years*, because *contemporaneously* with *the restoration of the Jews*. Thus does the scheme, which makes *the king of the North* to be *the Turk*, set Daniel and St. John at direct variance: and hence, even supposing that *the king of the North*, and not *the wilful king*, is to perish in Palestine at the end of *the 1260*

\* Such is the opinion of Mr. Mede. He supposes *the first blast of the seventh trumpet* and *the first effusion of the seventh vial*, which he justly calls *the vial of consummation*, exactly to synchronize; and he maintains, that at this era *the three times and a half terminate*. Though, as I have already observed, I prefer Bp. Newton's arrangement of *the seventh trumpet*, I think Mr. Mede's opinion indisputable that *the 1260 days* expire when *the vial of consummation* is poured out, because the contents of *that vial* plainly shew that it relates to the time of *God's great controversy with the nations*. But *this great controversy*, this *period of unexampled trouble*, synchronizes, according to the unanimous testimony of all the prophets who treat of the subject, with *the restoration of the Jews*; which *restoration* commences, according to Daniel, at the close of *the three times and a half*: therefore the *contemporary period of unexampled trouble* must commence at the close of *the three times and a half*; and consequently *the effusion of the seventh vial*, which treats of that period, must likewise commence at the close of *the three times and a half*: in other words, *the seventh vial* must begin to be poured out, so soon as *the three times and a half* or *the 1260 days* expire; which was the point asserted. Compare Mede's Clav. Apoc. Par. Alt. Synchron. 4, 5.—Comment. Apoc. in Tub. vii. et. Phial. vii.—and the plate at the end of his Clav.

years, it is plain that the power which perishes *after* the expiration of that period cannot be *the Ottoman empire* which (according to St. John) will be subverted *before* the expiration of it.

Yet even this is not all. *Two* expeditions into the *very same country*, attended with *exactly the same circumstances*, can scarcely be contemporary. But we have abundant reason to believe, as will be stated at large hereafter, that *the Roman confederacy of the beast, the false prophet, and the kings of the earth*, will undertake such an expedition into Palestine, as is here described by Daniel, at the close of *the 1260 years*. How then can *the Turk* undertake exactly such another, and exactly at the same time? Perhaps it may be said, the *two* expeditions will form only *one allied* expedition. How then can this allied expedition have *two* commanders in chief? In the Apocalypse *the beast under his last head*, which most commentators, though I think very erroneously, have supposed to be *the Papacy*, is the commander in chief;\* and not a hint is given of any co-operation on the part of *the Turk*: as indeed how should there, when St. John has told us, that *the Ottoman empire, or the mystic Euphrates* had been previously destroyed? In Daniel, *the king of the North* (still arguing according to Mr. Mede's and Bp. Newton's reference of the expedition against Palestine to *the king of the North* and not to *the wilful king*,) whom they suppose to be *the Turk*, is the commander in chief; and not a hint is given of any co-operation on the part of *the beast*: when yet,

\* The reader will perhaps be inclined to think from the present aspect of affairs, that *the probability of the Pope being commander in chief of a vast expedition against Palestine* is much on a par with *the probability of the Turk being commander in chief of a contemporaneous expedition against the same country*. Yet does this expectation necessarily result from the belief that *the ten-horned apocalyptic beast is the Papacy*: for that *beast* is plainly represented, as not merely taking an *inferior* part in the *confederacy of the Latin kings*, but as *animating and heading* it. According to the light in which I view that yet *unaccomplished prophecy, the Pope and his hierarchy, or the false prophet* who is the same as *the second apocalyptic beast*, will be more or less indeed concerned and interested in this expedition against the land that extends 1000 furlongs: nay, with Mr. Whitaker, I even think it not *improbable*, that Jerusalem may finally be the seat of *the apostate man of sin*: but *the power*, that will form the confederacy of vassal kings and head the expedition into Palestine, namely *the Roman beast under his last head*, I certainly believe to be a very different power from *the Papacy*. But this matter will be discussed at large hereafter, when I consider the character of *the two apocalyptic beasts*.

according to St. John, *that very Turk* was no longer in existence.

Since then *the king of the North* plainly cannot be *the Turk*, and since consequently the actions, which Mr. Mede and Bp. Newton ascribe to *the king of the North*, cannot have been performed by *the Turk*; since moreover, as I will venture to affirm, if the actions ascribed to *the king of the North* were not performed by *the Turk*, they were never performed by *any king of the North*, and if not by *any king of the North* certainly not by *any power* which may be deemed the antitype of *the wilful king*: it will follow, that all these actions, whether performed by *the wilful king* as I suppose, or by *the king of the North* as Mr. Mede and Bp. Newton suppose, are still future; which will bring me back to the point whence I set out, namely, that the period to which they are ascribed is future likewise; in other words that *the time of the end* denotes some future period, which (as I have already attempted to shew) there is reason to think commences when *the 1260 years* terminate.

In fact, the only expedition undertaken against Palestine at the close of *the 1260 years* and contemporaneously with *the restoration of the Jews*, an expedition noticed by almost every prophet that treats of *the restoration of the Jews*,\* is plainly the expedition undertaken by *the Roman confederacy of the best, the false prophet, and the kings of the Latin earth*. Hence, since Daniel predicts an expedition undertaken against the same country and at the same time either by *the infidel king*, or by *the king of the North*, this expedition must be the same as that mentioned in the Apocalypse: consequently it must be undertaken by *that king* who may be considered as *the dominant Roman power*. But *the king of the North*, unless I greatly mistake, is not a *Roman power*: whereas *the wilful king*, according to my interpretation of his character, is *the greatest of the Roman powers*. For

\* This point is fully considered in my unpublished work on *the restoration of Israel and the destruction of Antichrist*. The Jewish Rabbies themselves have collected from their own prophets, that *the restoration of their countrymen* will synchronize with *the destruction of the Roman power in its last form*; and they scruple not to maintain, that *the Edom*, whose overthrow is represented as being contemporary with *the return of the chosen people*, denotes *that power*. (See Isaiah liii. liiii.) I believe them to be perfectly right in their opinion.

these various reasons, deduced from a general survey of the context of this and other prophecies, I conclude, that the expedition, certainly will be undertaken, not by *the king of the North*, but by *the infidel king*: and I apprehend it was from some such general survey of the different prophecies, which treat at once of *the restoration of the Jews* and *the contemporaneous destruction of some great enemy of God in Palestine*, that the ancient fathers believed that *Antichrist* was destined to perish in that country; an opinion, which Bp. Horsley, and I think very rightly, judges to be well founded.\*

But it may be said, if I maintain, that *the infidel king* is *atheistical France*, that the predicted expedition into Palestine will be undertaken by *the infidel king*, and that this predicted expedition about to be undertaken by *the infidel king* is the same as the contemporary expedition about to be undertaken into the land that extends 1600 furlongs by *a confederacy of the beast under his last head, the false prophet, and the kings of the earth*: if I maintain these various connected positions, it will necessarily follow, that, at the time of the expedition, *the infidel king* must have become the same as *the beast under his last head*. Such appears undoubtedly to be the consequence of this train of comparative reasoning. I must at present however decline saying any thing more on the subject, as I purpose to resume it after I have discussed the character of *the seven-headed apocalyptic beast*, and when I treat of the events foretold under *the last vial*.

It may not be amiss to remark, that, whenever *the mystic Euphratean waters* are exhausted under *the sixth apocalyptic vial*, or in other words whenever *the Ottoman empire* is overthrown, it will greatly assist us in explaining both the present prophecy of Daniel, and another of Ezekiel, which many, though I believe erroneously, have thought to be parallel to it. Both Mr. Mede and Bp. Newton suppose, that the events predicted in Dan. xi. 44, 45, which they refer to *the king of the North*, are the same as those predicted in Ezek. xxxviii, xxxix; and they both equally suppose, that those two prophecies will be accomplished in some yet future expedition of

\* Letter on Isaiah xviii. p. 103.

*the Turk* into Palestine at the era of *the restoration of the Jews*. I have just explicitly avowed my total dissent from them, and have very fully given my reasons for such dissent: according however to all appearances, though I presume not to say *how soon*,\* not many years will elapse before the question is decided between us for ever. If *the Ottoman empire* fall, as I myself firmly believe it *will do*, without undertaking the predicted expedition into Palestine contemporaneously with *the return of the Jews*; we shall then be sure, that it cannot be the subject of *either* of the two prophecies, whether the two relate to the same event or not to the same event. And, if it should prove *not* to be the subject of the prophecy contained in Dan. xi. 44, 45, which of course it *cannot* be unless it fulfil that prophecy by undertaking the expedition into Palestine; then neither can it be the subject of the prophecy contained in Dan. xi. 40—43. And, if it be not the subject of *that* prophecy; then it cannot be *the king of the North*, to whom *the entering into the countries* and all that follows is ascribed, erroneously indeed I believe, by Mr. Mede and Bp. Newton. And, if *the Ottoman power* be not *the king of the North*; then neither can *the Saracenic power* be *the king of the South*. In short, unless *the now debilitated Turk* shall perform at some future period all that is predicted in Dan. xi. 44, 45, which both Mr. Mede and Bp. Newton allow to be yet unaccomplished; their whole exposition of Dan. xi. 36—45, will be untenable.

\* *The Turkish empire* seems at present to exist, balanced as it were between the jealousy of *France* and *Russia*; and, what is more, its crisis, so far as human foresight can calculate, seems very rapidly approaching. The usurper is claiming all the Turkish provinces that ever belonged to the Venetian republic; and, if *France* and *Russia* seriously measure their strength, it will most probably be upon Ottoman ground. Can an empire, which totters to its very base, and which is faintly struggling with open rebellion, stand the shock of two such conflicting rivals? Unless I greatly mistake, the route of *Antichrist* or *the infidel king* to *Palestine* will be through the northern provinces of *Turkey* and *Asia minor*. Here *the king of the South* will butt at him: and here the more mighty *king of the North* will come against him like an impetuous whirlwind, not only with land forces, but with many *ships* to prevent his crossing the Constantinopolitan strait. Yet, in despite of this resistance, he shall overflow the countries like a torrent, and safely "pass over." Wonderful is the concurrence of facts with prophecy! Even now we behold the monster, who at one period seemed effectually excluded from *Turkey* by the powerful intervention of *Austria*, hanging upon the frontiers of *the Ottoman empire*, and devouring by anticipation his devoted prey. June 3, 1806.

Since then *the infidel king* is to spring up *after the reformation* and to continue to *the time of the end*, when he is to undertake an expedition against Palestine, we must look for his two antagonists, *the kings of the South* and *the North, after the reformation* also. And here it may be observed, that, since *the king of the North* is nowhere said to be *a horn of the fourth beast*, we may seek him either *within* or *without* the limits of *the ancient Roman empire*, according as we are directed by existing circumstances. The same remark applies with equal force to *the king of the South*. Now, when we consider that near *twelve centuries* have elapsed since *the rise of the great Apostacy* in the year 606, and consequently (if this be the true date of it) that it has to continue but little more than 60 years; when we next recollect, that *the king of the North* is to be contemporary with *the infidel king*, whose *primary rise* must be dated from the year 1789 when the French revolution commenced, who was *fully revealed* in the year 1792, when the reign of atheism and anarchy began,\* and *whose overthrow* will begin to take place at the end of the 1260 years; when from this circumstance we obviously deduce, that *the king of the North* is to be *the most powerful northern sovereignty of Europe* that shall be in existence between the years 1789 and 1866, at which last period the 1260 years terminate if they be dated from the year 606; and when we lastly advert to the existing and probably future state of the great European commonwealth, we can scarcely doubt but that *the king of the North* is the colossal monarchy of *Russia*. What state is meant by *the king of the South*, is not quite so easy to determine.

As for the predicted wars of *the infidel power* with *these two sovereigns*, none of them have yet received their accomplishment. The prophet begins his account of them with declaring, that they shall happen at *the time of the end*. The time therefore is not yet: for the 1260 years have not yet elapsed, consequently *the time of the end* is not yet come. Assuredly however will *Antichrist* hereafter invade Palestine in conjunction with

\* These dates will be fully discussed hereafter.

*the false prophet and the kings of the Latin earth*: and, though tidings out of the East and out of the North\* may trouble him, will succeed in planting the curtains of his pavilions *between the seas† in the glorious holy mountain*: yet, notwithstanding the temporary prosperity of his affairs, he shall come to his end, and none shall help him. The series of events, which terminates with the destruction of *the monster and his confederated host*, will be contemporary with *the restoration of the Jews*. At the close of *the 1260 years*, and at the commencement of that intermediate period styled by Daniel *the time of the end*, Antichrist will undertake the expedition which will terminate in his destruction; and at the same period *the Jews* will begin to be restored.‡ Few therefore of the present generation can expect to behold even *the beginning* of the expedition: none can hope to witness his predicted invasion of *Palestine*, his capture of *Jerusalem*, his *tremendous destruction between the two seas*.§ Awful as the scenes have been, which we have

\* Daniel teaches us, that he will hear these tidings out of the East and out of the North, while engaged in the conquest of *Egypt*. Now we have reason to believe, that a large body of the *Jews* will be restored in a converted state by some great maritime power. Suppose then that these Jewish converts and their protectors should land in *Palestine*, while *Antichrist* was in *Egypt*, the tidings of such a circumstance must undoubtedly come to him out of the East and out of the North. But the series of events, here detailed by Daniel, are considered at large in the work which I am now preparing for the press on *the restoration of Israel and the destruction of Antichrist*. To that work I beg to refer the reader.

† *The Dead sea and the Mediterranean sea*, between which Jerusalem is situated.

‡ Dan. xi. 40. xii. 1, 6, 7. That the declaration contained in these two last verses relates to the commencement and not to the accomplishment of the restoration of Judah, in other words, that Judah will only begin to be restored at the end of *the three times and a half* is manifest from the following statement. We are taught in Dan. xii. 1. that the Jews will be delivered at the same time (according as we understand the passage,) either with the commencement of the infidel king's expedition in Dan. xi. 40. or with its overthrow in Dan. xi. 42. The *last* supposition is forbidden by other parallel prophecies, which represent the Jews as being *already* in their own land at the time that the Antichristian confederacy is broken: consequently, they must have *begun* to be restored *previous* to its being thus broken. The *first* supposition therefore must be adopted: whence it will follow, that the Jews *begin* to be restored contemporaneously with the commencement of the infidel king's expedition. But this expedition *commences at the time of the end* (Dan. xi. 40.); and *the time of the end commences* at the expiration of the 1260 years: therefore the expedition *commences* at the expiration of the 1260 years: and therefore the restoration of the Jews, which *commences* with the commencement of the expedition, must necessarily *commence*, not be *perfect*, at the expiration of the 1260 years likewise.

§ I speak only as supposing my date of *the 1260 years* to be the true one.



beheld as it were with our own eyes, a yet more dreadful prospect extends before us, ere the blessed reign of Christ upon earth shall commence. The revealing angel, who shews to Daniel *that which is noted in the Scripture of truth*, concludes his prophetic narrative with informing him, that, at the period during which *the atheistical tyrant* is destroyed, and *the Jews* are restored, "*there shall be a time of trouble, such as never was since there was a nation even to that same time.*" Nor can we wonder that that era should be marked with peculiarly horrible events, when we recollect that it is to witness the dying struggles, not only of *Atheism*, but likewise of *Papery* and *Mohammedism*. It is an era however, which will be terrible only to the enemies of the Church of Christ. Those, who have come out of *the mystic Babylon*, and have refrained from polluting themselves with the Antichristian abominations of *Infidelity*, will not be partakers of *her last pagres*.\*

Thus have we seen, that this favoured servant of God has, with inimitable simplicity and wonderful accuracy, given us *three distinct paintings* of *three great enemies* of the Gospel of Christ; *Papery*, *Mohammedism*, and *French Atheism*. *The two first*, being (to use Dean Prideaux's expression) *the two feet of the great Apostacy* with which it trampled both upon the East and the West during the same period of *1260 years*, are represented by the kindred symbols of *two little horns*; for *Papery* and *Mohammedism* had these features in common, that they were each *a less or a greater deflexion* from pure Christianity, and that they each equally affected to act not *contrary* to the will of Heaven, but *under its immediate sanction*: while *the last*, being completely a monster *sui generis*, the *very Antichrist* predicted by St. John; *the last*, as if no symbol could be found adequate to describe the enormous wickedness of his character; *the last* is exhibited to our view by *no hieroglyphic*, but stands confessed in all his native horrors, as *a king who should magnify himself above every*

Should I be so mistaken in the date, as that *the 1260 years* expire *sooner* than I expect, these awful events will of course take place proportionably *earlier* likewise.

\* The whole of this subject will be more fully discussed hereafter.

god, who should speak marvellous things against the God of gods, who should neither regard the god of his fathers, the desire of women, nor any god, but who, instead of the Lord of hosts, should impiously honour tutelary deities, and especially venerate a strange god whom his less daring fathers of the Apostacy never knew.

I shall now proceed to examine the kindred prophecies of St. John, who, like his illustrious predecessor Daniel, foretells, with the addition of various more minute circumstances, that *the Church shall be in a depressed state during the 1260 years of a great Apostacy from the simplicity of the Gospel.*



## CHAPTER VI.

### *Of the four first apocalyptic trumpets*

AS the nature of my subject confines me to those parts of the Apocalypse which treat of *the 1260 years of the great Apostacy*, I shall pass over in silence the contents of *the six first seals*, and commence my observations from *the last seal*, which comprehends *all the seven trumpets*.

“And, when he had opened the seventh seal, there was silence in heaven about the space of half an hour. And I saw the seven angels which stood before God; and to them were given seven trumpets. And another angel came and stood at the altar, having a golden censer: and there was given unto him much incense, that he should offer it with the prayers of all saints, upon the golden altar which was before the throne. And the smoke of the incense, which came with the prayers of the saints, ascended up before God out of the angel’s hand. And the angel took the censer, and filled it with fire of the altar, and cast it into the earth: and there were voices, and thunderings, and lightnings, and an earthquake.”

The prophet had already, under *the sixth seal*, predicted the conversion of *the Roman empire* to Christi-

anity in the days of Constantine, the downfall of paganism, and the tranquillity which *the Church* enjoyed for a season after her manifold troubles and persecutions.\* The opening of *the seventh seal* is the prelude to the disturbing of that tranquillity, the harbinger of the downfall of *the Western empire*, the herald of the revealing of *the man of sin*. The year 313 was marked by the famous edict of Constantine in favour of Christianity: in this year therefore the tranquillity of *the Church* commenced. No great length of time however elapsed before the peace of *the Empire* began to be broken by the incursions of the northern barbarians about *the years* 321 and 323. At this period I conceive *the seventh seal* to have been opened, and *the silence of half an hour* or rather of *half a season* to have commenced.† As *the seventh seal* introduces those first incursions of the Goths that took place after the beginning of *the Church's* tranquillity, incursions which were easily repelled by the yet vigorous government of *the Empire*; so *the silence* seems to denote *the state of mute and anxious expectation* in which *the Church* anticipated, as it were, from various less important invasions, the grand irruption of the Gothic monarch Alaric and his associates under *the first trumpet*. The period then of *the half season* describes the affairs of *the Church* and *the Empire* from about *the year* 323 to *the year* 395.

What *the Church* gained in outward splendour and prosperity under Constantine, she lost in purity of man-

\* Rev. vi. 12—17. vii. 1—17. See. Bp. Newton's Dissert. in loc. I cannot but think however, that his Lordship extends *the season of tranquillity*, predicted in *the seventh chapter*, much too far, in supposing it to reach from the reign of Constantine to the death of Theodosius, when *the first trumpet* began to sound. Such an opinion neither accords with facts, nor with the tenor of the prophecy. If we advert to facts, we shall find, that the peace of the Church began to be disturbed even during the life of Constantine by the heresy of Arius, and afterwards by the apostacy of Julian. If we advert to the prophecy, we shall find, that the scheme in question makes *the tranquillity of the sixth seal* synchronize for the most part with *the silence introduced by the opening of the seventh seal*. Now, since *the tranquillity* is placed under *the sixth seal*, it is reasonable to suppose that it is considered as terminating, when *the seventh seal* is opened, which introduces no scenes of peace, but a mute and anxious expectation of the calamities soon about to fall upon the Roman empire under *the trumpets*. History shews, that this supposition is just; for we can scarcely consider that as a period of much tranquillity to the Church which was at once disturbed by the quarrels of the Consubstantialists and the Arians, the malignity of Julian, and the perpetual incursions of the Goths.

† I shall take occasion hereafter to discuss the import of the word *hour*.

ners and doctrine. The holy simplicity of primitive Christianity was no more, and the heresy of Arius introduced a succession of crimes disgraceful alike to humanity and religion. Accordingly, before the sounding of *the trumpets* commences, the state of the world at that period is foretold by an emblem most significant of the corruptions then prevailing among Christians. *Much incense* is offered from a *golden censer* along with the prayers of *the Church*, in order to shew how much purification those prayers required ere they were meet to be presented before the throne of grace; and the placing of this circumstance “immediately before the sounding of *the trumpets*, suggests, that the subject of these prayers was the aversion of something to be called for by *those trumpets*: and what could this be, but that of the destruction of *the Roman empire*, for the duration of which we know the ancient Christians were wont to pray? It is plainly suggested, that the petition for some delay would be accepted; yet all further applications on that head are discouraged by a most significant emblem, that of *the censer being cast away*: while *the filling of it with fire from the altar*,” the well known symbol of *divine wrath*, “but too plainly indicates, that the succeeding troubles should at least be forwarded by *those who minister at the altar*; and the immediate succession of voices, and thunderings, and lightnings, and an earthquake, manifest, that, though the sounding of *the trumpets* should be deferred, yet some judgments should immediately follow.”\*

Upon referring to history we find, that the incursions of the northern barbarians gradually became more and more formidable. Between *the years 365 and 379*, an almost perpetual war was carried on between them and the Romans with various success: and in *the last of these years*, when *the Empire* seemed on the point of being completely overrun and dismembered, Gratian associated with himself in the imperial dignity the famous Theodosius. By the successful valour of this warlike prince, the sounding of *the first trumpet*, and the impending ruin

\* Whitaker's Comment. p. 80.

of *the Empire*, were delayed for sixteen years: but “the genius of Rome expired with Theodosius, the last of the successors of Augustus and Constantine, who appeared in the field at the head of their armies, and whose authority was universally acknowledged throughout the whole extent of the Empire.”\*

“And the seven angels, which had the seven trumpets, prepared themselves to sound.”

*The four first trumpets* describe the removal of *that power*, which in the days of St Paul letted or prevented the developement of *the man of sin*, namely, *the western imperial dignity of Rome*: while *the three last*, which are awfully styled *the three woes*, detail the history of *the great two-fold Apostacy* both in *the East* and in *the West*; exhibit *the man of sin* in the plenitude of his power, upheld by the secular arm, and tyrannizing over *the Church of Christ*; predict his complete destruction at *Armageddon*, in the very act of opposing the Almighty conjointly with his temporal colleague *the ten-horned beast* or *revived Roman empire*; and finally bring us to the period, when all the kingdoms of this world shall become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ.

“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 trees was burnt up, and all green grass was burnt up.”

Throughout a great part of the prophecy of *the trumpets*, the *Roman empire* is denominated *the third part of the whole symbolical universe*, as including the third part of the then known world, and as being seated principally in Europe, which at that time was accounted the third part of the world.† *Hail and lightning mingled with blood* denote a *tremendous tempest of desolating war and foreign invasion*. The *storm* therefore, which is here

\* Hist of Decline, Vol. v p. 157

† See Bp. Newton's Dissert on Rev. viii. and Waple and Whiston in loc. Mr. Bicheno conjectures, that the expression *the third part*, which occurs so frequently in this portion of the Apocalypse, is used in allusion to *the three prefectures of the Roman empire*. History however will not bear him out. We do not find that *one particular prefecture* was affected exclusively by *the blast of one particular trumpet*, which the adoption of such a scheme necessarily requires: on the contrary, the miseries introduced by at least *the first trumpet* extended more or less to *all the three prefectures*. Signs of the times, Part. iii. p. 153.

represented as falling upon *the earth* or *Roman empire*, typifies *that grand compound irruption of the barbarous northern nations*, from the effects of which *the Roman empire* never recovered itself, as it had done from those of the foregoing irruptions. In the natural world a *storm* is frequently preceded by a *calm*: hence in the figurative world *the great hail-storm* mingled with lightning is represented as being preceded by *silence*. This *silence* however is not so deep, but that the latter part of it is interrupted both by thunders, and lightnings, and an earthquake,\* the immediate harbingers of *the hail-storm*. Accordingly we find, that the fierce Gothic tribes though perpetually at war with the Romans, and though threatening to overwhelm them by repeatedly violating the long extent of the northern frontier, were for a time restrained by the genius of Theodosius :† but, upon the decease of this great prince in *the year 395*, the *northern cloud*, which had so long been gathering, discharged itself with irresistible fury upon the Empire. “He died in the month of January ; and before the end of the same year the Gothic nation was in arms—The barriers of the Danube were thrown open : the savage warriors of Scythia issued from their forests ; and the uncommon severity of the winter” (the season in which *natural hail* and *snow* are generated) “allowed the poet to remark, that they rolled their ponderous waggons over the broad and icy back of the indignant river—The fertile fields of Phocis and Beotia were covered with a deluge of barbarians, who massacred the males of an age to bear arms, and drove away the beautiful females with the spoil and cattle of the flaming villages.” The whole territory of Athens was blasted by the baleful presence of Alaric ; and “the travellers, who visited Greece several years afterwards, could easily discover the deep and bloody traces of the march of the Goths.”‡

Such were the first effects of *the symbolical hail storm*. Having thus ravaged Greece, it was next carried into

\* Rev. viii. 5.

† “As the impatient Goths,” says Mr. Gibbon, “could only be restrained by the firm and temperate character of Theodosius, the public safety seemed to depend on the life and abilities of a single man.” Hist. of Decline, Vol. iv. p. 443.

‡ Hist. of Decline and Fall, Vol. v. p. 176—181.

Italy and the West. Under the guidance of Alaric, it passed over Pannonia, Istria, and Venetia: and threatened the destruction of imperial Rome herself. At length it was driven out of Italy by Stilicho.

Yet, scarcely was *this part of the tempest* dissipated, when *another dark cloud*,\* generated like its fellow in the cold regions of the North, (so accurately does the symbol correspond with its antitype) burst in *the year* 406 upon the banks of the upper Danube, and thence passed on into Italy. Headed by Radagaisus, the northern Germans emigrated from their native land, besieged Florence, and threatened Rome. Stilicho however was again victorious; but the remnant of the vanquished host was still sufficient to invade and desolate the province of Gaul. "The banks of the Rhine were crowned, like those of the Tiber, with elegant houses, and well cultivated farms. This scene of peace and plenty was suddenly changed into a desert; and the prospect of the smoking ruins could alone distinguish the solitude of nature from the desolations of man. The flourishing city of Mentz was surprised and destroyed; and many thousand Christians were inhumanly massacred in the church. Worms perished, after a long and obstinate siege; Strasburgh, Spire, Rheims, Tournay, Arras, Amiens, experienced the cruel oppression of the German yoke; and the consuming flames of war spread from the banks of the Rhine over the greatest part of the seventeen provinces of Gaul. That rich and extensive country, as far as the ocean, the Alps, and the Pyrenees, was delivered to the barbarians; who drove before them, in a promiscuous crowd, the bishop, the senator, and the virgin, laden with the spoils of their houses and altars."†

Meanwhile *that part of the storm*, which was directed by Alaric, soon began to beat afresh. After the death

\* I have adopted the language of the historian. Unconscious that he was bearing his testimony to the truth of prophecy, he has used the self-same allegorical language as that employed by St. John. "The correspondence of nations," says he, "was in that age so imperfect and precarious, that the revolutions of the North might escape the knowledge of the court of Ravenna; till *the dark cloud*, which was collected along the coast of the Baltic, burst in thunder upon the banks of the upper Danube." Hist. of Decline and Fall, Vol. v. p. 214.

† Hist. of Decline, Vol. v. p. 225.

of Stilicho, the Gothic sovereign again invaded Italy : and Rome herself, after three successive sieges, was sacked by the northern barbarians.\*

It is observable in *literal storms of hail*, that their violence appears for a season to subside, and afterwards to return with redoubled fury. This was exactly the case with *the figurative tempest of Gothic invasion* predicted in the Apocalypse. After the exploits of Alaric and Radagaisus had been achieved, the violence of *the main body of the hail-storm* abated, but its *outskirts* still continued to beat upon the more remote provinces of *the Western empire*. In *the year 409*, Spain was overrun and ravaged by the Suevi, the Vandals, and the Alans ; who were afterwards, in their turn, compelled to submit to the arms of the Goths.† The Vandals however still prevailed in Galicia ; and, in order (as it were) that no part of *the Roman world* should escape the devastating influence of *the northern hail-storm*, soon afterwards invaded the African province. In *the year 429*, they crossed the Streights of Gibraltar under the command of Genseric, invited by the mistaken policy of Boniface. At that period the African coast was extremely populous, and the country itself so fruitful that it deserved the name of *the common granary of Rome and of mankind*. “On a sudden, the seven provinces, from Tangier to Tripoli, were overwhelmed by the invasion of the Vandals. War, in its fairest form, implies a perpetual violation of humanity and justice ; and the hostilities of barbarians are inflamed by the fierce and lawless spirit which incessantly disturbs their peaceful and domestic society. The Vandals, where they found resistance, seldom gave quarter ; and the deaths of their valiant countrymen were expiated by the ruin of the cities under whose walls they had fallen. Careless of the distinctions of age, or sex, or rank, they employed every species of indignity and torture, to force from the captives a discovery of their hidden wealth. The stern policy of Genseric justified his frequent examples of military execution : he was not always the master of his

\* Hist. of Decline, Vol. v. p. 184—329.

† Ibid p. 350—355.



own passions, or of those of his followers; and the calamities of war were aggravated by the licentiousness of the Moors, and the fanaticism of the Donatists.”\*

Thus did *the first great storm of hail* lay waste *the Roman empire*. Collecting itself in the North, it burst over Greece and Italy; ravaged Gaul and Spain; and at length spent itself in Africa.

Scarcely was the fury of *this tempest* exhausted, when *another* no less destructive began to gather, as we perpetually behold one storm of hail rapidly succeed another. The Hungarian monarch Attila, having united in his own person the empire of Scythia and Germany, soon turned his arms against the declining power of the Romans. In *the year 441*, he invaded *the Eastern empire*. “The Illyrian frontier was covered by a line of castles and fortresses; and, though the greatest part of them consisted only of a single tower with a small garrison, they were commonly sufficient to repel or to intercept the inroads of any enemy, who was ignorant of the art, and impatient of the delay, of a regular siege. But these slight obstacles were instantly swept away by the inundation of the Huns. They destroyed with fire and sword the populous cities of Sirmium and Singidunum, of Ratiara, and Marcianopolis, of Naissus and Sardica; where every circumstance, in the discipline of the people and the construction of the buildings, had been gradually adapted to the sole purpose of defence. The whole breadth of Europe, as it extends above five hundred miles from the Euxine to the Adriatic, was at once invaded, and occupied, and desolated, by the myriads of barbarians whom Attila led into the field—The armies of the Eastern empire were vanquished in three successive engagements; and the progress of Attila may be traced by the fields of battle—From the Hellespont to Thermopylae and the suburbs of Constantinople he ravaged, without resistance and without mercy, the provinces of Thrace and Macedonia. Heraclea and Hadrianople might perhaps escape this dreadful irruption of the Huns; but words, the most expressive of total extirpa-

tion and crasure, are applied to the calamities which they inflicted on seventy cities of the Eastern empire.”\*

A pause at length took place in *the storm*. In *the year 446*, the Constantinopolitan emperor concluded an ignominious peace with Attila: but, in *the year 450*, the restless Hun threatened alike both the East and the West. “Mankind,” says the historian, “awaited his decision with awful suspense.” *The storm* however now burst over Gaul and Italy. After ravaging the former of these countries with savage barbarity, Attila turned his arms toward the seat of *the Western empire*. Aquileia made a vigorous but ineffectual resistance; and the succeeding generation could scarcely discover its ruins. The victorious barbarian “pursued his march; and, as he passed, the cities of Altinum, Concordia, and Padua, were reduced into heaps of stones and ashes. The inland towns, Vicenza, Verona, and Bergamo, were exposed to the rapacious cruelty of the Huns;” the rich plains of modern Lombardy were laid waste; and the ferocious Attila boasted, that “the grass never grew on the spot where his horse had trod.” Rome herself escaped: and, by the sudden death of Attila, his empire fell asunder, and *the great northern storm of hail* was dissipated.†

“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 sea and had life, died; and the third part of the ships were destroyed.”

The death of Attila took place in *the year 453*; and, with that event, the invasions of *the Roman empire* from *the North*, aptly symbolized by *a storm of hail*, were brought to a termination. The blast of *the second trumpet* introduces a new calamity from a directly opposite quarter of the world. What proceeds therefore from *the South* cannot with any propriety be represented by *hail*. Accordingly we find, that the contrary emblem of *fire* is used to describe it. *A burning blast* causes a great

\* Hist. of Decline, Vol. vi. p. 45—53.

† Ibid. p. 87—135.

*mountain* to burst forth into a blaze; and afterwards, heaving it from its base, casts it flaming into the midst of *the sea*. This imagery is manifestly copied from a parallel passage of Jeremiah, which will afford us the best explanation of what is intended by St. John. Addressing himself to Babylon, the Lord solemnly declares, "Behold, I am against thee, O destroying mountain, which destroyest all the earth: and I will stretch out mine hand upon thee, and roll thee down from the rocks, and will make thee a burnt mountain."\* It appears then, that *the destruction of Babylon* is symbolized by *the tearing up of a large mountain from its base, and by setting it on fire*. Now it is well known, that *Babylon* is the constant apocalyptic type of *Rome*. Hence, in a prophecy like that of *the trumpets* which treats of *the fall of the Roman empire*, the symbol of *a mountain*, circumstanced precisely similar to *the Babylonian mountain*, cannot with propriety be interpreted as relative to any power excepting that of *Rome* alone. In *the year 455*, Genseric, king of the Vandals, sailed from Africa, and suddenly landed at the mouth of the Tiber. Rome, once the mistress of the world, was now unable to resist the arms of a barbaric chieftain. During fourteen days and nights it was given up to the licentiousness of the Vandals and the Moors; and was plundered of all that yet remained to it from former conquerors of public or private wealth, of sacred or profane treasure. Having thus at once satiated his rapacity and cruelty, Genseric set sail again for Africa, carrying with him immense riches and an innumerable number of captives, among whom were the empress Eudoxia, and her two daughters. By former ravages the power of Rome had been greatly weakened, but by Genseric it was so completely broken† that in a little time it was utterly subverted. Hurlled from its base, and plunged like *a huge blazing mountain* into a sea of wars and tumults, "it struggled hard, and gasped as it were for breath, through eight short and tur-

\* Jerem. li. 25.

† So completely was it broken at this period, that many, among whom are Mr. Mede, have dated *the fall of the western empire* from the year 455 or 456.

bulent reigns, for the space of twenty years, and at length expired under Augustulus.\*

“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 many men died of the waters because they were made bitter.”

We have seen, that the language used by St. John in describing the effects of *the former trumpet* is borrowed from a passage of Jeremiah, wherein the fall of Babylon, the apocalyptic type of Rome, is predicted; this, which is here employed by him, is taken in a similar manner from Isaiah. “Thou shalt take up this proverb against the king of Babylon, and say, How hath the oppressor ceased, the golden cities ceased! The Lord hath broken the staff of the wicked, and the sceptre of the rulers—How art thou fallen from heaven, O day star, son of the morning! how art thou cut down to the ground, which didst weaken the nations:”† Arguing then both from analogy of interpretation, and from the general tenor of the present prophecy, if *the mountain of the second trumpet* mean Rome, *the star of the third trumpet* must mean *the prince of Rome*; precisely in the same manner as *the mountain* spoken of by Jeremiah means *Babylon*, and *the star* described by Isaiah as falling to the ground means *the prince of Babylon*. In the language of symbols indeed *the shooting of a star from heaven to earth* signifies either *the downfall of a king*, or *the apostacy of a minister of religion*; but in the present instance we cannot hesitate to adopt the secular interpretation. St. John is describing *the calamities of the Roman empire* in general, and *the downfall of the Western empire in particular*: hence it is more congruous to explain the symbol of *the falling star* secularly than spiritually. And this opinion is decidedly confirmed by the testimo-

\* Bp. Newton's Dissert on Rev viii. Mr Lowman supposes like myself, that the symbol of *casting a mountain into the sea*, here used by the prophet, denotes *the subversion of a kingdom by hostile invasion*. “Great disorders and commotions, especially when kingdoms are rived by hostile invasions, are expressed in the prophetic style by carrying or casting mountains into the midst of the sea.” Paraph. in loc.

† Isaiah xiv. 4, 5, 12.

ny of history. At the era of *the third trumpet*, that is to say at the era posterior to *the hail-storm of northern invasion* and *the fiery blast of southern devastation*, we find that *a great temporal star* immediately connected with *the blazing mountain* did actually fall from *heaven to earth*; but we shall in vain, at the same period, look for the apostacy of some *remarkable spiritual star*.\* On these grounds, I doubt not that *the falling star of the third trumpet* is *the line of the Western Cesars*, which was finally hurled from *the political heaven* in the year 476.† The last emperor Momyllus or Augustulus was deposed by Odoacer king of the Heruli, who put an end to the very name of *the Western empire*, and caused himself to be proclaimed *king of Italy*.‡

St. John intimates, that *the fall of this star* should eventually be productive of much bloodshed among *the rivers and fountains* or *the settled Gothic governments of the West*, which now filled the place formerly occupied by *the Roman empire*; and thence styles it *Hormwood*, as indicative of the bitter discords which its downfall should occasion. As the union of the nations of the West under one head would naturally be the cause of peace among them, so their disunion under many heads would as naturally be the cause of war. Thus we find, that Odoacer after a short reign of sixteen years was attacked and slain by Theodoric king of the Ostrogoths; that the Ostrogothic monarchy was in its turn subverted by the lieutenants of the Eastern Emperor; and that Italy was afterwards alternately a prey to the Lombards and the Franks. If from Italy we cast our eyes over

\* *The fallen star of the third trumpet* cannot be *Arcus*, because he died before even *the first trumpet* began to sound. His opinions were started about the year 318, and continued to agitate the East till about the year 381. *The hail-storm of the first trumpet* had long been collecting; but it did not burst till the year 395.

† Mr. Lowman most justly observes respecting this symbol, that "the most natural interpretation of it seems to be this: that, as *the rising of a star* denotes *the rise of some new power or authority*, so *the fall of a star from heaven* signifies *the fall of some kingdom or empire*." (Paraph. in loc.) He would have expressed himself however with more accuracy, had he said *the fall of some king or emperor*.

‡ Mr. Mede applies *the shooting of this star* to *the downfall of the Western Cesars*; and thence takes occasion to style it *Hesperus*, or *the evening star of the West*. I perfectly agree with him in his interpretation of the symbol; but think it right to observe, that he has no warrant for denominating the star *Hesperus*. In the Apocalypse it is simply called *a great star*.

Gaul, we shall behold the same spectacle of war and discord in the contests of Clovis with the Alemanni, the Burgundians, and the Visigoths : while the period of *the fallen star* was marked in Britian by the establishment of the Saxon Heptarchy,\* and the subsequent never ceasing wars between the princes of the Saxon blood.†

“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.”

*This trumpet* describes, under the symbol of *an eclipse of the third or Roman part of the political luminaries of the world*, the effects produced upon *the empire*, considered as *one great whole*, by the sounding of *the three first trumpets*. When all the provinces of the West were occupied by the northern invaders, when Rome herself became a mere appendage to a Gothic kingdom, and when the line of the Italian Cesars had ended in the person of Augustulus ; then commenced *the great eclipse of the fourth trumpet*. *The Roman sun*, shorn of his rays, no longer emitted his pristine splendor ; *the figurative moon*, or *the body of the people subject to his influence*, shone, by the defalcation of the western provinces, with scarcely more than half her wonted lustre ; and *the figurative stars*, or *the governors of provinces*, experienced a proportionate diminution. “The day shone not for a

\*Or, according to Mr. Turner, Octarchy. See his Hist. of the Anglo-Saxons, B. ii. C. 6

†The state of *the Roman world*, when *its symbolical rivers and fountains* began to be tinged with *wormwood* by the downfall of *the Western empire*, is thus described by Mr. Gibbon. “I have now accomplished the laborious narrative of the decline and fall of the Roman empire, from the fortunate age of Trajan and the Antonines, to its total extinction in the West, about five centuries after the Christian era. At that unhappy period, the Saxons fiercely struggled with the natives for the possession of Britian : Gaul and Spain were divided between the powerful monarchies of the Franks and the Visigoths, and the dependent kingdoms of the Suevi and Burgundians ; Africa was exposed to the cruel persecution of the Vandals, and the savage insults of the Moors ; Rome and Italy, as far as the banks of the Danube, were afflicted by an army of barbarian mercenaries, whose lawless tyranny was succeeded by the reign of Theodoric the Ostrogoth. All the subjects of the empire, who, by the use of the Latin language, more particularly deserved the name and privileges of Romans, were oppressed by the disgrace and calamities of foreign conquests ; and the victorious nations of Germany established a new system of manners and government in the western countries of Europe.” Hist. of Decline, Vol. vi. p. 494.

third part of it, and the night likewise." While "the victorious nations of Germany established a new system of manners and government in the western countries of Europe, the majesty of Rome was faintly represented by the princes of Constantinople, the feeble and imaginary successors of Augustus. Yet they continued to reign over the East, from the Danube to the Nile and Tigris; the Gothic and Vandal kingdoms of Italy and Africa were subverted by the arms of Justinian;"\* nor did the long line of the Cesars, become finally extinct till Constantinople fell a prey to the martial fanaticism of the Turks.

Thus was *he that letted* removed out of the way, and thus was an opening prepared for *the man of sin*, and *the svestern Apostacy*. Constantine quitted the ancient capital for the city of which he claimed to be the founder; Honorius, the first of the divided Italian Cesars, fixed his residence at Ravenna; and at length *the Western empire* was completely overthrown in the person of Augustulus. Nothing now impeded the growth of *the little horn* except *the three Gothic kingdoms* which were destined to be plucked up by the roots before it. During their eradication it gradually increased; and, before it had attained the summit of its temporal power, *the saints* were delivered into its hand, and it became *a mighty spiritual persecuting empire*. Then was *the man of sin* revealed, *that son of perdition*, whose tyrannical reign and final destruction is described at large under *the three last trumpets*.

As I have materially varied from Bp. Newton in the preceding interpretation of *the first four trumpets*, it is a mark of respect only due to so excellent a commentator to state the grounds of my differing from him. According to his Lordship's exposition, "at the sounding of *the first trumpet*, Alaric and his Goths invade the Roman empire, twice besiege Rome, and set fire to in in several places. At the sounding of *the second trumpet*, Attila and his Huns waste the Roman provinces, and compel the Eastern emperor Theodosius the second, and the Western emperor Valentinian the third, to submit to

\* Hist. of Decline and Fall, Vol. vi. p. 421-

shameful terms. At the sounding of *the third trumpet*, Genseric and his Vandals arrive from Africa, spoil and plunder Rome, and set sail again with immense wealth and innumerable captives. At the sounding of *the fourth trumpet*, Odoacer and the Heruli put an end to the very name of *the Western empire.*"\*

All the subsequent errors of this interpretation may be traced up to an erroneous curtailment of the effects produced by *the first trumpet*. *The northern hail-storm*, according to the most natural explanation which can be given of it, must mean *all* the invasions of *the Roman empire* by way of Germany, Scythia, and the North; whether conducted by Alarie, Radagaisus, or Attila; whether executed by the Goths, the Vandals, the Suevi, the Alans, or the Huns. If once we attempt to separate these kindred expeditions from each other, we shall be obliged to divide them not merely between *two trumpets* as Bp. Newton has done,) but among *all the seven*. Proceeding as they universally did from the same quarter of the world,† the region of *literal hail*, they must jointly be considered as constituting only *so many different showers of one great symbolical hail-storm*. I conceive Bp. Newton then to be perfectly right, in supposing that *the first trumpet* relates to Alarie and his Goths; but perfectly wrong in placing Attila and his Huns under *the second trumpet*, instead of under *the first*. Such an arrangement, in fact, proves itself to be erroneous; for it has led the Bishop to a complete violation of the principles of symbolical language in his remarks both upon *the second, the third, and the fourth trumpet*. He interprets for instance *the burning mountain* to mean *Attila*; *the falling-star*, to mean *Genseric*; and *the eclipse of the sun, moon, and star*; to mean *the extinction* of the imperial dignity in the person of Augustulus, and *the eclipse* of the senate and consuls under the government of the Gothic sovereigns of Italy. The symbol however of *a mountain set on fire, torn violently from its base, and hurl-*

\* Table of contents to Dissert. xxiv.

† The Huns originally migrated from the borders of China. The Gothic tribes were likewise of Asiatic extraction. But they all equally invaded *the Roman empire* from the northern regions of Scythia, Media, and Germany. Hence I conceive them all to be alike intended by *the hail-storm of the first trumpet*.



*ed into the sea*, must surely mean, agreeably to the parallel passage in Jeremiah,\* not a *victorious prince*, but a *subverted empire*. So again: the symbol of a *fallen star* denotes either a *king hurled from the summit of his power*, or an *apostate pastor*: hence it is plainly impossible, that the *fallen star* of the *third trumpet* should be Genseric; for he was not a *minister of the Gospel*, and he was a *triumphant* instead of being a *vanquished sovereign*. Lastly an *eclipse of the sun, moon, and stars*, cannot be fairly interpreted to mean an *extinction* of the sun, and only an *eclipse* of the other luminaries: yet does the scheme of Bp. Newton, by leading him to view the *Western Empire* as something altogether distinct from the *Eastern Empire*, instead of considering the *fourth trumpet* as affecting the *whole Empire in general* by producing the downfall of its *Western half*, constrain him to adopt this incongruous explanation of its imagery.†

On these grounds, I have ventured to bring forward a different interpretation, which at once harmonizes with the symbolical language of prophecy, and which shews how a way was prepared for the development of the *great Apostacy*.



#### CHAPTER VIII.

*Of the three last apocalyptic trumpets, or, as they are peculiarly styled, the three woe-trumpets.*

*HE that letted* being now removed, the prophet commences the history of the *great Apostacy* which he details under the *three last trumpets*, usually denominated the *three woe trumpets*. He begins with an account of the *Eastern branch of the Apostacy* under the two

\* Jerem. li. 25.

† Whatever objections are here made to the scheme of Bp. Newton apply with equal force to that of Mr. Whitaker, who has throughout followed the Bishop, enlarging only very considerably upon the brief remarks of his predecessors. I am indebted to him for some useful hints in the elucidation of the *hail-storm of the North*.

*first woe-trumpets.* He next proceeds to the parallel history of *the Western branch of the Apostacy*, which he gives at large under *the two first woe-trumpets*, and more briefly under *the third*: and, in order that his narrative may be unbroken, and that all confusion may be prevented, he throws the whole history of *the western Apostacy*, under *all the three trumpets*, and during *the entire period of 1260 years*, into a little book, or codicil to the larger book of the Apocalypse. And he finally details at last the operation of *the last woe-trumpet*, which contains within itself *the seven vials* both in *the East* and in *the West*.

Concerning *the three woe-trumpets* themselves it may briefly be observed in general: that *the first* describes *the rise of the two-fold Apostacy*; *the second* represents it in *the zenith of its power*, till the primary and only partial manifestation of *Antichrist*;\* and *the third* exhibits *its downfall*, displaying at the same time the multiplied horrors of *the harvest* and *vintage* of the Lord, or *the uncontrolled reign of the atheistical king* and *his subsequent destruction along with all the other enemies of God*, and at length conducting us to that happy period when all the kingdoms of the world shall become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ.

\* *The French Revolution in the year 1789.* It professed to establish a limited monarchy, respecting at once the prerogatives of a lawful prince, and the liberties of the people. This only partial revelation of *Antichrist* deceived numbers, and led them to form the romantic idea, that France was become (to use the detestable cant of the day) a *regenerated kingdom*. Four years however were not suffered to elapse from the commencement of the revolution, ere the streets of Paris and the provincial towns streamed with the blood of innumerable victims, ere the sovereign himself was brought to the scaffold, ere religion was abolished and a sort of jumble of atheism and idolatry was established in its stead. In the *first year of Gallic liberty*, *Antichrist* was partially revealed: in the *fourth year of liberty*, and the *first year of equality*, (Aug. 12, 1792) he threw off his mask of toleration, candour, and universal philanthropy; and stood openly revealed in all his native deformity. His lamb-like pretensions to reason, moderation, and humanity, vanished as the fleeting clouds of the morning: and the astonished world suddenly beheld the existence of an "execrable power, which alone has steeled the hearts of its votaries against every feeling of nature: has dared to sanction treason, parricide, lust, and massacre; and to infuse into the breasts of its subject-multitudes a new passion, which has sunk them beneath the level of the brute creation: a passion for the sight of their fellow-creatures in the agonies of death, and a *literal* thirst for human blood." Hist. the Inter. Vol. ii. p. 215, 216.

## CHAPTER IX.

*Concerning the effects of the two first woe-trumpets in the East.*

THE effects of *the two first woe-trumpets in the East* have been so fully and satisfactorily discussed by the excellent Bp. Newton, that I shall do nothing more than abridge his remarks, with the exception of noticing a single error into which I conceive his Lordship to have fallen.

At the sounding of *the fifth trumpet*, (*the first of the three woe-trumpets*) a star which had fallen\* from heaven to earth, opened the bottomless pit and let out a vast swarm of locusts with their leader Apollyon at their head. The commission of these locusts was, not to hurt the grass of the earth, nor any green thing, nor any tree; but only those men, who had not the seal of God in their foreheads; and, in point of time it was limited to *five prophetic months*, or 150 natural years. As for the locusts themselves, they were like horses prepared unto battle; their crowns were of gold; their faces were as the faces of men; they had hair as the hair of women; their teeth were as the teeth of lions; their breast plates were like breast plates of iron; they had the tails of scorpions, armed with deadly stings; and the sound of their wings was as the sound of chariots of many horses running to battle.†

Bp. Newton supposes *the fallen star* to be *the impostor Mohammed*; and yet afterwards represents *the locust sovereign Apollyon* as being *Mohammed* likewise. To say nothing of so plain a repetition, the prophet evidently describes *the star* and *the king* as being two entirely different persons. *The fallen star* opens the door of the bottomless pit, and lets out *Apollyon* with his locusts: consequently *Apollyon* was confined in the pit, till he was let out by *the star*: therefore *Apollyon* and *the star*

\* Such is the proper translation of  $\pi\epsilon\pi\tau\epsilon\lambda\alpha\sigma\iota\alpha$ , as Mr. Whitaker rightly observes. Comment. p. 116.

† Rev. ix. 1—11.

cannot both be *Mohammed*. Moreover, independent of this circumstance, *the Arabian impostor* can with no more propriety be symbolized by a *fallen star*, than *the Vandalic monarch Genseric*. Mohammed never was a *star* in the sense of a *Christian pastor*; and, when he afterwards became a *sovereign*, so far from *falling* from his high estate, he was uniformly *successful* in all his enterprises. We must look out therefore for some other character, to whom the hieroglyphic of a *fallen star* is more applicable.

I conceive then, that *the fallen star of the first woe-trumpet* is no other than *the apostate Nestorian monk Sergius or Baheira*; who assisted Mohammed in the forging of his imposture, and who infused into it all the antitrinitarian venom of his own sect. The Mussulmans assert, that he first noticed the prophet while yet a boy: when he observed a luminous cloud around his head, which preserved him from the too intense rays of the sun; perceived the dry trees, upon which he sat, instantly to put forth branches clothed with verdant foliage, to serve him for a shade; and discovered the seal of prophecy, impressed between his shoulders.\* But, according to Dr. Prideaux, "the truth of the matter is, Mohammed did not fall acquainted with him till a long while after, when he was projecting his wicked design in his head; in order to the better forming of which, being very desirous to acquaint himself with the Jewish and Christian religions, he was very inquisitive in examining into them, as he met with those who could inform him. And in one of his journeys into Syria, either at Bostra as some say, or at Jerusalem as others, lighting on this Baheira, and receiving great satisfaction from him in many of those points which he desired to be informed in, he did thereon contract a particular friendship with him. And therefore, not long after, the monk, for some great crime, being excommunicated and expelled his monastery, fled to Mecca to him; and, being there entertained in his house, became his assistant in the framing of that imposture which he afterwards vented, and continued

\* Modern Univ. Hist. Vol. i. p. 26.

with him ever after ; till at length the impostor, having no further occasion for him, to secure the secret put him to death.”\*

In *the year 606*, Mohammed committed the first overt act of his imposture by retiring to the cave of Hera: consequently then it was, that *the fallen star* Sergius opened the door of the bottomless pit. *The locusts* however and *their leader* did not immediately issue forth, or publicly disclose themselves: their open manifestation was to be preceded by *the smoke and flames* of the false religion which they were about to propagate. Accordingly Mohammed emerged from his solitary retreat about *the year 609*, and began to excite that *smoke* which soon darkened all *the eastern heaven*. “Three years he *silently employed* in the conversion of fourteen proselytes, the first fruits of his mission.† But, in *the fourth year,*” or *the year 612*, “he assumed the prophetic office, and resolved to impart to his family the light of divine truth.”‡ In *this year 612*, then *Mohammed and his disciples*, or *Apollyon and his locusts*, may be considered as *issuing* from the bottomless pit, which *the fallen star Sergius* had been the main instrument of opening. Consequently *the five prophetic months*, during which the locusts were allowed to torment mankind expired in *the year 762*; when the caliph Aïmansor built Bagdad as the future seat of his empire, and called it *the city of peace*. At this period the Saracens ceased from their lo-

\* See Priccaux's Life of Mohammed, p. 47.

† Mr Whitaker's conjecture, that *the bottomless pit*, or *the cave of the abyss*, (which no doubt is the literal translation of the original expression) alludes to *the cave of Hera*, (caves being often considered by pagan superstition “as the seats of oracles and sources of inspiration,”) has the merit of possessing much ingenuity; but I am not perfectly satisfied how far it may be deemed solid. In *the first place* it does not appear that we are warranted in taking *symbolical language* in a literal sense, unless it be *avowedly* *esopivine*; as, for instance, when the Euphratèan army is said to consist of *horsemen*, and to seem as if *vomiting fire and brimstone, and smoke*; and, in *the second place*, Mohammed *issued* from the cave of Hera about *the year 609*, which will not agree with that part of the prophecy, which speaks of *the locusts tormenting men five months*. Whitaker's Comment. p. 123

‡ Dr Priccaux makes the impostor emerge from his cave in *the year 608*, and spend *four years* in the private exercise of his assumed function. This arrangement however, no less than that of Mr Gibbon, equally brings us to the year 612. Life of Mohammed, d. p. 15.

§ Hist. of Decline and Fall, Vol. ix. p. 84.

cust devastations, and became a settled people. Henceforth they no longer made such rapid conquests as they had formerly done; but only engaged in ordinary wars like other nations. *The five months*, or 150 years, being now expired, *Mohammedism* was firmly established; although the power of its particular votaries, the Saracens, began to decline, in order to make room for its new proselytes, described under *the next trumpet*.\*

*A command was given to Apollyon, and his symbolical locusts, that they should not hurt the grass of the earth, nor any green thing, nor any tree.*—Accordingly it was the special injunctions of Abubeker to the Saracens, that they should destroy no palm-trees, nor burn any fields of corn; that they should cut down no fruit trees, nor injure any cattle except such as they killed to eat.

*The commission of the locusts extended only to hurt those men who had not the seal of God in their foreheads; and, though they were permitted to hurt them, their warrant gave them no authority to kill them.*—Now it appears from history, that in the countries invaded by the Saracens a very great defection from primitive Christianity had taken place; for, before they began their ravages, the transgressors (to use the language of Daniel) were come to the full, the will-worship of saints and martyrs had extended itself far and wide, and *the great Apostacy of 1260 days* had commenced. Hence we find, that, when they approached Savoy, Piedmont, and the southern provinces of France, which had been but little tainted with the general disease, and which were afterwards the seat of the Waldenses and Albigenses, they were defeated with great slaughter by Charles Martel in several engagements. They were however only allowed to torment the great body politic of the apostate empire; they were not permitted to kill it. Accordingly, they were

\* I cannot assent to Sir Isaac Newton's supposition, that the prophet's repetition of *the five months*, in two different verses, implies *ten months*, or 300 years. Had St. John meant to convey this idea, he would have joined the two periods of *five months each*, by a conjunction copulative, in *the same verse*; as thus: their power was to torment men *five months and five months*. The illustrious commentator does not seem to have been aware, that upon the same principle, we must extend the persecution of *the Church* from 1260 years to twice 1260 years; for the period is twice mentioned in the single prophecy of *the woman's flight into the wilderness*. Compare Rev. xii. 6. with ver. 14:

never able to *take* Constantinople, or to *subvert* its monarchy, though they frequently attempted it; the task of giving *the fatal blow* to its declining power being reserved for their successors the Turks.

*The symbolical locusts were like horses prepared for the battle*: the strength of the Saracens consisted chiefly in their cavalry—*The locusts had on their heads as it were crowns like gold*: the Arabs have constantly worn turbans; and even boast that they wear, as their common attire, those ornaments which among other people are the peculiar badges of royalty—*The locusts had faces as the faces of men, and hair as the hair of women*: the Arabs, as Pliny testifies, wore their beards, or at least their mustachios, as men; while their hair was flowing or plaited, like that of women—*The teeth of the locusts were as the teeth of a lion*; an expression frequently used in Scripture to denote great strength;\* *the sound of their wings was as the sound of chariots of many horses running to battle*; to represent at once the rapid conquests of the Saracens, and their proverbial skill in horsemanship: *and they had stings in their tails like Scorpions*; to signify that they should carry along with them, wherever they flew, a loathsome and deadly superstition.†

At the conclusion of the prophecy respecting *the Saracenic locusts*, it is added, "One woe is past." Now, since we had already been informed, that their power of doing mischief was limited to *five months, or 150 years*; it is evident, that *the first woe-trumpet* ceased to sound at the end of *the 150 years, or in the year of our Lord 769*. It further appears, that a considerable period of time was to elapse between the end of *the first woe-trumpet*, and the beginning of *the second*: for the prophet here simply intimates, that "there come two more woes hereafter;" whereas, at *the conclusion of the second woe*, he asserts, "behold the third woe cometh quickly."‡

At the sounding of *the sixth angel*, a command was given him to loose *the four angels* which are bound in

\* "Break their teeth, O God, in their mouth: break out the great teeth of the young lions, O Lord." Psalm lviii. 6.

† Bp. Newton's Dissert. on Rev. ix.

‡ We shall find in the sequel that this has been exactly the case

*the great river Euphrates*, ready prepared to slay *the third part of men* for an hour, and a day and a month, and a year. Thus liberated from their confinement, *the four angels* issued forth at the head of two hundred thousand thousand horsemen. The warriors themselves appeared to be prophet to wear breast-plates of fire, and hyacinth, and brimstone; and from the lion-like heads of their horses seemed to proceed fire, and smoke, and brimstone. By these destructive flashes *a third part of men* were killed. *The horses of the Euphratean cavalry*, like *the Saracenic locusts*, had power no less in their tails than in their mouths: for “their tails were like serpents, and had heads, and with them they do hurt.” Notwithstanding the death of *the third part of men*, the prophet informs us, that those, who had escaped *the e two successive plagues*, still hardened their hearts, and repented not of their idolatry, their sorcery, and their fornication.\*

*The four angels are the four sultanies of the Turks*; the capitals of which were *Bagdad, Damasus, Aleppo*, and *Iconium* †. These were long restrained from extending their conquests beyond the territories immediately adjoining to the river Euphrates, by the instrumentality, in the course of God’s providence, of the crusades. But, when the Christians abandoned Syria and Egypt at the latter end of *the thirteenth century*, then *the four angels on the river Euphrates* were loosed. Ortoğrul, dying in *the year 1088*, was succeeded by his son Othman; who, in *the year 1099*, founded *a new empire* composed of the remains of *the four Turkish sultanies*.

Under *the fifth trumpet*, we have seen the men, who had not the seal of God in their foreheads, *tormented but not killed*. We now find, under *the sixth trumpet*, that *the third part of men*, or *the Roman empire* then

\* Rev. ix. 13—14.

† Late the proud seat of Saracenic domination.

The number *four* twice occurs in the early history of the Turks, no less than in the precise number of their *Sultanies*. *Soliman Shah* was drowned in attempting to cross the Euphrates with his *three sons*; and was succeeded by his youngest son *Ortoğrul*, who had likewise *three sons*. I think however, that *the four Sultanies* are peculiarly meant; for prophecy usually speaks of *states*, rather than of *individuals*. But, in whatever manner the prediction of *the four Euphratean angels* be understood, it is accurately accomplished in the *four sultanies of the Turkish empire*.



represented by *the Constantinopolitan monarchy*, is to be slain, and not merely tormented by *the Euphratèan horsemen*.\*

The space of time, allotted for the entire completion of this great enterprize, is *an hour, and a day, and a month, and a year*; or *391 natural years and 15 days*. The accurate accomplishment of this numerical prophecy is singularly remarkable. The Turks, under Ortogrul, gained their first victory over the Greek empire in *the year 1281*, by the conquest of Cutahi: in *the year 1357*, they crossed over into Europe: in *the year 1453*, they took Constantinople; and the remaining provinces of the empire soon followed the fate of the capital: in *the year 1669*, they made themselves masters of Crete: and in *the year 1672*, they wrested Cameniec, their last conquest, from the Poles. If now we compute *391 years* from *the year 1281*, they will exactly bring us down to *the year 1672*. Upon this wonderful coincidence, Bp. Newton further remarks, "if more accurate and authentic histories of the Ottomans were brought to light, and we knew *the very day* wherein Cutahi was taken as certainly as we know that wherein Cameniec was taken, the like exactness might also be found in *the fifteen days*." Since the time of their last conquest, the Turks have had various wars with the European powers, and with various success; but they have never made any fresh territorial acquisition, and now in all human probability never will.

*The cavalry of the Euphratèan warriors is described as consisting of myriads upon myriads: and they are represented as wearing breast-plates of fire, of hyacinth, and of brimstone; or, in other words, red, blue, and yellow.* The Turks brought immense armies into the field, com-

\* I have already stated, on what grounds *the Roman empire* is represented as a *third part of the symbolical universe*. It may not be improper here to observe, that the death of a beast and the death of a community do not mean the same thing. The death of a beast denotes the extinction of those idolatrous principles which cause a pagan empire to be symbolized by a beast: whereas the death of a community denotes its subversion. Hence we do not find it said, that *the Roman beast* was slain by *the Euphratèan horsemen*; because such phraseology would not have conveyed the intended meaning of the prophet; but that *the third part of men*, or the body politic of what remained of the original empire was slain. Accordingly, in perfect agreement with this distinction, *the Roman beast* still continued to exist, and will exist to the very end of the *1260 years*, notwithstanding the political death of the *third part of men*.

posed chiefly of horse ; and, from the first time of their appearance, have been peculiarly attached to the colours of blew, yellow, and scarlet—*The heads of their horses were as the heads of lions, to denote their great strength and fierceness : out of their mouths seemed to issue fire, and smoke, and brimstone : and by this semblance of lightning, the prophet observed, that the third part of men were killed.* This is a manifest allusion to artillery and gunpowder, which were invented under the *sixth trumpet*, and were the main engines used by the Turks, in subverting the Greek empire—*The horses moreover had power to do hurt by their tails, as well as by their mouths, their tails being like unto serpents, and having heads.* The Turks, like the Saracens, were not merely secular conquerors, but were animated with all the wild fanaticism of a false religion. They profess and propagate the same imposture ; they injure no less by their doctrines, than by their conquests ; and, wherever they establish their dominion, the Koran triumphs over the Gospel.

*Yet, notwithstanding the signal overthrow of the Constantinopolitan monarchy, the rest of men, who were not killed by these plagues, reputed not of their idolatrous worship of mediatory saints and angels, nor of their spiritual sorceries and fornication—*Accordingly we find, that in the *papal church* idolatry was at its height during the sounding of the *sixth trumpet* ; in the same manner as *Mohammedism* attained to the zenith of its glory by the subversion of the *Greek empire*. Previous to this period, the *Greek church* had struggled successfully with the *Roman church* for independence and equality ; but the downfall of Constantinople effectually humbled both the ecclesiastical rival of *Popery*, and the temporal antagonist of *Mohammedism*. In the days of the Saracens, the *Arabian imposture* triumphed over the proud monarchy of Persia ; but was only able to torment the declining remains of the once formidable empire of Rome. In the days of the Turks, it beheld the city of Constantine prostrate at its feet, as well as the capital of Chosroes. Still however did the *Church of Rome* continue her triumphs over sense, humanity, and religion. Unawed by the signal punishment of her sister of Constantinople,

she resolutely set her face against *the reformation* which commenced under *this trumpet*, and persecuted those who protested against her superstition and appealed to Scripture: *a more tremendous power* therefore, than either *the Saracens* or *the Turks*, will be summoned against her by the blast of *the third woe*; which nevertheless will afterwards perish, united with her.

It is observable, that *the precise duration of the second woe-trumpet*, is not marked by St. John in his prophecy of *the Euphratèan horsemen*. The Turks were prepared for the slaughter of *the third part of men, an hour, and a day, and a month, and a year*; or *391 natural years, and 15 days*: consequently *the second woe-trumpet began* to sound at the commencement of *those 391 years*, or in *the year of our Lord 1281*; but it does not *terminate* till *the great earthquake in the West* has taken place, and till *a tenth of the Roman city* has fallen.\* Then we are informed, that “the second woe is past, and, behold, the third woe cometh quickly.”

\* Rev. xi. 13.



A  
DISSERTATION  
ON THE  
PROPHECIES,

THAT HAVE BEEN FULFILLED, ARE NOW FULFILLING, OR WILL  
HEREAFTER BE FULFILLED,

RELATIVE TO THE  
GREAT PERIOD OF 1260 YEARS;

THE PAPAL AND MOHAMMEDAN APOSTACIES;  
THE TYRANNICAL REIGN OF ANTICHRIST, OR THE INFIDEL  
POWER;

AND  
THE RESTORATION OF THE JEWS.

TO WHICH IS ADDED,  
AN APPENDIX.

---

BY THE REV. GEORGE STANLEY FABER, B. D.  
VICAR OF STOKLION-UPON-TEES.

---

*Second American from the second London Edition.*

IN TWO VOLUMES.

---

VOL. II.

---

“Shut up the Words, and seal the Book, even to the time of the end: many shall run to and fro, and knowledge shall be increased.” DAN. xii. 4.

---

NEW-YORK:

PUBLISHED BY M. AND W. WARD, AND EVERT DUYCKINCK.

*George Long, printer.*

---

1811



# CONTENTS.

---

## VOL. II.

---

### CHAP. X.

*Contents of the little book—History of the Western Apostacy under the three woe-trumpets.*

THE little book comprehends the eleventh, twelfth, thirteenth and fourteenth chapters of the Revelation, p. 9.—These chapters in point of chronology, run parallel to each other, p. 9.—And they form a complete history of the Western Apostacy, p. 10.—The contents of the little book may be properly divided into five sections : 1. The prophesying of the witnesses ; 2. The war of the dragon with the woman ; 3. The history of the ten-horned beast of the sea ; 4. The history of the two-horned beast of the earth ; 5. The collateral history of the true Church, of the Reformation, and of the harvest and vintage of God's wrath, p. 12.

#### SECT. I.

*Concerning the prophesying of the two witnesses.*

The little book commences with the year 606, or with the beginning of the first woe-trumpet, p. 12.—What is meant by measuring the temple, and not measuring the outer court of the gentiles p. 13.—The two witnesses are not the Old and New Testaments, p. 14.—Bp. Newton is perfectly right in the spirit, though not quite accurate in the letter, of his interpretation of their character, p. 15.—They are certainly two churches, p. 15.—Throughout the whole Apocalypse, the idea of a two-fold Church of Christ is constantly preserved : the Church before, and the Church after, the advent of our Lord, p. 15.—The two witnesses *literally* represent these two Churches, forming jointly the faithful Church general : but *spiritually* they mean the mystic children of the universal Church, those that are Israelites indeed, p. 16.—The circumstance of their being said to *prophesy* is no objection to the supposition, that they symbolize all God's faithful witnesses during the prevalence of the Apostacy, p. 17.—In what sense they shut up heaven, and smite the earth with plagues, during the time of their prophesying, p. 17.—In what sense they are said to have only one mouth, p. 18.—How, and when, the two witnesses were slain by the beast of the bottomless pit, p. 21.—Our Lord was literally crucified within the limits of the great city, p. 22.—In what manner the witnesses lay dead three days and a half, p. 24.—The meaning of the word *Hour*, p. 32.—At what period we are to divide the first woe-trumpet from the second woe-trumpet in the history of the Western Apostacy, p. 35.—At the close of the second woe, the great earthquake of the French Revolution throws down a tenth part of the Roman city, p. 40.—At the sounding of the seventh trumpet, or third woe-trumpet, the limited monarchy of revolutionary France is dissolved ; and the reign of openly established Anarchy and Atheism commences, p. 42.

## SECT. II.

*Concerning the war of the dragon with the woman.*

The prophecy of the war between the dragon and the woman cannot relate to the days of Constantine ; both because it is contained in the little book, and because it twice declares itself to be connected with the 1260 years of the Apostacy, p. 51.—The woman is the spiritual Church of true believers, as contradistinguished from the nominal believers of the outer court, p. 58.—The dragon is the devil acting through the instrumentality of the seven-headed and ten-horned beast, p. 58.—Difficulty of interpreting the symbol of the man-child, p. 60.—What is meant by the fall of the dragon from heaven to earth, p. 64.—The war between Michael and the dragon is the spiritual contest between the witnesses and their enemies during the whole period of the 1260 years : but the particular victory of Michael, here mentioned, was achieved at the era of the Reformation, p. 64.—In what sense the devil hath but a short time upon earth, p. 66.—An attempt to trace the steps of the dragon, after he was cast out of the symbolical heaven by the Reformation, p. 66.—The meaning of the flood, which he vomited out of his mouth against the woman, p. 73.—In what manner the earth swallowed it up, p. 74.—How the dragon will go forth to make war with the woman and the remnant of her seed, p. 75.

## SECT. III.

*Concerning the ten-horned beast of the sea.*

The seven-headed and ten-horned beast of the sea is not the same as his own little horn mentioned by Daniel, or the Papacy, p. 78.—On the contrary, he is the same as Daniel's ten-horned beast, of whom the little Papal horn was only a single member : that is to say, he is the temporal Roman Empire, p. 86.—In what sense St. John beheld the rise of the ten-horned beast, p. 88.—How the ten-horned beast is said to continue or to practise 42 months, which is the same period as the reign of his own little horn, p. 88.—In what sense it is said, that this beast " was, and is not, and yet is," p. 89.—The apocalyptic ten-horned beast is the Roman beast, in his revived or papally idolatrous state, p. 90.—How he is said to have seven heads, p. 91.—In what sense he was wounded to death by a sword under his sixth head, and afterwards restored to life again, p. 93.—An inquiry into what is meant by the last head of the beast, p. 101.—This last head can only be sought for among the following powers : the line of the Western Emperors ; the three kingdoms of the Heruli, the Ostrogoths, and the Lombards ; the Exarchate of Ravenna ; the Popedom ; and the Carolingian empire, p. 107.—The last head of the beast consists jointly of his seventh and eighth heads ; whence it may be termed his *septimo-octave head*, p. 107.—This septimo-octave head cannot be the line of the Western Emperors and the Papacy, p. 108.—Neither can it be the three Gothic kingdoms in Italy and the Papacy, p. 108.—Nor can it be the Exarchate of Ravenna and the Papacy, p. 109.—Nor the Papacy considered as existing in a twofold capacity, p. 111.—But the Patriarch of Rome, merging into the Carolingian Emperors, p. 111.—While Charlemagne was Patriarch of Rome, he was the seventh head ; when he became Emperor, he was the eighth head,



the seventh and eighth heads being then, in his person, amalgamated, as it were so as to form one septimo-octave head, p. 114.—Three objections to this scheme of interpretation answered p. 117.—No power has ever yet arisen within the limits of the Roman Empire, which at all answers to the prophetic character of the double or septimo-octave, head, except the Carlovingian monarchy alone, p. 123.—On what head of the beast the ten horns appeared to be growing, p. 124.—Various points of resemblance between the beast and the revived or Papal Roman Empire, p. 125.—General statement of the whole interpretation of the symbol of the seven-headed and ten-horned beast, p. 128.—Accomplishment of the last part of the prophecy, p. 129.

#### SECT. IV.

##### *Concerning the two-horned beast of the earth.*

The two-horned beast of the earth and the image are not Infidelity and democratic Tyranny, p. 131.—Neither are they the French Republic and the prostitute goddess of reason and liberty, p. 136.—The two horned beast is not the same as the beast of the bottomless pit—*Ludovicus* cannot be the name of the beast, p. 138.—The two-horned beast is not the Romish clergy, as contradistinguished from the Papacy, p. 140.—But he is the catholic spiritual empire of the church of Rome, considered as including both the Pope his head, and the regular and secular papal clergy his two lamb-like horns, or distinct ecclesiastical kingdoms, p. 141.—This spiritual empire, which at its first rise was only a small spiritual kingdom, is represented by Daniel under the symbol of a little horn springing up among the ten horns of the Roman beast: but, when the saints were given into the hand of the little horn by the Pope being constituted Bishop of Bishops and supreme head of the universal Church, the little horn became a catholic spiritual empire, and as such is represented by St. John under the symbol of a second beast co-operating with the ten-horned or secular Roman beast, p. 142.—Points of resemblance between the two-horned beast and the Papacy, p. 143.—His two horns, p. 144.—His first horn symbolizes the regular clergy, p. 147.—His second horn, the secular clergy, p. 149.—His making of an image for the ten-horned beast is the revival of idolatry by the Pope, p. 159.—Reasons why the image cannot be either the Pope, the Carlovingian empire, or the Inquisition, p. 163.—The prophetic description of the name of the beast must be carefully attended to, in order to discover what it is: for it is not sufficient merely to discover a name that comprehends the number 666, and thence to infer that that name is the name of the beast, p. 172.—The opinion of Irenæus upon this point is perfectly just, p. 174.—*Latinus* is the name of the beast: both because it contains the number 666, because it is the name of a man, because it is the name of an empire, and because it is the gentile name of every individual in that empire, p. 174.—The mark of the beast is *the cross*, as abused by the secular Latin empire to the purposes of cruelty and superstition, p. 176.—The two apocalyptic beasts in short are the two contemporary Latin empires, secular and spiritual, p. 181.—To shew their close connection with each other yet further, St. John afterwards represents them jointly under one great compound symbol, a harlot or apostate church, riding upon a seven-headed and ten-horned temporal beast, p. 181.

## SECT. V.

*The history of the true Church during the period of the great Apostacy—The harvest and vintage of God's wrath.*

Under the image of 144,000 sealed servants of God standing and exulting on the mount Zion, is represented the desolate church in the wilderness, sorrowful yet always rejoicing, during the period of the 1260 years, p. 185.—The 144,000 are the same as the two mystic witnesses; and they peculiarly represent the internal state of the Church previous to the era of the Reformation, although the witnesses will continue more or less to prophesy in sackcloth to the very time of the end, p. 186.—Their joy is purely of a spiritual nature, and subsists along with great temporal distress, p. 186.—After describing the 144,000, the prophet suddenly introduces an angel flying in the midst of heaven and bearing the everlasting Gospel, p. 188.—By this angel Luther and his followers seem to be intended, through whose instrumentality the Reformation was most unexpectedly begun, p. 188.—The first angel is followed by a second, prophetically denouncing the destruction of the mystic Babylon, p. 190.—By this angel Calvin, and the different reformed continental churches of his persuasion, appear to be meant, p. 190.—The second angel is followed by a third, denouncing everlasting misery to those who shall continue to worship the beast and his image, and to receive his mark, p. 192.—By this third angel, the third great branch of the Reformation, the Church of England, which is not professedly either Lutheran or Calvinistic, seems to be represented, p. 193.—The great persecutions at the era of the Reformation predicted, p. 193.—Having passed the epoch of the Reformation, the prophet describes in brief the events of the third woe-trumpet under the types of a harvest and a vintage; for this last chapter of the little book, like the preceding ones, extends through the whole period of the 1260 days, p. 194.—The history of the third woe-trumpet however the prophet details at large in the greater book of the Revelation, dividing it into the seven periods of the seven vials, p. 196.—These vials must be arranged in three classes, in order that they may be made to synchronize with the harvest and the vintage; namely, the vials of the harvest; the intermediate vials; and the vial of the vintage, p. 197.

---

 CHAP. XI.

*Concerning the effects of the last woe-trumpet, the pouring out of the seven vials, and the restoration of the Jews.*

At the sounding of the last woe-trumpet, the seven vials full of the last plagues are poured out, p. 198.—The seven vials are all posterior to the 12th of August, 1792, when the third woe-trumpet began to sound, and when Antichrist was revealed, p. 198.—They more or less affect both the East and the West, p. 199.—Though they succeed each other in regular chronological order, no intimation is given, that one shall be completely emptied, before another begins to be poured out, p. 200.—The harvest comprehends the three first vials, and symbolizes the miseries inflicted upon mankind by the tyranny of Antichrist during the madness of the French Revolution, p. 200.—

The vintage synchronizes with the seventh vial, and relates to the final destruction of all God's enemies in the land of Palestine, p. 200.—The remaining three vials occupy the intermediate space between the harvest and the vintage, p. 200.

## SECT. I.

### *Concerning the vials of the harvest.*

The harvest may be considered as commencing, not merely with the first vial, but with the earliest blast of the third woe; and the downfall of the tenth part of the great city may be esteemed the first fruits of it, p. 201.—The harvest describes the miseries both internal and external, produced by the terrific anarchy of the French Revolution; and comprehends the three first vials, p. 201.—At the pouring out of the first vial on the 6th of August, 1792, the noisome sore of atheism breaks out, or publicly makes its appearance, in France and throughout the whole Latin earth, p. 202.—At the pouring out of the second vial in the beginning of September, 1792, the horrible and long protracted massacres, perpetrated during what was called *the reign of terror*, commence, p. 204.—At the pouring out of the third vial, the regularly established governments of the Latin empire experienced dreadful devastation from the arms of Republican France during a series of bloody and unsuccessful campaigns, the issue of which has been a tremendous aggrandizement of that infidel power, p. 206.—The figurative harvest having been gathered in when France once more became a monarchy, and when a general peace was made in the year 1801, the affairs of the world have in some measure returned to their old channel, p. 209.

## SECT. II.

### *Concerning the three intermediate vials.*

The period between the harvest and the vintage is marked by the pouring out of three vials, the last of which is the precursor of the vintage, p. 209.—At the pouring out of the fourth vial, the sun of the Latin firmament, or the now-existing principal government of the divided Papal Roman empire, scorches men with the intolerable heat of a systematic military tyranny, p. 210.—This government is that of France, under the present despotic usurper; and the blaze of his tyranny extends not merely to France, but likewise to Holland, Switzerland, Italy, Spain, and all the west of Germany, p. 211.—The influence of this vial will probably continue to the days of the vintage, and the military tyranny produced by it be the principal immediate instrument of forming the great confederacy, p. 21.—We must not look for any further Reformation from Popery, p. 213.—Reasons for thinking, that there will be no fresh general persecution of Protestantism; or at least that no attempt of that nature will prove successful, p. 21.—All the remaining vials are as yet future. At the pouring out of the fifth vial, some great temporary calamity will fall upon the empire of the secular beast; but, what event may be alluded to, or what power will then be the last head of the beast, it is impossible at present to determine, p. 215.—At the pouring out of the sixth vial, the waters of the mystic Euphrates, which symbolize the Turkish monarchy, will be completely dried up, in order that a way may be prepared for the kings from the East, p. 217.—These waters have already begun to experience a rapid and great exhaustion: whence we may infer, that the era of the sixth vial, or the downfall of the Ottoman power, cannot be very far distant, p. 218.—Whenever that event happens, it will serve as a key to the right explanation of the fifth vial, p. 219.—The kings from the East are most probably the ten tribes of Israel, for the restoration of which the overthrow of the Turkish empire will prepare a way, p. 219.—Under this vial, the kings of the Latin earth will begin to be gathered together to the great battle of Armageddon by the beast and the false prophet, p. 222.

## SECT. III.

*Concerning the vial of the vintage.*

The vintage is the catastrophe of the great drama of the 1260 years, and synchronizes with the last vial, or the vial of consumption p. 213.—At the pouring out of the seventh vial, three important events take place: the earthquake, by which the Latin city is divided in three parts; the overthrow of the great scarlet whore, or the spiritual Babylon; and the battle of Armageddon, p. 225.—The 17th, 18th, and 19th chapters of the Revelation all belong to the last vial, or the times of the vintage, p. 225.—The war which will be decided at Armageddon, will be undertaken by a confederacy of the beast, the false prophet, and the kings of the Latin or Papal earth, p. 238.—The infidel king will be deeply concerned in it, p. 231.—The confederacy will probably be made against the Protestant powers, and the converted Jews now about to be restored to their own country, p. 227.—The infidel king may possibly before this period become the last head of the beast; and thus take the lead in the expedition, as he is represented doing by Daniel, p. 230.—The four parallel prophecies of St John, Daniel, Zechariah, and Joel, cited and compared with each other, p. 232.—These corresponding prophecies throw much light upon the events of the seventh vial, p. 238.—The battle of Armageddon will literally be fought in Palestine between the two seas, p. 240.—The particular scene of the conflict will be Megiddo; for *Armageddon* signifies the *destruction at Megiddo*, p. 242.—The war, which this battle will terminate, will, in one sense or another, be a religious war or crusade, p. 243.—Statement of the order, in which the events at the close of the 1260 years will probably succeed each other, p. 244.—When those years shall have expired, the Jews will begin to be restored, p. 244.—One great body of them will be restored in a converted state by some powerful maritime nation of faithful worshippers, p. 245.—Another great body of them will be restored in an unconverted state by the Antichristian faction, p. 247.—Route of Antichrist to Palestine, p. 247.—Route of the maritime nation to Palestine, p. 248.—Conversion of the unbelieving Jews, whom Antichrist had placed in Jerusalem, p. 248.—Antichrist returns from Egypt, whither he had marched after the conquest of Palestine, and sacks Jerusalem, p. 249.—He prepares to attack the troops of the maritime power, and the converted Jews under its protection in the neighbourhood of Megiddo, p. 250.—He is miraculously overthrown by the word of God, p. 251.—The Jews will suffer severely in the course of their restoration, p. 253.—A third part of the Antichristian army will be spared; and, being scattered throughout the whole world, will be instrumental in bringing about the restoration of the ten tribes, p. 254.—When these are restored, they will jointly form one nation with Judah, p. 255.—The restoration of Judah will probably occupy a period of 30 years, and the subsequent restoration of Israel, a period of 45 years, p. 256.—At the end of this last period the Millennium will commence, p. 257.—How far prophecy enables us to ascertain the power intended by the great maritime nation of faithful worshippers, p. 258.—A summing up of the particulars, which may be collected from prophecy, relative to the restoration of the house of Israel, and the other events which take place during the time of the end, p. 259.

## CHAP. XII.

*Recapitulation and conclusion.*

PROPER date of the 1260 years, p. 261.—Prophecies respecting the Papal little horn, p. 262.—Prophecies respecting the Mohammedan little horn, p. 263.—Prophecies respecting the Infidel king, p. 263.—We are now living under the fourth vial, p. 265.—All the concurring signs of the times indicate, that we cannot be far removed from the termination of the 1260 years, p. 265.—Conclusion, p. 268.

APPENDIX, p. 269.

## DISSERTATION, &c.

---

### CHAPTER X.

#### *Contents of the little book—History of the Western Apostacy under the three woe trumpets.*

ST. JOHN, having shewn the effects of *the two first woe-trumpets in the East*, next passes to the collateral and contemporary history of *the West*: for *the same woe-trumpet*, which called into action *the Mohammedan Apostacy*, produced likewise the developement of *the papal Apostacy*; both these *two little horns* commencing their joint reign of *1260 prophetic days* in the self-same year.

In order to avoid needless confusion, the Apostle throws the *whole* history of *Popery*, during *the whole 1260 days*, and under *all the three woe-trumpets*,\* into a sort of episode to his *general* series of prophecies; which he terms a *little book*, or *codicil* to his *greater book of the Apocalypse*. This *little book* comprehends the *eleventh, twelfth, thirteenth, and fourteenth chapters* of *the Revelation*: and, in point of chronology, all these chap-

\* Bp. Newton is certainly much mistaken in saying, that *the little book* "properly cometh under the sixth trumpet" *The little book* itself repeatedly declares, that it comprehends *all the 1260 years*; but *the 1260 years* extend through *the whole period of the three woe-trumpets*; or at least through the whole of it, except that part which is included in the effusion of *the last vial*, and which synchronizes with *Daniel's time of the end*: whence it is manifest, that *the little book* must include, not only *the sixth trumpet*, but *the fifth and seventh* also. This is sufficiently evident both from the date of *the fifth trumpet*, and from the termination of *the seventh*; for *the fifth trumpet* begins to sound at the very commencement of *the 1260 years*, namely, when *the bottomless pit* was opened in *the year 605* by *the fall'n star Sergius*; and *the seventh trumpet* brings us down, through the different stages of *its first six vials*, to the end of *the 1260 years*. Since then *the little book* comprehends *the whole of the 1260 years*, it must necessarily commence with the sounding of *the fifth trumpet*, and must likewise include *the seventh trumpet*. Accordingly we find, that *the seventh angel* is represented as actually sounding in *the little book*; Rev. xi. 15 (though a more particular account of the effects of his blast is reserved for a distinct prophecy in *the large book*. Rev. xv.—xix

.....

ters run parallel to each other, relating severally, though with some variety of circumstances, to the same period and the same events; so as to form jointly a *complete history of the western Apostacy, and of all the principal actors in it.*

1. *The first chapter of the little book\** gives an account of the treading of the holy city under foot during forty two months; of the desolate prophesying of the witnesses during the same period of 1260 days; of the victory of the beast of the bottomless pit over them during three days and a half: of their triumphant ascent into the symbolical heaven; and of the earthquake which was to overthrow the tenth part of the city, and to be the last event under the second woe: and it finally announces the sounding of the seventh trumpet, which brings us down to the end of the 1260 days; but announces it without descending minutely to particularise its effects.† *In this chapter,* (it is to be observed) *the beast of the bottomless pit is barely mentioned: and no intimation whatsoever is given, either what this beast is, by whose instigation he acts, or whose minister he is; the prophet reserving these particulars for his two succeeding chapters.*

2. *The second chapter of the little book‡* lets us into the whole mystery of iniquity, so far as its *original mover* is concerned. We there learn, that the 1260 years persecution of the true Church of Christ is the contrivance of *that old serpent, the devil;* who is represented under the image of a dragon with seven heads and ten horns, in order to shew us by the instrumentality of *what minister* he was about to slay the witnesses, and to drive the woman into the wilderness.

3. *The third chapter of the little book,§* passes from the master to the servant; and shews us who is *that minister of the dragon, that beast of the bottomless pit,* which had already been represented as the murderer of the two witnesses. It describes him as having seven heads

\* Rev. xi

† Its effects are afterwards detailed very circumstantially under the *seven vials*, and in the chapters subsequent to that which relates to the *pouring out of the vials.*

‡ Rev. xii.

§ Rev. xiii.

.....  
*and ten horns*; the very heads and horns, which *the dragon* induces him to use against *the woman*, mentioned in *the preceding chapter*.

*The third chapter* further teaches us, by *whose instigation* as a *second cause*, *the minister of the aragon*, or *the beast of the bottomless pit*, is induced to take up arms against *the woman* and *the two witnesses*. His *instigator* is *another beast*, quite *distinct* from *himself*, though very intimately connected with him: *a beast*, which comes up out of *the earth*, or *Roman empire*; which has *two horns* like *a lamb*; which speaks as *a dragon*; and which exerciseth all the power of *the first beast* before him, not in a *hostile* but in a *friendly* manner, for he causeth *the whole earth* to worship his colleague and supporter *the first beast*.

4. *The fourth chapter* of *the little book*\* describes the state of *the true Church* during the prevalence of *the Western Apostacy*; predicts *the Reformation*; and divides some of the most prominent events of *the seventh trumpet*, which are detailed at large hereafter under *the seven vials*, into two grand classes, *the harvest* and *the vintage* of God's wrath, teaching us that *the winepress* shall be trodden in a certain country, the space of which extends 1600 furlongs.

We learn then from *the four chapters* of *the little book*, both *what the beast of the bottomless pit is*, namely a certain beast with seven heads and ten horns; *by whose instigation he acts*, namely by that of a second beast with two horns; and *whose minister and tool he is*, namely that of the great red dragon. We moreover learn, that, *making himself a tool of the dragon*, and acting by *the instigation of the second beast*, *the seven-headed and ten-horned beast of the sea and the bottomless pit* (for *the beast of the sea* and *the beast of the bottomless pit* are *one and the same power*,† *the sea* describing his *natural* and *the bottomless pit* his *spiritual* origin) should wage a war of 1260 years against *the woman* and *the two witnesses* who have the name of God written in their foreheads; but that nevertheless *the Apostacy*

\* Rev. xiv.

† Compare Rev. xiii. 1. with Rev. xvii. 3, 8:

should receive a great check by the preaching of the Gospel,\* and afterwards should be totally overthrown in the time of God's vintage.†

The way being thus cleared by this general statement, I shall proceed to consider the contents of *the little book* at large in five different sections, according as it naturally divides itself. 1. The prophesying of the witnesses; 2. The war of the dragon with the woman; 3. The ten-horned beast of the sea; 4. The two-horned beast of the earth; 5. The collateral history of the true Church, and the harvest and vintage of God's wrath.

#### SECTION I.

##### *Concerning the prophesying of the two witnesses.*

In the present section I shall attempt to explain *the first chapter of the little book*, which contains the history of the persecution of *the two witnesses* by *the beast of the bottomless pit*.

“And there was given me a reed like unto a rod: and the angel stood, saying, Rise, and measure the temple of God, and the altar, and them that worship therein. But the court, which is without the temple, leave out, and measure it not; for it is given unto the Gentiles; and the holy city shall they tread under foot for forty and two months.”

This prophecy commences with *the year 606*; which is the first year of *the great Apostacy*, and which synchronizes with the earliest blast of *the first woe-trumpet in the East*.‡ *The temple, the altar, and they that worship therein, are those few Christians, who in the midst*

\* Rev. xiv. 6.

† Rev. xiv. 18, 19, 20.

‡ I may here add to the arguments, by which I have already shewn that *the year 606* is most probably the true date of *the 1260 years*, the following one. Unless this year be pitched upon, we shall find it impossible to make *the beginning of the first woe-trumpet in the East* synchronize with *the beginning of the same woe-trumpet in the West*. But we know that *the first woe-trumpet* begins to sound in the East in *the year 606*: whence I see not how we are to avoid concluding, that it begins likewise to sound in the West in the same year. Accordingly we find this same year to afford us the most probable date of *the rise of the western apostacy* and *the commencement of the 1260 years*; for in this year *the Roman beast* delivered *the saints* into the hand of his *little horn*. I can scarcely believe, that so many coincidences, all leading us to *the year 606*, are purely accidental.



of a crooked and perverse generation stood fast in the faith of Jesus Christ : and the court without the temple symbolizes those, who retained indeed the name of Christians, but had grossly apostatized from the truth. The holy city, which is given to them to tread under foot and pollute with superstitious abominations, during the period of forty-two prophetic months, a period equivalent to the 1260 years of the Apostacy, is the visible Church of Christ.\* St. John therefore is ordered to measure, or take an account of, the faithful servants of God, who never ceased, in a greater or less number, to exist throughout the whole duration of the Apostacy : while he is commanded to leave out, and not to measure, the outer court, as containing only those nominal Christians, who in practice were Gentiles, and who were unworthy the notice of a Being of infinite purity.†

“ And I will give power unto my two witnesses, and they shall prophesy a thousand two hundred and three score days clothed in sackcloth. These are the two olive trees, and the two candlesticks standing before the God of the earth.

\* The holy city here mentioned cannot mean the literal Jerusalem, because the treading of it under foot is to continue only 1260 years, and during the reign of the Papal horn ; whereas the treading under foot of the literal Jerusalem has already continued upwards of 1700 years, and commenced long before the reign of the Papal horn. The prophecy therefore of our Lord in Luke xxi. 24 which relates to the literal Jerusalem, cannot have any connection with the prophecy of St. John in Rev. xi. 2. which relates to the period of the 1260 years. See the preceding 2d Chapter of this Work.

† Measuring the servants of God is equivalent to sealing them. (See Rev. vii. 5.) Hence the commission of the Saracenic locusts extended only to those, who had not the seal of God in their foreheads ; they were not able to approach to Piedmont and Savoy, the country of those that were sealed. The unmeasured tenants of the outer court, and the unsealed men throughout the Roman empire, are alike the votaries of the Apostacy : while they that were measured, and they that were sealed, were the saints who refused to be partakers of its abominations. Mr. Mede is perfectly right in his idea of the outer court ; but I cannot think with him that the inner court means the primitive Church previous to the revelation of the mark of sin, because the whole allegory is included within the 1260 years, and consequently those symbolized by the inner court and those symbolized by the outer court must necessarily be contemporary. They of the outer court indeed are the very men who persecute the witnesses of the inner court. (See Comment. Apoc. in loc.) The sealing of the servants of God takes place under the sixth seal and during the reign of Constantine, because the Apostacy, considered individually, commenced about that time. It separated the wheat from the tares, and was preparatory to the subsequent grand division of the witnesses from the gentiles of the outer court. A new race of gentiles began to insinuate themselves into the holy city at the time when the servants of God were sealed, or when the Apostacy commenced individually ; but the outer court was not formally given unto them by the secular power, till the saints were given into the hand of the little papal horn in the year 606, and till the Apostacy became dominant.

And, if any man will hurt them, fire proceedeth out of their mouth, and devoureth their enemies: and, if any man will hurt them, he must in this manner be killed. These have power to shut heaven, that it rain not in the days of their prophecy: and have power over waters to turn them to blood, and to smite the earth with all plagues, as often as they will.\*

It is evident, that *these two witnesses* are to be contemporary with *the great Apostacy*, because they are to continue throughout its whole duration of 1260 years;† and it is equally evident, that they are to be hostile to it, because they are represented as prophesying in sackcloth, and as being the peculiar objects of *the beast's* fury. They are moreover not to exist at *this* time, or at *that* time, but from *the very beginning to the very end* of *the Apostacy*: consequently it is manifest, that they cannot be *any two mere individuals*. The question then is, *what* they are? Mr. Gallaway endeavours to prove them to be *the Old and New Testament* † In this conjecture he follows Colter, More, and Napier: ‡ but he is nevertheless certainly mistaken: for such an opinion runs directly counter to a very wholesome rule, which every commentator upon hieroglyphical prophecy ought particularly to attend to: *Having once established the definite meaning of a symbol, never afterwards think yourself at liberty to depart from that meaning.* § The *two witnesses* are expressively said by St. John to be *the two olive trees*, and *the two candlesticks*, standing before the God of the earth. But both *an olive-tree*, and *a candlestick*, are equally symbols of *a church*. || Consequently *the two witnesses*, must be *two churches*; and therefore cannot be *the two Testaments*. Bp. Newton thinks that *no two particular men, or particular churches*, are meant by

\* I speak of the *Apostacy* in its dominant state.

† Brief Comment p. 45 et infra. Mr. Burton fancies the *two witnesses* to be Daniel and St. John; but, as he does not even attempt to shew in what particulars they answer to the character of *the witnesses*, he leaves no room for a regular confutation. Essay on the numbers of Daniel and St. John, p. 241, 242, 246.

‡ See Pol. Synop. in loc. Brightman thinks, that they are *the Scriptures*, and *the congregation of the faithful*. Apoc. Apoc. Fol. 169.

§ See the beginning of *the Preface to this Work*.

|| See the preceding chapter upon symbols.

them : but only that there should be *a few faithful servants of God* in every age, who should protest against the superstitious corruptions of their times. His Lordship is perfectly right in *the spirit*, though not quite accurate in *the letter*, of his interpretation. There is so much precision in all the numbers both of Daniel and St. John, that we ought to be *very* jealous of breaking down the barrier of their *literal* acceptance.\* Scripture will ever be found the most satisfactory expositor of Scripture : and such I apprehend to be the case in the present instance. Throughout the whole Apocalypse the idea of *the twofold Church* of Christ is accurately preserved : *the Church before the advent of our Lord, and the Church after the advent ; the Church founded upon the Prophets, and the Church founded upon the Apostles ;* Jesus Christ himself being equally the corner stone of *both*. Accordingly we find, in the very beginning of the Revelation, mention made of *twenty four elders*, who are represented as being in *heaven*, the symbol of *the universal Church*. *Twelve of these*, in allusion to *the twelve Jewish patriarchs*, are representatives of *the pre-Christian Church* : and *the other twelve*, in allusion to *the twelve Apostles*, are representatives of *the post-Christian Church*. Whence *the mystical number of God's chosen* is said to be 144,000 ; or *twelve* multiplied into *twelve*, and afterwards again multiplied into *a thousand*, to shew that the pious constitute an exceeding great multitude. Whence also *the symbolical city of the lamb*, or *the universal Church triumphant*, is described as *a perfect cube of 12,000 furlongs* ; having *twelve gates* upon which are written the names of *the twelve tribes of Israel*, and *twelve foundations* in which are the names of *the twelve Apostles* of the Lamb. And whence lastly the faithful are represented as singing the song not only of *the Lamb*, but likewise of *Moses the servant of God*. Now, when we recollect, that the prophet begins the chapter, wherein he treats of *the two*

\* It was wisely observed by Abp. Secker, that "it doth not appear that any of the numbers in Daniel mean uncertainty." His Grace might with equal propriety have extended his remark to St. John, with a very few exceptions which explain themselves. See Rev. vii. 4, and P. v. xxi. 13, 17.

witnesses, with an account of his measuring *the spiritual temple*: when we further consider, that St. John's imagery of *the two candlesticks*, and *the two olive trees*, is evidently taken from Zechariah's vision *in the second temple*; \* and that he himself describes *the twenty four elders* as being in *the figurative heaven, or the Church general*, in the same manner as *the candlesticks* and *the olive trees* were placed in *the temple*, which is another symbol of *the spiritual Church general* as contradistinguished from *the outer court* of mere nominal Christians: when the whole of this is duly weighed, and when the undoubted fact that St. John borrows this set of hieroglyphics from *the Jewish temple and its furniture*, is taken into the account, I think we cannot but come to the conclusion, that *the twenty four elders, the twelve gates, and the twelve foundations* of the new Jerusalem, *the two olive trees, the two candlesticks, and the two witnesses*, all equally signify *the spiritual members of the catholic Church*, considered as *one great whole*, though made up of *two component parts*. Not that any of the members of the pre-Christian Church *literally* prophesied during *the 1260 years of the great Apoc'asy*: the prophet speaks only of men of a like spirit with themselves, the mystical children of *the Church general* now for ever united under its illustrious head, those who are Israelites indeed. "Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, *and un'o seeds*, as of many; but as of one, *and to thy seed*, which is Christ—But, before faith came, we were kept under the law, shut up unto the faith which should afterwards be revealed—Ye are *all* the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus—There is neither Jew nor Greek, neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for *ye are all one* in Christ Jesus. And, if ye be Christ's, *then are ye Abraham's seed*, and heirs according to the promise." †

\* Zech iv 2, 5, 9, 11—14

† It is evident, that *the two olive trees* are the same as *the two candlesticks*, and that they do not design to symbolize *four* different particulars: because *the witnesses*, who are only *two* in number, are said to be supplied not merely by *the two olive trees*, but likewise additionally by *the two candlesticks*. Whence it will follow, that *the one olive tree* is the same in point of signification as *the one candlestick*, and the other as *the other*.

‡ Gal iii. 10, 23, 26, 28, 29.

Mr. Galloway objects, that *the two witnesses* cannot be *those who protested against the corruptions of popery* during *the 1260 years*, because *they were to prophesy in sackcloth*; whereas *none of the reformers* ever pretended to *the gift of prophecy*, but contented themselves with being merely *preachers of God's word*. In making this unguarded objection, Mr. Galloway seems to have forgotten, that in the New Testament *prophesying* is not unfrequently used as a mere synonym of *preaching or expounding*.\* *The prophesying therefore of the two witnesses* is nothing more than *their zealous avowal of the principles of the Gospel*; *their shutting of heaven*, so that it *rain not* in the days of their prophecy, is *the shutting up the temple or spiritual Church*, so that *the dew of God's word and spirit* should not descend upon the apostate inhabitants of *the Roman earth*;† and *their power of smiting the earth with diverse plagues* means that *all the various plagues, denounced in the Apocalypse, blood, slaughter, and desolation, should, in the course of God's just judgments, be the consequence of men's slighting the warning voice of his two mystical prophets*. Not that it was *their wish* to shut up heaven, or to call down the vengeance of the Almighty upon earth; *their desire* was to preach repentance and the forgiveness of sins: *the fire of God's wrath* would never have proceeded out of their mouth: they never would have had occasion to denounce his righteous indignation against sin; if *they of the Apostacy* would have reformed themselves, instead of hurting or persecuting *the two witnesses*. When it is said therefore, that *they have power to shut heaven, to turn the waters into blood, to smite*

\* See the whole of 1 Corinth. xiv upon which Mr. Cruden very justly remarks, "This term (*prophesying*) is used by St. Paul for *explaining Scripture, preaching, or speaking to the Church in public*. See also 1 Corinth. xi. 4, 5—1 Thess. v. 20. (which the margin of the Bible refers to 1 Corinth. xiv) and Rom. xii. 6. The use of the word in this sense probably originated from the frequent appeals made by the primitive teachers to the prophets who had prophesied of Christ. See Acts ii. 14—37 iii. 18. iv. 10—13. v. 28 vii. 2—51 xxiv. 14 xxv. 6—7 and xviii. 23. See also the grounds of our Lord's own discourse with the two disciples at Emmaus. Luke xxiv. 25, 26, 27 and his subsequent address to the eleven and those that were with them. Ver. 44, 45, 46

† "Rain," says Sir Isaac Newton, "if not immoderate, and *dew and living water* are put for *the graces and doctrines of the Spirit*; and the defect of rain, for *spiritual barrenness*. Observ. on Dan. and Rev. p. 19

*the earth with plagues, and to dart from their mouth consuming fire*; these expressions must all be understood, not in a *causal*, but in a *consequential*, sense: for the commission, given to *the two figurative prophets*, is, in point of its proper mode of interpretation, exactly analogous to the charge which God delivered to Isaiah: “*Make* the heart of this people fat, and *make* their ears heavy, and *shut* their eyes; lest they see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and understand with their heart, and convert, and be healed.”\* In perfect strictness of speech, Isaiah was no more able to inflict the plague of spiritual stupidity, than *the two prophets* of the Apocalypse were that of spiritual barrenness and natural calamities. Both the passages must be explained exactly upon the same principle: the judgments, which *these prophets* were severally empowered to inflict, were not caused by them as *active agents*, but were *the consequence of their ministry being slighted*. In this sense we are authorised by inspired authority to interpret the charge given to Isaiah:† consequently, by a parity of reasoning, we are at liberty to explain the powers, committed to *the two apocalyptic prophets*, in a similar manner.‡

It is not unworthy of remark, that *the two witnesses* are described as having only *one mouth*.§ This circumstance at once shews that they are *mystical*, not *literal*, characters; and serves to demonstrate the propriety of the foregoing explanation. *The pre-Christian and the post-Christian Church*, forming jointly *the Church general*, have but *one mouth*, testifying and declaring the same simple road to salvation through the alone sacrifice of Christ. In the strictly scriptural words of the Anglican church already cited, “although the ancient patriarchs were not named *Christian men*, yet was it a Christian faith that they had; for they looked for all benefits of God the Father, through the merits of his Son Jesus Christ, as we do now. This difference is

\* Isaiah vi 10.

† See Matt. xiii. 15. and Acts xxviii. 27.

‡ It is very justly remarked by Bp. Newton, when commenting upon this very passage, that “in Scripture language the prophets are often said to do those things, which they *declare* and *foretell*.”

§ Rev. xi 5.

between them and us, that they looked when Christ *should* come, and we be in the time when he *is* come.”\*

“And, when they shall draw near to the close of their testimony, † the beast, that ascendeth out of the bottomless pit, shall make war against them, and shall overcome them, and kill them. And their dead bodies shall lie in a street of the great city, which spiritually is called Sodom and Egypt, where also our Lord was crucified. And they of the people and kindreds and tongues and nations shall see their dead bodies three days and a half, and shall not suffer their dead bodies to be put in graves. And they, that dwell upon the earth, shall rejoice over them, and make merry, and shall send gifts one to another; because these two prophets tormented them that dwelt on the earth. And after three days and a half the spirit of life from God entered into them; and they stood upon their feet: and great fear fell upon them which saw them. And they heard a great voice from heaven, saying unto them, Come up hither. And they ascended up to heaven in a cloud; and their enemies beheld them.”

Prophecy, as it might be naturally expected, dwells only upon great and prominent circumstances; were it otherwise constructed, the whole world could not contain the volumes which it would occupy. We must consider therefore, what circumstance in the history of *the two witnesses*, which occurred *before* the sounding of *the seventh trumpet*, ‡ is of a sufficiently definite nature to occasion this *very* peculiar mention of it.

\* The same sound doctrine is set forth in the article; “The Old Testament is not contrary to the New: for both in the Old and New Testament everlasting life is offered to mankind by Christ, who is the only Mediator between God and man, being both God and man.” Thus have *the two witnesses* only *one mouth*, with which they unanimously protest against the host of mediators venerated by *them of the Apostacy*.

† Such is certainly the proper translation of the Aorist *τελευτωσι*. The subjunctive mood of the first Aorist generally bears a kind of future signification: and the context amply shews, that such *must* be its meaning in the present instance. *The witnesses* were to prophesy during *the whole 1260 years*, which are commensurate with *the two first woe-trumpets* and *the greatest part of the third*. At the time of this event, they were only under *the second woe-trumpet*: (See Rev. xi. 7—12. and 14, 15.) consequently they could not have *finished* their testimony, as our translation erroneously represents them to have done: because they were to *continue prophesying* to the *very end* of the 1260 years. “Cum finituri sint testimonium suum (sic enim ὄψιν τελευτωσι: vertentur, non de præterito, cum finierint.) Mede’s Comment Apoc. in loc.

‡ See Rev. xi. 7—12, 15.

Before *the prophets* can be capable of experiencing *political death*, the only death to which a community is liable, they must receive *political life*.\* This never was the case previous to the time of *the Reformation*; therefore *the prophets* cannot have been *slain* before *the Reformation*. Many years indeed antecedent to that era, they had continued prophesying in sackcloth; many years was the sad narrative of their persecutions written within and without with lamentations, and mourning, and woe: as yet however they were not *slain*, for as yet they were incapable of a *political death*. But at *the Reformation* they first received in Germany *political life* † consequently at *the Reformation* they first became liable to *political death*. ‡ To this era I have already thought myself warranted in peculiarly referring *the second persecution of the men of understanding*, which Daniel describes as taking place *previous* to the revelation of *the atheistical king*; and to this era I now think myself equally warranted in looking for an accomplishment of the present prophecy.

The foe, that slays *the witnesses*, is styled *the beast of the bottomless pit*: and *this beast* will be found, upon

\* Hence St. John predicts, in a similar manner, *the subversion of the Eastern empire*, under the image of *the third part of men being killed by the Euphratean horsemen*; having previously informed us, that *the Saracenic beasts* should not be allowed to *kill* the men who had not the seal of God in their foreheads, but only to *torment* them, because *their commission* extended no further than to *harass* the Roman empire. See *the preceding remarks upon these prophecies*.

† They were not established as a church in England till the accession of Edward the sixth in the year 1547; at which period their cause had already been espoused by the Elector of Saxony, and other German sovereigns. These princes associated themselves into what was called *the league of Smalcald*, in the years 1530, 1531, 1535, and 1537; and in that city first called themselves *protestants*. Then it was that *the witnesses* received *political life*. "*Mori ea notione dicitur qui in quo cinque statu constitutus sive Politico sive Ecclesiastico, seu quovis alio, desinit esse quod fuit; unde et occidit qui tali morte quemquam afficit.*" (Mede's Comment Apoc. in myst. duor. test.) This excellent definition of Mr. Mede's shews the propriety of the distinction which I have made between *the death of the third part of men or the Roman community*, and *the death of the Roman beast*. Death in both cases signifies *the causing them to cease to be what they were before*. Hence *the death of a community is the causing a community to cease from existing as a community*; and *the death of a beast is the causing a beast or idolatrous empire to cease from existing as a beast or idolatrous empire*.

‡ The allegory, here used by St. John, was very familiar to the Hebrew prophets. They frequently predict *the restoration of the Israelites* from their present scattered state, their state of *political death*, under the image of a *resurrection from the dead*. Let the reader peruse Ezekiel xxxvii, and he will acquire a very clear conception of the principle on which the apocalyptic prediction, relative to *the death and revival of the two witnesses*, is founded.



examination, to be *the first beast* of the Apocalypse, or *the beast with seven heads and ten horns*.\* In short, as it shall be fully shewn hereafter, he is the same as Daniel's *fourth beast*, or *the Roman Empire*: and he slays *the witnesses* by the instrumentality of his *last head*.† Before we can understand therefore the import of the prediction relative to *the death of the witnesses*, which is to take place towards the close of *the 1260 years*, and under *the second woe-trumpet*, we must learn *what form of Roman government* is intended by *the last head of the beast*. This matter however must be reserved for future discussion, when the whole character of *the beast* is considered at large. For the present then, in order that the thread of the prophecy relative to *the witnesses* may be preserved unbroken, I must be allowed to assume, that *this last head* is not *the Papacy*, as Mr. Mede and Bp. Newton suppose, but *the line of the Gothic emperors of the West*; the first of whom was Charlemagne, and whose representative, at the time of *the Reformation*, was Charles the fifth.

Now, upon consulting history, we shall find, that *the witnesses* first received political life in *the years 1530, 1531, 1535, and 1537*, by the formal association of the protestant German princes in *the league of Smalcalde*: and that shortly afterwards *the Roman beast under his last head*, and at the instigation of his colleague *the two horned ecclesiastical beast*,‡ began to make open war upon them with a view to crush *the Reformation* in the bud. Infinite Wisdom determined to try, "the patience

\* Compare Rev. xi. 7. with Rev. xiii. 1. and xvii. 7, 3.

† Or to speak more accurately, *his septimo-octave head*. "The seven heads are seven kings. The beast that was, and is not, even he is the eighth, and is of the seven." (Rev. xvii. 9, 10, 11.) Thus it appears, that St. John identifies even *the whole beast* with *his last head*, on account of the vast power which *this last head* was destined at its first rise to possess: consequently, when he asserts, that *the beast* should make war upon *the witnesses*, since the chronology of the prophecy shews that *the beast* should do this under *his last head*, and since St. John identifies *the beast* with *his last head*, it is manifest that this war was to be undertaken by *the last head of the beast*. The same remark applies to the last war of *the beast*, *the false prophet*, and *the kings of the earth*, against *the Lamb*. *The beast* here, as in the former instance, means *the last head of the beast*: and *the kings of the earth* or *Roman empire*, those *sovereigns* who are in communion with *the false prophet*. This subject will be fully discussed hereafter.

‡ See Rev. xiii. 11.

and faith of the saints," by making him for a short season completely successful in his projects. On the 24<sup>th</sup>\* of April 1547, he totally routed the protestants in the battle of Mulburg; in consequence of which defeat their two great champions, who had given them political life, the Elector of Saxony, and the Landgrave of Hesse, were compelled to submit to the Emperor on terms of absolute discretion.

The prophets were now politically dead; but they were not long to continue so: whence it is said, that they lay *unburied*. The place, where their *dead bodies* were thus exposed, was a *street of the great city*, "spiritually called *Sodom and Egypt*, where also our Lord was crucified." The excellent Bp. Newton, and the learned Mr. Mann of the Charter House whom he cites, needlessly perplex themselves with elaborately shewing, how the *city of Rome* may be said to be the *city where our Lord was crucified*: whence they conclude, that, whenever this prophecy is accomplished, the dead bodies of the prophets will lie unburied in some *literal* street of the *literal* great city: "some conspicuous place within the jurisdiction of Rome," as the Bishop expresses himself. The *great city* however, the *mystic Babylon*, which throughout the Apocalypse is represented in constant and direct opposition to the *holy city*, or the *Church*, is certainly not the *city*, but the *empire of Rome*:† whence a *street of this great city* is a *kingdom or province of the empire*, considered as a whole; and a *tenth part of the city*, as mentioned in the thirteenth verse of the present chapter, is not a *tenth part of the literal city of Rome*, but a *tenth part of the Roman empire*, and consequently is precisely equivalent to *one of the ten horns or kingdoms of the beast*. This being the case, there is no need to seek for a *spiritual* sense, in which our Lord may be said to have been crucified in the *great city*: he *literally* suffered within its precincts: for he was put to death in Palestine, at

\* Brightman says the 27<sup>d</sup> of April.

† The *temporal Babylon* is the *temporal empire of Rome*; the *spiritual Babylon* is the *spiritual empire of the Roman Pontiff*.

that time a province of the Roman empire.\* This obvious exposition will shew the great accuracy of the

\* "*Urbs magna* 1. Sodomā; 2. Ægyptus. Hinc discimus urbem magnam ad totum bestię regnum extendi, nam Ægyptus non civitas erat, sed regnum. Interfetrrix Christi Hinc constat Romana hoc loco non intelligi. Christus autem in Romana urbe crucifixus dicitur, i. e. in ejusmodi et imperio; in urbis platea, h. e. intra ditionem Romanam, sive in provincia ipsius." Pol. Synop. in loc.

"Hęc urbs magna est tota illa dicitio cujus est Roma metropolis: quo sensu decima pars urbis cadit, infra ver. 13. Platea est pars aliqua Romane ditionis, in qua spectaculum hoc visendum exhibetur, cujus gaudium se diffundit per totum imperium. Urbs autem ipsa magna una cum metropoli sua in reliquo versu describitur, idque duobus disertis nominibus, et adjuncta simul insigni nota, nequis in orbe forsan erraret—Primum nomen est Sodomā—Secundum nomen est Ægyptus, non urbs aliqua, qualis Sodomā, sed integra regio et provincia. Unde hoc nomen non est proprium ipsius metropolis, sed totius ejus ditionis." Apoc. Apoc. Fol. 174. 175

"The great city is that city which reigneth over the kings of the earth, or Rome, the empress of the world. Streets of the great city are its public places throughout its dominion; for the great city is not considered so much in its buildings, as a seat of empire. It is Rome and the Roman empire, says the Bp of Meaux; and, taking the great city for Rome and its empire, he adds, It is literally true, that Jesus Christ was crucified there, even by the Roman power. And it is moreover true, that the same Rome, which crucified Christ in person, crucified him also every day in his members. The general meaning of this passage is well expressed by Mr. Daubuz: The dead bodies of the witnesses shall lie throughout the extent, in the most conspicuous places, or the chief principal parts, of the Antichristian jurisdiction" (Lowman's Paraph. in loc.) Had. Mr. Daubuz said singularly a street or a conspicuous place, as the Apostle does, instead of expressing himself plurally, I should have had nothing to object.

"In the street of the great city, i. e. in Bohemia, one street of the papal dominions, or the great city Rome, in a large sense." (Fleming's Apoc. Key, p. 41.) I do not think Bohemia to be the street intended; but Mr. Fleming's mode of interpretation is the same as my own.

"It is probable the whole Roman empire may be here represented, as one idolatrous and impure city; as elsewhere the Church of Christ is represented by one pure holy and glorious city." Doddridge's Paraph. in loc.) This argument from analogy is an excellent one.

"It is a truth which must be held as certain, being one of the keys of the Revelation, that the city, the great city, signifies in this book, not Rome alone, but Rome in the conjunction with its empire: the name of this great city is Babylon—This being supposed and proved, that the city is the whole Babylonish and Antichristian empire, it must be remembered that this empire of Antichrist is made up of ten kingdoms and of ten kings, who must give their power to the beast. A tenth part of the city fell; that is one of these ten kingdoms which make up the great city, the Babylonish empire, shall forsake it—Now what is this tenth part of the city which shall fall? In my opinion, we cannot doubt that it is France—The kings, who yet remain under the empire of Rome, must break with her, leave her solitary and desolate. But who must be in this last revolt? It is most probable that France shall—Seeing the tenth part of the city, which must fall, is France, this gives me some hopes that the death of the two witnesses, hath a particular relation to this kingdom. It is the street or place of this city; that is the most conspicuous and eminent part of it." (Jurieu's Accompl. of the Scrip. Proph. Part II. p. 261—267) The reader will perceive the points wherein I differ from M. Jurieu: the passage is cited simply to shew what he understood by the great city.

"Civitatem illam magnam, quę regnum gerit in reges terrę, non tam urbem quampiam moeribus circumam (quanquam a tali, cen accepit quadam, origine

prophecy now under consideration. *The two mystic prophets* were not, at the precise time alluded to by St. John, to lie dead and unburied throughout *the whole of the great city*; but only, as he expressly informs us, *in one particular street or region of it*.\* Now, since their persecutor upon this occasion was to be *the beast under his last head, the street of the city*, where they were to lie unburied, must evidently be *that region of the empire* which should be subject to the more immediate jurisdiction of *the last head*. Accordingly in the *very year 1547*, when *the prophets* were *politically slain in Germany*, *the figurative street* under the special control of *the last head*;† they first obtained *political life in another street of the great city*, where *the last head* had no authority, by the accession of Edward the sixth to the throne of *England*.

St. John informs us, that *their dead bodies* were to lie unburied in *this street of the city*, precisely *three days and a half*; that is, *three natural years and a half*; when they should suddenly come to life again, stand firmly upon their feet, and ascend triumphantly to heaven, in spite of the machinations of their enemies.

*The two prophets*, as we have seen, were slain by *the beast* in the battle of Mulburg, on *the 24th of April 1547*. By this decisive victory the cause of *the reformation* seemed irretrievably ruined in *Germany*, *the street of the great city where their dead bodies lay unburied*: the mass was restored; protestantism was in a manner suppressed: and they that dwelt upon *the Roman earth*, the papists of the various tongues and nations into which *the great city* had been divided by the incursions of the Goths, rejoiced over *the two prophets* that tormented them by their troublesome admonitions; and made merry; and sent gifts one to another. But this joy was of no very long continuance. The sure word of

ducere potest), quam multitudinem societatem per caput aut capita, utentem potestate imperandi, tanquam jure metropoleos ostendimus. Propheta metaphoraset enigmata amat. P. civitas est quasi civitas; forum, quasi forum. Ita Apoc. X 8 Civitas magna, ubi Christus crucifixus est Romanam ditiozem notat." Heidegger Myst. Bab. Mag. Tom I p. 219.

\* In una platearum. Pol. Synop. in loc.

† It is worthy of observation, that Spain was not subject to Charles V. as *the last head*, but as one of the ten horns of the *beast*.

prophecy had declared, that it should last only *three years and a half*. Accordingly the reformers again stood upon their feet at Magdeburg in *the October of the year 1550* ;\* and in *the December* of the same year defeated the Duke of Mecklenburg, and took him prisoner. Great fear now fell upon all that saw them ; but the time was not yet arrived, when they were finally to ascend into *the symbolical heaven*, in the very sight of their enemies. This was at length accomplished by the peace ratified at Passau in 1552, and confirmed at Augsburg in 1555 ; by which the protestants were allowed to enjoy the free exercise of their religion.† Then it was, that *the two prophets ascended into heaven*, or, in other words, *became an acknowledged church*. Hitherto, although possessing *political life*, they only stood upon their feet on *the earth*, surrounded and assailed by their imperial and papal enemies : but now they triumphantly ascended into *heaven*, and firmly established themselves in direct opposition to their enemies who beheld them, *the first beast*, and his instigator *the second beast*.

Thus it appears, that an accurate comparison of prophecy with history has shewn us both *the time when*, and *the place where*, these remarkable events were to take place. It was necessary that *the two prophets* should receive *political life* in order to be capable of *political death*. This they first did throughout the whole Roman empire, in *Germany*. It was further necessary, in order to the exact accomplishment of the prediction, that they should be slain in *a street of the great city* peculiarly under the control of *the last head of the beast*.

*This street* is *Germany* likewise. To *Germany* therefore we must look, and to *no other street of the city*, for the completion of the prophecy. Accordingly upon looking there we have found, that, as *the prophets* first received *political life* in *Germany*, so they first experienced *political death* there : that this *political death* was

\* "Hoc suadet oppositionis ratio, ut talis sit cædes, qualis resurrectio. Resurrectio autem hæc non est proprie dicta, qualis nulla futura est ante adventum Christi, sed analogica et politica, qua ad honorem rerumque regimen suscitabuntur. In stylo sacro *Vivere* subinde est *Esse*, et *Mori* est *Non esse*." Med. et Mor. apud Pol. Synop. in loc.

† See Brightman's Apoc. Apoc. Fol 176, 177, 178.

inflicted upon them by the very agent pointed out by St. John, *the beast under his best heed*: that *the prophets* resumed the functions of *political life in the autumn of 1550*, exactly *three years and a half* from *the spring of 1547*, when they were slain: and now, once more standing upon their feet, routed the Duke of Mecklenburg in *the December* immediately following: and lastly that they ascended into *the ecclesiastical heaven*, after they had stood on their feet upon *the earth*, and *after* great fear had fallen upon their enemies, in *the year 1552*; when, by the treaty of Passau, the emperor was compelled to allow them the free exercise of their religion, and to readmit them into the imperial chamber, from which they had been excluded ever since the victory of Mulburg.

All the interpretations, which have been given of this prophecy, except the present, appear to have failed, from the paying too exclusive an attention to *the allotted period of three days and a half*; and from not taking into the account those other parts of the prediction, which point out both *the time when, the place where, and the imperial head under which*, it was to receive its completion. Several of these interpretations are mentioned by Bp. Newton—The prophecy in question has been applied for instance to *the council of Constance*, which sat about *three years and a half*, enacted many laws against pretended heretics, and condemned to the flames John Huss and Jerome of Prague. But *these two martyrs* were only *individuals*: they cannot with any propriety be termed *two candlesticks, or two churches*: they did not prophesy *1260 years*: they were incapable of revivification, for it is a mere evasion of the plain words of St. John to say, that they revived in their followers: consequently they cannot be *the two apocalyptic prophets*—It has also been applied to *the French massacre of the protestants on the eve of St. Bartholomew, 1572*, and the treaty of Henry the third with the Huguenots concluded *May the 14th, 1576*; whereby all the protestants, about *three years and a half* after the massacre, were admitted to the free and open exercise of their religion. But this exposition will in no respect accord with the prophecy, except in the coincidence of

*the three years and a half*: for the protestants never did more than *preach in sackcloth* throughout *France*, not being able to obtain *political life* in that country; and, even if they had obtained *political life* there, as they did in *England*, still the war would have been made upon them, *not by the beast*, as St. John assures us should be the case, *but only by one of his ten horns*, or *the French sovereign*—It has likewise been applied by Jurieu to the *persecution of the French protestants after the revocation of the edict of Nantz*. But this pious author's exposition is not only liable to the same objections as the preceding one, but has since shared the fate of most *human prophecies* founded upon a *divine prophecy*. He ventured to foretell, that that should be the *last persecution of the Church*; that *the witnesses* should lie dead *three years and a half* from *the year 1685*, when the edict was revoked; that *the Reformation* should then be established by royal authority throughout the kingdom; and that the whole country should renounce *Pope y*, and embrace *Protestantism*. Events have precluded the necessity of any other confutation\*—It has lastly been applied by Bp. Lloyd and Mr. Whiston to

• This notion of Jurieu's has, with some variations, been recently revived by Mr. Bicheno. He asserts, that *the two witnesses* represent *the advocates for religious truth and civil liberty*; that *the beast*, which slays them, is *the second apocalyptic beast*; that *that second beast* is *the French monarchy from the time of Louis XIV*; that *the witnesses* were slain in *the year 1685* by the revocation of the edict of Nantz: that *the three days and a half*, during which they lay dead, are what he styles *three lunar days and a half*, in other words, *three prophetic months and a half* for *105 natural years*; and that at the end of these *105 years* they were revived and stood upon their feet by means of *the French revolution* in *the year 1789*.

I think him quite mistaken. for the following reasons—1 *The witnesses*, upon the principles of symbolical language, must be *two churches*: *the advocates for religious truth and civil liberty* are not *two churches*—2. *The witnesses* plainly represent *a body of men eminent for Christian piety*; and, as their death means their *political extinction*, so their resurrection means their *political revival*. Thus Ezekiel represents *the restoration of the house of Israel to their ancient political existence among the nations*, under the similar imagery of a *resurrection of dry bones* (Ezek. xxxvii). How then can *the pious witnesses* be said to be raised up again to political life by an event, which threw the reins of the French government into the hands of a set of *the vilest and most unprincipled miscreants* that ever disgraced any age or country? According to the prophet, the *self-same* body of men, that were politically slain, were politically to revive. Mr Bicheno surely cannot in sober seriousness affirm, that *the snarlers of the revocation of the edict of Nantz* revived in the persons of those blessed advocates for religious truth and civil liberty, *the demagogues of the infidel republic*—3. By asserting that *the three days and a half* are *so many lunar days or months of years*, he violates both the *general analogy of prophetic computation*, and in a yet more striking manner the *particular analogy of that*

*the persecution of the Piedmontese protestants, which commenced at the latter end of the year 1686, and terminated in June 1690. But here again the very same objections occur: the prophets never had political life in Piedmont; and the persecution was carried on against them by their sovereign the Duke of Savoy, not by the beast under his last head.*

Bp Newton, like Jurieu, thinks, that *the war of the beast against the two witnesses* is to be the *last* persecution of the Church. Were this opinion well founded, it would alone completely overthrow my application of the prophecy to the history of the League of Smalcalde; because both *the revocation of the edict of Nantz, and the persecution of the Piedmontese, were posterior to the protestant war in Germany.* But in truth no such thing is even hinted at by St. John: indeed, if it were, he would contradict himself. He begins with informing us, that *the witnesses* should prophesy *the whole of the 1260 years, clothed in sackcloth.* He next predicts *their war with the beast.* And he lastly notes *the sound-*

used in the present prediction. It is first said, that *the witnesses* are to prophesy 1260 days, and afterwards it is said that they are to lie dead *three days and a half.* Now we can scarcely suppose, that St. John uses two entirely different modes of computation in the same prophecy: for, in fact, if he did, there could be no certainty in any numerical prediction: it must be left entirely to the arbitrary decision of a commentator to say whether a *prophetic day* means a *natural year, or a month of natural years*; in other words, whether it means *one year or 30 years.* Mr. Bicheno himself allows however, that *the 1260 days are 1260 years.* If then *the 1260 days, during which the witnesses prophesy, be 1260 natural years,* we must, I think, necessarily conclude, unless we make St. John guilty of a most singular inconsistency, that *the three days and a half, during which they lie dead, are three natural years and a half* likewise. All that Mr. Bicheno says, respecting what he terms *the decorum of symbols,* seems to me a mere gratuitous assumption. Had the apostle meant to intimate, that *the witnesses* should continue in a state of political death during 105 years, I can discover no symbolical impropriety in his saying that *their dead bodies should lie unburied 105 days.* Ezekiel, we know, represents *the long political woe of the house of Israel under the imagery of dead bodies lying so long unburied that nothing remained of them but dry bones*: why then should Mr. Bicheno think it so grievous an impropriety, that the apostle should have said, that *the dead bodies of the witnesses lay unburied 105 days, if he had intended 105 years?* The truth is, that he meant to express, not 105 years, but simply *three years and a half*—4. But, even if none of these objections existed, still his scheme would not hold good, even upon his own principles. Let the *second apocalyptic beast* be what it may, it is not that beast which slays *the witnesses,* as Mr. Bicheno supposes, but *the first or ten-horned beast.* The reader will find this position amply proved in the course of a few pages, when I consider Mr. Galley's hypothesis, who makes the very same mistake as Mr. Bicheno in fancying that *the witnesses* are slain by the *second apocalyptic beast,* though he supposes that *beast* to be *republican France.* In truth, *the beast* has just as little relation to France under the *one government,* as to France under the *other.* Signs of the times. Part. I. p. 17—57.



ing of the seventh trumpet. It is plain therefore, that their war with the beast was to take place before the sounding of the seventh trumpet: yet, since the greatest part of the seventh trumpet synchronizes with the last period of the 1260 years, some of the witnesses, long after the war of their German brethren with the beast, had still to continue prophesying in sackcloth, or in a state of persecution, during the greatest part of the time that the seventh trumpet was sounding; that is to say, during the pouring out of its first six vials; whence it is manifest, that the war of the beast cannot be the last persecution; because, if it were, the witnesses would cease to prophesy in sackcloth, even before the sounding of the seventh trumpet, and consequently would not continue to prophesy in sackcloth during the whole space of the 1260 years. The fact is, the witnesses were to be slain and to lie exposed only in one particular street of the city, not in every street of it. In this single street the whole scene of their war with the beast is laid: there they are slain; there they revive; and there they ascend to heaven. It will follow therefore, that the establishment of protestantism in Germany, the cradle of the reformation, does not exempt other protestants from still continuing in a persecuted state during the whole of the 1260 years. The war with the beast is a particular, not a general persecution: and the context of the whole prophecy amply shews, that it was not to be the last particular persecution, though it might be the last in protestant Germany.\*

I am only aware of two objections, which can be made to my application of this prediction to the Smalcaldic league.

1. The first objection is, why this persecution should be particularly noticed more than many others of at least equal, if not greater, magnitude and importance. I answer, that independent of its undoubted importance, it is a perfect unique in the history of the 1260 years. The French and Bohemian protestants have been stimulated to rebellion by the persecutions of their rulers; the Wal-

\* It is probable, that although there may not be precisely another persecution of protestantism, there will be a war undertaken partly at least for the express purpose of utterly crushing it. I have already more than once hinted at this hol. war: I shall hereafter state at large what may be collected from prophecy upon the subject.

cienses have been cruelly harassed formerly; and the Savoyards have been no less cruelly treated in more modern times: but in all these events there are no sufficient marks of discrimination; they are spoken of in the general under the phrase of *the witnesses prophesying in sackcloth*. On the contrary, in the Smalcaldic league, we behold a regular association of lawful sovereigns to maintain the religion of themselves and their subjects against *foreign* oppression: we behold a complete religious war between *independent* princes: we behold a religious war attended with every one of the predicted circumstances. *The 30 years war*, and *the actions of Gustavus of Sweden*, may indeed be considered as a sort of religious war between protestants and papists; but it possesses none of the determined features of *the Smalcaldic league*, nor does it answer in any circumstantial points to the prediction. Hence I assert, that *the Smalcaldic league* was worthy of a place in prophecy, because it is a perfect *unique* in the history of *the 1260 years*: and I moreover assert, that no other persecutions were of a sufficiently definite nature to be otherwise described, than under the general phrase of *the witnesses prophesying in sackcloth*.

2. *The second objection* is, that *the war of the beast against the witnesses* was to take place when they were drawing near to the end of their testimony; whereas the protestants were defeated in Germany in *the year 1517*, which is already *near three centuries ago*. This objection however will not appear of any great weight, when *the whole duration of the Apostacy* is considered; for *three centuries* are either *a long or a short period* according to *the number with which they are compared*. *The Apostacy of 1260 years* most probably commenced, as we have seen in 606: consequently in *the year 1517*, *the witnesses* had prophesied *upwards of nine centuries*, or very near *three quarters of their whole testimony*. *The remaining period* therefore was *short* in comparison with *that which preceded it*.\*

\* It may also be added, that, since the firm establishment of the Reformation, the sufferings of *the witnesses* have been very greatly mitigated; inso-much that what they have endured during *the last quarter* of the period of *their prophesying in sackcloth* is not to be compared with their troubles during *the three*

It is a trite observation, that one error generally prepares the way for another. This is the case with Mr. Galloway's interpretation of the prophecy respecting *the two witnesses*. He assumes as proved, that *the two witnesses* are *the two Testaments*; and that their enemy, *the beast of the bottomless pit*, is the same as *the second apocalyptic beast*, or *the beast of the earth*, which he conceives to be "*the powers of atheism established by revolutionary France.*" From these premises he concludes, that *the three days and a half*, during which *the witnesses* were to lie dead, are the same as *the time and times and dividing of time*, during which *the saints* were to be worn out by *the little horn of the fourth beast*: and consequently, since *the little horn*, as well as *the beast of the earth*, is, upon his hypothesis, *revolutionary France*, that Daniel and St. John allude to *one and the same event*; namely, *the suppression of Christianity in France, during the space of three years and a half*. I have already shewn the erroneousness of this conjecture, so far as *the little horn* is concerned; I shall now point out, that it is equally erroneous in the case of *the present prophecy*.

Mr. Galloway supposes, that *the two witnesses* are *the two Testaments*. We have seen, on the contrary, that they are not *the two Testaments*, but *the protestant confessors, the spiritual children of the two-fold church of Christ*. Now the revolutionary fanaticism of *France* was not directed against the protestants *exclusively*, but against all who professed the Christian religion: the supposed completion therefore does not accord with the prophecy in *this* particular.

Mr. Galloway further supposes, that *the beast of the bottomless pit*, who slew *the witnesses*, is the same as *the second apocalyptic beast*, or *the two-horned beast of the earth*; and that *this two-horned beast of the earth* is *revolutionary France*. Waving at present the discussion of the *last* of these points, I shall only now observe, that

*first quarters* of it. Would that we were more sensible of the great mercy of God in being allowed to enjoy the undisturbed exercise of our religion: for what are we better than our fathers, that the Almighty should shew himself thus gracious to us?

*the beast of the bottomless pit*, who slew *the witnesses*, is certainly not the *two-horned beast of the earth*, but the *ten-horned beast of the sea* :\* consequently Mr. Galloway's interpretation will not hold good even upon *his own hypothesis*. He has largely endeavoured to prove, that *the ten-horned beast is the Papacy*, † and that *the two-horned beast is revolutionary France* : but, whatever power *the ten-horned beast* may be, he is evidently the same as *the beast of the bottomless pit* : whence it would follow, even according to Mr. Galloway's own plan, that *the two witnesses* were slain by *the papal beast*, not by *the atheistical one* : therefore *his exposition of the whole prophecy must be radically faulty*. This will yet further appear, when I have proved, as I trust I shall be able to prove, that neither *the one*, nor *the other*, of *the two apocalyptic beasts*, is *revolutionary France*.

“And in that hour there was a great earthquake, and a tenth part of the city fell, and in the earthquake were slain seven thousand names of men : and the remnant were affrighted, and gave glory to the God of heaven. The second woe is past ; and, behold, the third woe cometh quickly.”

Before any satisfactory interpretation can be given of this passage, it will be necessary to ascertain the meaning of the word *hour* which occurs in it : for, upon that, and upon the circumstance of *the earthquake* being the last event of note under *the second woe-trumpet*, the hinge of the whole exposition turns.

☞ Let the reader only compare together the following texts, and he will be sufficiently convinced of the truth of my assertion

“The beast, that ascendeth out of the bottomless pit, shall make war against them.” Rev. xi. 7.

“And I stood upon the sand of the sea, and saw a beast rise up out of the sea, having seven heads and ten horns.” Rev. xiii. 1.

“I will tell thee the mystery of the woman and of the beast that carrieth her, which hath the seven heads and ten horns. The beast, that thou sawest, was, and is not, and shall ascend out of the bottomless pit.” Rev. xvii. 7, 8

It appears then, that, in one text, *the seven-headed and ten-horned beast* is said to arise out of *the sea* ; and, in another text, to ascend out of *the bottomless pit* : whence it is a palpable truth, that *the beast of the sea*, and *the beast of the bottomless pit*, are the self-same *ten-horned and seven-headed beast*. Not that I conceive *the sea* and *the bottomless pit* to mean precisely the same thing ; the history of the rise of the *Saracenic locusts* sufficiently confutes such an opinion : but I apprehend, that *the sea* typifies the natural origin of the *beast* ; and *the bottomless pit*, his spiritual origin.

† Comment. p. 159—Proph. History of the Church of Rome, passim.

*A year, a month, and a day*, are all definite terms, conveying only one single idea: but *an hour* is not so; for it either signifies *the twenty-fourth part of a day*, or *a season of indeterminate length*.\* It occurs in both these senses in the Apocalypse, as its several contexts abundantly shew. Thus, when we read of the Euphratèan horsemen being prepared for *an hour and a day, and a month, and a year*, we cannot entertain any reasonable doubt of the word *hour* signifying in this instance *the twenty-fourth part of a day*: and since *the day* here mentioned is *a prophetic day* or *a natural year*, its corresponding *hour* will be *the twenty-fourth part of a year*, or *fifteen natural days*. But, when we read of there being silence in *heaven* about the space of *half an hour*, between the opening of *the seventh seal* and the sounding of *the first trumpet*, a mode of expression used to denote *the state of mute expectation* in which the Church anticipated, as it were, from various less important invasions, the grand irruption of the Goths under Alarie; it is evident, that what is there translated *half an hour* ought rather to be rendered *half a season*; both because the meaning of the word is not limited by being connected with the definite terms *a day, a month, or a year*; and because common sense itself shews that *that half hour* of silent and anxious suspense must not be confined to merely *seven natural days and a half*, the length of *a determinate prophetic half hour*. In reality, *this half hour*, or rather *half season*, extends from about *the year 321 or 323*, when the happy tranquillity of the Constantinian age began to be disturbed by the incursions of those Goths who finally subverted the Western empire, to *the year 595*, when, *the half season* of restraint having elapsed, they burst with irresistible violence the barriers which the great Theodosius had opposed to them, and poured like an overwhelming torrent into the empire.

\* Thus Ὠρὴ ἀρπυγῆς, *the vernal hour*, means *the whole season of spring*; the length of the Ὠρὴ, or *season*, being in this particular instance determined by the annexed adjective ἀρπυγῆς. Εἰς ἄρπυγῶν is a phrase of a similar nature, though not precisely of the same construction. The two expressions occur in Homer and Theocritus.

When the word *hour* then occurs in an insulated form, unconnected with the specific terms of *a day, a month, or a year*, it certainly means, not *the twenty-fourth part of a day*, but *a season of indeterminate length*: and, when it is *thus used in the Apocalypse*, I know not *what season* it can reasonably be supposed to mean, except it be *some one of the great Apocalyptic periods*; namely *one of the seven seals, one of the seven trumpets, or one of the seven vials*.\* Thus the *hour or season* of God's judgment upon Babylon† is manifestly *the one particular period* under which *the papal Apostacy* is to be abolished; a period, comprehended within the limits of *the last vial*: and thus the one *hour or season*, in which *the ten horns* were to receive power as kings along with *the beast*, means *the period of the first woe-trumpet*; at the beginning of which *the ancient Roman idolatrous beast* revived, by his lapsing, under *his ten horns*, into the demolatry of *Popery*.‡ *The ten kings* indeed had received power previous to this time; but they had not till then received power *along with the beast*: for the era of their first rise was between *the downfall of paganism* and *the commencement of Popery*; that is, during the short space of time that *the Roman beast* had put off his bestial nature, or, in the language of the prophet, while he *was not*. But, if they rose while *the beast was not*, though they were *horns* or kingdoms of *the Roman empire*, they could not in strictness of speech be styled *horns of the beast*, till *the empire* once more became a *beast*. And this event did not take place till *the year 606*, when the *first woe-trumpet* began to sound, and when *the beast* ascended out of the bottomless pit, and resumed his old posture of determined hostility to the Church of Christ.§

\* It is almost superfluous to observe, that I except such passages as Rev. iii. 3, and iii. 10, from relating to any of the apocalyptic periods; but I am not aware of a third exception in the whole book of the Revelation, unless *the half hour of the seventh seal* be a sort of one.

† Rev. xiv. 7, xviii. 10, 17, 19.

‡ Rev. xvii. 12.

§ "Kingdoms they might be before, but they were not before kingdoms or horns of the beast till they embraced his religion." (Bp. Newton's Dissert. on Rev. xvii.) Though I cannot agree with Bp. Newton, that *the first beast means the Papacy*, the propriety of this remark will be unaltered, whether his scheme or mine be adopted. Daniel, not noticing *the three-fold state of the beast* as St. John does, simply describes *the first rise of the ten horns* and of *the eleventh little*

Arguing therefore from analogy, and from the context of the particular passage now under consideration, I will venture to affirm with some degree of positiveness, that *the hour or season*, in which *the great earthquake* was to take place, and which is declared by St. John to be the very same as that in which *the war of the beast against the witnesses* was to be carried on and *their triumphant ascent into heaven* to occur; that *this hour or season is the period comprehended under the second woe-trumpet*.

It is observable, that *the two first woes* are accurately distinguished from each other, as they took place in *the East*; but that no precise line of discrimination is drawn between them, as they sounded in *the West*: it is merely stated, that, as soon as *a tenth part of the city* should have fallen by *the earthquake*, *the second woe* should be past, but that *the third woe* should quickly follow it: this line of discrimination therefore must be drawn by referring to eastern chronology. I have already stated, that *the first woe-trumpet* describes *the rise and establishment of the two-fold Apostacy*; that *the second* represents *the middle and most flourishing period of its existence*; and that *the third* details *the several steps of its downfall*, introducing moreover upon the stage *a new and most formidable power*.

*The first of the woe-trumpets* seems to have begun to sound in *the year 606*, when *the desolating transgression of Mohammedism* arose, and when *the saints* were given into the hand of the already existing *Papal little horn*. Under *this trumpet* are comprehended *the five prophetic mouths* of Saracenic conquest, which began in 612, and ended in 762, when Bagdad was built, and when *Mohammedism* may be considered as firmly established. Now, since the prophet assures us, that *the first woe* expired at this period, we must look for the *establishment of Popery* either in or before *the year 762*, in order that *horn* which sprung up among them. This division of the empire however took place during the intermediate state of *the beast*: hence St. John does not consider *the ten kingdoms* as *horns of the beast*, till *the Roman empire* reassumed its ancient *bestial nature*; and hence Daniel carefully distinguishes between the period when *the little horn* first arose, and the period when *the saints* were delivered into his hand. This last period is the same as that when St. John beheld *the beast*, in his *third or revived state*, ascend out of the *sea* of Gothic invasion.

it may be comprized under *the same woe* as *the establishment of Moham.medism*. Accordingly the proper date of *the firm establishment of Popery* is *the year 755*, or as some say *the year 758*, when Pipin, king of France, having taken the apostolic see under his special protection, conferred upon it *the Exarch te of Ravenna*.

*The second woe-trumpet* began to sound at the commencement of *the hour, the day, the month, and the year*, when the Turkish horsemen were prepared to slay *the third part of men, or the Eastern empire*; this, as we have seen, was in *the year 1281*. In *the same year 1281*, *the apal Apos acy* may be considered as having attained *the zenith of its power*; as will sufficiently appear from the following statement of the several rapid strides which it had previously made to absolute universal domination. In *the year 774*, the Pope obtained a grant of the greatest part of the kingdom of the Lombards. In *the year 787*, the worship of images, which had already been established in 607, was confirmed by the second council of Nice. In *the year 817*, the Emperor Louis finally confirmed to the Pope his Italian dominions. In *the year 1074*, Gregory the seventh strictly forbade the marriage of the clergy. In *the year 1059*, Robert Guiscard assumed the title of *Duke of Apulia and Calabria*; and afterwards did homage to the Pope, as his superior lord, for the dominions which have since been erected into *the kingdom of the two Sicilies*. In *the year 1137*, the same feudal submission was made by Don Alonso of Portugal. In *the year 1213*, John of England declared his monarchy a fief of the apostolic see.\* In the pontificate of Innocent the third, which lasted from *the year 1198 to the year 1216*, the Saladine tenth, a tax originally laid upon the whole Latin empire for the service of the holy war, was continued for the benefit of the successors of St. Peter: and Innocent himself “may

\* The Spanish kingdom of Arragon, the Dukedom of Austria, the islands of Sardinia and Corsica, and more than one of the Italian principalities, declared themselves, in the same dark period, feudatories of *the Popacy*. The long continued tyranny, which *the Pope* exercised over the kingdom of Naples, is well known. In short, it appears at one time to have been the studied design of *the Bishops of Rome* to render themselves *temporal*, no less than *spiritual*, sovereigns of Europe. In this design however, as we shall hereafter see, they by no means succeeded.



boast of the two most signal triumphs over sense and humanity, the establishment of transubstantiation, and the origin of the inquisition.\* Finally, to complete the aggrandisement of *the church of Rome, in the period between 1274 and 1277*, she bowed to reluctant submission the neck of her ancient rival of Constantinople; a submission, not long-lived indeed, but existing in its full force in *the year 1281*, when *the second woe-trumpet* began to sound.†

Thus it appears, that *the second woe-trumpet* commenced in *the West*, as it did in *the East*, in *the year 1281*. Now we learn from St. John, that *the last event*, comprehended under it, is to be *the fall of a tenth part of the great city by an earthquake*. Consequently, since *the second woe-trumpet* began to sound in *the year 1281*, and since *the witnesses* were slain in *the year 1547*, the two events, of *the death of the witnesses* and *the earthquake*, must of course happen in *the same apoc lyptic hour or season*: that is to say, they must both take place under *the second woe-trumpet* which commenced in *the year 1281*; though *the one event*, as we shall find, was to be many years prior to *the other*.

And here we must carefully note, that *the fall of the tenth part of the city* is almost immediately to be followed by *the third woe*: “the second woe is past; behold, the third woe cometh quickly.” Now, since both *the first and the second woes* form such very prominent epochs in history, as we have seen them do, it is but natural to conclude that *the third and last woe* will by no means yield to its predecessors either in *the wonderful* or *the horrible*; nay, since *it alone* is subdivided into *seven distinct periods*, it is no very improbable supposition, that it will far *outdo* them in both.‡ Those commentators, who first very justly applied the prophecy of *the war of*

\* Hist. of Decline and Fall, Vol. ii. p. 152.

† It is a remarkable circumstance, that the submission of the Greek Church was withdrawn in *the year 1283*, as if it had only continued beyond *the year 1281*, that *the Papacy* might be in the full meridian of its power, when *the second woe-trumpet* began to sound. See Gibbon's Hist. of Decline and Fall, Vol. ii. p. 304, 337.

‡ Its last period, that of *the vintage*, will be according to Daniel, “a time of trouble, such as never was since there was a nation:” and its first period, that of *the harvest*, which comprehends *the three first vials*, is described by St. John as being a very remarkable season of trouble and distress.

.....

*the beast with the witnesses to the war of the Emperor Charles the fifth with the Smalcaldic protestants*, did not sufficiently attend to this circumstance. Misconceiving St. John's expression of *the same hour*, they imagined, that *the great earthquake* was immediately to succeed, and as it were to be *the consequence of the war of the witnesses*: hence they concluded, that by *the fall of the tenth part of the city* was meant, that "a great part of the German empire renounced the authority, and abandoned the communion of the church of Rome." But here the question obviously occurs, what great calamity came so quickly after this event, as to merit the appellation of *the third woe*, and to begin the accomplishment of the prophecy of *the seven vials*? Analogy shews, that it must at least be equal to *the two double woes* of the *two-fold Apostacy*: but history mentions no event, as immediately succeeding the establishment of *the reformation* in Germany, that is either of a sufficient magnitude, or of a sufficiently peculiar nature, to warrant us in concluding, that *the third woe* did really "come quickly" after this establishment. Matters went on in the usual succession of state intrigues, hollow peaces, and rapidly recurring wars: and it has frequently been observed, that *the balance of Europe*, as it is termed, was first thought of *in the reign of Charles the fifth*; and that afterwards the different states, by means of various alliances and counter-alliances, were pretty equally poised till the tremendous explosion of *the French revolution*. It is plain therefore, that *this* explanation of *the earthquake* will not hold good: and, if it do not, all the other explanations, attached to the other schemes of interpreting *the war of the witnesses*, must of course fall to the ground along with the schemes to which they are attached.\* We must look out then for a very different event from *the establishment of the German reformation*, in order to find a satisfactory exposition of *the great earthquake*, which was to overthrow *a tenth part of the city*; and of *the third woe*, which was to "come quickly" after it.

\* The reader will find an account of them in Bp. Newton's Dissert. on Rev. xi.

We have seen, that Daniel predicts the tyranny of *Popery* and *Mohammedism*, under the symbols of *two little horns*; and that of *the atheistical government of France*, under the character of *a king who neither revered the God of heaven, the Desire of women, nor any other god, but who magnified himself above all*. Hence we may naturally expect, that St. John, writing under the influence of the same Holy Spirit, would observe the same order, and would foretell the same events: and such, I apprehend, we shall find to be really the case. The apostolical prophet, having fully detailed the history of *the two double woes of the two-fold Apostacy, Mohammedan and Papal*, introduces, at the close of *the second woe*, what may be termed *the primary revelation of Antichrist*; and immediately after, under *the third woe*, proceeds to *the full development of the same power* in all its multiplied horrors: *a power*, fully worthy of being celebrated under *a fresh trumpet*; for *Popery* and *Mohammedism* only corrupted and mutilated the word of God, but *it* has defied him even to his face, and as *a national act* (a portent hitherto unheard of) has openly denied his very existence.

*An earthquake* is the symbol of *a violent revolution* either *religious* or *political*: and *a tenth part of the great city*, or *the Roman empire*, is manifestly the same as *one of the ten horns of the Roman beast*. But, from the time of *the German reformation* to the close of *the last century*, there has been no event to which this prophecy of *the earthquake* can with any probability be applied, except *the revolution of France*; a country, which has always been one of the most powerful of *the ten streets of the great city*, and which at the period of *this earthquake* was the only one of *the ten original horns* that remained.\* Hence I scruple not to conclude, that *that revolution* is here foretold.

It is represented however as taking place *before* its own proper *woe-trumpet* began to sound; because, as the event has shewn, *Antichrist* was not destined to appear *at first* in all his naked horrors. *The great earthquake of the second woe*, and *the fall of the tenth part of the city* which

\* I have already observed, that owing to the frequent revolutions of nations, *the other original horns* have long since fallen.

it produced, were for some time celebrated, by the fanatical advocates of a chimerical liberty, as the very quintessence of human wisdom, the glory of an enlightened age, the most sublime effort of political jurisprudence. We were loudly called upon to contemplate the magnificent spectacle of a great nation rising as one man, and decreeing themselves free; and we were particularly charged to venerate the mild splendor of a phenomenon hitherto unknown in the annals of a guilty world, the phenomenon of a *bloodless* revolution. Soon however the scene changed, even before *the third woe-trumpet* began to sound: and *the infidel tyrant*, weary of his unnatural lamb-like mask, almost as soon as he had assumed it, impatiently dashed it aside, and commenced a series of massacres and proscriptions worthy of a Sylla or a Marius. In *the year 1789, the earthquake* commenced: and in it fell *a tenth part, the only remaining tenth part, of the great Roman city*: that is to say *the French monarchy, the only one of the ten original regal horns then in existence*. This circumstance, added to the chronological era to which *the earthquake* is assigned, namely, the close of *the second woe* or a period subsequent to *the permitted season of Ottoman conquest*, might in itself be sufficient to teach us that *the French revolution* can alone be intended in this prediction. But the prophet adds even a yet more decisive mark: “in the earthquake,” says he, “were slain seven thousand names of men.” The expression is remarkable, and full of meaning. In common *earthquakes* or *political revolutions*, *men alone* are ordinarily slain; but, in the present earthquake, their very *names* are to be slain: and the number of their *names* is said to be *seven thousand*, or *seven multiplied by a thousand*, the usual apocalyptic method of describing a great multitude.\* Now it is a remarkable cir-

\* Thus the mystic number of God's elect is 144, or *the square of 12*, which is multiplied by *a thousand*, to shew us that they constitute an exceeding great multitude. (Rev. vii. 4.) The number 12 is similarly multiplied by *a thousand* in the apocalyptic description of *the new Jerusalem* (Rev. xxi. 10—16.) The present prediction is constructed upon the very same principle. The number of *the names or titles* of the *tribes* and *clans* number is multiplied by *a thousand*, to describe how great a multitude of ancient French nobility constituted. It is well known that they were the most numerous of any country in Europe, Germany alone perhaps excepted.

circumstance, that not merely *names or titles of nobility in general* should be abolished or slain by *the earthquake of the French revolution*, but that precisely *seven such names or titles* should be then abolished: 1. Prince. 2. Duke. 3. Marquis. 4. Count. 5. Viscount. 6. Bishop. 7. Baron. All these *names* were slain in the course of *the earthquake*, which overthrew *the only remaining tenth part of the Roman city, or the monarchy of France*: for the first shock of *the earthquake* took place in *the year 1789*; and the last, on *the memorable 10th of August, 1793*. Thus are we alike directed by chronological and circumstantial evidence to apply this prediction to *the French revolution*. It was to be fulfilled after *the Ottoman power* had ceased to be victorious: it was to be fulfilled in *one of the ten original horns of the beast*: it was to be fulfilled in *the downfall of the monarchy* symbolized by *that tenth horn*, and in the abolition of precisely *seven names or titles of nobility*. No event, except *the French revolution* answers to all these particulars: and it *does* exactly answer to them *all*: consequently we have as much certainty, as can be attained in these matters, that *the French revolution* is here foretold by St. John.\*

\* I have explained this prophecy much better in the present edition, than I did in the first: and I readily acknowledge my obligations to Mr. Bicheno for what is here said relative to the phrase, *names of men*. To his remarks on this phrase, I have added the observation, that precisely *seven such names* were slain in *the earthquake of the French revolution*. It is almost superfluous to observe, that *archbishops* and *bishops* are in effect the same title. The name of *king* was abolished by the fall of *the tenth part of the city, or the French monarchy itself*: and in the same *earthquake* were slain *the seven orders of nobility*, temporal and spiritual. *Bishops* were afterwards restored by the republican rulers, but not in their former capacity of *ecclesiastical peers*. Bicheno's Signs of the times, Part I. p. 38—42. Ibid. Part II. p. 90, 96, 97.) Mr. Bicheno cites the following curious passage from a discourse of Dr. J. Mather, who wrote in the year 1710. "We are assured, that, when *the sixth trumpet*, called also *the second woe*, has done its work, *the seventh trumpet*, called *the third woe*, will come quickly. Now there is reason to hope that *the second woe* is past, that is, that *the Turk* shall be no more such a plague to the apostate Christian world, as for ages past he has been. At the time when *the second woe* passeth away, there is to be a *great earthquake*. In that *earthquake* one of *the ten kingdoms* over which *Satan* is, has reigned, will fall. There is at this day a *great earthquake* among the nations. May *the kingdom of France* be that *tenth part of the city* which shall fall! May we hear of a mighty revolution there; we shall then know that the kingdom of Christ is at hand." Signs of the times, Part II. p. 85.) The speculations of Jansen, whose work was published in England in the year 1687, are equally curious. "It is a truth, which must be held as certain, being one of the keys of the Revelation, that *the city, the great city*, signifies, in this book, not *Rome alone*, but *Rome in conjunction*

While *the earthquake* however was overthrowing *the tenth part of the city*, and slaying *the seven thousand names of men*, “the remnant were affrighted, and gave glory to the God of heaven.” Those, who had not suffered themselves to be deceived by the specious promises of *Antichrist*, readily saw through the flimsy veil of pretended liberty, philanthropy, and toleration, which but ill concealed the distorted features of the atheistical revolution. They acknowledged their fears; and were stigmatized as *alarmists*: they protested against the strumpet claims of democratic licentiousness to the venerable title of *rational liberty*; and were branded as the slavish enemies of the freedom of mankind: they gave glory to the God of heaven, by maintaining that religion is the only solid basis of sound government; and were ridiculed as bigots or enthusiasts.

*The earthquake* had now overthrown *the tenth part of the city*; the *second woe* therefore was past; and, behold, the *third woe* cometh *quickly*. *The year 1789* was styled *the first year of Liberty*: but *Antichrist* had not yet attained his full purpose. He panted to soar with a bolder flight than any of his predecessors in ini-

with its empire—This being supposed and proved that *the city* is *the whole Babylonish and Antichristian empire*, it must be remembered that *this empire of Antichrist* is made up of *ten kingdoms* and of *ten kings*, who must give their power to the *beast*. *A tenth part of the city fell*: that is, one of these *ten kingdoms* which make up *the great city, the Babylonish empire*, shall forsake it. Now what is this *tenth part of the city* which shall fall? In my opinion we cannot doubt that it is *France*—And in *the earthquake* were slain *seven thousand*, in the Greek it is, *seven thousand names of men*. I confess that this seems somewhat mysterious—I am inclined to say, that these words, *names of men*, must be taken in their natural signification, and do intimate that the total reformation of *France* shall not be made with bloodshed: nothing shall be destroyed but *names*, such as the names of *Monks*, of *Carmelites*, of *Augustines*, of *Dominicans*, of *Jacobines*, *Franciscans*, *Capucines*, *Jesuits*, *Minims*, and an infinite company of others, whose number it is not easy to define, and which the Holy Ghost denotes by the number *seven*, which is the number of perfection, to signify that the order of *Monks* and *Nuns* shall perish for ever.” (Cited by Bicheno. *Signs of the times*. Part I. p. 39, 40.) Dr. Goodwin, who wrote 140 years since, had formed a very just conception of what was meant by *slaying names of men*. “By *the earthquake* here, is meant a great concussion or shaking of states, political or ecclesiastical—The effect of *this earthquake*, and fall of *this tenth part of the city*, is killing *seven thousand of the names of men*—Now by *men of name*, in Scripture, is meant *men of title, office, and dignity*—As in the case of *Corah’s conspiracy*, so here a civil punishment falls upon these—For having killed *these witnesses*, themselves are to be killed (haply) by being bereft of their names and titles, which are to be rooted out for ever, and condemned to perpetual forgetfulness.” Cited by Bicheno, *ibid.* p. 41.

quity; and he rested not till he had established the reign of *democratic equality* and *frantic atheism*.

“ At an early period of the Revolution in France, the fraternity of illuminated Free-Masons took the name of *Jacobins*, from the name of a convent where they held their meetings. They then counted three hundred thousand adepts, and were supported by two millions of men scattered through France, armed with torches and pikes, and all the necessary implements of revolution. Till the 12th of August, 1792, the French Jacobins had only dated the annals of their revolution by the years of their pretended liberty. On that day, when the king was carried prisoner to the Temple, after having been declared to have forfeited his right to the crown, the rebel assembly decreed, that to the date of *liberty* the date of *equality* should be added in future in all public acts; and the decree itself was dated *the fourth year of liberty, the first year and day of equality.*”

On this memorable day then, about three years after the commencement of the earthquake which threw down the French tenth part of the great Roman city, and only two days after the last dreadful shock of that earthquake, I conceive the third woe-trumpet to have begun its tremendous blast. “ The second woe was past; and behold the third woe came quickly.” Antichrist now stood revealed in all his horrors; and the long continued efforts of *Popery* and *Mohammedism* were constrained to hide their diminished heads in the presence of a *gigantic monster*, who alike trampled upon the laws of man, and defied the majesty of heaven.

On the 12th of August, 1792, the infidel king exalted himself above all law; on the 26th of the very same month, he exalted himself above all religion. As the first of these days witnessed the abolition of all the distinctions of civil society, so the second beheld the establishment of atheism by law. A decree was then past, ordering the clergy to leave the kingdom within a fortnight after its date: but, instead of allowing them the time specified even by their own decree, the Jacobin tyrants of France employed the whole of that period in seizing, imprisoning, and putting them to the most cruel

deaths. The conduct of these unfortunate men, during this dreadful season of trial, certainly deserves the commendation of the Christian world. In spite of the various corruptions, with which they had debased the purity of the Gospel, they still shewed (to use an apostolic phrase) that they "had a little strength:" and I doubt not that many of them "slept in the Lord," though I cannot concede to Mr. Galloway and Mr. Kett, that they are *the saints whom the little horn of the fourth beast* was destined to wear out. The ministers of religion were now no more; and no traces of Christianity could be found in the reprobate metropolis of the atheistical republic. One of the churches was converted into a heathen temple, the den of *the foreign god and his kindred Mahuzzim*: and the rest were used as places of public festivity and amusement. There the abandoned citizens of Paris flocked in crouds, no longer as formerly to worship their Maker; but to hear his name blasphemed, his existence denied, and his eternal Son ridiculed as an impostor.\*

On the 27th of the same month, one of the Jacobinical miscreants caused an oath to be taken by all the members of the national assembly, that every exertion should be used to purge the earth of royalty: and it was decreed, that the convention should be what they were pleased to term *a committee of insurrection* against all the kings in the universe. Claiming a diabolical pre-eminence above mere *private* assassins, the pretended representatives of a whole nation enjoyed the unheard of honour of being the first *body of men*, that openly and systematically proposed to institute *a band of patriots*; who, either by sword, pistol, or poison, should attempt to murder the sovereigns of all nations. The proposal indeed was not carried into effect: but this was owing to *fear*,

\* On the 6th of November, 1792, a discourse upon *atheism* was pronounced by Dugout, and applauded by the convention: and, in November 1793, the hopeful pupils of the new republican school appeared at its bar, when one of them set forth, that all religious worship had been suppressed in his section, even to the very idea of religion. He added, that he and his school fellows detested God; and that, instead of learning Scripture, they learned the declaration of rights. The convention, delighted with the progress made by these young atheists, ordered, with the most enthusiastic applause, that they should be admitted to the honours of the sitting.



not to *principle*. The *prudence* only of the measure was called in question, because *they themselves* might expect reprisals. As far however as they *durst*, they *acted*. On the 19th of the following November, a decree of iraternity and assistance to their brethren in rebellion throughout Europe was passed: and, on the 21st, the president ordered it to be translated into all languages as the manifesto of *all nations against kings*: a rare instance of French vanity and presumption; the *convention* had decreed it, therefore it was the manifesto of *all nations*. On the 15th of December, another decree was passed by these friends of liberty for extending the French system, *per fas atque nefas*, to all countries occupied by their armies; and, on the 19th, Marat, the *velicæ* of the people, asserted in the Jacobin club, that in order to cement liberty two hundred thousand heads ought to be struck off. Meanwhile the streets of Paris were deluged with torrents of gore: the massacres of *August* and *September* will never be erased from the blood stained annals of France: and the whole republic was converted by this "liberty of hell" into "one great slaughter-house."\*

On the 21st of January, 1793, the king, after suffering every species of indignity from his mockery of a trial, down to the ribaldry even of a *Parisian mob*, was publicly murdered upon a scaffold. On the 16th of October, in the same year, the queen shared the fate of her husband. And, on the 19th of May, 1794, the princess Elizabeth, with a refinement of cruelty peculiar to the French, was executed the last of *twenty-six* persons.

On the 17th of October, 1793, all external signs of religion were abolished: and, with a view to encourage the most unrestrained profligacy, it was enacted, that an inscription should be set up in the public burying grounds, purporting that "*Death is only an eternal sleep*." On the 25th, in order that no trace might remain of the Christian Sabbath, a new calendar was adopted by the Convention; in which time was computed, not by weeks, but by periods of ten days each: and, instead of the an-

\* After the massacres of *August* and *September*, the revolutionary tribunal, established *March the 5th*, 1793, authorised the incessant exercise of the guillotine: and, in many towns which had the misfortune to be suspected of Anti-jacobinical principles, decreed it to be permanent.

cient commemorations of the saints, festivals, similar to those of the idolatrous Romans, were instituted to the *not o al Mahuzzim, the Virtues, Genius, Labour, Opinion, and Renard*. On the 7th of November, Gobet, the republican bishop of Paris, with his grand vicars, and others of his clergy, entered the hall of the national convention, solemnly resigned his functions, and abjured Christianity: and, that the truth of the prophecy might be evinced, that *some of those were also allured who had clear escaped from them that live in error*, several protestant ecclesiastics abjured their religion at the same time. Finally, on June the 6th, 1794, fornication was established by law, as anarchy and atheism had already been: the convention decreed, that there is nothing criminal in the promiscuous commerce of the sexes.

Such have been the tremendous effects *already* produced by the *third woe-trumpet*; a trumpet, which, considering the *very* short period of time that has elapsed since it began to sound, has far exceeded its *two predecessors* in scenes of horror and confusion. “The massacre of St. Bartholomew, an event that filled all Europe with consternation, the intamy and horrors of which have been dwelt upon by so many eloquent writers of all religions, and that has held Charles IX. up to the execration of ages, dwindles into child’s play, when compared to the present murderous revolution, which a late writer in France emphatically calls a *St. Bartholomew of five years*. According to Mr. Bossuet, there were about 30,000 persons murdered *in all France* on that day: there have been more than that number murdered *in the single city* of Lyons and its neighbourhood; at Nantz there have been 27,000; at Paris 150,000; in la Vendée 300,000. In short, it appears, that there have been two millions of persons murdered in France, since it has called itself a *republic*; among whom are reckoned 250,000 women, 230,000 children (besides those murdered in the womb,) and 24,000 Christian priests.”\* If such has been the effusion of blood *in France alone*, how will the dreadful catalogue of the miseries produced under

\* Gifford’s Preface to *Banditti unmasked*.

*the third woe* be swelled, when *all the wars*,\* which the revolution has kindled, are likewise taken into the account? how will it be yet incalculably swelled, ere the terrific blast of *this trumpet* has ceased, by *the time of trouble* predicted by Daniel at the close of *the 1260 years*; a time, such as never was since there was a nation even to that same time?† We have already beheld the effects of *the first and second woes*: do we need any further proof to convince us, that *the third woe* has begun to sound?

Having thus discussed the prophecy at large, I shall conclude with drawing my arguments to a point.

*The witnesses*: then are to be slain, not when they have finished their testimony, but when they are drawing near to finish it. This translation is at once required, both by the Greek idiom, and by the harmony of the prediction itself. *The witnesses* are to prophesy in sackcloth *only 1260 years*: and, at the end of that same period, the power of *the beast* and *the little horn* is to begin to be broken. Hence it is manifest, that *the slaughter* must take place *during* the period, not *subsequent* to it: for how can *the witnesses* be slain at the very time when their calamities are finished: and how can they be slain by *the beast*, when the judgments of God are gone forth to avenge his Church, and to slay *the beast* himself?

Let us next note the era of *the slaughter*. It is placed under *the second woe*, previous to the fall of *a tenth part of the Roman city* and the sounding of *the third woe*. But *the 1260 days* must necessarily extend to the commencement of *the last period of the third woe*, because *the beast* is overthrown under *the seventh vial*: therefore they cannot expire at *the slaughter of the witnesses*, which takes place under *the second woe*, and before even the *earliest blast of the third woe*.

Still it may be doubted whether *the witnesses* be yet

\* These wars, as we shall hereafter see, are predicted under *the third vial*, as the massacres and proscriptions of revolutionary France are under *the second*. These matters will be discussed hereafter.

† As yet we have only been spectators of *the harvest of God's wrath*, or *the first grand period of the third woe-trumpet*: the more dreadful period of *the vintage* is yet future (See Rev. xiv. 14—0.) The two periods of *the harvest and the vintage*, by *the former* of which I understand *the French revolution* considered in all the effects which it has produced, will be discussed hereafter.

slain or not, because it may be doubted whether *the third woe* has begun to sound. Let us for a moment lay prophecy aside, and attend only to history. *The rise of Mohammedism and the conquests of the Saracens* from one singular epoch in history: *the rise and conquest of the Ottoman empire* from another singular epoch: after these two, where shall we pitch upon a third epoch equally singular? Can any other answer be given, an answer which the passing occurrences of every day render more and more probable, except *the French revolution and its amazingly extensive consequences*? Now *the Saracens* and *the Turks* are universally allowed to be the subjects of *the two first woes*. And are *they* more worthy of a place in prophecy, than the daring impieties, the unheard of miseries, and the vast change in the constitution of the whole European commonwealth, which have flowed from *the French revolution*? Since we are compelled to date a new order of things from this tremendous convulsion, is it improbable that it should have been selected by the Spirit of God as one of the great apocalyptic eras? Is it improbable to suppose, that *the third woe* began to sound, when *the reign of Antichrist, of anarchy, and of atheism*, commenced?

But this is not all: we have a clue afforded us by the prophecy itself. Immediately before the sounding of *the third woe*, *a tenth part of the great Latin city* is overthrown by a violent *earthquake*; and the consequence of this *earthquake* is, that *seven thousand names of men* are slain, not merely *men themselves*, but *names or titles of men*. If therefore the application of *the third woe* to *the commencement of the reign of Antichrist* do not correspond with this particular, we may be absolutely sure, that it is erroneous: but, if on the other hand, it do minutely correspond with this particular, then we have attained to at least a very high degree of probability (so high as to fall little short of moral certainty,) that it is not erroneous; for, in that case, it will be difficult to conceive, how the prediction can ever be more minutely fulfilled, than it has already been. What then shall we say, when we find that it *does* exactly, and in every

point, correspond with this particular? *The reign of Antichrist* was ushered in by *the fall of monarchical France*, one of *the ten parts of the great city*, or (what is only another mode of speaking) one of *the ten horns of the Roman beast*: nay more; *the only one of the ten original horns* then in existence, and consequently *the only monarchy* by the fall of which the prophecy could possibly be accomplished. *Nine* out of *the ten original horns* had fallen by conquest or other political changes previous to the era of *the French revolution*: when *that revolution* took place, *the tenth original horn* fell: at present therefore *none of the ten original monarchical horns* are standing.\* Hence it is manifest, that, if the prophecy has not been already accomplished, it now never can be accomplished. The result therefore of the whole is this: if *the fall of the tenth part of the city* be *the first French revolution*, and if *the third woe* began to sound at *the commencement of the reign of Antichrist*; in that case, *the slaughter of the witnesses* must be past, because it takes place under *the second woe*, and consequently previous to the sounding of *the third woe*.

“ And the seventh angel sounded; and there were great voices in heaven, saying, The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord, and of his Christ: and he shall reign for ever and ever. And the four and twenty elders, which sat before God on their seats, fell upon their faces, and worshipped God, saying, We give thee thanks, O Lord God Almighty, which art, and wast, and art to come; because thou hast taken to thee thy great power, and hast reigned. And the nations were angry, and thy wrath is come, and the time 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

\* *The Anglo-Saxon horn* fell by the Norman conquest. But in *France*, when the crown was transferred from the Merovingians to the Carolingians, and from the Carolingians to the Capets, it never ceased to be worn by a dynasty of native princes. At *the revolution* that ancient monarchy was first overthrown; and now that the regal form of government is restored, the sceptre of Pharamond, the Frank, of Champaigne, the Frank, and of Hugh Capet, the Frank, is wielded by Napoleon Buonaparté, the Corsican. Our Henry VI. was indeed crowned *king of France*; but his title was never acknowledged by the English, and he was himself speedily dispossessed of the conquest of his father.

and great ; and shouldst destroy them which destroy the earth. And the temple of God was opened in heaven, and there was seen in his temple the ark of his testament : and there were lightnings, and voices, and thunders, and an earthquake, and great hail.”

The prophet, reserving a more full account of the several important events which were to take place under *this woe* for the pouring out of *the seven last plagues* and the chapters subordinately connected with them, gives us here a general preliminary statement of them. For the consolation of the afflicted Church he inverts the order of their accomplishment, placing the triumphant establishment of the kingdom of Christ, *before* God's assumption to himself of his great power ; *before* the time of his wrath ; *before* his destruction of those that destroyed the earth ; *before* the day of the anger of the nations ; *before* the last earthquake, which was to divide the great city into three parts, and to overthrow the cities of the nations ; and *before* great Babylon came in remembrance before God. Anticipating the final triumph of Christianity and the commencement of the millennium, he eagerly looks forward to that blessed period when the kingdoms of this world should become the kingdoms of our Lord ; and afterwards, as it were reluctantly, touches upon the calamities which yet remained to be fulfilled under *the seven vials*. The propriety of this interpretation of the passage will be evident, if we consider that *the seventh trumpet* was to introduce *the third great woe*, which surely cannot be the conversion of the world to Christ, and if we reflect that *all the seven vials* of the *last plagues* yet remain to be poured out ere the triumphant reign of the Messiah commences.\*

Thus it appears, that *the eleventh chapter of the Apocalypse*, or *the first of the little book*, extends through *the whole period of the 1260 years*. The *three remaining chapters of the little book* do the same : for *all the four*, in point of chronology, run parallel to each other ; and jointly give us a complete history of *the western Apos-*

\* See Mede's Works B. V. Summary view of the Apoc. p. 920—Bp. Newton's Dissert. on Rev. xi. in loc.—Sir Isaac Newton's Observ. on the Apoc. Chap. II. p. 254.

*tacy, and of all who are concerned with it whether actively or passively.*

## SECTION II.

*Concerning the war of the dragon with the woman.*

The main-spring of the *Apostacy* is the great red dragon, or, as the Apostle himself informs us, *the devil*. It was this grand deceiver of the whole world, that actuated *the two-horned beast*, and that employed at his instigation *the ten-horned beast*, to trample under foot the Gospel of Christ. Hence St. John thinks it necessary to dedicate *one whole chapter of the little book* to the full elucidation of his wiles.

“ And there appeared a great wonder 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 wonder in heaven; and behold a great red dragon, having seven heads and ten horns, and seven crowns upon his heads. And his tail drew the third part of the stars of heaven, and did cast them to the earth: and the dragon stood before the woman which was ready to be delivered, for to devour her child as soon as it was born. And she brought forth a man-child, who was to rule all nations with a rod of iron; and her child was caught up unto God, and to his throne. And the woman fled into the wilderness, where she hath a place prepared of God, that they should feed her there a thousand two hundred and threescore days.”

The excellent Bp. Newton appears to me to have failed in no part of his commentary upon the *Apocalypse* so much as in that of the present chapter. Although he had before very justly stated that *the little book* described the calamities of *the western church*, and as such was with good reason made a separate and distinct prophecy: and although *the little book* itself repeatedly declares that it comprehends *nothing* but *the history of the great Apostacy of 1260 years*, which commenced as we have seen in *the year 606*; yet he now supposes, in direct contradiction to his former statement, that St. John

resumes his subject from *the beginning, from the very first propagation of Christianity*. Hence he conjectures, that *the dragon*, which persecutes *the symbolical woman*, or *the Church*, is *pagan Rome*; and that he is styled *the red dragon*, because “purple or scarlet was the distinguishing colour of the Roman emperors, consuls, and generals;” that *the man-child* is primarily *the mystic Christ*, for whom *the Roman dragon* laid snares to destroy him in his infancy, as Pharaoh did of old for the male children of the Hebrews: but that *Constantine* however, the first Christian emperor, “was here more particularly intended, for whose life *the dragon Galerius* laid many snares, though he providentially escaped them all; and, notwithstanding all opposition, was caught up unto the throne of God, was not only secured by the divine protection, but was advanced to the imperial throne, called *the throne of God*; for there is no power but of God; *the powers, that be, are ordained of God*.” Agreeably to this system, his Lordship thinks that *the war between Michael and the dragon*, mentioned in *the succeeding verses*, is *the struggle between Christianity and Paganism*; and that *the fall of the dragon from heaven* is *the final overthrow of idolatry*. In a similar manner, *the wrath of the dragon* after he is cast down to the earth, is *the attempt to restore paganism in the reign of Julian*, and *the discord excited in the church by the followers of Arius*; and *the flood*, which he vomited forth from his mouth, signifies *the irruption of the northern barbarians*, whom Stilicho, prime minister of the Emperor Honorius, invited into the Roman empire. The Bishop however, being perfectly aware that *the woman’s recess into the wilderness during the space of 1260 days*, stood in direct opposition to the whole of his scheme, maintains, that this is said merely by way of *prolepsis*, or *anticipation*; and that she did not flee into the wilderness *at this time*, but *several years after*, during the reign of *Antichrist*: notwithstanding the prophet is at this very time professedly writing *the history of the 1260 days*; and notwithstanding *the three other chapters of the little book*, namely, *the chapter which immediately precedes this*, and *the two chapters which immediately follow it*,



are by the Bishop himself allowed to relate *exclusively to the events of the 1260 days in the West.* \*

This plan of interpretation is liable to numerous objections—*In the first place*, it is highly improbable that the prophet, after having *already* foretold the conversion of *the Empire* to Christianity under *the sixth seal*, should now at length, after he has begun to write the history of *the western Apostacy*, suddenly *return* to the pagan persecutions of the Church and the days of Constantine. To suppose this is to suppose that a professedly chronological prophet, without a shadow of reason, violates at once the order both of *time* and of *place*: the order of *time*, by suddenly turning back from *the year 606*, when *the Apostacy* in its dominant state commenced, to *the earliest days of Christianity* and *the year 312*, when Constantine became a convert; the order of *place*, by us suddenly quitting *the peculiar history of the West* for *the general history of the whole empire*, and more especially *that part of the empire which lay in the East*—*In the*

\* Sir Isaac Newton's mode of explaining the whole prophecy of *the little book* appears to me very unsatisfactory. In many respects, it is liable to the same objections as the scheme of Bp. Newton; and in some points, it is liable even to greater objections. Thus Sir Isaac conceives *the two women*, mentioned in the Apocalypse, to be *one and the same person*; notwithstanding their characters are evidently so different: and supposes, that *the woman* fled into *the wilderness*, when *the Roman empire* was divided into *the Greek and Latin empires*; notwithstanding the prophet represents her as fleeing there at *the beginning of the 1260 days*. The general outline of his whole explanation, so far as it regards the three grand symbols of *the little book*, is as follows. He conjectures, that *the dragon* is *the Greek or Constantinopolitan Empire*; that *the ten-horned beast* is *the Latin Empire*; and that *the two-horned beast* is *the church of the Greek empire*. In none of these particulars can I think him right, except in his opinion of *the two-horned beast*: and even of that his definition seems to me to be somewhat too limited, for *the sixth head of the ten-horned beast* when it revived was *the Constantinopolitan Emperor*. As for *the dragon* being *the Greek empire*, such an opinion is utterly irreconcilable with the plain declaration of St. John that he is *the devil* and nothing but *the devil*: and as for *the second apocalyptic beast*, there is scarcely a single point in which his character answers to that of *the Greek Church*. For *the Greek Church* never wrought miracles to deceive *the Latins*; nor did it exercise all the power of *the first beast* or *the Latin empire*, before him: nor did it cause *the whole earth* to worship *that beast*; nor did it set up *any image* for him; nor lastly did it ever forbid all to buy and sell, except those who bore the name and the mark of *the first beast*. In short, Sir Isaac's exposition entirely confounds the whole plan of *the little book*, which treats exclusively of the affairs of the West, as *the two first rose-trumpets* had already treated of the collateral affairs of the East.

Since Sir Isaac has discussed all these matters in a single chapter, I thought it best to throw together my objections to his scheme in a single note, and not resume the subject hereafter. I shall only add, that I have not brought forward any objection that might have been urged, but have only stated some of the principal ones. See Observations on the Apocalypse, Chap. iii.

*second place*, the Bishop's supposition, that *the dragon is pagan Rome*, runs directly counter to the unequivocal declaration of St. John, that *he is the devil*\*—In the *third place*, his conjecture, that *the man-child is Constantine*, is equally incongruous with the analogy of scriptural language. The description of *this man-child*, that he should rule all nations with a rod of iron, is evidently borrowed originally from the *second Psalm*, where the *universal dominion of Christ* is predicted. The same mode of expression is twice likewise used in the Apocalypse to describe the power which Christ exercises both in his own person and through the instrumentality of the faithful:† hence surely it is very improbable, that it should here be intended to allude to *Constantine*. Had the prophet meant to have pointed out *that prince*, he would scarcely have used such *very* ambiguous phraseology, as must by his readers have been thought *prima facie* applicable, not to *Constantine*, but to *Christ*—In the *fourth place*, the *prolepsis*, of which the Bishop speaks, is no where to be discovered in the plain simple language of the prediction. Nothing is there declared,

\* I have never been able to learn, upon what grounds Mr Mede and Bp. Newton so peremptorily pronounce *the dragon* to be the *pagan Roman empire*; and, as if such an opinion could not be doubted, interpret the whole prophecy accordingly. Nothing can be more definite than the language of St. John. He tells us unequivocally, that *the great dragon* is "that old serpent, called the Devil and Satan, which deceiveth the whole world." (Rev. xii. 9) If then *the dragon* be *the devil*, how can he be the *pagan Roman empire*? The circumstance of his being represented with *ten horns* shews plainly, that the agent, through whose visible instrumentality he persecutes *the woman*, is *the Roman empire in its divided state*. But *the Empire* was not divided till after it had renounced Paganism. The whole of the prophecy therefore must relate to *the Empire*, not when *pagan*, but when *p.p.l.* In short, what most decidedly shews it to be absolutely impossible that *the dragon* should be *the Pagan Roman empire*, he is brought again upon the stage long after *the Pagan Roman empire* had ceased to exist. Under the yet future *sixth vial*, an evil spirit is said to come out of his mouth (Rev. xvi. 13); and, at the commencement of *the Millennium*, after the destruction of *the beast* and *the false prophet*, he is bound for the space of a thousand years, and cast into the bottomless pit. Nor is this all: at the end of the thousand years he is again let loose to deceive the nations, and succeeds in forming the great confederacy of *Gog and Magog*; after the overthrow of which he is finally cast into the lake of fire and brimstone. It is observable, that in the course of the last prediction relative to him, he is no less than four times styled *Satan* and *the devil*: but, even independent of this circumstance, how is it possible that *the Pagan Roman empire* can perform all the actions ascribed to *the dragon*? (Rev. xx. 1—10.) Bp. Newton himself allows him to be *the devil* at the close of his career. If then he be *the devil* in one part of the Apocalypse, he must surely be *the devil* in every other part.

† Rev. ii. 27. and xix. 15

but merely that *the woman*, in consequence of *the dragon's* violence, fled into *the wilderness*, where she continued 1260 days: that, during her sojourn there, a war took place between *Michael* and *the dragon*; the result of which was, that *the dragon* was cast out of heaven: and that afterwards, still during her sojourn there, which the prophet carefully mentions a second time, *the dragon* vomited a great flood out of his mouth against her, in order that she might be completely carried away by it. In all this, I can perceive nothing like the slightest intimation of any *prolepsis*, but rather the very reverse: I can only discover a plain account of *the woman's* persecution during 1260 days: an account, which exactly tallies with the general subject of *the little book*; with *the 1260 days prophesying of the witnesses* in the preceding chapter, and with *the 42 months tyranny of the beast* in the succeeding chapter. Hence I conclude, that *this middle chapter* of *the little book* treats of the same period, that its *first and two last chapters* treat of—In the fifth place, the scene of the warfare between *the woman* and *the dragon* is laid, at least *the beginning of it* is laid, in heaven, or *the Church general*. *The dragon*, the persecutor, was a sign in heaven, no less than *the woman*, the persecuted. Whence it will undeniably follow, that *the seven-headed and ten-horned dragon*, must have stirred up this persecution against *the woman* through the instrumentality, not of a pagan, but of a nominally Christian, power. Heaven indeed is the symbol either of temporal or spiritual polity: \* little doubt however can be entertained in which sense it is to be taken in the present instance, when we note that both *the woman* and *the dragon* were equally signs in *this heaven*. Where *the woman* was, there was *the dragon* also. But, in the days of Paganism, imperial Rome alone occupied *the temporal heaven*: the Church was utterly excluded from it. *The heaven* therefore cannot be *the temporal heaven*. But, if it be not *the temporal heaven*, it must be *the spiritual heaven*, or *the Church*. And, if it be *the spiritual heaven*, or *the Church*, then the prophecy can have no relation

\* See the preceding chapter upon symbolical language.

to the persecutions of *pagan Rome*: for the empire, as *pagan*, never was in the *spiritual heaven*; and consequently cannot be *the dragon*, which the prophet declares to have been in the *self-same heaven* with *the woman*. In no sense therefore, either *temporal* or *spiritual*, can *the dragon*, upon Bp. Newton's interpretation, be placed in *heaven* at the same time that *the woman* was there.\*

\* The interpretation, which Mr Mede and Mr Whitaker give of this prophecy, is nearly the same as that of Bp. Newton. The point in which they vary from each other is the *man-child*.

An exposition, essentially differing from that of all these writers, has been offered by Mr Bicheno. He supposes the *dragon* to be the *Roman empire* from its first rise down to the moment of its present existence in the *German empire*. While it was *pagan*, it was only a *great red dragon*; but, when it was converted to Christianity, and thus got into the *Church*, it acquired the additional character of *Satan* or the *serpent*. *Michael and his angels* are the *Goths and other northern nations*. The *heaven*, out of which they cast the *dragon*, is *Italy*. The *earth* into which he is cast, is the *empire without the limits of Italy, or the Roman provinces*. After he has been thus ejected from *heaven or Italy*, he makes his appearance first in France when Charlemagne became *Emperor of the Romans*; and afterwards in Germany, where he has ever since continued. The *widowness*, into which the *woman* flees, symbolizes *Bohemia, Saxonia, and Moravia*; and the *war of the dragon* against the *woman* denotes the *persecution of the protestants in those parts by the Emperors of Germany*. The *seven heads* and *ten horns* of the *dragon* are the same as the *seven heads and ten horns of the beast*; which represents the *ecclesiastical tyranny of the Pope*. The *dragon* at the close of the *Apocalypse* is still the *German empire*. The *beast*, or the *Papacy*, will be first overthrown; at which period the *dragon* will only be bound, or have his power so weakened, as to be incapable of any immediate exertions: but, at the end of the *thousand years*, which are no more than a *thousand natural weeks*, he will be let loose again. That is to say, "after nineteen natural years and a quarter," for to this short period of time Mr Bicheno reduces the *thousand years*, "the imperial monarchy will again exert its power, from extensive alliances, and make one grand effort against the *Church of God*, the liberties of the regenerated nations, and particularly against the *Jews*, to prevent the re-establishment of their commonwealth:" but this effort will end only in the destruction of them that make it, for God will magnify himself in their everlasting overthrow. (Signs of the times, Part I p. 14, 15. Part III p. 129, 130. The destiny of the German empire passim.)

The objections, which I have made to Bp. Newton's scheme, might in themselves be sufficient to confute this singular exposition of Mr Bicheno: nevertheless I shall add a few remarks on those parts of it wherein he differs from the Bishop.—In his notion, that *heaven* means *Italy*, and the *earth* the *provinces of the Roman empire*, to say nothing of his not having a shadow of authority for making such an assertion, he is totally inconsistent even with himself. The *great star* that falls from *heaven* under the *third trumpet* he elsewhere supposes to be *Attila*. If *heaven* denote *Italy*, how did *Attila* fall out of it? So, in the present prophecy, the *woman* is said to have been in the *same heaven* with the *dragon*. At what period was the *Church* exclusively confined to *Italy*? Again: the *whole earth* is said to worship the *ten horns* of the *beast*, which, according to Mr Bicheno, is the *Papacy*. Did the *provinces* of the *Roman empire* also venerate the *Pope*? Was his authority totally disregarded in *heaven* or *Italy*? But the *seven heads* of the *dragon* are the same as the *seven heads of the beast*; and the *last head* of the *beast* Mr Bicheno supposes to be the *Pope*. If then the *existing head* of the *dragon* be the *Papacy*, how can the *dragon* in his present

The fact is, *this second chapter* of the little book, like its fellows preceding and succeeding, relates solely and exclusively to the events of the 1260 years.\*

state be the Emperor of Germany? Is the Pope the head of the German empire?—The thousand years however are only *nineteen nunci al years and a quarter*. Who, that has paid the least attention to prophecy, will tolerate an assertion which violates every principle of prophetic computation?—But the unfortunate Emperor of Germany, after he has been bound *nineteen years and a quarter*, is at length to perish fighting against the regenerated nations of Europe; that is to say regenerated according to the maxims of French democracy, against which Mr. Bicheno is very indignant that any one should presume to raise his hand. I ask where is he to find any of those regenerated nations? France, Holland, Switzerland, and the quondam Cis-Alpine republic, have been most effectually re-regenerated by Buonaparté: and the man who asserts that in the disastrous campaign of 1805, Austria was embarked in a crusade against liberty, must possess a most astonishing obliquity of intellect. I mean not to say, that Mr. Bicheno makes such an assertion, for all his writings were published before that period. I only conjecture, from the peculiar manner in which his *Destiny of the German empire* was lately re-advertised that he supposes the dragon to have been bound by the fatal battle of *Austerlitz*—Mr. Bicheno somewhat triumphantly asks, where is the dragon elsewhere used as a symbol of the devil? Now, even if it were not, it would be amply sufficient, so far as the present prophecy is concerned, to reply, that St. John tells us, no less than *seven times*, that the dragon is *Satan or the devil*; and therefore that I conclude him to be the devil. But Mr. Bicheno must surely either have overlooked the *third Chapter of Genesis*; or must have been ignorant, that the dragon of the ancients was not the poetical monster of the middle ages, but simply a large serpent. What St. John beheld, was a great red snake with seven heads and ten horns; not a creature with four legs and two wings like the fabulous griffin, as the licence of painters is wont ridiculously to represent the apocalyptic dragon—This leads me to notice the odd idea, that the Roman empire while pagan was only the dragon; but that when it was converted to Christianity, it became the serpent and the devil. Constantine was certainly not a pattern of primitive piety, and the Church in his days was by no means so pure as it had been: yet I really cannot digest the assertion, that the empire by embracing even a debased Christianity changed from bad to worse.

Mr. Lowman does not attempt to give a regular explanation of the prophecy relative to the dragon and the woman: but he very judiciously confines it to the period of 1260 days, and supposes it exactly to synchronize with the preceding vision of the witnesses, and the succeeding vision of the two beasts. “*The seven heads and ten horns*,” says he, “is a description so exactly agreeable to the description of the beast, that it may, I think, be justly understood as a limitation of the opposition here meant to the times of the beast, or to that time when the Roman power was represented by ten horns, as well as by seven heads and crowns; or not before ten kingdoms were erected by the nations which broke in upon the Roman empire, and divided it into many independent governments—The representation of the wild beasts in this vision (Chap. xiii.) refers to the same times with the two former visions of the witnesses prophesying in sackcloth, and the woman flying into the wilderness.” Lowman’s Paraphrase in loc.

On the whole, I think it abundantly evident, that the times previous to the commencement of the 1260 days are necessarily excluded; and consequently that the prophecy can have no relation to the *age of Constantine*.

\* All the four chapters of the little book must, in point of chronology, run either successive or parallel to each other. Three of these chapters, namely, the first, the third, and the fourth, (Rev. xi. xiii. xiv.) Bp. Newton himself supposes to run parallel to each other, all of them equally relating to the events

.....  
*Heaven is the Church general, the same as the holy city, mentioned in the last chapter. The woman is the spiritual church, consisting of true believers; the same as the temple, and the two witnesses. And the part of heaven, occupied by the dragon, is the nominal church of the Apostacy; the same as the outer court trodden under foot by the Gentiles, and as the great scarlet whore, hereafter mentioned by the Apostle as riding triumphantly upon the ten-horned beast.*

*The woman is represented, as being clothed with the Sun; to denote that her spiritual nakedness is only clothed by the righteousness of Christ: as standing upon the Moon, which, like herself, is a symbol of the Church: to mark, that she shines only with a borrowed light, being naturally a dark opaque body.\* and as wearing a crown of twelve stars; to shew, that, as the Church is a "crown of rejoicing"† to the Apostles, so the Apostles are the brightest crown of the Church.*

*The dragon, as the Apostle himself teacheth us, is "that old serpent, called the devil and satan." He is*

*of the 1260 years: yet, with singular inconsistency, he conceives the second of the chapters chronologically to precede the third: and, consequently, since the third treats of the same era as the first and fourth, the second must, according to his scheme, precede the first and fourth, no less than the third. Such a mode of interpretation completely destroys the beautiful simplicity, with which the little book is arranged. All its chapters, as I have just observed, must be either successive or parallel to each other. This being the case, if Bp. Newton makes the third chapter succeed the second, he ought likewise to make the second succeed the first, and the fourth the third: instead of which he selects one of the middle chapters of the book, and makes it precede all the others, which he supposes to run parallel to each other. This he does in direct opposition, both to the plain language, and the plain tenor, of the little book: Its three first chapters respectively declare, that they treat of the events of the 1260 years: (Rev. xi. 2, 3. xii. 6, 14. xiii. 5.) hence it is evident, that they must be parallel, not successive, to each other. As for the last chapter, (Rev. xiv.) though no such declaration is explicitly made respecting it, yet its contents, as Bp. Newton rightly observes, sufficiently shew, that "it delineates, by way of opposition, the state of the true Church during the same period, its struggles and contests with the beast, and the judgments of God upon its enemies." On the whole, I think it abundantly evident, that all the four chapters of the little book, run parallel to each other: consequently the second of them can have no connection with the age of Constantine.*

\* Bp. Newton supposes the moon here to mean the Jewish new moons and festive, as well as all sublunary things: but I cannot find, that this interpretation at all tallies with the general analogy of symbolical language. When the Sun means a temporal sovereign, the Moon, as Sir Isaac Newton very justly observes, and as I have stated in my chapter upon symbols, is "put for the body of the common people, considered as the king's wife?" when the Sun is Christ, the Moon will, in a similar manner, signify his mystical wife the Church.

† I. Thess. ii. 19

here represented with *seven heads and ten horns*, to shew us by whose *visible* agency he should persecute the woman; namely by that of the *seven-headed and ten-horned beast* mentioned in the next chapter: and he is said to be in *heaven*, because the empire which he used as his tool, made profession of Christianity; and therefore constituted *part*, although an *apostate part* of the *visible Church general*.\*

As he is described with *seven heads and ten horns* in allusion to the *first apocalyptic beast*, or the *Papal Roman empire*; so he is said likewise to have a *tail*, in reference to the *corrupt superstition* so successfully taught by the *second apocalyptic beast*, or, as he is elsewhere styled, the *false prophet*. With *this tail* he draws the *third part of the stars of heaven*, and casts them down to the earth: in other words, he causes *those Christian bishops*, whose sees lay in the *Roman empire*,† to apostatise from the purity of the apostolic faith. The appointed time, during which he is permitted to reign, is the *1260 years of the great Apostacy*: hence the woman is said to flee from his face, during precisely that period, into the *wilderness*, as *Elijah* heretofore did from the face of *Ahab*: and there, in the midst of the *spiritual barrenness* which spreads far and wide around her, she is fed with the *heavenly manna of the word* in her prepared place; as *Elijah* was, in the waste and howling desert, by the ravens.

Thus far the prophecy is sufficiently easy of interpretation, but the character of the *man-child* is attended with wonderful difficulties. That he must be *Christ* in some sense, is manifest, as *Mr. Mede* very justly observes:‡ but the matter is, how we are to interpret his character, so as to make it accord with the general tenor

\* It is observable, that our reformers never thought of unchurching the church of Rome; though they freely declared it to have "erred, not only in living and manner of ceremonies, but also in matters of faith." Hence, while they rejected its abominations, they did not scruple to derive from it their line of episcopal and sacerdotal ordination; well knowing, that *holiness of office* is a perfectly distinct thing from *holiness of character*, and that the consecration of a *Judas* was no less valid than that of a *Paul* or a *Peter*.

† We have already seen, that the *Roman Empire* is frequently represented in the Revelation as being a *third part of the symbolical Universe*.

‡ "Cum verba sint *Christi* periphrasis, necesse est ut huiusmodi *Christus* aliqui designetur." Comment. Apoc. in loc.

of the prediction. It seems at once extremely harsh, and altogether incongruous with the universal phraseology of Scripture, to suppose that *the absolutely literal Christ* can be intended by this symbol; for our Lord is invariably represented as *the husband*, never as *the son*, of his Church. Hence Mr. Mede conceives, and perhaps not without reason, that *the mystic Christ* is here meant, or *Christ considered in his members*; in other words, that by *the man-child* we are to understand *the whole body of the faithful, or the spiritual children of the Church*. The greatest difficulty however yet remains. Supposing this interpretation of the symbol to be the right one, how are we to interweave it with the prediction, so as to make them properly harmonize together? Mr. Mede believes *the pangs of the woman previous to her parturition* to denote *the persecutions of the Church during the days of paganism*; and *the catching up of the child & the throne of God* to signify *the introduction of the Christians into sovereign power by the conversion of the Roman empire under Constantine*. This interpretation however both completely violates (as I have already observed) the chronology of the prophecy, by carrying us back to a period long prior to the commencement of *the 1260 years*; and, in other respects likewise, is very far from being unexceptionable. If *the man-child* denote *the whole body of Christians*, why should they be said to be born more in the age of Constantine than in any other age? And, if numbers of spiritual children still continue to be born to *the Church* by the laver of regeneration, how can *the pangs of the woman* signify *the pagan persecutions*?

Mr. Lowman's scheme appears to me liable to much fewer objections than Mr. Mede's. Like myself he confines *the whole war between the woman and the dragon* to the period of *the 1260 years*, instead of going back to the days of primitive Christianity, and the age of Constantine; and most justly observes, that the prediction "plainly describes an afflicted and persecuted state of *the Church* in general, during this period." Having taken this ground, which to myself at least appears absolutely impregnable, inasmuch as it is twice so



particularly marked out by the Apostle,\* he paraphrases the passage relative to *the birth of the man-child*, as follows. “*The woman* ready to be delivered brought forth a man child, to intimate that *the Christian Church* should be continued by a constant succession of converts, notwithstanding all opposition. Thus Christ’s kingdom should prevail over all enemies, and break all opposition, as the ancient oracles prophesied concerning him, *That he should rule all nations as with a sceptre of iron*. As soon as *this child* was born, I beheld it caught up to God and his throne, to intimate God’s care and protection of *the true Christian Church*, and the safety of *the Church* in God’s protection.” †

This exposition is incomparably the best that I have hitherto met with. In the first place, Mr. Lowman assigns the prophecy to its right chronological era; namely *the period of the 1260 years*. In the next place, he very justly, I think, supposes *the travailing of the woman* to “mean *her fruitfulness*, and to denote *the number of converts to true religion*; rather than *the afflictions of the Church on account of her profession*,” as Mr. Mede imagines. And he justly adopts the most natural interpretation of *the catching up of the man-child to the throne of God*; namely, that it signifies *the superintending care with which the Almighty for ever guards his faithful people*. Yet even this exposition is not free from every objection. The question will still recur, Why should *the woman* be represented as bringing forth *the man-child* immediately before her flight into the wilderness during *the 1260 days*, rather than at any other era? Did she bear no spiritual children before that era? Has she borne none since? If the text indeed will sanction the gloss

\* Rev. xii. 6, 14.

† Lowman’s Paraph. in loc. He adds in a note, “Grotius supposes, I think, with great probability, that these expressions, *As her child was caught up unto God and his throne*, are an allusion to the preservation of Joash, in the time of Athaliah’s usurpation, when she put to death all the rest of the royal family. (2 Kings xi. 1, 3.) *Jeoshebah took Joash the son of Ahaziah, and stole him from among the king’s sons which were slain—And he was hid in the house of the Lord six years*. He was kept safe in one of the chambers of the temple, till he was brought out by Jehoiada the high-priest, and restored to the kingdom of David.” Thus the true worshippers of God shall not all be destroyed by the enemies of religion: some like Joash, shall be kept safe, as if in heaven, the true temple, till they shall appear publicly with victory, over their enemies.”

which Mr. Lowman has put upon it, that *the bringing forth of the man-child* intimates that *the Christian Church should be continued by a constant succession of converts*, I would without hesitation adopt the whole of his exposition; but I am not perfectly satisfied, that such a gloss is allowable. Let every person however judge for himself. The symbol of *the man-child* has always appeared to me by far the most difficult in the whole Apocalypse; whether we consider its general interpretation, or its particular application to the prophecy in question. Hitherto I have met with no exposition, that gives me *entire* satisfaction: but, at the same time, I readily confess, that, after much thought and labour bestowed upon the subject, I can produce nothing that pleases me better, or indeed so well, as this exposition of Mr. Lowman.\* In short, I consider the symbol of *the man-child* as a complete *crux criticorum*. Much has been written on the subject, but I have read nothing that is *wholly* unobjectionable. It is possible, that some future commentator may be more successful in his inquiries than those who have preceded him.

But, whatever difficulty there may be in satisfactorily interpreting the symbol of *the man-child*, every other symbol and every other particular in this vision are sufficiently plain. The whole prophecy relates to *the persecution of the true Church, by the papal Roman empire under the influence of the devil, during the allotted period of three times and a half or 1260 days*.

“And there was war in heaven: Michael and his angels fought against the dragon: and the dragon fought

\* The Jesuit Cornelius à Lapide supposes, like Mede and Lowman, that *the man-child* denotes *the faithful people of God*. “*Propriè et genuinè, filius masculus est populus fidelis et sanctus, quem Christo parit Ecclesia*” (Comment. in Apoc. in loc.) The objection, which I urge jointly to the opinion of Mede and Lowman, he rather cuts through, than answers. “*The Church*,” says he, “brings forth, and chiefly in the end of the world will bring forth, a masculine offspring to Christ, that is *the faithful*.” This however by no means meets the question. The point is, if *the man-child* denote *the whole body of the faithful*, why is he said to be born at one era rather than at another? The prophecy does not represent *the woman* as incessantly bringing him forth. I once thought, that *the man-child* or *the mystic Christ* might denote *the word of God*, both *Christ* and *the Scriptures* being equally so denominated by a conversion of terms not unusual among the sacred writers; and I bestowed some labour upon an attempt to prove this point: but I wholly failed of success, and I am convinced that such an exposition is altogether untenable.

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, called the devil and Satan, which deceiveth the whole world : he was cast out into the earth, and his angels were cast out with him. And I heard a loud voice saying in heaven, Now is come salvation, and strength, and the kingdom of our God, and the power of his Christ : for the accuser of our brethren is cast down, which accused them 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 death. Therefore rejoice, ye heavens, and ye that dwell in them. Woe to the inhabitors of the earth and the sea ! for the devil is come down unto 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 (*still*) persecuted the woman, which brought forth the man child. (Now to the woman were given two wings of a great eagle,\* that she might fly into the wilderness, into her place, where she is nourished for a time, and 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 her 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 the remnant of her seed, which keep the commandments of God, and have the testimony of Jesus Christ.”

Throughout the whole of the present prophecy, we cannot too attentively keep in mind, that *the dragon* is neither *the Roman empire* nor *the Pope*, although *the in-*

\* This idea is manifestly taken from that of Exodus, wherein the sojourn of the Israelites in the wilderness, from the face of the Egyptians, is described precisely in the same manner as the sojourn of the woman in the spiritual wilderness, from the face of the serpent. “ Ye have seen what I did unto the Egyptians : and how I bare you on eagle’s wings, and brought you unto myself” (Exod. xix. 4.) Bp. Newton, agreeably to the plan of interpretation upon which he set out, and which I cannot but think wrong, seems to imagine, that, *the eagle* being *the Roman-sign*, *the two wings* may allude to the *Eastern* and *Western empires*.

*stigator* of them both, but simply *the devil*: for this clear discrimination of character, which the Apostle anxiously as it were insists upon, will alone lead us to a right understanding of what is meant by *his fall from heaven to earth*. So long as Satan found an *apostate Church* a convenient engine for persecuting the faithful followers of Christ, just so long he continued in it: but, when the age of superstition and ecclesiastical tyranny was past; when the papal thunders were no longer regarded; and when he found, that *the two witnesses* ascended up into *heaven* not only in *Germany*, but in *Britain, Sweden, and Denmark*, in despite of all his attempts to prevent them; then it became time for him to quit his ancient station, and to seek some more convenient battery against *the symbolical woman*. Driven from *heaven* or *the Church*, and finding that he could no longer execute his gigantic plans of mischief through the instrumentality of *the Papacy*, he next took his stand upon *the earth*, and again renewed his attacks upon *the woman* and *her mystic offspring* with more virulence than ever. Not but that he still retained his influence over *the apostolical heaven*, and over many of *those stars* whom his long-fostered superstition had cast down to *the ground*: but the *Roman church* was henceforth only an *inferior consideration* with him: like a worn out instrument, its blows were not now attended with their former effects: a *new station* must be assumed, whence in an age of literature and refinement *the woman* and *the remnant of her seed* might be assailed with a greater probability of victory. This station, we learn from the prophet, was *the earth* or *the secular Roman empire*. Satan, no longer arrayed like an *angel of light*, like a *minister of the Church of Christ*, now assumed the garb of *humanity, liberality, candour, and philosophy*: and prepared to vomit forth from the dark dens of atheism and infidelity *that flood*, with which he hoped to carry away his enemy.

Flectere si nequeo superos, Acheronta movebo.

From this general statement, I shall descend to particulars. *The war between Michael and the dragon* does

not, I apprehend, relate *exclusively* to the war between the witnesses and the beast, mentioned in the preceding chapter, although it doubtless comprehends it as a part of one great whole. The difference between them is sufficiently striking to justify this supposition. *The war of the witnesses* took place in only one particular street of the great city. *The war of Michael* was carried on in the Church general. *The war of the witnesses* was fought upon earth; whence we may conclude, that it was not only a *spiritual* one, as being fought by the witnesses; but also a *literal* one, like those of the *Saracenic locusts* and *Turkish horsemen*, as being fought upon earth, and with a *material* enemy, the last head of the beast. *The war of Michael* was fought in heaven; and the weapons of his soldiers were not carnal, but spiritual; for they overcame the dragon "by the blood of the Lamb, and by the word of their testimony, and they loved not their lives unto death." This second war therefore comprehends the *spiritual*, though not the *literal*, part of the former war of the witnesses. It was not, like the first, begun and ended within the space of a few years; but it was a long-continued struggle between the powers of light, and the powers of darkness. It commenced with the *Apostasy* itself; it raged with dreadful fury in the age of the Waldenses and Albigenses: it issued in a signal victory at the time of the reformation, the victory here celebrated by the prophet: but it will continue, with abated violence, even after Satan has chosen a different and more formidable station, to the very end of the 1260 years; for, throughout the whole of this period, are the saints to be given into the hand of the papal horn, and the witnesses to prophecy in sackcloth. At the era of the reformation then, the great victory of Michael over the dragon was achieved. Then it was, that "salvation, and strength, and the kingdom of our God, and the power of his Christ," were manifested. Then it was, that "the accuser of our brethren was cast down, which accused them before our God, day and night," of the very same crimes which he had heretofore alleged against the primitive martyrs and confessors; *promiscuous fornication, infanticide, and even bestiality*. Then

it was, that "the heavens, and they that dwell in them," were called upon to rejoice; *heavens*, because the boasted catholicism of *the Roman heaven* was now annihilated, and *many reformed heavens or churches* were established, differing indeed unhappily in ecclesiastical polity, but holding one head, even Christ. And then it was, that a *woe* was prophetically denounced against "the inhabitants of the earth" or *the papal Roman empire in general*, and "of the sea," or *a part of it which was shortly to be convulsed by revolution in particular*; even that *third woe*, which was to be so much more tremendous than either of its *two predecessors*: "for the devil had come down unto them, having great wrath, because he knoweth that he hath but *a short time*." He had *many years* reigned triumphant in *the Church* under the *first* and *second woes*, during the long period of *the latter days*, during the age of superstition and idolatry: but his final great attempt to destroy *the woman* under the *third woe*, during the period of *the last days*, during the age of atheism and profane mockery, is to be comparatively only *a short time*. He was cast indeed from *heaven* under the *second woe*; but his *peculiar time*, the *short time* alluded to by the Apostle, commenced with the sounding of the *third woe-trumpet*. For this *last great woe* he had been diligently preparing, ever since his signal defeat by Michael and his angels: but his scheme was not ripe for execution, till the blast of the *seven'h trumpet* gave the signal for the open developement of infernal anarchy, and undisguised hostility to the God of heaven. *The seventh trumpet*, as we have seen, began to sound on the *19th of August, in the year 1792*, immediately after the last shock of the *earthquake on the 10th of August*, when the *French revolution* may be considered as accomplished. Now, supposing *the Apostacy* to have commenced in the year 606, it will be evident, that of the *1260 years* only 74 remained unelapsed in the year 1792: consequently Satan had but *a very short time* for the accomplishment of his *last plan*, compared with the *preceding centuries* of his sway in *the church of Rome*.

In order the more fully to perceive the exact fulfilment of the prophecy now under consideration, it will

be proper to trace the steps of *the dragon*, after he was cast out of *heaven*, and before the complete revelation of *Antichrist* took place under the *third woe-trumpet*.

At the revival of letters in Europe, the first discovery, that was made, was that of the multifarious absurdities maintained by *the Church of Rome*. These had long been held up to the world as the essentials of Christianity; and every impugner of them had been treated as a heretic. The consequence was, that the mummeries of *Po-pery* were charged upon *the Gospel*: and, because *they* were evidently ridiculous superstitions, it was thought to be ridiculous superstition likewise. Hence arose scepticism; which the subtle enemy of mankind soon matured into infidelity, and even into atheism.

The prophecy teaches us, that when *the dragon* quitted *heaven*, he retired to *the earth*, and *the sea*: and history testifies, that it was not long, ere the fruits of his labours were abundantly evident in *France*, *Germany*, and *Italy*. "It is certain," says Mosheim, "that in *the sixteenth century* there lay concealed in different parts of Europe several persons, who entertained a virulent enmity against religion in general, and in a more especial manner against the religion of the Gospel; and who, both in their writings and in their private conversation, sowed the seeds of impiety and error, and instilled their odious principles into weak and credulous minds. It is even reported, that in certain provinces of *France* and *Italy*, schools were erected, whence these impious doctrines issued."\* These continental infidels may be considered as the real fathers of our English free-thinkers. Accordingly "the histories of those times bear witness, that our English youth, who travelled even so early as the reign of James the First, returned too often with the seeds of vice and infidelity, which they gathered with

\* It is probable, that from some one of these secret schools proceeded the famous pamphlet of *the three impostors*, meaning *Moses*, *Christ*, and *Mohammed*: if indeed there ever were such a pamphlet. Infidelity prevailed even among *the Popes* themselves; as if, disgusted with the absurdities of the very superstition which was so profitable to them, they had sought refuge in the bosom of atheism. The blasphemy of Leo the tenth is well known. "Thine fable of Jesus Christ," said he to Cardinal Bembo, "hath done us good service." According to the Romanists, *every Pope* is infallible: what sentiments will they entertain of Leo?

the knowledge and the manners of more polished countries: and the court of Charles the second displays, in a very striking manner, the principles and habits, which the King and his Nobles had learned upon the continent. The general detestation of the hypocrisy and fanaticism of the Puritans tended to heighten their irreligion, and encouraged them to publish their opinions: but the kingdom at large was not infected by them; and the following reigns exhibit in ever rank of people an attachment to religion, and a zeal in its cause, which the annals of no other nation can furnish”\*

For a considerable length of time, however, infidelity was confined to the higher and the literary orders; the humble and unambitious Christian was happily placed without the sphere of its influence. The project of *the wily serpent* was as yet in its infancy: and little did those nobles, who encouraged it, imagine, that they were unwarily helping to construct an engine destined for their own destruction. But, as the period of *the third woe-trumpet* approached, Satan took at once both a wider and more systematic range. Infidelity was diffused in a manner unknown in any former age. No class of society was exempt from its poison. Publications, adapted to the comprehension of the lower orders, were zealously distributed throughout every country in Europe by the secret clubs of the illuminated: and, as a mind unused to argument, can readily see an objection, without being able accurately to follow the train of reasoning which pervades the confutation of it, a captious doubt, once injected into the head of a poor and illiterate man, can scarcely ever be removed even by the clearest demonstration of the evidences of Christianity.† Impudent as-

\* Hist. the Inter. Vol II. p. 135.

† A learned and much-revered friend of mine, (the Rev. R. Hudson, A. M. head-master of the Grammar school at Hipperholme,) some time since put into my hands a small tract, which was industriously circulated in his neighbourhood. It was replete with a variety of quibbling questions, which the merest sciolist in theology would find little difficulty in answering, but which were perfectly well adapted to puzzle the intellect of a plain unsuspecting labourer. In order to avoid the necessity of annexing *the printer's name* to a publication, it was ingenuously *ante-dated*. “It was by small tracts of this sort,” says the present worthy Bishop of London, “disseminated among the lower orders in every part of France, that the great body of the people there was prepared for that most astonishing event (which, without such preparation, could never have been so suddenly and so generally brought about), [the



sertion now occupied the place of proof; and a conviction of false representation was little regarded by those, whose object was to disseminate error, and who had regularly calculated that an atheistical publication would be read by many that would probably never see the answer to it. *Formerly* infidelity was conveyed in the shape of a *professed treatise*; and they, who chose to peruse it, were at least *aware* of what they might expect. Hence a careful Christian parent knew how to secure his inexperienced offspring from the effects of its poison. But *now*, there is scarcely a book which he dares to trust in the hands of his children, without first thoroughly examining it himself: and, even after *all* his precautions, his son may accidentally take up a treatise on *bot any* or *geology*, and rise from the perusal of it, if not an infidel, yet a sceptic. In short, the lurking poison of unbelief has of late years been “served up in every shape, that is likely to allure, surprise, or beguile the imagination; in a fable, a tale, a novel, a poem; in interspersed and broken hints; remote and oblique summaries; in books of travels, of philosophy, of natural history; in a word, in any form rather than that of a professed and regular disquisition.”\*

The sure word of prophecy has taught us where to look for the *real* origin of these infernal productions. “Wee to the inhabitants of *the earth* and of *the sea*! for the devil is come down unto you, having great wrath, because he knoweth that he hath but a short time.” It has done more. It has explicitly described to us the character of those abandoned men, those hardened scoffers, whom Satan was about to employ as his wretched tools in *the last days*.† The existence of such men we have witnessed with our own eyes: but, till lately, we were not aware of their existence in any other than their mere *individual* capacity.

public renunciation of the Christian Faith. In order to produce the very same effects *here*, and to pave the way for a general apostacy from the Gospel, by contaminating the principles and shaking the faith of the inferior classes of the people, the same arts have been employed, the same brevities of infidelity have, to my knowledge, been published and dispersed with great activity, and at a considerable expence, among the middling and lower classes of men in this kingdom.” Charge 1794.

\* Paley’s Moral Philosophy

† See the prophecies relative to *the last times* collected together in *the third Chapter of this Work*.

We have at present however upon record the confession of an arch-atheist, that there has long been in Europe, particularly in *april* Europe, a systematic combination of *the scoffers of the last days*, for the purpose of *at once* overturning the throne and the altar, of letting loose *at once* those 'two dogs of hell, *anarchy and atheism*.

"There was a class of men," says the notorious Condorcet, "which was soon formed in Europe, with a view, not so much to discover and make deep research after *truth*, as to diffuse it: whose chief object was to attack *prejudices* in the very asylums, where the clergy, the schools, the governments, and the ancient corporations, had received and protected them: and who made their glory to consist rather *in destroying popular error*, than in extending the limits of human knowledge. This, though an indirect method of forwarding its progress, was not, on that account, either less dangerous or less useful. In England, Collins and Bolingbroke; in France, Bayle, Fontenelle, Voltaire, Montesquieu, and *the schools formed by these men*, combated in favour of *truth*.\* They alternately employed all the arms, with which learning and philosophy, with which wit and the talent of writing could furnish them. *Assuming every tone, taking every shape*, from the ludicrous to the pathetic, *from the most learned and extensive compilation to the novel or the petty pamphlet of the day*; covering truth *with a veil, which, sparing the eye that was too weak to bear it, left to the reader the pleasure of guessing it*; *insidiously caressing prejudices, in order to strike at them with mere certainty and effect*; seldom menacing more than one at a time, and that only in part; sometimes *soothing* the enemies of reason, *by seeming to ask but for a half toleration in religion, or a half liberty in polity*; *respecting despotism when they combated religious absurdities, and religion when they attacked tyranny*: *combating these two pests in their very principles, though apparently inveighing against ridiculous and disgusting abuses*; *striking at the root of those pestiferous trees, whilst they appeared only to wish*

\* What the truth was, for which Voltaire combated, a long life laboriously spent in the service of a hard task-master has amply shown: and France has no less amply tasted the fruits of it.

to lop the straggling branches : at one time pointing out superstition, which covers despotism with its impenetrable shield, to the friends of liberty, as the first vic in which they are to immolate, the first chain to be cleft asunder ; at another denouncing superstition to despots as the real enemy of their power, and alarming them with a representation of its hypocritical plots and sanguinary rage ; but never ceasing to claim the independence of reason, and the liberty of the press, as the right and safeguard of mankind ; inveighing with enthusiastic energy against the crimes of fanaticism and tyranny ; reprobating every thing which bore the character of oppression, harshness, or barbarity, whether in religion, administration, morals, or laws ; commanding kings, warriors, priests, and magistrates, in the name of nature, to spare the blood of men ; reproaching them, in a strain of the most energetic severity, with that which their policy or indifference prodigally lavished on the scaffold, or in the field of battle ; in fine, adopting the words reason, toleration, and humanity, as their signal and call to arms. Such was the modern philosophy, so much detested by those numerous classes which exist only by the aid of prejudices. *Its chiefs* had the art of escaping vengeance, while they exposed themselves to hatred ; of concealing themselves from persecution, while they made themselves sufficiently conspicuous to lose nothing of their glory.”\*

In order as it were that the meaning of this rhapsody may not possibly be mistaken, the same Condorcet plainly tells us, what effects *this sort of truth*, propagated by Voltaire, did produce. Celebrating the glories and benefits of the *French revolution*, he observes, “ that it would have been impossible to shew in a clearer light the eternal obligations which human nature has to Voltaire. Circumstances were favourable. He did not foresee *all* that he has done, but *he has done all that we now see.*”† In order moreover, that we may not too candidly fancy, that Voltaire’s zeal was *only* directed against the *abuses of Popery*, while he respected *genuine*

\* Cited by Kett from *Esquisse d’un tableau historique des progrès de l’esprit humain*, par Condorcet. For the original, see the Annual Register, p. 200 : for the extract, Barruel’s Mem. of Jacobinism, Vol. ii. p. 133.

† *Life of Voltaire*, cited by Kett.

.....  
*Christianity*, he himself unequivocally informs us, that *the very Gospel of the Messiah*, whether embraced by protestants or papists, was *the real object* of his animosity.\* “I am weary,” says the pseudo-philosopher of Ferney, “of hearing people repeat, that *twelve men* have been sufficient to establish Christianity: and I will prove, that *one* may suffice to overthrow it—Strike, but conceal your hand—The mysteries of Mithras are not to be divulged: the monster must fall pierced by a thousand *invisible* hands: yes, let it fall beneath a thousand repeated blows—I fear you are not sufficiently zealous; you bury your talents; you seem only to *con’emn*, whilst you should *abhor* and *destroy* the monster—Crush the wretch.”

By the incessant labours of Voltaire, his diabolical principles, even before the foundation of Weishaupt’s order of *the Illuminated*, were protected by *the sovereigns* of *Russia, Poland, and Prussia*, and by an innumerable host of *Landgraves, Margraves, Dukes, and Princes*. They had penetrated into *Bohemia, Austria, Spain, Switzerland, and Italy*. They had many zealous advocates in *England*: they had thoroughly impregnated *France*: and, in short, had more or less pervaded *the whole Roman earth*, where *the dragon* had now taken his station after his expulsion from *the symbolical heaven*.

It is not however perfectly ascertained, that Voltaire wished for more than the overthrow of *religion* and *royalty*. Proud of his talents, he at first “did not pretend to enlighten housemaids and shoemakers, equally contemning the rabble, whether for or against him:” but, after the German union, a yet *more extensive* plan of mischief was resolved upon. The internal ingenuity of Weishaupt contrived a method of subverting not only *religion* and *royalty*, but *all governments whatsoever*: and Jacobinism, that consummation of united German and French villany, proposed to set mankind free from *every restraint* both of *human* and *divine* law, and to let them loose like wild beasts upon each other, an infuriated herd of *anarchists* and *atheists*.

\* The reader will have observed, that, in one of the clauses of the foregoing declamation of Condorcet, *religion* is used as the synonym of *religious abuses*: and *government* and *religion* are declared to be *the two pests*, which the new philosophy combats in their *very principles*.

In this manner it was, that *the dragon*, quitting *heaven*, for *earth*, and “having great wrath because he knoweth that he hath but a short time,” prepared to vomit against *the symbolical woman* a noisome *flood* of mock philosophers, German and French, illuminated and masonic, “with all their trumpery;” of philanthropic cut throats, civic thieves, humane anarchists, and candid atheists; of high-born Catilines, and low-born buffoons;\* of enlightened prostitutes, and revolutionary politicians; of popish priests, and protestant ecclesiastics, united only by the common bonds of apostate profligacy; of Jews, Turks,† infidels, and heretics; of the *catharmata* of the prisons of Lyons and Paris, wretches who, escaping the just sentence of the law, commenced the reformers of the world; in short, of *all* the filth and offscouring of *all* the kennels of *all* the streets of *the great mystical city Babylon*. At the sounding of *the third woe-trumpet*, the *flood* was at its height; and threatened to carry away in wild indiscriminate confusion every thing sacred and venerable, every thing salutary and dignified, every thing wise, every thing lovely, every thing that adorns this life, every thing that fits us for a better life. Woe to the inhabitants of *the Roman earth*; for the scourge of an unheard of war impends over their devoted heads! Woe to those that flounder in the miry waves of “*the vasty deep*,” the *turbid sea* of republican uproar “foaming out its own shame;” for the darkened sky portends a tempest of strange miseries hitherto unthought of! Short was the time that elapsed between *the great earthquake* and the blast of *the seventh angel*, when *revolutionary France*, in the phrenzy of democratic enthusiasm, established *atheism* and *anarchy* by law; held out the right hand of fellowship to the insurgents of every nation; commenced a tremendous massacre of her enslaved citizens; proclaimed the Son of God to be an impostor, and

\* During the French revolution, a *comedian*, dressed as a “priest of the Illuminati, publicly appeared, personally attacking Almighty God, saying, *No, thou dost not exist! If thou art power over the thunder-bolts, grasp them, aim them at the man who dares see thee, it shall fall in the face of thy actors. But no, I blaspheme thee, and I still live: no, thou dost not exist!*” (Barruel’s *Mem. of Jacobinism*, Vol. iii. p. 27.) To the catalogue of low-born buffoons Mr Thomas Paine may with much propriety be added.

† See *List the Interp.* Vol. ii. p. 267

his Gospel a forgery; swore to exterminate *Christianity* and *royalty* from off the face of the earth, as she had blotted them both out of her own dominions; and madly unsheathed the sword against every regularly established government. But the Church of the Lord is founded upon a rock; and he hath promised, that "the gates of hell shall never prevail against it." Although "the heathen rage, and the people imagine a lie;" although the destroyers of the earth "set themselves in array, and the rulers take counsel together against Jehovah, and against his anointed; *Let us break their bands asunder, and cast away their cords from us:*" yet "he, that sitteth in the heavens shall laugh; the Lord shall have them in derision." Congregated Europe, so God willed, met the infidels in arms. Long and bloody was the contest; for *the whole* "*earth helped the woman.*" Yet, notwithstanding the various successes of the atheistical republic, when the general pacification took place in *the year* 1801, *the earth* had swallowed up *the flood*, which *the dragon* cast out of his mouth. A trial had been made of modern philosophy; and even *French* vanity was compelled to own, that this its favourite child, however beautiful in theory, was but ill calculated for practice. *Atheism* was displaced from his throne, and *Christianity*, the *apostate Christianity* indeed of *the Church of Rome*, was nominally at least restored. This, although an unwilling homage paid to religion, was nevertheless not the triumph of *the mystic woman*. For that triumph we must look to *reformed* countries; and in a peculiar manner, I apprehend, to *Britain and her virtuous sovereign*. Here the *raging flood* has been in a remarkable manner swallowed up. Bursting as it did with hellish violence over *papal Germany, Italy, and Spain*; here its proud waves, by the marvellous interposition of Providence, have been stayed. Superior to all Europe, *France* was unable to break the single strength of *England*, even when republican artifices had banded against her the united force of *Russia, Sweden, Denmark, and Spain*; for *England* stayed herself upon her God. Adopting her Saviour's rule of judging men by their fruits, she perceived, ere long, that modern philosophy, notwithstanding its high preten-

sions, was any thing but *heaven-born*. In this favoured land its absurdities have been more ably and more fully exposed than elsewhere. *Here* peculiarly hath the Scripture been accomplished, that *the scoffers of the last days*, those resisters of the truth, "men of corrupt minds, reprobate concerning the faith, should proceed no further; for their folly should be manifest unto all." *Here* Christianity is still as little likely to be overthrown, as it was before Voltaire and his miscreant associates first drew the breath of heaven. *Here* the woman is still nourished in her "place prepared of God," though surrounded by a *wilderness of Popery, Mohammedism, and Infidelity*. *Here* she is still holpen "from the face of the *Serpent*," and from the raging waves of the *flood*. Resolute in honouring the religion of Christ, and in giving glory to his holy name, both *the sovereign* and *the people of England* have hitherto been enabled firmly and successfully to resist alike the secret artifices and open assaults of *the infernal serpent*.

"And the dragon was wroth with the woman; and went to make war with the remnant of her seed, which keep the commandments of God, and have the testimony of Jesus Christ."

We are repeatedly informed by St. John, that *the little book* extends through the whole period of *the 1260 days*, though a more particular account of *the last times* under *the seventh trumpet* is reserved for *the prophecy* that immediately succeeds *the little book*. Such being the case, it is evident, that *this war of the dragon against the woman*, being mentioned *at the very end of the whole history of the dragon's machinations*, will take place *at the very end of the 1260 days*, or, as Daniel expresses it, *at the time of the end*.\* But, if it take place *at the time of the end*, it must be the same as *the expedition of the infidel king* predicted by Daniel, and as *the war foretold* by St. John, as about to be undertaken by *a confederacy*

\* I have already observed, that *the four chapters of the little book* run parallel to one another; each extending from *the beginning to the end of the whole 1260 days*. *This war* therefore between *the dragon and the woman* will synchronize with *some part of the blast of the seventh trumpet*, mentioned in *the preceding chapter*: in other words, it will synchronize with *some one of the seven seals*, all of which are included under *the seventh trumpet*.

of the beast, the false prophet, and the kings of the Roman earth, under the seventh vial. As yet therefore it is future. It will be the last great effort of Satan against the Church previous to the commencement of the Millennium; an effort made by his two agents, *Infidelity* and *Poperly*, unnaturally then as at present leagued together, to oppress the faithful worshippers of God, and to prevent the restoration of the converted Jews.\* From the declaration, that it shall be a war against the remnant of the woman's seed, and from other parallel declarations,† I think we may infer, that it will be a sort of *crusade* or *holy war*; a war, entered upon by *Infidelity* and *Poperly*, under the pretext of *religion* and under a pretence of *zeal* for the catholic church, against those that have come out of the *mystic Babylon*, and have refused to be partakers of her sins. If I be right in this opinion, the powerful protestant kingdom of England will certainly be one of the principal objects against which the wrath of the dragon will be directed. Her courage and wisdom have long been the main instruments under God, of confounding all his measures, and of frustrating all his attempts. While he yet reigned in the symbolical heaven, she was his grand opponent, and thence obtained the glorious title of the bulwark of the Reformation: and now that he has been cast out into the earth, she hath still proved his most indefatigable and successful adversary, blasting his schemes, exposing his nefarious projects, withering the arm of his wretched vassals, and in the presence of the enslaved Roman empire, bearding them to their face with stern defiance. Hence we must expect, that his almost exclusive rage will be directed against her. The end however is not yet. This war, professedly undertaken against the roman and the remnant of her seed, has not yet commenced: and, when it does commence, whatever temporary and partial success may attend Antichrist and his rebel rout, it will eventually and speedily terminate in their confusion and utter overthrow. At the close of the 1260 days the dragon shall begin to gather together by secret diabolical

\* More will be said upon this subject hereafter.

† These will be considered in a future chapter.



agency *the beast, the false prophet, and the kings of the papal earth*, to the appointed place of their destruction at *Armageddon*; and shall cause his minister, *the infidel tyrant*, then become *the avowed champion of the false prophet*, to “go forth with great fury to destroy, and religiously to devote to extermination, many.” But, all though he shall succeed in “planting the curtains of his pavilions between the seas in the glorious holy mountain,” yet in vain shall he “sanctify war;” in vain shall he assemble his enslaved multitudes against *that mighty maritime nation*, which is destined to take the lead in turning the captivity of God’s ancient people. Unable to impede the progress of those “swift messengers” of the Lord “unto a nation dragged away and plucked, unto a people wonderful from their beginning hitherto, a nation expecting, and trampled under foot, whose land” *the symbolical “rivers”* of foreign invaders “have spoiled;” unable to frustrate the least of the high purposes of Jehovah, this lawless despiser both of things human and things divine, shall, in *the fatal battle of Armageddon*, “come to his end, and none shall help him.”\* Into these yet future matters however we must not dare to pry *beyond what is expressly written*. The book of futurity is as yet sealed; and who shall open it before the appointed season? We have in our hands *the prediction of the war between the dragon and the remaining seed of the woman*. We have it in *strict chronological connection with other prophecies*. We have abundant reason to conclude, that this war will commence at *the close of the 1260 days, in the last times of atheism and profaneness*. We know, that it must commence *after the dragon has been cast out of heaven; after he has taken his station upon earth; after he has vomited forth a flood against the mystic woman; after the earth has swallowed up the flood; when every current event bears testimony, that the third woe-trumpet is sounding, that the vials of the*

\* The proposition, that *some great maritime and commercial nation will be very much concerned in bringing about the restoration of the Jews*, is admirably proved by the present Bp. of St. Asaph, in his letter upon the 18th chapter of *Isaiah*. Whatever degree of probability there might be in the conjecture, his Lordship does not venture to assert, that *England will be this great maritime and commercial nation*; and his prudent reserve upon that point I cannot do better than imitate.

*last plagues* are pouring out, and that *Sa'an* is come down to the inhabitants of *the earth* and *the sea*, having great wrath; and *wh'n* prophetic truth and chronological computation dec'de with united voice, that "he hath but a short time," that *the period of the great Apostacy* is nearly expired. To this era, thus variously pointed out, *the time of the end*, or *the close of the 1260 days*, alone corresponds in every particular. May we, like Daniel, rest, and stand in our lot at the end of the days."\*

## SECTION III.

*Concerning the ten-horned beast of the sea.*

The prophet after having conducted us as it were behind the scenes, and shewn us that every string both of *the great Apostacy*, and of *the tyranny of Antichrist*, is in reality worked by *the infernal serpent*, next proceeds to bring us acquainted with the characters of the *ostensible* agents, *by whose ins'rumentality* and *through whose instigation* the Church was to be in a persecuted state through *the long period of 1260 years*.

"And I stood upon the sand of the sea, and saw a beast rise up out of the sea, having seven heads and ten horns, and upon his heads the name of blasphemy. 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 seat, and great authority. And I saw

\* Mr. Galloway is right in his general idea respecting this prophecy, that a prediction, immediately connected with the 1260 days, cannot possibly relate to the days of Constantinople: but he appears to me to be almost invariably wrong in his particular exposition of it. See Comment. p. 120—157.

† The Latin copies, the Alexandrian M.S., and the Syriac, read *and he stood*, meaning *the dragon*; and accordingly join the clause *and he stood upon sand of the sea* to the preceding chapter (Pol. Synop. in loc.) I know not however why we should give up the common reading, which is that of all the Greek copies with the single exception of the Alexandrian followed by Aldus, and which agrees remarkably well with the context. Mr. Mede wishes to adopt it, because he thinks, that it confirms his interpretation of the preceding chapter, and shews that *the rise of the ten-horned beast* is posterior to *the war of the dragon with the woman*. This however it certainly cannot do, even if it be adopted; for, as I have already stated very sufficiently *the woman's sojourn in the wilderness of 1260 days*, plainly intimates, that *the war of the dragon* is the very same, as *the 4<sup>th</sup> months tyranny of the beast*; and, consequently, that *the war* cannot in point of time precede *the tyranny*, as Mr. Mede and Bp. Newton suppose.

one of his heads as it were wounded to death ; and his deadly wound was healed : and all the world wondered after the beast. And they worshipped the dragon, which gave great power unto the beast, saying, Who is like unto the beast ? who is able to make war with him ? And there was given unto him a mouth speaking great things and blasphemies ; and power was given unto him to continue\* forty and two months. And he opened his mouth in blasphemy against God, to blaspheme his name, and his tabernacle, and them that dwell in heaven. And it was given unto him to make war with the saints, and to overcome them : and power was given him over all kindreds, and tongues, and nations. And all that dwell upon the earth shall worship him, whose names are not written in the book of life of the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world. If any man have an ear, let him hear. He, that leadeth into captivity, shall go into captivity ; he, that killeth with the sword, must be killed with the sword. Here is the patience and the faith of the saints."

In the preceding chapter, *the dragon* is represented as persecuting *the woman* with his *seven heads* and *ten horns* ; here we have the symbol of *a beast*, which has likewise *seven heads* and *ten horns*. Now, since *the dragon* is declared to be *the devil*, *the heads* and *horns*, which he is described as using against *the woman*, must be *the heads* and *horns* of *some power* subservient to his views. *This power* is now brought upon the stage.

According to Mr. Kett, "*the first beast of the Revelation, and the little horn of Daniel, are generally allowed to mean the same power, whatever that power may be.*"† and he afterwards asserts, that *this ten horned*

\* Or rather, *to practise prosperously*. The word *παύσει* does not so much describe his *existence*, as his *propriety*. At the close of the 42 months the judgments of God will begin to go forth against him : and he is then considered, it may use the expression, as *dead in law*, although some time will elapse before he is finally slain. There is reason to believe from Daniel that this time, which he styles *the time of the end*, which is the period of *God's great controversy with the nations*, and which synchronizes with *the last day*, will occupy a space of at least 39 years (See Dan. xii. 11-12). Indeed *the whole time of the end* seems to occupy a space of 7 years.

† Hist. the Interp. Vol. i. p. 385.

*beast is the Papacy,\** or, as he terms it, *the Papal Antichrist.†*

Nearly the same opinion is maintained by Mr. Gallo-way. He does not indeed allow, that *the first beast of the Revelation* is the same as *the little horn of Daniel's fourth beast*, for he asserts that *that little horn is the revolutionary power of France*;‡ but he has written a whole dissertation for the express purpose of shewing, that *the ten-horned apocalyptic beast is the Papacy.*§

Bp. Newton, with much more propriety than either of these two authors, observes, that “no doubt is to be made, that *this beast* was designed to represent *the Roman empire*; for thus far both ancients and moderns, papists and protestants, are agreed.”|| Had his Lordship steadily adhered to this simple, and indeed undeniable, proposition, I should have had the happiness of being able to sanction my own views of the subject with the authority of one of our ablest commentators upon prophecy: but, quitting the assertion with which he originally set out, he soon entirely diverts the attention of his reader from *the great secular Roman beast* (as the Bishop himself¶ styles it) to *that spiritual power* which Daniel symbolizes by *the little horn of the beast*. He commences his discussion with saying very truly, that *the beast is the Roman empire*; and *this beast* he afterwards pronounces no less truly to be *a secular beast*: yet, in the course of a very few pages, he informs us, that *the beast* is evidently *the little horn*, which he had already proved with irrefragable arguments to be *the Papacy*. Now *the beast* is said by St. John to be the same as *his own last head*:\*\* hence the Bishop, having

\* Yet he elsewhere teaches us, that *the little horn* is the same as *the second apocalyptic beast*, which he conceives to be *French Infidelity*. (Ibid. p. 347.) I have cited the whole passage, where this assertion is made, at the beginning of the 4th chapter of the present work.

† Ibid. p. 392—and Vol. ii. p. 1—66.

‡ This point has already been fully discussed in the 2th chapter of the present work.

§ Prophetic Hist. of the Church of Rome. ¶ Dissert. on Rev. xiii.

|| Dissert. on Rev. xiii. Mr. Mede, in a similar manner, although his opinion be the same as that of the Bishop, especially styles the first apocalyptic beast *the secular beast*, and the second *the ecclesiastical beast*. See his Comment Apoc in loc.

\*\* “The beast, that was, and is not, even he is the eighth, and is of the seven” (Rev. xvii. 11.) Some suppose, that this is spoken by way of synec-

pronounced *the beast* to be *the little horn* or *the Papacy*, of course pronounces *the Papacy* to be *the last head* likewise: that is to say, he makes a *spiritual power* to be *the last head of the beast*, and consequently *the whole beast*, notwithstanding he had declared that *this very beast is a secular empire*.

Respecting this opinion it may be observed, that, if *the beast* be a *secular empire*, it is impossible that his *last head*, which is identified with himself, should be a *spiritual power*; because, if that were the case, *the beast* would no longer be a *secular empire*, but a *spiritual one*. *Popery* indeed, like *Mohammedism*, is symbolized, merely as an *ecclesiastical kingdom*, by a *horn originally small*, and afterwards becoming so powerful as to have a look more stout than its fellows, and as to influence the actions of the whole *beast*; nor is there any inconsistency in representing symbolically what has really happened, namely the rise of an *ecclesiastical kingdom out of a secular empire*; but I can form no idea how it is possible, that *the papal horn* should be considered as *the last head of the secular beast*, when *that head* is declared to be the same at its first rise as *the whole secular beast* himself. *The Pope* can only be *the last head of the secular beast* either in his *spiritual* or in his *secular* character. He cannot in his *spiritual*; because *the last head of the beast* is to be the *whole beast*; and no ingenuity can shew, that an *ecclesiastical kingdom, as such*, is the same as a *secular empire*. He cannot in his *secular*, as sovereign of *St. Peter's patrimony*: both because it is unreasonable to esteem a petty *temporal* prince the head of a great *secular empire*; and because, as I have just observed,

doché; but I know not what right we have to tamper with the plain declaration of the Apostle. (See Pol. Synop. in loc.) I consider it as a very leading part of the prophecy, and as being studiously introduced to prevent any possibility of mistake respecting the power intended by the *last head*. *The temporal dominion* of all the *six first heads*, springing up as they respectively did before the division of the Empire, extended over *the whole of the Empire*; and we are here assured by St. John, that *the temporal dominion of the last head*, notwithstanding the division of the Empire into the *ten horns*, shall extend over *the whole of the Empire* likewise. Would we then discover *the last head*, we must seek for a power whose dominions have been commensurate with *the whole Western Empire*; for *this last head*, whatever it may be, is, like its six predecessors, to be *the whole beast*.

*the last head* was to be *the whole secular beast* at its first rise, which *the Pope* as a temporal prince never was.

I am perfectly aware, that to this objection Bp. Newton would reply, that *the Pope* is "*the head of the state* as well as of *the church, the king of kings, as well as the bishop of bishops;*"\* that there is no contradiction in a person being at once *the head* both of *the state* and *the church*; and consequently that *the Pope*, although a *spiritual* character, may be justly esteemed *the head of the secular beast* in his capacity of "*king of kings.*" I am aware likewise, that the canonists assert, that "there is no sovereign power but in *the Pope*;" and that *the Popes* have repeatedly maintained, that all regal authority is derived from them, as in that remarkable instance when *Boniface the eighth* wrote to *Philip the Fair*, "We will have thee know that thou art subject to us both in *temporals* and *spirituals.*"† But to all such arguments as these the answer is sufficiently obvious: there is a very wide difference between *only claiming* and *really possessing* temporal supremacy. Now *the Popes* have been sufficiently importunate in *claiming* the title and authority of "*king of kings;*" and, had they succeeded in *establishing* such a claim, I could readily have allowed that they might be, what Bp. Newton supposes them to be, *the last head of the secular beast*:‡ but, if we con-

\* Bp. Newton's Dissert. on Rev. xiii.

† Whitaker's Comment. p. 234—234, 256, 257.

‡ Mr. Whitaker, who mars Bp. Newton's much more simple exposition by fancying that *the Papacy* is *the Dictatorial head revived*, cites Dr. Barrow as asserting, that in the last Lateran council, "one bishop styled the *Pope prince of the world*: another orator called him *king of kings and monarch of the earth*; another great prelate said of him, that *he had all power above all powers both of heaven and earth.*" (Whitaker's Comment. p. 256.) He likewise cites a sermon of *Pope Innocent the third* as containing the following passage. "The church, who is my spouse, does not at her marriage come to me empty handed. She has bestowed a precious, an invaluable, dowry on me; an absolute power in spirituals, an extensive authority in temporals. She has given me the mitre for the ensign of my spiritual, and the crown of my temporal, jurisdiction: the mitre as priest, the crown as king; constituting me his vicar, who bears this inscription written on his thigh and his vestment, *King of kings and Lord of lords.*" (Ibid. p. 234.) He further cites a bull of *Sixtus the fifth* against the *king of Navarre* and the *Prince of Condé*, wherein it is declared, that "the authority delegated to St. Peter and his successors, by the infinite power of the Eternal, is above all power of the kings of the earth; that theirs it is to enforce the observance, and to punish the infringers of it, by pulling them from their thrones, how powerful soever they be, and casting them to the earth as ministers of Satan" (Ibid. p. 239.) In all these declarations however I can discover nothing like a proof, that *the Pope* is *head of the state*, and therefore

suit history, we shall find that the very reverse is the case: the claim has often been *made*, but it has never been *allowed*\* by the great European powers: consequently, if it has never been *allowed*, but on the contrary strenuously *resisted*, with what propriety can we admit the scheme, which makes *the Pope* to be *the last head of the secular beast*, as being “the head of *the state* as well as of *the church*, the *king of kings* as well as *bishop of bishops*?”

When *Pope Hiliebrand* excommunicated and deposed *the Emperor Henry*, that prince called an assembly, and asked their opinion respecting the pretended right of *the Pope* to depose an *Emperor*: upon which, all, both Germans and Italians, unanimously pronounced, that *the Pope*, instead of having power over *the Emperor*, owed him obedience.† So likewise, although *the Emperor Frederic* condescended to hold *the Pope's* stirrup, he first declared, that this was no mark of homage, but only a compliment paid to his holiness as the spiritual representative of Christ.‡ *The same Emperor*, in order to shew his independence of *the Pope*, repudiated his wife by his own authority:§ and, when *the Pope* had

*a head of the secular beast*. I learn from them most undeniably, that *the Popes* have repeatedly *claimed* a temporal, no less than a spiritual supremacy: but, before I can allow that they constitute *a head of the beast*, I must have it shewn to me that their claim has been *allowed*. Till this be done, we are only informed what *the Popes* have been *styled* by themselves and their flatterers, not what they *really are* and *have been*. Exactly the same remark applies to Mr. Sharpe's observations upon the same subject. *The Pope* may call himself *Rexor Orbis*, and claim an authority over all the kings of the earth, so long as he pleases; but this *alone* will never prove that he *is* the ruler of the world, or that any such authority is *allowed* to him. (Append. to an Inquiry into the description of Babylon p. 11.) It is not unworthy of notice, that even the *claim* of temporal supremacy was not made by *the Popes*, till a considerable period after they had been declared *supreme head of the Church*. The insolent *Gregory the second*, throughout his whole quarrel with *Leo Isauricus* respecting image-worship in the year 727, though he vehemently claimed the power of excommunicating even sovereign princes, presumed not to assert that he possessed any *temporal supremacy* over *the Emperor*. In one of his epistles to *Leo*, “the limits of civil and ecclesiastical powers are defined by the Pontiff. To the former he appropriates the body; to the latter, the soul: the sword of justice is in the hands of the magistrate; the more formidable weapon of excommunication is entrusted to the clergy; and, in the exercise of their divine commission, a zealous son will not spare his offending father; the successors of St. Peter may lawfully chastise the kings of the earth.” (Hist. of Decline and Fall, Vol. ix. p. 135.) Indeed several years afterwards, it is sufficiently manifest, that *the Pope* was a mere feudal vassel of Charlemagne, whom he acknowledged to be his rightful sovereign.

\* At least never allowed with any continuance, and certainly never allowed by all the great powers at the same time.

† Mod. Univ. Hist. Vol. xxix. p. 86. + Ibid. p. 118. § Ibid. p. 117.

presumed to assert that he bestowed upon him *the Empire* as a fief of *the holy see*, he published a manifesto, in which he openly gave the lie to all those who should dare to say, that he held his crown of any other than God himself, declaring that he would rather resign it altogether than suffer it to be debased in his possession.\* In a similar manner, when *Pope Innocent the third* excommunicated and deposed *the Emperor Philip*, the German nobility of his party complained in a letter to *the Pope*, that his holiness had intermeddled in the election of a king of the Romans, contrary to the rights of the German princes and the duty of his own pontificate, which originally depended upon the imperial crown.† So again, when *Pope Honor us* threatened to excommunicate *the Emperor Frederic the second* on account of his expelling from their sees some bishops who were creatures of the *Pope*, he was plainly informed, that *the Emperors* had always possessed an authority and sovereign jurisdiction over the ecclesiastical state, that his grand-father and father had maintained this jurisdiction in full force, and that he neither could nor would divest himself of it to the prejudice of the Empire and his successors.‡ *The Emperor Albert* indeed was compelled by the exigencies of the times to own, that kings and emperors received the power of the temporal sword from *the Pope* :§ but afterwards, when *Pope John* declared *the imperial dignity* to be a fief of *the holy see*, the *Emperor Louis* assembled all the learned men of Germany, both of the clergy and the laity, to give their opinion of the bull which contained such a claim. These all concluded, that it was unjust, unreasonable, and contrary to the Christian religion, as tending to abolish the sovereign power of princes ; and the states of *the Empire* requested *the Emperor* to take care, that the imperial dignity should not be trampled upon, nor the Germanic liberty reduced to bondage.|| Finding however that *the Popes* still from time to time renewed their pretensions, the princes of *the Empire*, ecclesiastical as well as secu-

\* Mod. Univ. Hist. Vol. xxix. p. 120, 121.

† Ibid. p. 168.

‡ Ibid. p. 180.

§ Ibid. p. 257.

|| Ibid. p. 294, 295, 296.



lar, at length enacted the famous constitution by which *the Empire* was declared to be forever independent of *the Pope*.\*

If from *the Empire* we pass to *Hungary*, we shall find, that *the temporal supremacy of the Pope* was in *the year 1303* so steadily resisted in that country, that his holiness himself was excommunicated by the Hungarian bishops, in consequence of his having presumed to lay the city of Buda under an interdict, because his pretended right to dispose of the crown of that kingdom was resolutely denied.†

In our own country, when *Pope Hildebrand* summoned *William the Conqueror* to do homage for *the kingdom of England*, as a fief of *the Roman see*, *William* replied, that he held his crown only of God and his own sword; and, when the nuncio threatened him with the censures of the Church, he published an edict, forbidding his subjects to acknowledge *any Pope* but such as he should approve, or to receive any order from Rome without his permission.‡ *England* indeed submitted to *the Pope* in the disgraceful reign of *king John*: but in that of his successor the English agents at the council of Lyons protested against the act, and declared that *John* had no right without the consent of his barons to reduce the kingdom to so ignominious a servitude.§

As for *France*, when *Boniface the eighth* claimed a temporal superiority over *Philip the Fair*, the states of the kingdom formally disavowed the authority of *the Pope*, and maintained the independent sovereignty of that prince ||

So likewise, when *Gregory the seventh* claimed the same superiority over the different kingdoms of *Spain*, *Don Alonso* and *the other sovereigns* unanimously declared, that they were independent princes, and would own no superior upon earth.¶

Thus it appears, when we descend to facts, upon what very slender grounds Bp. Newton makes *the Pope*

\* Mod. Univ. Hist. Vol. xxix. p. 311.

† Ibid. Vol. xlii. p. 32.

‡ Smollett's Hist. of England, Vol. i. p. 418.

§ Mod. Univ. Hist. Vol. xxxix. p. 174.

|| Ibid. Vol. xxiii. p. 327.

¶ Ibid. Vol. xx. p. 63.

to be *the last head of the secular beast*, “the head of *the state* as well as of *the church*, the *king of kings* as well as the *bishop of bishops*.”

Nor is this the only objection to which the system of Bp. Newton is liable. In a prophecy of Daniel already considered, *four great beasts* or *universal empires*, are described as rising successively out of *the sea*. The *last* of them, like *the apocalyptic beast* now under consideration, is said to have *ten horns*, to be exceeding terrible, and to be different from those which preceded it. Hence I collect, that *the fourth beast of Daniel*, and *the first beast of St. John*, are designed to symbolize *the same power*. No doubt however is entertained, that *Daniel's fourth beast* is *the Roman empire*; it follows therefore, agreeably to Bp. Newton's *original proposition*, that *St. John's first beast* is *the Roman empire* likewise at some period or other of its existence. Now *this fourth beast of Daniel* is said to have a *little horn*, springing up among his *ten larger horns*: which *little horn* has been shewn to be *the Papacy*. If then *the little horn* be *the Papacy*, and if *Daniel's fourth beast* be not *the Papacy*, but *the Roman empire* out of which *the Papacy* sprung; *St. John's first beast*, being the same as *Daniel's fourth beast*, must assuredly be *the Roman empire* likewise, and therefore cannot be *the Papacy*. To me, I must be free to confess, it is a matter of no small wonder, that *the first beast of St. John* should ever have been thought to symbolize *the Papacy*; for, if *this beast* be the same as *Daniel's fourth beast*, a point maintained even by Bp. Newton himself, he certainly cannot be likewise the same as only *the little horn* of *that very identical beast*. The reason is manifest: such a supposition as this does in fact make *Daniel's fourth beast* precisely the same as *his own little horn*; a supposition to the full as unwarrantable, as to conclude that he is the same as *any one* of his other *ten horns*.\* Yet does Bp. Newton, not regarding

\* Such a supposition cannot be better confuted than in the following passage. “ Si Malvendæ et Lessio fides habeatur, bestia hæc Johannis decacornis et septiceps nihil aliud erit quam cornu illud parvulum bestæ quartæ Danielis: et proinde decem cornua apud Danielem non erunt cornua bestie, sed parvi istius corniculi, quod tamen post illa decem exortum est, septemque capita apud Johannem ejusdem corniculi capita erunt. Quo quid absurdius!

this manifest violation of symbolical analogy and figurative propriety, adopt the inconsistent scheme of typifying *the Papacy* both by *the eleventh horn of a beast*, and by *the identical beast himself* to whom *that eleventh horn belongs*.\*

*The seven-headed and ten-horned apocalyptic beast* then is the same as *the fourth and ten-horned beast of Daniel*: in other words, he is *the Roman empire*; which, according to the sure declaration of prophecy, is *the last universal empire* with which *the Church* shall be concerned. Daniel does not mention *the seven heads of this beast*, nor does he specially define *his form*; he only observes, that he was dreadful, terrible, and strong, and that he was diverse from *all the beasts* that were be-

Certè si bestia illa quarta Romanum est imperium, sunt hæc cornua ipsius bestiae, h. e. Romani status, vel reges provinciarum, in quas imperium illud dividendum est." Downham: apud Pol. Synop. in loc.

\* It was observed to me, with his usual acuteness, by the present Bp. of St. Asaph, in a conversation upon this very subject, that it is impossible for *one of the horns of a symbolical beast* to mean the same thing as *the symbolical beast himself*. *A head*, importing as it does *a form of government*, must necessarily be in some sort identified with *the beast or empire* over which it presides, because they jointly form only *a single body politic*: but *a horn*, importing *one of the kingdoms which have sprung out of an empire*, can never be identified with *the whole empire*, of which it constitutes only *a single part*. Hence St. John does not say, that *the six first heads of the beast* are respectively the same as *the beast himself*; because such an observation would have been plainly superfluous, *the empire* under all its *six heads* being in an undivided state, and therefore of course universally subject to *its six successive forms of government*: but he specially observes that *the last head* should be *the beast himself*; because, although *the empire* previous to the rise of *this last head* had branched out into *ten horns*, yet *this last mighty head* should at its first rise so completely swallow up most of *the ten separate horns*, as to become, like *each of its six predecessors*, the *whole beast*, however unexpected such an event might be after the division of the empire. *A power* may indeed be symbolized both by *the little horn of one beast*, and by *the whole body of another distinct beast*, as is the case with *the Spiritual kingdom of the Papacy* expanding into *a spiritual empire*: but it certainly cannot be symbolized both by *the horn of a beast* and by *the very identical beast to whom that horn is attached*.

Mr. Bicheno adopts and states the commonly received interpretation in such a manner as to make it plainly confute itself. "What is here (Dan. vii. 8.) represented under the emblem of *a horn of the fourth beast* is the same tyranny which is shewn to John (Rev. xiii. 1—10.) as *a beast*. In this all our best commentators are agreed. Nor let it seem strange, that what is here prefigured by *a horn of the fourth beast*, the Roman dominion, should be represented in another vision as *a beast with seven heads and ten horns*;" (Signs of the times. Part I p. 13.) To me, I must confess, such a mode of exposition appears very strange. *The ten-horned beast of Daniel* is manifestly *the ten-horned beast of St. John*; how then can *the little horn*, which sprung up long after the rise of *the beast*, be *the beast himself*; and how can *the apocalyptic beast*, six of whose heads according to Mr. Bicheno's own plan are *secular heads*, symbolize nothing except the *ecclesiastical Roman power*?

fore him: but St. John amply supplies this deficiency, by informing us, that he had not only *the ten horns* noticed by Daniel, but likewise *seven heads*; and that *his shape* was compounded of *all the three beasts* which preceded him, *the Babylonian lion, the Medo-Persian bear, and the Macedonian leopard.*

I. This general position being established with the full *original* consent even of Bp. Newton himself, the first point to be considered is, in what sense St. John could be said prophetically to behold the rise of *the Roman empire*, when it had already been in existence many ages before *he* was born, and when even he himself unequivocally declares such to be the case.\*

The Apostle affords us two distinct solutions of this important question: *first* by teaching us that *the beast*, after *his rise from the sea*, should have power given him to continue *forty two months* or *1260 years*,† the very period during which *his little horn* was to carry on its persecutions against *the saints*; and *afterwards* by telling us, that *this some beast* “was, and is not, and yet is.” Hence it appears, that, in *some sense* or *another*, the *Roman beast* was to possess a wonderful peculiarity which should most essentially distinguish him from his *three predecessors in universal empire*: he was first to *exist*; afterwards he was to *cease to exist*; and lastly, he was *again to come into existence.*

“The mystery of the woman, and of the beast that carrieth her, which hath the seven heads and ten horns. The beast, that thou sawest, was, and is not; and shall ascend out of the bottomless pit, and go 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 yet is.”

From comparing this passage with St. John's assertion, that *he saw the beast rise out of the sea*, and that

\* See. Rev. xvii. 10.

† “Power was given unto him to continue forty and two months.” What is here translated *continue* ought rather to be translated Hebraically *practise* or *prosper*. Now *the Roman bear* revived, and began to *practise*, when he delivered *the saint's* into the hand of *his little horn*: consequently *the period of his practise*, and *the reign of his little horn*, are necessarily commensurate. See Bp. Newton's Dissert. on Rev. xiii.

having thus arisen he was to possess power forty two months ; it will be manifest, that *the second period of the beast's existence* begins with, terminates with, and is therefore exactly commensurate with, *the 1260 years of the great Apostacy*. consequently, that it precisely coincides with the tyrannical reign of *his own little horn* during a time, times, and half a time ; with the treading of *the holy city* under foot during forty two months ; with the prophesying of *the two witnesses* during 1260 days ; and with the flight of *the woman* into the wilderness, from the face of *the dragon*, during the same period.\*

The near alliance of *the Apostacy* and *the beast* will lead us to the right understanding of what is meant by his *having been*, his *not being*, and his *renewed existence*. † “ *A beast*,” as Bp. Newton most truly observes, and as I have already very fully stated in a preceding chapter, “ *A beast*, in the prophetic style, is a *tyrannical idolatrous empire* : the *kingdom of God* and of *Christ* is never represented under *the image of a beast*.” This being the case, *an empire* is said to *continue in existence as a beast*, so long as it is a *tyrannically idolatrous empire* : when it puts away *its idolatry and tyranny*, and turns to the God of heaven, *the beast*, or those qualities whereby the empire was a beast, *ceases to exist*, though *the empire itself* may still remain : and, when it resumes *its idolatry and tyranny*, though they may not perhaps bear precisely the same names as *its old idolatry and tyranny*, it then once more recommences its existence in its original character of a *beast*. So singular a circumstance as this never happened either to *the Babylonian beast*, *the Medo-Persian beast*, or *the Macedonian beast*. Whatever may have been the sentiments of Nebuchadnezzar, Darius the Mede, and his nephew Cyrus ; whatever decrees they may have promulged in favour of true religion throughout their widely extended dominions ; whatever privileges they may have granted to the ancient people of God : the

\* See the preceding 5th chapter of this work. This coincidence of times seems to have been the principal reason why *the ten-horned beast* has been so frequently confounded with his own *little horn* or *the Papacy* : each was to continue in power 1260 days.

† “ —the beast that was, and is not, and yet is ” The Complutensian edition reads “ was, and is not, and yet shall be.”

voice of history bears ample testimony, that their subjects, *as a body*, never ceased to be idolaters.\* But this singular circumstance *has happened to the Roman beast, and to the Roman beast alone.* That empire was originally a *beast*, by its profession of paganism, and by its persecution of the first set of men of understanding mentioned by Daniel:† it ceased to be a *beast* under Constantine the great, when it embraced Christianity, and became the protector of the church: and it again relapsed into its *bestial state*, when it set up the tyrannical supremacy of the *Pope*, adopted the worship of saints and martyrs, and bitterly persecuted the second set of men of understanding.‡ Now the *beast* erected the spiritual domination of the *Pope* in the year 606, by conferring upon him the prerogatives of universal episcopacy. Consequently then it was that the *beast* arose out of the sea, or out of the turbulent times of Gothic invasion, in his third or revived state: and he may be considered as having firmly taken his station upon the shore, when in the year 607 idolatry was openly re-established in the old heathen Pantheon. In this state, the *dragon*, or *Satan*, is said to have given him “his power, and his seat, and great authority;” in the same manner as he had given them to him before, when the resolute advocate of paganism.§

\* Though the Persians, in the time of Xerxes’s famous expedition, were professed iconoclasts; yet, notwithstanding Dr. Hyde’s laborious attempt to prove the contrary, I cannot but think it sufficiently evident, that they worshipped, possibly not altogether excluding the true God, the Sun, the Moon, and the Host of Heaven, in conjunction with their diluvian ancestors.

† Dan. xi. 3.

‡ Ver 35.

§ It is in this same third or papally idolatrous state that the *beast* “shall go into perdition,” or be utterly destroyed, as St. John in perfect harmony with Daniel specially informs us. (Rev. xvii. 11.—Dan. vii. 11.) After his division into *ten kingdoms*, and, “because of the voice of the great words which the horn spake?” that is to say, when he has again become a *beast* by upholding the papal superstition, as he was before a *beast* by supporting the abominations of paganism; in this last state he goeth into perdition. “He shall not, as he did before, cease for a time, and revive again; but shall be destroyed for ever.” (Bp. Newton’s Dissert. on Rev. xvii.) Hence we may conclude, that, since the *beast* is to be destroyed on account of his *little horn*, he will continue firmly leagued with his *little horn* to the very time of the end. Accordingly, as Daniel describes the *beast* and his *little horn* as perishing together, so St. John teaches us that the *same beast* and the *false prophet* shall be involved in one common ruin fighting against the Word of God. (Rev. xix. 20.) The necessary result of this statement is, that we must not expect any further reformation; but, on the contrary, that the followers of the *Pope* will become hardened in their false doctrines, and judicially blind to the clear denuncia-

II. The next point to be considered is the symbolical import of *the seven heads of the beast*, and especially of his *last head*.

It is to be observed, that, although *the seven-headed and ten-horned beast* arose out of *the sea* in the year wherein *the Apostacy* commenced, we are not on that account to suppose, either that *all his seven heads* were *then* in existence, or *all his ten original horns*.\* The symbol of *an Empire* must be so constructed as to take in the whole history of *that Empire*: whence, if we contemplate it at any given period previous to its final dissolution, *some members of the symbol* will unavoidably relate to *past events*, *some to present events*, and *others to future events*. This, we are specially informed by St. John, is the case with *the present symbol*.

“Here is the mind, which hath wisdom. The seven heads are seven mountains, on which the woman sitteth. They are also seven kings (or forms of government :) five are fallen, and one is, and the other is not yet come; and, when he cometh, he must continue a short space. And the beast, that was, and is not, even he is the eighth, and is of the seven, and goeth into perdition.”

From this passage we learn, that *the seven heads* have *a two-fold mystical signification*; alluding both to *the seven hills* upon which *the city of Rome* was founded,

tions of Scripture, so that like the Jews of old they shall unwittingly accomplish the oracles of God. As blindness in part hath happened unto Israel; so, because the Papists received not the love of truth that they might be saved, God hath sent them strong delusion that they should believe a lie. (See 2 Thess. ii. 10, 11.) Mr. Whitaker, to whom the thanks of every Protestant, particularly at the present juncture, are due for his well-timed and masterly statement of the abominations of Popery, observes, that “above a century ago Puffendorff expressed an opinion, that for the future, in all probability, *the Pope* would by degrees gain ground on the protestants, and stated what makes any real reformation in the doctrine of his followers impossible; that, if it should once be granted, that *the Pope* has hitherto maintained but one single erroneous point, his infallibility would then fall to the ground: and, if that were removed, the whole superstructure of his ecclesiastical sovereignty, which is founded on it, must fall too.” (Comment. p 460.) Ought not this consideration to put protestants upon their guard how they give any encouragement to the encroaching spirit of Popery?

\* *Two of the three horns*, which were to be plucked up before *the little horn*, namely *the kingdom of the Heruli*, and *the kingdom of the Ostrogoths*, were fallen previous to the year 606; as were likewise *five out of the seven heads*, or *forms of government*. Sir Isaac Newton justly remarks, that, “whatever was their number afterwards, they (*the ten horns*) are still called *the ten Kingdoms* their first number.”

and to *seven different forms of government* which either had arisen or should rise in *the Roman empire*. At the time when St. John wrote, *five of these forms* had already fallen, and *the sixth* was then in actual existence: there is no difficulty therefore, and consequently no dispute, in settling what is meant by *the first six heads of the beast*. Two Roman historians indeed have satisfactorily decided this point for us, by teaching us, that, previous to *the sixth* or *imperial form* under which St. John lived, their country had been subject to exactly *five others*; namely *kings, consuls, dictators, decemvirs, and military tribunes with consular authority*.<sup>2</sup> The only point then, liable to dispute, is, *what form of Roman government* is intended by *the last head*: and here, I think, there cannot be much dispute, if we only compare *prophecy* and *history* together.

I have stated, that *the beast* arose out of *the sea* in the year 606, when he delivered *the saints* into the hand of *his little horn* by conferring upon *the Pope* the right of universal supremacy. Then it was, that he relapsed into his bestial state; and consequently then it was, that he began to exist afresh. Hence, since *five of his heads* had fallen in the days of St. John; and since *the same imperial sixth head*, that was originally an *idolatrous head*, and afterwards ceased to be so, constituted *the Bishop of Rome* a tyrant over *the Church*: hence, I say, it appears, that *the beast* began to exist afresh under *his sixth*: that is to say, *the beast* both *was, is not, and began again to be*, under *one and the same sixth head*: consequently, in point of chronology, when *the beast* revived, *his last head* had not arisen. In the symbol however it was necessary that he should be represented complete in *all* his members, though *some* of those members, as I have just observed, unavoidably relate to *past* events, some to *present* events, and some to *future* events. Accordingly *the beast*, when he emerged from *the sea*, appeared to St. John complete with *all his seven heads*, notwithstanding *five of those heads* were already fallen, and notwithstanding *the last head* was not as yet in existence. In order to assist us in our inquiries after *this last head*,

<sup>2</sup> Liv. Hist. L. 6. C. 1.—Tacit. Annal. L. 1 in initio cited by Pp. Newton.



the prophet observes, that, whenever it *did* come, it should be *a double head*, consisting of *the seventh head* melting, as it were, into *the eighth head*; and that it should likewise be *the beast that was, and is not*: it should in some sense or another, be *the beast that was, and is not*, although *the beast* revived under *his sixth head*; and it should moreover be so powerful at its first rise, that it should in a manner be identified with *the whole beast himself*, notwithstanding his *ten horns*, and his additional *little horn* mentioned by Daniel.

I know not any better method of ascertaining what power is intended by *the last head of the beast*, or *the last form of Roman government*, than simply to follow the current of history from the days of St. John. *The sixth* or *imperial* head was flourishing in the height of its glory when the Apostle wrote; and we know, that *the last head* had not then arisen, both from the testimony of history, and from the unequivocal declaration that it was "not yet come." Now the first remarkable event, that St. John notices in the history of *the sixth head*, is, that it was *wounded to death* or *slain* by the stroke of a sword.\* Before any attempt can be made to explain this part of the prophecy, we must endeavour to acquire a clear idea in the abstract of what is meant in the language of symbols by a *beast's being slain*; for, till this idea be acquired, it will be a vain labour to seek for what we may perhaps fancy to be a corresponding event.

*A beast is a tyrannical idolatrous empire. The life of a beast* therefore, or *the vital principle whereby he is a beast*, must necessarily mean *his tyranny and idolatry*. Consequently *the death of a beast* must be *the very reverse of his life*: that is to say, *a beast is slain*, not when *a temporal empire is subverted*, but when *he ceases to be a beast by abjuring his idolatry and tyranny*. So again: *as the death of a beast is his abjuration of tyranny and idolatry, the revival of a beast is his relapsing a second time into tyranny and idolatry*. In short, the symbolical imagery of a *beast being slain*, of *his continuing dead for a certain space*, and of *his afterwards coming to life*

\* Rev. xiii. 3, 14.

again, is precisely equivalent to the literal prediction respecting *the Roman beast*, that, as he *had been*, so he *shou'd cease to be*, and afterwards *should again be*.\* This being the case, *the ten-horned beast* received his *deadly wound*, and *ceased to be* (for these two phrases are only different modes of expressing the same thing,) at the period when Constantine embraced Christianity, and became the protector of the Church: and *his deadly wound* was healed, and he *began again to be* (for these two phrases in a similar manner are only different modes of expressing the same thing,) when Phocas set up a spiritual tyrant to wear out *the saints*, and when the empire relapsed into idolatry. It is specially said, that *the sixth head* was slain, and that *the self-same sixth head* revived: in other words, *the beast* both received *his deadly wound*, and had *that deadly wound* healed so that he "did live," under *one* and *the same sixth head*. The *five preceding heads* simply *fell*: they died, as it were, natural deaths, and continued pagan from their first rise to their final fall. But *the sixth head* was to be *slain*: it was, like its five predecessors, to be pagan at its first rise, but it was not to continue so: it was to cease to exist as *the head of a beast*, and was to die a violent death in the height of its strength, its *life* or *bestial principle* being taken away from it by the powerful preaching of the word, that sword of the Spirit which is twice in the Apocalypse represented as issuing from the mouth of the Messiah. Not that *all temporal authority* was to be annihilated throughout its dominions; but simply *its life*, or *the principle whereby it was the*

\* Vide supra Chap. 2. I shall here once more cite Mr. Mede's excellent definition of *figurative death*. "*Mori ea notione dicitur qui in quocunque statu constitutus, sive politico sive ecclesiastico, seu quovis alio, desinit esse quod fuit; unde et occidit qui tali morte quemquam afficit.*" When *the beast* then was wounded to death, he ceased to be what he had been before: but *a beast* is a *tyrannical idolatrous empire*; therefore *the Roman beast*, when slain by the sword, did not experience *political subversion* (as Bp. Newton supposes,) but simply ceased to be what he had been before, namely, a *tyrannical idolatrous empire*. Mr. Lowman very justly thinks, that *the life, the death, and the revival of the beast*, mean the very same as *his being, his ceasing to be, and his being again*: but he seems to me greatly to mistake the import of the two sets of phrases, in supposing that they denote *the overthrow of the Roman empire by the Goths, and the revival of it by the rise of the Papacy*. In fact, *the Roman empire under its sixth head* was not overthrown by the Goths; but still continued to subsist under *that same head* at Constantinople, whither the seat of government had been transferred long before the loss of the western provinces.

*head of a tyrannical idolatrous empire*, was to be taken away. Yet, notwithstanding its being thus slain, it was after a certain period to revive; its *deadly wound* was to be healed: *the vital principle of bestiality*, which was for a time extinct, was again to be infused into it: it was once more to become *the living head of a beast*, or *an empire in direct opposition to the Gospel*: and all the world was to go a wondering after the new idolatry of *the revived beast*, as they had formerly wondered after his old pagan idolatry. Accordingly we learn from history, that *the Roman beast* was both *slain*, or *ceased to be*, under *his sixth head*; that the empire continued as a *Christian state under the same sixth head*; and that under *the same sixth head* likewise it *revived*, and once more *came into existence as a beast*. In the year 313 then, when Constantine published his famous edict for the advancement of Christianity, *the beast* was wounded to death in *his sixth head*; and, in the year 606, when he delivered *the saints* into the hand of an idolatrous spiritual tyrant, *his deadly wound* was healed, he became a *living anti-evangelical power*, and he completely resumed all the bestial functions of his former pagan character. The space therefore between *the year 313* and *the year 606* is the space of time, during which *the beast was dead*, or, as St. John otherwise expresses it, *was not*.\*

This interpretation of *the death and revival of the Roman beast under his sixth head* will be found to be the only one that accords with the general tenor of symbolical language. In Daniel's vision of *the four beasts* we read, that *the Roman beast* is to be *slain*† at the end

\* I have been informed by a friend who has paid much attention to the subject of prophecy (the Rev. T. White,) that this very interpretation of *the death and revival of the beast* was given many years ago by Dr. Henry More. He says, that *the beast* was slain under his *sixth head* by ceasing to be idolatrous, and that he revived by relapsing a second time into idolatry. I have never had an opportunity of reading *the Mystery of Iniquity*, but I feel myself considerably strengthened in my opinion by the sanction of so able a writer.

† St. John predicts his destruction in somewhat different terms. Instead of saying that *he should be slain*, he represents him as *being cast alive into hell*. The discrepancy however is more apparent than real. Daniel briefly describes the subversion of his power, and intimates that his body should be given to the burning flame; St. John describes at large the manner in which the apostate faction will be overthrown, and the future punishment of those that were members of *the beast* by receiving *his mark* and worshipping *his image*. Though

of the 1260 years, but that *the lives of the other beasts* are to be prolonged for a season and a time, though their *dominion* be taken away. Now, since the triumphant reign of *the saints* upon earth is to succeed to the death of *the Roman beast*, I know not what warrant there is for imagining that all government within the precincts of *the Roman empire* is utterly to be at an end. It seems more reasonable to suppose, that a happy evangelical order of things will succeed to the present distracted Popish state of the Roman world. Such being the case, *the death of the beast* must evidently mean, not *the annihilation of all lawful Christian government*, not a *Jacobinical subversion of the powers that be* upon the lawless principles of the frantic fifth-monarchy men in the sixteenth century; but *the utter destruction of those detestable maxims and doctrines which constitute his bestiality*, which are *his very life*, which are interwoven even with his existence as a *beast*, without the profession of which he would not be a *beast*. This is yet further manifest from the predicted fate of *the other beasts*. Their *lives*, or *bestial principles*, are to be prolonged during the period of the Millennium; though *their dominion*, or *power of injuring the Church* is to be taken away: while *the Roman beast* is to be *slain*; his *principles* are to be *utterly destroyed*, never more to revive; and with the destruction of those principles *the dominion* of his *little horn* is to be finally taken away; for all, both governors and governed, will form one congregation of faithful worshippers, one great empire of *the saints* of the Most High.\* Accordingly we find, that *the beasts whose lives were prolonged*, in other words, *the nations which shall adhere to the vanities of the Gentiles*, make a grand attack at the close of the Millennium upon *the Church*: but, their *dominion* being now taken away, they entirely fail of success, and are consigned to the same punishment as those that professed and taught the apostate *beast* shall begin to be slain when *the 1260 days* shall have expired, and though a new and happy order of things will succeed to his destruction, that destruction will not be accomplished without a dreadful slaughter of his adherents; "there shall be a time of trouble, such as never was since there was a nation even to that same time." Compare Dan. vii. 11, 26. xii. 1 with Rev. xix. 11—21

\* Dan. vii. 11, 26.

tate principles of *the Roman beast*.\*—The conclusion to be drawn from the preceding view of Daniel's prophecy is this. Since *the first death of the Roman beast*, there mentioned, means *the destruction of his principles*, and since *the prolongation of the lives of the other beasts*, means *the prolonged existence of their principles*; *the first death of the Roman beast under his sixth head*, mentioned by St. John, must mean (arguing at least from analogy) *the destruction of his idolatrous tyranny by the sword of the Spirit*, while *his revival by the healing of his deadly wound* must in a similar manner signify *the renewed existence of his idolatrous tyranny*. This interpretation is yet further confirmed by the declaration, that *the beast* in his revived or papally-idolatrous state, and under *his last head*, should go into perdition, or be utterly destroyed. "A *beast*, in the prophetic style, as we before observed, is *atyrannical idolatrous empire*: and *the Roman empire* was idolatrous under *the heathen Emperors*; and then ceased to be so for some time under *the Christian Emperors*; and then became idolatrous again under *the Roman Pontiffs*, and so hath continued ever since. It is *the same idolatrous power* revived again, but only in another form; and all the corrupt part of mankind, whose names are not inrolled as good citizens in the registers of heaven, are pleased at the revival of it: but in this last form it shall go into perdition; it shall not, as it did before, *cease for a time, and revive again, but shall be destroyed for ever.*"†

I have made this citation with great pleasure from the writings of Bp. Newton, as containing what I believe to be the true explanation of *the existence, the non-existence, and the re-existence of the Roman beast*. All, that his Lordship has said upon this subject, is excellent, and immediately to the purpose: my wonder therefore is, that, after having adopted so judicious and consistent a mode of exposition, he should so completely have departed from it in what he says relative to *the death and revival of the beast under his sixth head*. In explaining this part of the prophecy, instead of strictly maintaining the anal

\* Rev. xx. 8, 9, 10.

† Bp. Newton's Dissert on Rev. xviii.

ogy of symbolical language, and adhering to the plan of exposition which he himself lays down, he suddenly adopts an entirely new system, and supposes *the death of the beast under his sixth head* to mean *the subversion of the Western empire*, and *his revival* to mean *the rise of the Carlovingian empire*. “*The sixth head*,” says he, “was as it were wounded to death, when *the Roman empire* was overturned by the northern nations, and an end was put to the very name of *Emperor* in Momyllus Augustulus: or rather, as the government of the Gothic kings was much the same as that of the Emperors, with only a change of the name, *this head* was more effectually wounded to death, when Rome was reduced to a poor dukedom, and made tributary to the Exarchate of Ravenna—But not only *one of his heads* was as it were wounded to death, but *his deadly wound* was healed. If it was *the sixth head* which was wounded, that wound could not be healed by the rising of *the seventh head* as interpreters commonly conceive: *the same head*, which was wounded, must be healed: and this was effected by the Pope and people of Rome revolting from the Exarch of Ravenna, and proclaiming Charles the great *Augustus* and *Emperor of the Romans*. Here *the wound of imperial head* was healed again, and hath subsisted ever since.”\* This scheme, independent of its manifest violation of that plan of symbolical exposition which the Bishop himself had so justly laid down respecting *the existence, the non-existence, and the revival, of the beast*, is certainly unsupported by history. According to the prophecy, *the sixth head*, in some sense or another, was to be *wounded to death* or *slain by a sword*, and was afterwards to *revive again*. But, according to the Bishop’s explanation, *the sixth head* was most assuredly *not slain* in the sense in which he understands the expression. *The western branch of the sixth or imperial head* was indeed subverted by Odoacer and his mercenaries; but *the sixth head itself* was not slain, (supposing the phrase *wounded to death by a sword* to mean *political subversion*) till many ages after. It still subsisted in the person of *the Con-*

*stantinopolitan emperor*; and was not finally slain, or wounded to death, (supposing with the Bishop that the phrase means *political subversion*) till the days of the Turkish horsemen under the second woe. And when at length it was thus *finally slain* by the arms of the Turks, it has never since *revived*, nor is it likely to *revive*. Hence it is manifest, that we must seek for some other mode of explaining *the death and revival of the sixth head*; and I know not any events in its history, which will satisfactorily explain those circumstances in a manner agreeable both to the language of symbols, and to the collateral prediction that *the beast should be, should not be, and should be again*, except *its dying in the quality of a head of the beast by embracing Christianity, and its reviving in the same quality by its relapsing into an idolatrous tyranny the same in nature though not in name as its former idolatrous tyranny while in a pagan state*.

The scheme of Mr. Whitaker seems to me to depart yet more widely from symbolical analogy, and to be still less tenable, than that of Bp. Newton. Notwithstanding St. John informs us, that *five of the heads were fallen* when he wrote, thereby plainly shutting *them* out from having any connection with the prophecies which he was commissioned to deliver, Mr. Whitaker supposes, that *the wounded head was not the imperial but the dictatorial head*: that it received its *deadly wound* by a sword when Julius Cesar was assassinated; that it was *healed* by the establishment of *the papal power*, which he conceives to be only *the Dictatorship revived*: and that thus, computing as in the days of St. John, *it had been, was not, and yet shall hereafter be*.—The arguments, which Mr. Whitaker brings in support of his opinion, I cannot but think perfectly inconclusive—Nothing can be more wild than to pronounce *the Papacy* to be the same head as *the Dictatorship*, merely because the power *claimed* by the *Popes* bears some resemblance to that *actually possessed* by the ancient *Dictators*. Yet this is the only proof of their identity, adduced by Mr. Whitaker.\*—*The wounded*

\* Even if the resemblance were *perfect*, which it is not, for the *Popes* never possessed, though they might *claim*, the Dictatorial power; still *mere resemblance* will not constitute *identity*. “*The Pope*,” says Bp. Newton, “is the

*head* moreover was a *form of government* ; consequently *its deadly wound*, whatever the precise nature of *that wound* may be, must be understood figuratively : we shall therefore most unwarrantably depart from the language of symbols, if we suppose that *the death of the head* means *the murder of an individual dictator* ; to say nothing of the impossibility of shewing how *the rise of Popery* could heal *the literal wounds of Julius Cesar*—Lastly, the expression *was, is not, and yet is*, however commentators may think proper to interpret it, can have no relation to the particular age in which St. John flourished. It is used by the angel, not in speaking of *the Roman beast\** as he had already been, *then was in the days of the Apostle*, and *was hereafter about to be* ; but in speaking of him *in his revived state*, that state in which he ascended out of *the sea*, that state which is contradistinguished both from *his former pagan existence*, and *his intermediate Christian non-existence in his bestial character*. Now *the beast* revived and ascended out of *the sea*, at the beginning of *the 1260 days*, or in *the year 606*. Consequently in *the year 606* *the beast* began to enter upon his new character : *his deadly wound* was then healed : he received *life afresh* : and all the world wondered after him, as they had done previous to *his death*. He *had been* : he *had ceased to be* : and now *once more was*—Nothing in short, that Mr. Whitaker has said relative to this mysterious phrase, induces me to give up the interpretation of it proposed by Bp. Newton : and, had his Lordship only considered *the death and the revival of the beast* always in the same sense : had he only considered *his death* by the stroke of the sword to be equivalent to *his non-existence*, and *his living*

most perfect likeness and resemblance of the ancient Roman emperors." Hence supposing the *image of the beast*, to mean the *effigies of the beast*, he supposed the *Pope* to be *that image*. Yet he never fancied, that this similarity authorized him to say, that *the Pope* was an *Emperor*, or that *the Papal head* was the *Imperial head recovered from its deadly wound* so that *the Emperorship* and *the Papacy* constituted jointly *only one head*.

\* We may observe moreover that this phrase is not applied to a *head of the beast*, as Mr. Whitaker's scheme necessarily supposes, but to *the beast himself*. The mere abolition of *the Dictatorship* did not make *the Roman beast* himself cease to be, in any sense of which the words are naturally capable.

† St. John seems to have first beheld *the beast* floundering in the sea with *one of his heads* wounded to death. Afterwards he beholds him reach the land ; and immediately *his deadly wound* is healed.



again to be equivalent to *his re-existence*; I should have had nothing more to do than simply to transcribe his exposition of this part of the prophecy.\*

Having now fully considered *the death and revival of the beast under his sixth head*, I shall proceed to state in a regular chronological series some of the most prominent events, which took place during the time that *the beast lay dead*, and after his revival; in order that we may see, whether history will not lead us to some satisfactory explanation of *the rise of his last head*.

Immediately after the death of Theodosius in *the year 395*, the Roman empire began to be invaded by the northern barbarians: and scarcely had their fury exhausted itself, when Rome was attacked from the south, and its strength completely broken, by the Vandals in *the year 455*. Thus debilitated, it still nevertheless preserved the name of *an empire till the year 476*, when Augustulus was deposed by Odoacer. These rude shocks greatly weakened the *Roman empire* considered as *one grand whole*, and diminished its glory: still however it continued to subsist in *the East*. All the events here enumerated, are predicted, as we have seen, under *the four first trumpets*. To *the kingdom of Odoacer in Italy* succeeded *the kingdom of the Ostrogoths in the year 493*. This subsisted till the reign of *the Eastern emperor Justinian*, when it was subverted by the conquests of Belisarius and Narses, whose arms delivered Rome and Italy from the yoke of the barbarians, and united them once more to the empire. The events, by which so great a revolution was effected, succeeded each other in the following order. Belisarius, the celebrated lieutenant of Justinian, began his career of victory by recovering from the Goths the African province in *the years 533 and 534*. His next exploit was the invasion and conquest of Sicily, in *the year 535*. Shortly after, in *the year 537*, he entered Italy and reduced Naples. In 536, he made himself master of Rome, which the Goths vainly attempted to take from him. In 539, he subdued the Gothic kingdom of Italy, and took Vitiges

\* See Whitaker's Comment. p. 212 & 213

its sovereign prisoner. Afterwards, during his absence, Rome was again occupied by the Goths; but, in 547, it was once more recovered by him. A third time it was taken by the Goths, in 549; and a third time, in 552, it was regained by the eastern Romans, under the eunuch Narses. The defeat and death of the last Gothic sovereign of Italy speedily followed: but it was not long, ere Narses had to contend with a fresh swarm of northern barbarians. In 553, Italy was invaded by the Franks and Alemans: in 554, they were totally defeated by Narses: and the period, which elapsed between the years 554 and 568, was occupied in the final settlement of Italy. That country, thus restored to its original masters,\* was henceforth administered as a province of the *Eastern empire*, by an imperial officer, styled the *Exarch of Ravenna*: "the remains of the Gothic nation evacuated the country, or mingled with the people: and the Franks abandoned, without a struggle, their Italian conquests."†

All these events took place during the time that *the beast lay dead*, or, as it is otherwise expressed, *was not*. Consequently, since he revived under *the same sixth head* that had been mortally wounded, we shall find it a fruitless labour to look during this period for the rise of *any power* that answers to the description given of *the last head*.

The *Exarchate of Ravenna*, though engaged in perpetual struggles with the Lombards, lasted about 170 years, in the course of which time, as we have seen, *the beast* revived, and *the papal little horn* commenced its tyrannical reign of 1260 *prophetic days*.

The extinction of *the Exarchate of Ravenna* by the Lombards, and the ambitious views of their king Aistulphus, were not beheld by *the Pope* with indifference. Though he had thrown off his allegiance to *the Constantinopolitan Emperor*, he soon found that he was but ill adapted to cope with the arms of a victorious prince. In

\* That part of Italy however, which has since borne the name of *Lombardy*, was almost immediately wrested from the Eastern Emperors by Alboin and his Lombards. The history of this event has been stated in a preceding chapter.

† Hist. of Decline and Fall, Vol. vii. p. 399

.....

this emergency, he applied for help to Pipin king of France; who speedily poured into Italy at the head of a large army, dispossessed the Lombard, and conferred the *Exarchate of Ravenna* upon the Pope. Still the *Bishop of Rome* found himself too weak to be an absolutely independent prince. After the grant of the *Exarchate* by Pipin, he received from his son and successor Charlemagne the investiture of a considerable part of Lombardy and of the *Dukedom of Rome*, which he held as fiefs under that monarch, though fiefs of the most honourable nature:\* and in the following reign of Louis the pious, he obtained a grant of those countries to hold them “in his own right, principality, and dominion.”†

In return for the various benefits which the Romans had received from the Carolingian princes, “the decrees of the senate and people successively invested Charles Martel and his posterity with the honours of *Patrician of Rome*.” This appellation had formerly been borne by the *Exarchs of Ravenna*, who were the mere lieutenants of the *Eastern Emperor*. “The leaders therefore of a powerful nation would have disdained a servile title and subordinate office: but the reign of the *Greek emperors* was suspended; and, in the vacancy of the *Empire*, they derived a more glorious commission from the *Pope* and the *Republic*. The Roman ambassadors presented these *Patricians* with the keys of the shrine of St. Peter, as a pledge and symbol of sovereignty; and with a holy banner, which it was their right and duty to unfold in the defence of the church

\* The Popes “were compelled to choose between the rival nations” of the East and the West; “religion was not the sole motive of their choice; and, while they dissembled the failings of their friends, they beheld with reluctance and suspicion, the catholic virtues of their foes. The difference of language and manners had perpetuated the enmity of the two capitals; and they were alienated from each other by the hostile opposition of seventy years. In that schism the Romans had tasted of freedom, and the Popes of sovereignty; their submission would have exposed them to the revenge of a jealous tyrant: and the revolution of Italy had betrayed the impotence, as well as the tyranny of the Byzantine court;” while, by reviving the western empire, “the Roman church would acquire a zealous and respectable advocate; and under the shadow of Carolingian power, the Bishop might exercise, with honour and safety, the government of the city” (Hist. of Decline and Fall, Vol. ix. p. 169, 170, 171.) According to Mosheim, the Popes held Rome under the Empire as the most honourable species of fief or benefice. Inst. Hist. Eccles. p. 264, 265. cited by Gibbon.

† Bp. Newton's Dissert. xiv.

and city. In the time of Charles Martel and of Pipin, the interposition of the *Lombard kingdom* covered the freedom, while it threatened the safety, of *Rome*; and the *Patriciate* represented only the title, the service, the alliance, of these distant protectors. The power and policy of Charlemagne annihilated an enemy, and imposed a master. In his first visit to the capital, he was received with all the honours which had formerly been paid to the *Exarch*, the representative of the *Emperor*; and these honours obtained some new decorations from the joy and gratitude of Pope Adrian the first—In the portico, Adrian expected him at the head of his clergy: they embraced, as friends and equals: but, in their march to the altar, the *king*, or *Patrician*, assumed the right hand of the *Pope*. Nor was the Frank content with these vain and empty demonstrations of respect. In the 26 years that elapsed between the conquest of Lombardy and his imperial coronation, *Rome*, which had been delivered by the sword, was subject, as his own, to the sceptre of Charlemagne. The people swore allegiance to his person and family: in his name money was coined, and justice was administered: and the election of the *Popes* was examined and confirmed by his authority. Except an original and self-inherent claim of sovereignty, there was not any prerogative remaining, which the title of *Emperor* could add to the *Patrician* of *Rome*.\*

Thus it was that, by the conquest of Lombardy in the year 774, Charlemagne acquired the undisputed sovereignty of Italy. The *Patriciate of the Exarchs* was a subordinate dignity emanating from the Constantinopolitan Emperors: The *Patriciate of Charles Martel and Pipin* was a mere title so long as the kingdom of the Lombards subsisted: but the *Patriciate of Charlemagne* was an independent monarchy, which owned no superior, which exercised real authority, and which differed from the *Emperorship* that succeeded it in name only, not in essence.

\* Hist. of Decline and Fall, Vol. ix. p. 152—153

The memorable year 800 beheld the *Carlovingian Patriarchate* for ever swallowed up and lost in the *Gothic imperial dignity*.

“On the festival of Christmas, the last year of the eighth century, Charlemagne appeared in the church of St. Peter; and, to gratify the vanity of Rome, he had exchanged the simple dress of his country for the habit of a *patrician*. After the celebration of the holy mysteries, Leo suddenly placed a precious crown on his head; and the dome resounded with the acclamations of the people, *Long life and victory to Charles, the most pious Augustus, crowned by God the great and pacific Emperor of the Romans!* The head and body of Charlemagne was consecrated by the royal unction: after the example of the *Cæsars*, he was saluted or adored by the *Pontiff*: his coronation oath represents a promise to maintain the faith and privileges of the church; and the first-fruits were paid in his rich offerings to the shrine of the Apostle. In his familiar conversation, the *Emperor* protested his ignorance of the intentions of Leo, which he would have disappointed by his absence on that memorable day. But the preparations of the ceremony must have disclosed the secret; and the journey of Charlemagne reveals his knowledge and expectation: he had acknowledged that the imperial title was the object of his ambition; and a Roman senate had pronounced, that it was the only adequate reward of his merit and services.”\*

Let us now examine how far these historical facts will enable us to interpret the prophecy.

The *head* or *form of government*, of which we are in quest, is represented by the prophet as possessing a peculiarity of character, which essentially distinguishes it from all its predecessors; it was, in some manner or

\*Hist. of Decline and Fall, Vol. ix. p. 173, 174. Let the reader seriously consider the whole of this and the preceding citation, and then decide whether the *Pope* appears very much like the *last independent head of the Roman beast* in the presence of his master Charlemagne.

The coronation oath of Charlemagne was couched, according to Baronius, in the following terms “In nomine Christi spondeo atque polliceor, ego Carolus Imperator, coram Deo et beato Petro Apostolo, me protectorem ac defensorem fore hujus sanctæ Romanæ ecclesiæ in omnibus utilitatibus, qua tenus divino fultus fuero adjutorio, prout sciero poteroque.” Annal. Eccles. A. D. 800.

another, to be a *double head*; it was at once to be both *the seventh* and *the eighth head of the beast*. That these *two heads, or forms of government*, are in fact but *one*, may be plainly collected from the words of St. John. When *the seventh king* "cometh, he must continue a short space: and the beast, that was, and is not, even he is the eighth, and is of the seven." In other words, although *the beast* may in some sort be said to have *eight heads, or eight forms of government*, yet strictly speaking he has but *seven*: for *his eighth head* is in reality *the same as one of his seven heads*. The question then is, with *which of the seven heads* must *the eighth head* be identified? This *eighth head* certainly cannot be the same as *any one of the five first heads*; for they were all fallen in the time of St. John. Neither can it be the same as *the sixth head*; for that was already existing in the days of the prophet, and was now and for many ages after existing at Constantinople. It only remains therefore, as I have already stated, for it to be the same as *the seventh head*; which, when it came, was to continue but a short space of time. To suppose otherwise indeed is introducing a sort of *Hysteronproteron* into the symbolical character of *the Roman beast*: for, if *the eighth head* be the same as *any one of the six first, the least*, instead of being finally slain under *his last head*, will go into perdition under a *head* which is prior in point of origin to *the seventh* that continues only a short space. Hence it appears, that, since *the seventh head* and *the eighth head* are in reality one and the same, we cannot attach any meaning to the short continuance of *the seventh head*, except this: that *some power* should be a *head of the empire*, for a short time only, in *one capacity*; and that afterwards it should still remain a *head of the empire*, even till the final destruction of its bestial principles, in *another capacity*: thus constituting at once both *the seventh and eighth heads of the beast*, or, if I may use the expression, *his sep'timo-octave head*.

At the time when *the beast* revived, his *sixth head* was seated in *the East*; consequently we must look for the rise of his *last head* in *the West*. Now we learn from the preceding historical statement, that, during the

non-existence of *the beast*, and subsequent to his revival in *the year 606*, the following powers only have had any sway in Rome and Italy: the line of *the Western emperors*, after the division of the empire, commencing with Honorius, and terminating with Augustulus; *the three kingdoms* of the Heruli, the Ostrogoths, and the Lombards; *the Exarchate of Ravenna* subject to the Eastern emperors; *the Popedom*; and *the Carlovingian empire*. No change has taken place in Italy subsequent to the rise of the last of these powers, either of a sufficient magnitude, or of a sufficiently peculiar nature,\* to warrant our seeking for *the last head of the beast* posterior to *the year 800*, when Charlemagne was crowned *Emperor of the Romans*: nor do I think, that we have any just grounds to look for it prior to the revival of *the beast* under *his sixth head*; nevertheless, since many have fixed the rise of *the short-lived seventh head* previous to *the year 606*, when *the deadly wound of the beast* was healed, I felt myself bound to notice the powers which existed in Italy before that year. Among the powers then here enumerated we must look for *the seventh and eighth heads of the beast*.

1. Mr. Mede conceives *the seventh head* to be *the line of Western emperors*, and *the eighth head* to be *the Papacy*. By this plan he makes *the beast*, agreeably to the prophecy, to have *apparently eight heads*, and *really only seven*: *the line of the Western Emperors*, which continued *about 80 years*, being in fact *a branch of the sixth or imperial head*. It appears therefore, that in order to reduce *the eight heads* to *seven*, he supposes *the sixth and the seventh* to constitute jointly *one imperial head*.†

However plausible such a scheme may be, it will by no means bear the test of examination, even independent of the objections that I have already made to *the Papacy*

\* Since this was written, Buonapartè has made himself master of all Italy; but we cannot reasonably suppose, that *the last head of the beast* has arisen in him; both because, however great his conquests have been, they have not been greater than those of Charlemagne; and because, if we suppose *the last head* to have arisen in him, we shall make *the beast* headless during the whole period that has elapsed between the fall of *the sixth head*, by the subversion of the Constantinopolitan empire, and the present era, May 1, 1806.

† Mede's Works, B. V. C. 12 p. 929

being considered *the last head of the secular beast*. It is not enough merely to reduce *the eight heads to seven*, according to an arbitrary system of *our own* invention: we must attend to *the express words* of the prophecy, otherwise we in fact do nothing. Now the prophecy declares, that *the eighth head* should be *one of the preceding seven*: but Mr. Mede, on the contrary, makes *the supposed seventh head* to be *one of the preceding six*; and *the supposed eighth head*, which the prophet had declared should be *one of the preceding seven*, he makes to be *quite distinct from every one of those seven*. According to the prophecy, we are first to pitch upon *seven distinct heads*, and then discover *an eighth head* which shall be *the same as one of those seven*: according to Mr. Mede, we are to amalgamate *the sixth and the seventh heads*, and then discover *an eighth which shall not be the same as any of those seven*. On these grounds, I think the plan of that eminent expositor perfectly untenable.

Mr. Sharpe supposes *the seventh head* to be *the three Gothic kingdoms* that succeeded *the imperial sixth head* in the supreme government of Rome, and *the eighth head* to be *the Papacy*.\*

This scheme is objectionable in every point of view. *Three successive kingdoms* cannot reasonably be esteemed *one head*. And, even if this were no objection, others would immediately arise. *The kingly head* was *the first of the heads of the beast*: consequently Mr. Sharpe's scheme, admitting for a moment *these three kingdoms* to be *a head*, amalgamates *the seventh head* with *the first*, as that of Mr. Mede amalgamated *the seventh head* with *the sixth*. Such being the case, every objection, that has been made to Mr. Mede's scheme, applies with equal force to that of Mr. Sharpe. *The eighth head*, according to both these plans, instead of being *one of the seven*, is *perfectly distinct from them all*. So again, *the three kingdoms*, which Mr. Sharpe supposes to constitute *the seventh head of the beast*, are *three of his ten original horns*. If then they be *three horns of the beast*, it is

\* Appendix to three tracts, p. 23—Inquiry into the description of Babylon, p. 89.



surely impossible that they should likewise, and *that in the self same capacity, be one of his heads.\**

3 Bp. Newton thinks, that *the Exarchate of Ravenna is the seventh head, and that the Papacy is the eighth head.†*

This supposition is in some respects even more objectionable than the two preceding ones. In *the first place* it does not consist with his Lordship's own sentiments respecting *the Roman beast*. In a former dissertation he had maintained (erroneously indeed I am persuaded), that *the Exarchate was one of the ten horns of the beast*: now he represents it, as *his seventh head*. But *the self-same power cannot, in the self-same capacity, be esteemed at once both a horn and a head of the same beast*—In *the second place*, no modification of language will warrant us in admitting, that, while *the independent Roman Emperor of Constantinople is the sixth head, his mere dependent lieutenant, the Exarch of Ravenna, is the seventh head*: for this would be to place, upon the very same footing, *a sovereign and his viceroy; the fountain of authority and the commissioned governor of a province*‡—In *the third place, the seventh head, whatever it be, must be the same as the eighth head*; the two forming jointly *one double septimo-octave head*: for, unless this be the case, *the beast will really have eight heads, instead of only seven*; the very contrary of which is expressly asserted by the prophet, who, in order to shew us *how the beast has only seven heads*, declares that *the eighth is one of the preceding seven*. But the Bishop never supposes *the Exarch of Ravenna to be the eighth head, for that*

\* It is almost superfluous to observe, that, if *the three horns* jointly cannot be *the seventh head of the beast*, no one of them can separately. Forbes supposes, that *the kingdom of the Ostrogoths is the seventh head* (See Pol Synop. in loc.), in which opinion Fleming agrees with him (Apoc. Key, p 16). But why should this kingdom be pitched upon in preference to *that of the Heruli* and *that of the Lombards*? The objection will equally apply to any scheme that should fix upon either of the *other two kingdoms* in preference to *the two* that must necessarily be excluded; and every other objection, that has been made to Mr Sharpe's scheme, will moreover apply with equal force to all schemes similar to that of Forbes. I have already complained, that I have not been able to discover, *what three Gothic kingdoms Mr. Sharpe alludes to, from the circumstances of his limiting their joint duration to no more than 70 years.*

† Dissert on Rev. xvii.

‡ —“the Exarchs of Ravenna, the representatives in peace and war of the Emperor of the Romans.” Hist. of Decline and Fall, Vol. vii. p. 398.

supposition would of course be untenable: *the eighth head* therefore he makes to be *the Pope*. Hence it is manifest, that, upon his Lordship's scheme, *the beast* has *actually eight heads*, instead of having only *seven*: namely, 1. Kings; 2. Consuls; 3. Dictators; 4. Decenvirs; 5. Military Tribunes; 6. Emperors; 7. Exarchs; and 3. Popes. The prophet however explicitly declares, that *the eighth head* is *one of the preceding seven*, and that *the beast* has but *seven heads*: with which then of his *supposed seven predecessors* can *the Pope* be identified? Of this natural objection the Bishop seems to be aware: and accordingly he endeavours to parry it, but in a manner to me at least not at all satisfactory, even allowing (what I am by no means disposed to allow) that *the Pope* may be justly considered *the last head of the secular beast* in his character of *king of kings*.\* “But possibly you may hesitate, whether this,” namely *the Exarchate of Ravenna*, “is properly a new form of government, Rome being still subject to the imperial power, by being subject to the Greek Emperor's deputy *the Exarch of Ravenna*: and, according as you determine this point, *the beast, that was, and is not, (was, while idolatrous; and was not, while not adolatrous),* will appear to be *the seventh or eighth*. If you reckon this *a new form of government, the beast that now is is the eighth*; if you do not reckon this *a new form of government, the beast is of the seven*: but, whether he be *the seventh or eighth*, he is *the last form of government, and goeth into perdition*.” To this statement the answer is sufficiently easy. St. John first enumerates *seven distinct heads*, and then introduces *an eighth*, teaching us that *the beast* has nevertheless no more than *seven heads*, for *the eighth* is of *the seven*. If then *the beast* has *seven distinct heads* at the rise of *the eighth*, and yet notwithstanding the rise of *the eighth* has no more than *seven*, that *eighth* must in some sense be the same as *one of the seven*. But, upon Bp. Newton's plan it is not the same as *any one of the seven*: and, in order to get quit of *the supposed seventh head the Exarchate*, so that *the beast* by the addition of *the Papa-*

\* I have already shewn how entirely unsupported such an opinion is by the testimony of history.

cy may still have no more than *seven*, he sometimes considers *the Exarchate* as a *head*, and sometimes as *not a head*.\*

4. Some commentators, probably aware of the difficulties here enumerated, difficulties which unavoidably arise from the separation of *the seventh* and *eighth heads*, have adopted the mode of exposition which I believe to be the true one; namely, that *the two heads* are *one power existing in a two-fold capacity*: but unfortunately they have for the most part not attended to the very accurate language in which St. John describes *the manner* of that existence. It is not sufficient to discover a power existing in a two-fold capacity *merely*: but that power must so exist, that it must *cease* to be in one capacity, when it *begins* to be in the other. When *the seventh head* “cometh, he must continue a short space:” he is not to *co-exist* with *the eighth*, but he is to *give place* to him. *The two heads* therefore must be *one power* existing in a *successive two-fold capacity*.

All the commentators, of whom I am now speaking, suppose *the Pope* to be *this double* or *septimo-octave head*. Accordingly some of them fancy, that he is *one of the heads* in his *temporal*, and *another* in his *spiritual, capacity*; while others conceive, that he is *one head* as *the sovereign of his own dominions*, and *another* as *king of the whole world*†—Now, even were such schemes liable to no other objections, it would be sufficient to observe, that these writers seem quite to forget, that *the seventh head* is represented as preceding *the eighth*, and as continuing only a short space: whereas both *the temporal* and *the spiritual*, both *the particular-temporal* and *the universal-temporal dominion of the Pope*, run parallel to each other, and are equally even now in existence, each having continued a long time.‡

Mr. Brightman and Mr. Mann of the Charter-house

\* Mr. Lowman’s interpretation is exactly the same as Bp. Newton’s, and is consequently liable to the very same objections.

† See Pol. Synop. in loc.

‡ I speak as adapting myself to the scheme which I am considering. In strictness of language *the universal-temporal dominion of the Pope* is neither at present in existence, nor ever was in existence. I have already very fully shewn, that *such dominion*, though *often claimed*, was *never allowed*.

certainly manage, with by much the greatest dexterity, the supposition that *the Pope is the double or septimo-octave head*.

Mr. Brightman thinks, that *the Papacy* arose in its quality of *the seventh head*, when Constantine removed the seat of empire from Rome; that *this short lived head* continued only about *a century* from the age of Constantine, when it was overwhelmed by the inundation of the Goths and Vandals; and that *the Papacy* lastly arose in its quality of *the eighth head*, which was to be *one of the seven*, when it was established upon the firm basis of temporal power by the grants of Pipin and Charlemagne. Then was healed the deadly wound which *the seventh papal head* had received from the Gothic sword; and then did *that same head*, considered as *the eighth papal head*, rear itself up again with greater vigour than it had ever possessed\*—Independent of the impropriety of *at all* considering *the Pope as a head of the beast*, this scheme is in *other* respects highly objectionable. So far was *the Bishop of Rome* from becoming *a head* of the empire, by the secession of Constantine from the ancient capital, that he still continued *a mere subject* of his sovereign, as much a subject in short as any other bishop: we may therefore safely pronounce, that, during at least *a century* after the Constantinian age, the period assigned by Mr. Brightman for the continuance of *the short-lived seventh head*, no *new head* whatsoever arose. And again: so far was this supposed *seventh head* from being slain by the Gothic sword, and from reviving afterwards in the capacity of *the eighth head*, that the incursions of the northern barbarians, as Machiavel most justly observes, contributed more than any circumstance whatsoever to advance the power of *the Papacy*. They did not *slay* it; but they *nourished* it, and gradually gave it *strength and consistency*.† Thus it appears, that Mr. Brightman's scheme is wholly unsupported by history.

Mr. Mann, on the other hand, conceives, that *the*

\* Brightman's Apoc. Apoc. Fol. 273, 274.

† See the citations from Machiavel in *the 4th chapter* of this Work. See likewise the citation from Sir Isaac Newton.

*Pope became the seventh head when he was constituted supreme head of the Church ;\* and that he afterwards became the eighth head, when he induced the Italians to revolt from the Emperor Leo on the score of image-worship,†—This scheme however is as little tenable as any of the foregoing ones. The seventh head was to continue but a short space : the ecclesiastical supremacy of the Pope has continued down to the present hour. The seventh head of a secular beast must be a secular power : the ecclesiastical supremacy of the Pope is a purely spiritual power : nor is it possible to conceive how he could become a head of the state or the secular beast by being constituted head of the Church. The eighth head must likewise be a secular power, and one moreover so large that at its first rise it must be (as we are taught by the prophet) commensurate in a manner with the whole beast : the temporal authority of the Pope never extended beyond his own dominions ; nor is it easy to imagine, how the sovereign of an Italian principality, can be the last secular head of the beast, when his temporal supremacy over the empire was at no time ever acknowledged.‡ But, if the Papacy be not the double head of the beast in its two-fold spiritual and secular capacity, it will be found impossible to point out any other manner in which there is even an appearance of probability that it might be that head. For, supposing the Pope to be intended by the double or septimo-octave head of the beast, where are we to draw the line of distinction between his two characters ? At what period did he*

\* Mr. Mann fixes this event to the age of Justinian ; whereas it did not really and permanently take place till the year 606, in the reign of Phocas. His scheme however is improved, instead of being injured, by this remark ; because it shortens the interval between the rise of his supposed seventh and eighth heads, thereby making it more consonant with the prophecy.

† Mann's M.S. cited by Bp. Newton, Dissert. on Rev. xvii.

‡ Let the reader attentively re-peruse the preceding citations from Gibbon relative to the inauguration of the Carovingian empire, and let him then declare whether in the presence of Charlemagne the Pope bears any resemblance to a head of the secular Roman beast. At that period, who was the sovereign of Rome and Italy ; who, the master of the Western empire ? Charlemagne or the Pope ? Yet so far will a love of system carry some writers, that Mr. Fleming actually speaks of the Pope becoming at this period the real king of Rome, and represents the Roman Emperors as being a mere empty title. (Apoc. Key. p. 35.) The very reverse of this is what we learn from history. Charlemagne was the real sovereign of the western empire : and the Pope held the dukedom of Rome under him as a mere feudal vassal.

cease to be *the seventh head*, and begin to be *the eighth head*? Or in what sense can he be said to have "continued a short space" as *the seventh head*? History will furnish us with no answer to these questions.

As for the other grounds on which *the Pope* cannot be esteemed *the last head of the beast*, namely, because his claim of temporal supremacy was never allowed, they have already been stated so fully at the beginning of the present chapter, that it is superfluous here to recapitulate them.

5. It remains only, that we inquire how far *the Carolingian empire* answers to the prophetic character of *the double head of the beast*.

The subversion of the kingdom of Lombardy in the year 774 made Charlemagne, already king of France, the undisputed master of Italy under the title of *Patrician of Rome*. In this capacity, he granted to *the Pope* the fiefs of a certain part of Lombardy and of the whole state of Rome, confirming at the same time the former grant made by his father Pipin. Here then, in the regular chronological order of prophecy, after *the beast* had been wounded to death under his sixth head, and after his deadly wound had been healed, we behold the rise of *the Carolingian Patriciate*, or *the seventh independent temporal head of the beast*. This head however, when it came, was to continue only a short space; for it was almost immediately to be absorbed in *the eighth head*, which (the Apostle informs us) is in reality *one of the seven* although styled *the eighth*, and which (I have shewn) can only be identified with *the seventh head*: consequently we are led to expect, that *the two heads* are to be so intimately blended with each other, as to form jointly only *one septimo-octave head*. Accordingly we find, that, just 26 years after its rise, *the seventh head* was for ever lost in *the eighth head*. In the year 774,\* *the Carolingian govern-*

\* I date the rise of *the Patrician head* from the conquest of Lombardy, because *the mere titular Patriciate of Charles Martel and Pipin* then first became a real form of government. Should the reader however be disposed rather to date its rise from the time when the title was conferred upon Charles Martel, the prophecy respecting the shortness of its duration will be no less accomplished. In that case, it will have continued about 50 years instead of 26; either of which periods may justly be termed a short time. As for *the Patriciate of the Exarchs*, it resembled in name alone *the Patriciate of Charlemagne*. They

*ment of Italy* commenced: in *the year 800*, Charlemagne assumed *the imperial dignity*, which has ever since been borne by a prince within the limits of *the old Roman empire*, and which has ever since given him precedence over *the ten horns* by constituting him in a manner *their head*.\* Here then we behold the rise of *the septimo-octave head of the beast*: † a matter so evident, that a writer, *in this respect certainly unprejudiced*, was naturally led by circumstances to bestow *this very title* upon Charlemagne. Pointing out the motives, by which *the Popes* were induced to espouse the cause of *the French monarch* in preference to that of *the Byzantine emperors*, he observes, that “the name of Charlemagne was stained by the polemic acrimony of his scribes: but the con-

bore the title of *Patrician* as dependent viceroys; he bore it as *an independent prince*, while the reign of the Greek Emperors was suspended, and during what Mr. Gibbon styles “*the vacancy of the Empire*.”

\* From the days of Charlemagne, *the Emperor* has always claimed, and has always been allowed, precedence over *every one of the ten horns*: and as such he has invariably been considered as *the head of the great European commonwealth*. This point however is best decided by a professed writer upon Heraldry. In his chapter upon *the precedency of kings and commonwealths*, Sir George Mackenzie has the following observations. “Amongst those who are supreme, *kings* have the preference from *commonwealths*; and, amongst *kings*, *the Emperor* is allowed the first place by the famous ceremonial of Rome, as succeeding to *the Romans Emperors*—And therefore the German and Italian lawyers, who are subject to *the Empire*, have with much flattery asserted, that *the Emperor* is *the Vicar of God in temporals*,” (manifestly in contradistinction to *the Pope*, who claimed and was allowed to be *the Vicar of Christ in spirituals*) “and that jurisdictions are derived from him, as from the fountain, calling him *dominum et caput totius orbis*.” (Mackenzie’s Observations on Precedency, chap. 1.) This last matter Sir George naturally enough refuses to allow, though he readily concedes a precedency of rank to *the Emperor*. His whole treatise may be found in Guillim’s Display of Heraldry. See also Mod. Univ. Hist. Vol. xlii. p. 80—105.

† It is not unworthy of notice, that Cardinal Baronius speaks of the coronation of Charlemagne in language, which strongly though undesignedly marks the rise of *a new head of the Roman beast*. “Quod autem ejusmodi translatio imperii ab Oriente in Occidentem, ubi posthac semper stetit et hactenus perseverat, divino consilio facta fuerit magno reipublicæ Christianæ emolumento, et imperii Orientalis desolatio, et alia eventa. satis superque demonstrarunt Nec vero id potuisse convenientius fieri quam per Romanum Pontificem totius Christianæ religionis antistitem, et summum Ecclesiæ catholicæ visibilem caput, pastoremque universi gregis Christiani; nec decentius quam in Carolum magnum, regem totius Occidentis potentissimum, eundemque Christianissimum, piissimum, justissimum, fortissimum, doctissimum, de religione Christiana, ecclesia catholica, sede apostolica, statu publico, semper in omnibus optime meritum; nec denique opportuniori tempore, quam cum jacerent absque possessore jura Orientalis Imperii, et periculum immineret ne caderent in schismaticos principes a fide catholica extorres, aut in Christianæ religionis infestissimos hostes Saracenos, nemo prudens et rerum æquus æstimator non affirmabit, nec inficias ire poterit, totum id Dei opus fuisse, ejusque mirabili consilio sapientissimè dispositum.” Anna. Eccles. A. D. 800

queror himself conformed, with the temper of a statesman, to the various practice of France and Italy. In his four pilgrimages or visits to the Vatican, he embraced *the Popes* in the communion of friendship and piety; knelt before the tomb, and consequently before the image, of the Apostle; and joined, without scruple, in all the prayers and processions of the Roman liturgy. Would prudence or gratitude allow *the pontiffs* to renounce their benefactor? Had they a right to alienate his gift to *the exarchate*? Had they a power to abolish *his government of Rome*? The title of *Patrician* was below the merit and greatness of Charlemagne: and it was only by reviving *the Western empire*, that they could pay their obligations or secure their establishment. By this decisive measure they would finally eradicate the claims of the Greeks: from the debasement of a provincial town the majesty of Rome would be restored: the Latin Christians would be united under a *supreme head* in their ancient metropolis:\* and the conquerors of the West would receive their crown from the successors of St. Peter. The Roman church would acquire a zealous and respectable advocate; and, under the shadow of the Carovingian power, the bishop might exercise, with honour and safety, the government of the city.†

To this interpretation of the prophecy respecting *the septimo-octave head of the beast*, it is possible, that *three objections* may be urged—*First*, that it does not accord with my own plan of exposition to suppose, that *a king of France* should be a *head of the beast*, because *France*

\* Though Charlemagne in a great measure united the Latin Christians under *one head*, by reigning at the same time in *France, part of Spain, Italy, Germany, and Hungary*, yet he never made *Rome* his metropolis; nor can I think with Mr. Gibbon that *the Popes* ever wished him to do it. Those subtle politicians were too well aware, that the immediate presence of a *sovereign prince* would grievously impede their schemes of aggrandisement, ever to desire that *Rome* should behold any other masters than themselves. With the title of *Emperor of the Romans* they were perfectly satisfied, so long as *the Emperor* remained at a respectful distance from *the seven-hilled city*.

† Hist. of Decline and Fall, Vol. ix. p. 170, 171. Charlemagne's devotion to *the Papacy* appears from this passage in his laws. "In memoriam beati Petri apostoli honoremus sanctam Romanam et apostolicam sedem; ut quæ nobis sacerdotalis mater est dignitatis, esse debeat ecclesiastica magistra rationis. Quare servanda est cum mansuetudine humilitas; ut, licet vix ferendum ab illis sancta sede imponatur iugum, tamen feramus, et pia devotione toleremus." A sentence says Baronius, worthy of being inscribed in letters of gold! Eccles. Annal. A. D. 801.



is *one of the ten horns* : consequently, in making the *patricio-imperial dignity of Charlemagne* to be *the last head*, I make that prince at once both *a head and a horn*, the very error with which I charge Bp. Newton in the case of the *Exarchate*—*Secondly*, that, while I am unwilling to allow *the Pope* to be *the last head*, on the ground of his temporal supremacy never having been acknowledged by the sovereigns of the Roman empire, I find no difficulty in supposing *the Emperor* to be *this last head*, notwithstanding his temporal supremacy, except so far as conceding to him a mere empty precedence, is as little allowed by any of the great powers as that of *the Pope* himself—*Thirdly*, that *the imperial dignity of Charlemagne and his successors* even to the present day, is nothing more than *a continuation of the sixth head*; and therefore that it cannot be esteemed *a new and distinct head*—*These three objections* shall be answered in their order.

1. It is undoubtedly true, that I denied the possibility of the *Exarchate* being typified both by *a head and a horn of the same beast* : but I denied it on this account, and I see no reason to retract my opinion : in the case of that government, the same power is represented by Bp. Newton, as being, *in the self-same capacity*, both *a head and a horn of the Roman beast*, which is a manifest unnecessary repetition : whereas Charlemagne was *not* both *a head and a horn*, in *the same capacity* ; but, like all his successors, in *two entirely different capacities*. As *king of France*, he was *a horn of the beast* ; as *emperor of the Romans*, he was *its last head*.\* It is evident indeed, that, since *the septimo-octave head* was to spring up when *the empire* was in a divided state, there would be, as it were, no room for it among *the ten horns*, unless it were, although *a distinct thing* itself, in some manner attached to *one of them*. Accordingly *the Carolingian*

\* *The Pope* might undoubtedly have been *a horn of the beast* in his *ecclesiastical capacity*, and *a head* in his *temporal*, if he had ever been, what Bp. Newton styles him, *a king of kings* as well as *a bishop of bishops* : but this, as I have already shewn from history, he never was ; and yet this is the only way in which it is possible for him to be *the last head* as well as *the little horn*. Mr. Mede's language is very inaccurate. He represents *the little horn* as being absolutely the same as *the last head*—“*the Antichristian horn with eyes and mouth ; that is, qui, cum revera cor in tantum sit, pro oculis tamen, esse quod cujus est proprius et oculos habere*.” Works P. iv. P. 15.

*imperial dignity*, although generally attached to *one of the ten horns*, is yet so perfectly distinct from *them all*, that the French successors of Charlemagne continued to be *kings of France* when they ceased to be *Emperors of the Romans*; and the *imperial dignity* itself was afterwards sometimes borne by one family, and sometimes by another, each however, so long as it enjoyed it, claiming and being allowed precedence.\* Hence it appears, that I am guilty of no inconsistency in supposing, that Charlemagne, in his *two different capacities* of *king of France* and *Emperor of the Romans*, may be considered as being at once both *a horn* and *a head of the beast*.

2. The *second objection*, that the *Emperor can no more be esteemed the last head of the secular beast than the Pope, because his temporal supremacy is no more allowed than that of the Pope*, will speedily vanish, if we consider the nature of symbolical prophecy, and the history of the first rise of the *Carlovingian empire*. Now it is manifest, that in a prophecy symbolically delivered, the symbols themselves cannot be represented as perpetually varying with the ever-varying revolutions of nations. The great outlines of facts, whether past, present, or future, must alone be attended to: and the different members of a *symbolical beast* must unavoidably be exhibited as stationary and permanent, when in reality they are by no means so. St. John himself gives us a clue to the right interpretation of his own prophecy. "Five of the heads," says he, "are fallen, and one is, and the other is not

\* The *imperial title* lately assumed by General Buonapartè, even supposing it to be something different from the *regal title*, no more affects the present scheme of interpretation, than the division of the *Old Roman empire* into its *eastern and western branches* does the universally acknowledged opinion that the *sixth head* is the *ancient imperial dignity*. The present title however of that usurper is manifestly no more than that of *king*. Whatever he may please to style himself, *France* is still only *one of the ten horns of the beast*. But should he at some future period be allowed by Providence to tread in the steps of Charlemagne, to subvert the imperial honours of Germany, and to re-annex to France the title and authority of *Emperor of the Romans*; in that case he would doubtless become the *septimo-octave head*: in that case the *imperial dignity* would only revert to *France*, as it was before transferred from *France* to *Germany*; it would still be the *same last head of the beast*. How far such an event is probable, the reader must judge for himself, when more is said hereafter upon the subject of yet unfulfilled prophecies.

Since this was written, the usurper has been permitted to tread in the steps of Charlemagne, and to erect again the *empire of the West*. His government is now plainly the representative of the *Carlovingian head of the beast*. June 1, 1806.

yet come :” nevertheless *the beast* still appears with *all his seven heads*, notwithstanding, when he arose out of *the sea of Gothic invasion*, *five* of them were no longer in existence, and *one* of them was as yet future. In a similar manner *the sixth head*, which at its first rise reigned paramount, like each of its five predecessors, over *the whole beast*, is still, no less than when it first arose, considered as *the sixth head*, even when its empire was overrun by the barbarians of the North and the Saracens of the South, when its fairest provinces were rent away from it, and when many independent kingdoms were erected which acknowledged not its supremacy. If then *the sixth head* be esteemed a *head*, from its *first rise* to its *final dissolution*, when cooped up by the Turks within the narrow limits of a single city; we must evidently adopt the same mode of considering *the last head*; that is to say, it will matter little, so far as the completion of the prophecy is concerned, whether the temporal supremacy of the *present* representative of *the last head* be acknowledged or not, provided only it was *once* acknowledged. We have merely therefore to inquire, whether this was ever the case with the *Carlovingian monarchy*; for such acknowledgment seems necessary, in the mind of the prophet, to complete the character of a *head of the beast*. He is silent respecting *the first six heads*, because they all arose before the empire was broken, and therefore it was unnecessary to specify that *they* were severally *the whole beast*: but he particularly informs us, that *the last* should likewise be *the whole beast*, because such a circumstance, however essential to the character of a *head*, seemed very improbable after the empire had been divided into *ten horns*.\* This however precisely came to pass. Allowing for the space occupied by *the yet existing sixth head*, *the last head* at its first rise was commensurate, either by actual sovereignty or acknowledged supremacy, with *the whole beast*. Charlemagne really possessed what the Popes only *ineffectually claimed*. The greatest part of *the Western empire* was immediately subject to him: he possessed ample territories without its

\* “The beast, that was, and is not, even he is the eighth (king or head), and is of the seven”

limits: and the petty kings of Britain and Spain, the only provinces not directly under his control, implored the honour and support of his alliance, and styled him *their common parent, the sole and supreme Emperor of the West*.<sup>\*</sup> The result therefore of the whole is this. If *the successors of Augustus* are still considered as *the sixth head of the beast*, even when they no longer possessed the temporal supremacy of Augustus; no reason can be shewn, why *the successors of Charlemagne* should not still be considered as *the last head of the beast*, although they now no longer possess the temporal supremacy of Charlemagne.<sup>†</sup>

3. With regard to *the identity of the ancient Augustan imperial dignity and the modern Carolingian imperial dignity*, it exists but in imagination. The two resemble each other merely in name: in all other respects there is

\* The reader will find a statement of the extent of the Carolingian empire, in the Hist of the Decline and Fall, Vol. ix. p. 180—187; which affords the best comment upon the prophetic declaration that *the last head should be the whole beast*. Respecting Charlemagne and his empire, Mr. Gibbon justly remarks, that “the dignity of his person, the length of his reign, the prosperity of his arms, the vigour of his government, and the reverence of distant nations, distinguish him from the royal croud; and Europe dates a new era from the restoration of the Western empire.” The very pagans indeed, as Cardinal Baronius observes, mourned for Charlemagne as the father of the world: “*ipso paganorum planxisse quasi patrem orbis*.” Annal. Eccles. A. D. 814.

† Since this was written, *the Carolingian emperorship of the West* has been transferred to France, and *the real temporal supremacy of Charlemagne* has been revived. June 1, 1806.

‡ The relics of that temporal supremacy, which constituted the Carolingian line of emperors *the last head of the beast*, may be clearly traced in the famous Golden bull enacted under the Emperor Charles iv. in the year 1356. In this bull each of the Electors is required to swear, that to the best of his discernment, he will choose “a temporal chief for the Christian people” who may be worthy of that station: and it is afterwards ordered, that none of them shall quit the city of Frankfort, “until they shall have, by a plurality of voices, elected and given to the world, or to the Christian people, a temporal chief, namely a king of the Romans, future Emperor.” With the same now empty affectation of the Carolingian supremacy, the Archbishop of Cologne is styled *Arch-chancellor of the Holy Empire in Italy*; the Archbishop of Trier, *Arch-chancellor of the Holy Empire in France and Arles*; and the Archbishop of Meutz, *Arch-chancellor of the Holy Empire in Germany*. The whole of the Golden bull may be seen in Mod. Univ. Hist. Vol. xxx. Bp. Newton indeed does not deny, that *the Carolingian emperorship is a head of the beast*; only he supposes it to be a continuation of *the sixth head*, instead of its being the distinct double last head. Such a scheme however appears to me extremely unnatural. When *the sixth head* was continued from the days of Constantine in the persons of the *Constantinopolitan emperors*, and consequently when it was actually in existence at the time of the rise of the *Carolingian Emperorship*, it seems very far fetched to say, that it was continued in the line of the *Carolingian Emperors*, the very first of whom did not flourish till upwards of three centuries after the downfall of the old western empire under Augustulus.

so great a difference between them, that they cannot with any propriety be considered as forming only *one head*. They differ in these respects.

*The Augustan Emperorship* was a *single head*, immediately succeeding *the five* which had fallen, and seated during the latter part of its existence at Constantinople contemporaneously with *the last head*.\* *The Carolingian Emperorship* is a *double head*, consisting of the *Patriciate* merging into *the feudal imperial dignity*, whence I have styled it *the septimo-octave head*—*The Augustan Emperorship* was composed of a *line of real Roman princes*,† who administered *the very Empire* that was erected by the valour of *the five first heads*. *The Carolingian Emperorship* was composed of a *line of Gothic princes*, who had invaded and occupied the territories of *the sixth head*—*The Augustan Emperorship* was sometimes hereditary, and sometimes conferred by the military violence of the Pretorian guards. *The Carolingian Emperorship* has sometimes indeed been hereditary, but has for the most part been elective, the right of election being vested in a certain number of princes—*The Augustan Emperorship* was always attached to territorial possessions, insomuch that, if the reigning Emperor had not been Emperor, he would have been no more than a private man. *The Carolingian Emperorship* was never attached to territorial possessions, *as such*; the prince, who enjoyed that dignity, sometimes being of one family and sometimes of another, holding his proper dominions by a quite distinct tenure from his Emperorship, being at once an hereditary sovereign and an elective Emperor, and rarely since the days of Charlemagne possessing a single foot of ground in his imperial capacity.‡ Accordingly the dignity of *the Carolingian Emperorship* has been borne alternately by a King of France, a Duke of Franconia,

\* It is worthy of notice, that St. John gives no intimation, that *the sixth head* should fall previous to the rise of *the septimo-octave head*, though he states so particularly that *the five first heads* had fallen previous to the rise of *the sixth head*.

† When I say *real Roman princes*, I only mean princes born in regions that acknowledged the sovereignty of the Augustan Emperors, not princes literally born at *Rome* or in *Italy*.

‡ Charlemagne's sovereignty of Italy gradually melted away into the imperial fiefs.

a Duke of Suabia, a Duke of Bavaria, a King of Bohemia, a King of Naples, and a King of Spain,\* whose hereditary territories were entirely independent of their imperial rank—Finally, *the Augustan Emperorship* consisted of a line of *military despots*, ruling, like the Turkish monarchs, over a nation of slaves. *The Carolingian Emperorship* has ever constituted its possessor *the chief of a Gothic feudal confederacy*. When this last particular is fully considered, we shall scarcely find any two lines of princes more dissimilar than *the Augustan* and *the Carolingian Emperors*. The principles of feudalism, brought by the northern tribes out of their native forests,† and carried to perfection in France, Germany, and Italy, draw an indelible line of difference between *the sixth* and *the last head of the beast*: and we must possess the power of imagination in a very high degree to suppose, that *Charlemagne*, surrounded by his Gothic military vassals, the Paladins, Dukes, and Counts of his Empire, or that *the modern Emperors of the Romans*, the feudal superiors of a long train of Electors, Princes, Margraves, and Landgraves, form a continuation of *the Augustan Emperors of Rome and Constantinople*, merely because they also have borne the title of *Emperors*.‡ So far indeed is *the sovereign of the Gothic Roman Empire*, from constituting

\* I pretend not accurately to state all the variations of descent in the Carolingian imperial dignity: I merely observe, in general terms, that it has been attached at different times to all these different families.

† The rudiments of feudalism may be clearly discovered in the account which Tacitus gives of the ancient Germans. In their yet infant state of society their princes, instead of granting to their couns or feudal vassals manors and estates subject to military service, presented them with horses and lances, and gained their affection by rude though plentiful entertainments. See Tac de Mor Ger C. 13, 14.

‡ The Italian Romances are curious and even valuable, as depicting with considerable accuracy, from the legends of the ancient troubadours, the state of Gothic manners in the Carolingian age. Whoever has read the poems of Boyardo and Ariosto will find it no easy matter to discover any resemblance between the court of the warlike sovereign of Orlando, Rinaldo, and Ruggiero, and that of the Roman Cesars; and history will teach him, that there is just as little resemblance between their respective principles of government. Mr Gibbon very truly observes, that “the victorious nations of Germany established a new system of manners and government in the western countries of Europe.” Hist of Decline, Vol vi p 404

The sceptre of Charlemagne has recently been transferred from Germany to France. Still however is *the new empire of the West* constructed on those very principles of feudalism, which characterized *the original empire of Charlemagne*. An assemblage of newly-created kings professing to hold their crowns as vassals of their superior lord Buonaparté, who scruples not to style their dominions *fed. of provinces of his empire*. June 1, 1805.

jointly with *the sovereign of the Constantinopolitan Empire*: only *one sixth head of the beast*, as Bp. Newton supposes, that the Greeks very unwillingly allowed even to *Charlemagne* the title of *Emperor*, and absolutely refused to bestow it upon his successors. They could not bring themselves to consider a barbarian of the North in the light of *an Emperor of the Romans*; and they were unwilling to concede that dignity to *a king of the Franks*, which they had never refused to *the short-lived genuine line of Western Emperors*, the real successors of *Augustus*.\* Under *Charlemagne* in short, Rome became subject to *a new head*: † *for a form of government* was then

\* The imperial dignity of *Charlemagne* was announced to "the East by the alteration of his style; and, instead of saluting his *fathers, the Greek Emperors*, he presumed to adopt the more equal and familiar appellation of *brother*—A treaty of peace and alliance was concluded between the two empires; and the limits of the East and West were defined by the right of present possession. But the Greeks soon forgot this humiliating equality, or remembered it only to hate the Barbarians by whom it was extorted. During the short union of virtue and power, they respectfully saluted the *august Charlemagne*, with the acclamations of *basileus*, and *Emperor of the Romans*. As soon as these qualities were separated in the person of his pious son, the Byzantine letters inscribed, *To the king, or, as he styles himself, the Emperor of the Franks and Lombards*. When both power and virtue were extinct, they despoiled Louis the second of his hereditary title; and, with the barbarous appellation of *Rex* or *Rega*, degraded him among the crowd of Latin princes. The same controversy was revived in the reign of the *Othos*; and their ambassador describes, in lively colours, the insolence of the Byzantine court. The Greeks affected to despise the poverty and ignorance of the *Franks* and *Saxons*; and, in their last decline, they refused to prostitute to the kings of Germany the title of *Roman Emperors*." Hist. of Decline, Vol. ix. p. 191—195.

† Many commentators, though they may not quite positively declare as much, seem to be impressed with a sort of idea, that *an actual residence at Rome* is a necessary characteristic of a *head of the Roman beast*. Hence we are sometimes asked, What other power, except *the Papacy*, can possibly be *the last head of the beast*, inasmuch as Rome since the days of the *Cesars* has been the seat of no other power? *Mere residence at Rome* however has nothing to do with the character of *a head of the beast*; though it seems essential to such a character to have enjoyed, at some period or other of its existence, *the sovereignty of Rome*. When *Constantine* removed the seat of government, he did not surely on that account cease to be the representative of *the sixth head*, any more than the *King of Scotland* ceased to be the head of Scotland by removing the seat of government to London, or the *Emperor of Russia* to be the head of Russia by transferring his residence from Moscow to Petersburg. Indeed those, who are the foremost in urging *the residence of the Pope in Rome*, as an argument of his being *the last head*, scruple not to declare that either *the line of the demi-Cesars, the exarchs of Ravenna, or the Gothic sovereigns of Italy* constitute *the short-lived seventh head*; although none of these, except the first, ever resided in Rome, and they only for about eight years. Rome was as much subject to *Charlemagne* who resided at Paris, as it was to *Constantine* who resided at Constantinople. The only difference was this; that *Charlemagne* granted Rome to *the Pope* to be held as a fief of the empire, under himself the superior lord, agreeably to the usages of feudalism.

instituted, differing radically and essentially from *every one of the previous six forms*, represented by the *six just heads of the beast*.

By way of recapitulation of what has been said, I will venture to assert, that no power has ever arisen within the limits of *the Roman empire* which at all answers to the prophetic character of *the septimo-octave head*, except *the Carlovingian monarchy* alone. Three things concur in this character: *the last head of the beast* was to be at once both *the seventh* and *the eighth head*, the *seventh* continuing only a short time, and then being swallowed up in *the eighth*; it was at its first rise to be *the whole beast*; and it was to be *the beast that was, and is not, and yet is*, that is to say, it was to be *the revived beast*, or *the beast while in his papally-idolatrous state*.

1. Now *the Carlovingian monarchy* was *the septimo-octave head*, as being *the Patricia's* merging into *the feudal Emperorship*.

2. It was *the whole beast*, as comprehending *the whole Western empire* either by actual sovereignty, or by the homage of acknowledged superiority.

3. And it was *the beast that was, and is not, and yet is*, as comprehending *that whole empire*, after it had relapsed into the abominations of *papal tyranny and idolatry*.

Neither *the Papacy*, nor *any other power*, except *the Carlovingian Patricia-Imperial government*, will be found to answer to this prophetic description; whence I doubt not, but that *that government* is intended by *the last head of the beast*.

Mr. Mede and Bp. Newton think, that St. John beheld *all the ten horns* growing together upon *the last head*. To this opinion however there appear to be insuperable objections, whether *the last head* be *the Papacy* or *the Gothic Emperorship*. *The springing up of horns out of a head* necessarily implies, that *the head* was in existence before *the horns*: whereas both *the Papal Empire* (as contradistinguished from *the primitive Bishopric of Rome*), and *the Carlovingian Emperorship*, arose after *the horns* had sprung up; namely, the one in *the year*

indeed the whole behaviour of Charlemagne shews plainly, that he was as much the real sovereign of Rome as Buonaparté is at present June 1, 1806



606, and the other in *the years 774 and 800.*\* Hence it is plain, that *the ten horns* could not have appeared to the prophet as growing upon *the last head*. To which then of *the heads* are we to assign *the ten horns*? Most assuredly to *the sixth*. In the days of St. John *five* were fallen: and, between the fall of *those five* and the rise of *the last, the ten horns* sprung up. It is plain therefore, that they can only have sprung up out of *the sixth*. Such accordingly we find to be the case. *The Roman Empire* was divided into *ten kingdoms* under *the sixth head of the beast*, previous to his revival under *the same sixth head*, and previous to the rise of *his last head*. It was *the sixth head* therefore that branched out into *ten horns*: consequently to *the sixth head* the *ten horns* must necessarily belong.

III In the remaining part of the prophecy respecting *the ten-horned beast* we are informed, agreeably to the preceding prophecy respecting the war between *the dragon* and *the woman*, that it was *the dragon* which gave his power and his seat or secular authority to *the beast*; and that *the beast*, as his agent, should persecute the saints *42 months* or *1260 years*. Hence it appears, that *the persecution of the dragon* and *the persecution of the beast* is one and the same; and that they are both exactly commensurate with *the reign of the little horn*. *The dragon* therefore, as I have already observed, we must consider as *the main-spring* of *the whole Apostacy*; *the ten-horned beast*, as his *secular engine of persecution*; and *the two-horned beast*, as *the spiritual instrument* which he used to stir up *the last head* and *the ten horns of the beast of the sea* against *the mystic woman*. In this sense then it is, that *the whole ten-horned beast*, after he had arisen from *the sea*, “opened his mouth in blasphemy to God, to blaspheme his name, and his tabernacle, and them that dwell in heaven.” He blasphemed the name of God by sanctioning all the blasphemous absurdities of his *little*

\* Bp. Newton dates the commencement of *the 1260 years* considerably later than *the year 606*: hence, according to his plan, it is still more impossible, that *the ten horns* should appear to St. John growing upon *the last head*, if *that last head* be *the Papacy*.

† “I saw one of his heads as it were wounded to death; and his deadly wound was healed—the beast, which had the wound by a sword, and did live.” Rev. xiii. 3, 14.

*Horn*,\* that predicted *man of sin* who proudly sat in the temple of God, and literally shewed himself that he is God by receiving the adoration of his cardinals: † hence it is said by Daniel, that *the beast* should be destroyed “because of the voice of the great words which *the horn* spake.” And he blasphemed the mystic tabernacle of God, and them that dwell in *the symbolical heaven*, by upholding and propagating the most foul and injurious calumnies against *the witnesses*, accusing them of all the crimes which pagan Rome had formerly laid to the charge of the primitive Christians. ‡

We are moreover informed, that all the world worshipped *the dragon* and *the beast*, and wondered after *the beast*. Respecting this worship we are afterwards taught, that it was *the second beast* who caused it to be paid to *the first*; and much light is thrown upon its nature by a phrase which more than once occurs in the Apocalypse: *men are said to worship the beast and his image*. Now it is superfluous to observe, that the Papists never literally worshipped *the devil*; and equally so to remark, that they never literally worshipped *the ten-horned beast*, or *the secular Roman empire*: yet this worship is immediately connected with the worship of *an image*, which *the second beast* caused to be made to, or for the use of, *the first beast*. Hence I apprehend, that *the worship of the dragon and the beast* means *the devotion of the whole Roman world to the apostate principles of the beast*, such as his idolatrous worship of images, his opposition to the truth, and his persecution of the witnesses. They, that

\* “Any acts of idolatrous worship,” says Mr. Lowman, “may well be expressed by *blaspheming God and his name*, as they deny to the true God his distinguishing honour, and give it to creatures, whether images, saints, or angels.” Paraph in loc.

+ See Bp. Newton’s Dissert. on *the man of sin*.

‡ Mrs. Bowdler ingeniously supposes, that *the blasphemy* here spoken of means *apostasy*, for which she cites Acts xxvi. 11. Taking the word in this sense, *the beast*, while pagan, laboured to cause the primitive Christians to *blaspheme* or *apostatise*, by requiring them to abjure their faith: and, when afterwards in an *apostatical* state himself, (2 Thess ii 3 1 Tim. iv. 1) he was equally zealous in causing *the witnesses* to *blaspheme*, not indeed the *literal* name of Christ, but certainly his *religion*, so far as *the spirit* of it is concerned, by *apostatizing* to *Papery*. Mrs. Bowdler however, who wrote in *the year* 1773, supposes, that a time may come when the ancient *pagan blasphemy of the beast* will be revived, and when men will be required to abjure the very name of Christ. Her conjecture has certainly been accomplished in at least one of the principal members of *the beast*. Practical Observ. on the Rev. p. 25—46.

dwelt upon the earth, worshipped *the dragon*, by lending themselves as tools to advance the infernal domination of the prince of darkness;\* and they worshipped *the beast* by adopting the idolatry which he upheld no less as a Popish than as a pagan empire.† I know not in what manner, except this, it is possible for *an empire* to be worshipped.

It is further said, that power was given to *the ten-horned beast* over all kindreds, and tongues, and nations; in-  
 somuch that all that dwell upon the earth shall worship him, whose names are not written in the book of life of the Lamb: These various kindreds, and tongues, and nations, are the different papal states of *the Roman earth*: over all of which *the beast* reigned, either through *his last head*, or through *his ten horns*. For a season, they all worshipped *the beast*, adopting his apostate principles, joining in his adoration of images, applauding his every persecution of the Church, and heartily concurring with him in his most violent measures against *the witnesses* whose names are written in the book of life: and even now, after the Reformation, only *one of the ten horns*‡ has protested against his tyranny, and resolutely sheltered *the mystic woman* and *the remnant of her* from his implacable rage.§ The *others* either still adhere to their ancient abominations, or have embraced the yet more blasphemous tenets of *Antichrist*. Notwithstanding their recent severe sufferings, they repent not of the works of their hands, their idolatry, their murders, their sorceries, their spiritual fornication, their thefts; or they repent of them, only to blaspheme the name of the God of heav-

\* "Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do." John viii. 44.

† "*Adoraverunt bestiam*, i. e. subjecerunt se bestię juxta constitutionem suam religiosam." (Pol. Synop. in loc.) The passage is equivalent to that, wherein it is said, that *the ten horns*. "gave their power and strength unto the beast." (Rev. xvii. 13.) *The whole Roman world*, under *all its ten horns*, embraced those idolatrous and heretical principles which gave to the Empire its bestial character; and employed its utmost power and strength to uphold them. Respecting the worship of *the beast's image* more will be said hereafter in its proper place.

‡ I use the phrase here in a general and indefinite sense, as it is used by the prophet himself. (Rev. xvii. 16.) Of *the ten original horns* France alone remained at the era of the Revolution.

§ Neither Denmark, Sweden, nor Prussia, are *even modern horns of the beast*, because they never were comprehended within the limits of *the old Roman Empire*.

en, and to refuse to give him glory. *The Roman beast* still retains all the characteristics of a *beast*: and in this state he will at length go into perdition on account of the great words of *the little horn*.

IV. It will not be improper at the end of this long discussion to give in one point of view the scheme of interpretation which I have adopted in preference to that of Bp. Newton. Whatever may be its other faults, it at least preserves *all the members of the seven-headed and ten-horned beast* perfectly distinct.

*The beast* then is *the secular Roman empire*—His *seven heads* (the last being his *double* or *septimo-octave head*) are 1. Kings; 2. Consuls; 3. Dictators; 4. Decemvirs; 5. Military Tribunes; 6. Augustan Emperors; 7. 8. Carlovingian Patricio-Emperors—His *ten primitive horns* are 1. The kingdom of the Huns; 2. The kingdom of the Ostrogoths; 3. The kingdom of the Visigoths; 4. The kingdom of the Franks; 5. The kingdom of the Vandals; 6. The kingdom of the Sueves and Alans; 7. The kingdom of the Burgundians; 8. The kingdom of the Heruli, Rugii, Scyrri, and other tribes that composed the Italian kingdom of Odoacer; 9. The kingdom of the Saxons; 10. The kingdom of the Lombards—His *little horn*, which grew up among his *first ten horns*, and which was different from them all, is *the ecclesiastical kingdom of the Pope*; which small as it originally was, afterwards became a *great ecclesiastical empire*—His *three primary horns*, that were plucked up before *the little papal horn*, are 1. The kingdom of the Heruli; 2. The kingdom of the Ostrogoths; and 3. The kingdom of the Lombards.

*The Apocalyptic ten horned beast* is not represented, like *the same beast* in the book of Daniel, with a *little horn*; because St. John wished to describe *the power* symbolized by *the little horn*, as having now, at the revival of *the secular beast*, become a *great spiritual empire* by being declared *supreme head of the universal church*. Accordingly *the two-horned beast* which is not mentioned by Daniel, occupies the place of *the little horn*, which is not mentioned by St. John. This *two-horned beast*, or *false prophet*, is the same as *the great scarlet whore*,

who rides triumphant upon *the secular beast*: that is to say, they both equally symbolize *the adulterous tyrannical church of Rome, or the spiritual catholic empire of the Pope.*

V. The prophecy awfully concludes with a call to attend to the just judgments of the Lord. "If any man hath an ear, let him hear. He, that leadeth into captivity, shall go into captivity: he, that killeth with the sword, must be killed with the sword. Here is the patience and the faith of the saints."

Hitherto we have beheld *the secular beast* triumphant, wearing out the *saints* at the instigation of *his little horn* by leading them into captivity, or by mercilessly putting them to death:\* we are now summoned to attend to the just retribution of a righteous God. The *full* execution of this sentence, long since pronounced upon *the beast*, is as yet future: for it will not take place till the last decisive battle of *Armageddon* after the termination of the *1260 years*. Then, we are taught by St. John, that *the beast* shall go into *perdition*, being taken along with his associate *the false prophet*, and cast into the lake of fire; and by Daniel, that *the beast* shall be *slain*, and his body destroyed and given to the burning flame.

This I apprehend to be the ultimate meaning of the prophecy; nevertheless it seems, in some measure, to have begun already to receive its accomplishment. *They that lead into captivity, and they that kill with the sword*, is so general and comprehensive an expression, that it seems necessarily to include, not only *the secular instruments* of papal persecution, but likewise *the ecclesiastical promoters* of it: accordingly both Daniel and St. John connect the fate of *the beast* with that of *the little horn* or *the false prophet*. We have beheld then in France

\* *Perpetual confinement* or *the galleys*, was the fate of those French protestants after the revocation of the *edict of Nantes*, who escaped the stroke of the sword. To the eternal disgrace of *Louis the fourteenth*, many of the female protestants, even *young girls*, were transported as *slaves* to the West-India colonies, merely because they refused to worship idols, and invoke dead saints. Would that protestant England was as little stained with the atrocities of the African slave-trade as with religious persecution!

There is reason to hope from a late decision of the British parliament, that ere long that infamous traffic will be abolished. Till a complete end be put to it, I see not how we can expect that the protection of a God of justice will be extended to us. June 21, 1806.

the descendant and successor of those, whose memory has been rendered infamous by *the diabolical crusade against the protestants of Provence, by the blood-stained eve of St. Bartholomew\**, by *the perfidious revocation of the edict of Nantz,†* himself led into captivity and slain with the sword. We have beheld numbers of his papal clergy crowded together into gaols, and put to death.‡ We have beheld the sovereign Pontiff, *that man of sin* who had led so many thousands captive, himself go into captivity. The voice of *the seven last thunders* hath long been sealed : but now it hath begun to shake both heaven and earth.

We are not however to imagine, that *the infidel tyrant of the last days* is allowed to prosper for his own sake. He is doubtless a mere instrument of vengeance in the hand of God. Like his precursor and type, the haughty sovereign of Assyria, he is “the rod of the Lord’s anger, sent against an hypocritical nation and against the people of his wrath, to take the spoil, and to take the prey, and to tread them down like the mire of the streets.—Howbeit he meaneth not so; but it is in his heart to destroy and to cut off nations not a few.” Hence, when he hath “performed his whole work,” as “the fruit of the stout heart of the king of Assyria and the glory of his high looks” were punished, so “shall he come to his end, and none shall help him.”

\* “*The French king* glorieth in his letters to *the Pope*, that he had slain 70,000 heretics in a few days.” Isaacson’s Chron. cited by Sharpe in *An inquiry into the description of Babylon*, p. 33. Bossuet acknowledges the murder of only 30,000.

† “Louis peremptorily required the protestants in France to sign a declaration of submission and strict obedience to his royal orders; and that they should promise to attend the mass, and entirely omit their own religious meetings; for otherwise they should forfeit, not only *their lands* and *all other property*, but also *their personal liberty*; the men being doomed to slavery in the king’s galleys for life, and the women to be shut up for life wherever their enemies should choose to immure them.” It is supposed, that, in the course of this detestable persecution, about a *million of protestants* saved their lives by quitting their country, and that at least 100,000 were murdered. (Sharpe’s *Inquiry into the description of Babylon*, p. 35—39.) Among those, who fled from their disgraced country at that dreadful period, was a pious ancestor of my own.

‡ “The decree was passed on the 15th day of May, 1562, which condemned the non-juring clergy to banishment. About the time of the federation which followed, many of the clergy were put to death with circumstances more or less sanguinary: great numbers also were crowded together in gaols, and other places of confinement.” Hist. the Interp. Vol. ii. p. 232.

## SECTION IV.

*Concerning the two-horned beast of the earth.*

To complete his account of the great promoters and upholders of the *Western Apostacy*, it now only remains, that St. John should describe the *spiritual power*, by the instigation, of which the *temporal ten-horned beast* was to persecute the witnesses during the space of 1260 years. Accordingly he concludes the *third chapter* of the *little book* with fully developing the character of this tyrannical empire within an empire, under the symbol of a second beast or universal empire, co-existing and co-operating with the first beast or universal empire.

“And I beheld another beast coming up out of the earth; and he had two horns like a lamb, and he spake as a dragon. And he exerciseth all the power of the first beast before him, and causeth the earth and them that dwell therein to worship the first beast, whose deadly wound was healed. And he doeth great wonders, in order that he may make fire come down from heaven on the earth in the sight of men.\* And he deceiveth them that dwell on the earth, by means of those miracles which he had power to do in the sight of the beast; saying to them that dwell on the earth, that they should make an image for the beast, which had the wound by a sword and did live. And he had power to give life

\* Such I conceive to be the proper translation of the original. This bringing down of fire from heaven upon earth was not itself a miracle; but wonders were wrought by the beast in order that he might possess without dispute or control the authority thus symbolically described. In our present version it appears as if the bringing down of fire was itself one of the beast's miracles; whereas the particle *ἵνα* signifies in order that, not so that. To justify the common version, the particle *ὥστε* ought to have occupied the place of *ἵνα*. Thus, after the Apostle has mentioned the different gifts conferred upon the Church, he adds that they were so conferred, “in order that we henceforth should be no more children:” *ἵνα μηκέτι ὡμεν νηπιῖοι.* (Ephes. iv. 14.) Thus also the same Apostle exhorts us to “come boldly unto the throne of grace, in order that we may obtain mercy:” *ἵνα λαβώμεν ἐλεῶν.* (Heb. iv. 16.) Thus again, on the other hand, St. Mark informs us, that “Jesus yet answered nothing; so that Pilate marvelled;” *ὥστε θαυμάζειν τὸν πῖλατον.* (Mark xv. 5.) And thus St. Paul informs the Corinthians, that God comforted him both by the coming of Titus, and by their fervent mind toward him, “so that,” says he, “I rejoiced the more:” *ὥστε μὲ μαλλὸν χαρῆσαι.* (2 Cor. vii. 7.) There are three other passages, besides this, in the Apocalypse, where in order that, is by our translators erroneously rendered so that; Luke xvi. 26. Rom. i. 20. and Galat. v. 17.

unto the image of the beast, 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. And he caused all, both small and great, rich and poor, free and bond, to receive a mark in their right hand, or in their foreheads: 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 six hundred three score and six."

A commentator upon the prophecies of Daniel and St. John can never be too much upon his guard against the fascinating idea, that he may expect to find *every passing event of his own day* there predicted. Before he ventures to introduce any exposition founded upon *present* circumstances, he ought to make it clearly appear, that it both accords with *the chronological* order so carefully preserved in those prophecies, that it strictly harmonizes with *the language of symbols*, and that it demonstrates *every* part of the prediction to tally *exactly* with its supposed accomplishment. How far *I* have attended to this sound canon of interpretation in the remarks already made upon the character of *the king who was to magnify himself above every God*, upon *the scoffers of the last days*, and upon *the tremendous calamities conceived to have been introduced by the blast of the third trumpet*, the cautious reader must decide. My object, however *I* may have succeeded, has been the serious investigation of truth, not the mere establishment of a system. *I* have endeavoured to the best of my judgment to *follow* prophecy, not to *lead* it to my own preconceived scheme of exposition.

Respecting this *second apocalyptic beast*, truth constrains me to say, that neither Mr. Kett, nor Mr. Gallo-way, appear to me to have attended to the foregoing canon in their remarks upon its prophetic character.

Mr. Kett thinks, that *the second beast* and *the image* are *Infidelity* and *Democratic tyranny*; that *the two horns of the beast* are *the German illuminati* and *French pseudo-philosophers*; and that *the particular democratic*



*tyranny symbolized by the image is the revolutionary republic of France.* Having laid down these principles, he observes, (what no doubt is perfectly true,) that it was *Infidelity*, which so bewitched the minds of the people as to induce them to set up *the atheistical republic*; and that, when *the image* was thus set up, it caused as many as would not worship it to be killed. He further observes, that all, both high and low, rich and poor, were compelled to wear *a mark* in their foreheads, *the tri-coloured cockade*, as acknowledging the authority of *the beast and his image*;\* and that those, who refused this badge of democratic atheism, were formally proscribed, and deprived of the common rights of humanity.†

In this interpretation Mr. Kett has only noticed such parts of the prophecy as apparently accord with it: he is totally silent respecting several particulars, which are altogether inapplicable to *Infidelity* and *Revolutionary France*. Such being the case, his interpretation cannot be valid: for no exposition of a prophecy is admissible, except the prophecy agree with its supposed accomplishment in *every* particular‡—St. John describes *the second beast* as “doing great wonders, in order that he may make fire come down from heaven on the earth in the sight of men; and as deceiving them that dwell on the earth by means of those miracles, which he had power to do in the sight of the first beast.” *The second beast* therefore must plainly be some power, which comes, like *the man of sin*, with signs and lying wonders, deceiving for a season the whole world with pretended miracles. Such a character as this however by no means answers to *Infidelity*. Modern philosophers, so far from making any claims to miraculous powers, take a pleasure in scoffing at even the real miracles recorded in Scripture. How is it possible then that *Infidelity* can be *the second*

\* Mr. Kett does not expressly say this; but I fancy it is what he means. See *Hist. the Interp.* Vol i. p. 396, 420.

† *Hist. the Interp.* Vol i. p. 413, 419. Vol. ii. p. 152—208.

‡ It is much to be doubted, whether *the very principle* of this interpretation be admissible, independent of all the objections to which it is liable. It seems to me so little agreeable to symbolical analogy to term *Infidelity a beast* or *an universal visible empire*, that I should certainly not have ventured myself to bring forward such an explanation of the symbol in question.

.....  
*beast*?—So again: if we ask an unprejudiced reader of the whole prediction relative to *the two apocalyptic beasts*, what his sentiments are respecting them; he will answer, that, *whatever powers* those *two beasts* may symbolize, they are evidently *two co-existing powers*, linked together in the closest manner, perfectly friendly to each other, and apparently contributing their mutual strength for the accomplishment of some common design. I confidently appeal to any person not previously wedded to some favourite system, whether this be not the plain and obvious meaning of the prophecy.\* Now, whether *the first beast* be *the Papacy*, as Mr. Kett supposes, or *the Roman empire in its divided state after it had lapsed into idolatry*, as I have endeavoured to prove; in either case, if *Infidelity* be *the second beast*, it certainly has shewn itself the very reverse of being friendly to *the first beast*: for the anti-social part of the Jacobin conspiracy was as steadily directed against all regular government, as its anti-christian part was against all religion. Before Mr. Kett's exposition therefore can be allowed to be well-founded, he must point out in what manner *Infidelity* "caused the earth and all them which dwell therein to worship the beast whose deadly wound was healed;" that is to say, in what manner *Infidelity* caused the whole world to devote themselves to the apostate principles upheld by *the beast*. He may possibly say, that Buonapartè has now taken those apostate principles under his special protection, and has formally entered into a league with *the Pope*. This however is not the point. The question is not what *an ambitious individual* has done, merely to serve his own purposes; but what *Infidelity* has done, that *Infidelity* which set up *the atheistical*

\* This point is so self-evident, that some commentators have thence run into the very contrary extreme to that of Mr. Kett; and have imagined, that *the two beasts* are actually *one and the same power*, or, as they express it, *the same Antichrist under two different symbols*. (See Pol. Synop. in loc.) Indeed either this, or something very nearly a kin to it, is the fault chargeable upon the systems both of Mr. Mede, Bp. Newton, Dr. Zouch, and Mr. Whitaker. Such an opinion, although certainly not agreeable to the plain declaration of the Apostle, who assures us that *the second beast* is "another beast," and therefore not *the same* as *the first beast*, serves at least to shew, that none of these commentators ever supposed *the two beasts* to be hostile to each other. Mr. Mede justly remarks, that they are linked together by the strongest bonds of friendship; "summa necessitudine inter se devinctæ."

.....

*cal republic, or the image* (as Mr. Kett supposes) *of the beast*. Now *Infidelity* placed itself in direct opposition to *all religion*; and what Buonapartè has done has been simply to avail himself of the wild confusion excited by *Infidelity*. The favour therefore, which *he* has shewn to Popery, can by no ingenuity be construed into an act of *that Infidelity* which was the parent of *French democracy*. Since *Infidelity* then has shewn the most determined hostility to *the first beast*, whether *the Papacy* or *the divided Roman empire* be symbolized by *that beast*, how is it possible that *Infidelity* can be *the second beast*? —Further: *a beast*, in the language of symbols, is *an universal empire* either *temporal* or *spiritual*. But *Infidelity* cannot, except by a very strained interpretation, be termed either *a temporal* or *a spiritual universal empire*. *Infidelity* therefore cannot be *the second beast*— This will be yet more evident, when we consider that St. John with a view to give us an insight into the true character of *the second beast*, styles him *a false prophet*.\* Now, since *a true prophet* is one, who professes himself a servant of God, and who either delivers true predictions, or who faithfully preaches the Gospel of Christ; † *a false prophet* must be one, who equally professes himself a servant of God, but who either delivers false predictions, or who garbles and corrupts the Gospel of Christ. It is evident therefore, that *Infidelity* cannot be *the false prophet* of the Apocalypse; because it answers to neither of these descriptions of *a false prophet*. *Infidelity* indeed zealously propagated the doctrines of a false philosophy, and is consequently *a false teacher*: but it certainly cannot be styled, with any propriety, *a false prophet*; because, so far from claiming a divine commission, like *Popery* and *Mohammedism*, it came as an absolutely independent teacher, ridiculing even the very existence of a Deity. Accordingly we find, that St. Peter, when foretelling the atheists of the last days, carefully preserves the distinction between *false prophets* and *false teachers*. He observes, that, as there were

\* Compare Rev. xix. 20. with Rev. xiii. 13, 14.

† This last is a signification of the word peculiar to the New Testament. I have already noticed it; and therefore it is superfluous to say any thing more upon the subject.

*false prophets* among the ancient people of God, who imposed upon them with pretended commissions from heaven; so there should be *false teachers* among the Christians of *the last days*, who privily should bring in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that bought them.\* If then these teachers were to *deny* the Lord that bought them, it is plain that they could not *come in his name* like the false prophets of Israel. Hence St. Peter, with the strictest propriety, terms the ancient impostors *false prophets*; but describes the modern ones, as being only *false teachers*—In addition to these objections, I might inquire with what justice *the French Republic* can be denominated *an image of the beast*: but, since it has been shewn that *Infidelity* cannot be *the second beast*, it is superfluous to discuss that part of Mr. Kett's scheme which is only subordinate. His main position being subverted, the rest of the edifice falls to the ground of course.

Mr. Galloway's system is nearly allied to that of Mr. Kett, though in some particulars it differs materially from it. He supposes, that *the earth*, out of which *the beast* arose, is *France*; that *the beast* himself is *the French Republic*; that *his head* is *the legislature*; that *his two horns* are *the two committees of safety*; that *the fire*, which he brought down from heaven to earth, is *the wrath of God*; that *the wonders*, which he performed, are *the victories of France*: that *the image*, which he set up, and to which he gave life and speech, is *the prostitute goddess of reason and liberty*: that *his mark* is *the cap of liberty* and *the tri-coloured cockade*; and that *the number 666*, the number also of *a man*, must be sought for in the name of the last French monarch *Louis*, when Latinized, *Ludovicus*.†

\* 2 Peter ii. 1.

† L . . . . .	50
U . . . . .	5
D . . . . .	500
O . . . . .	0
V . . . . .	5
I . . . . .	1
C . . . . .	100
U . . . . .	5
S . . . . .	0

The *first objection* to Mr. Galloway's interpretation is the same as one that has already been made to Mr. Kett's. It represents *the second beast* as *hostile*, instead of *friendly*, to *the first*: for Mr. Galloway, like Mr. Kett, supposes *the first beast* to be *the Papacy*. This objection Mr. Galloway struggles, and (I think) ineffectually struggles, to remove: *me* at least all his arguments have only served to convince, that it never can be removed either by himself or by Mr. Kett; and be it again observed, the objection is equally forcibly, whether *the first beast* be *the Papacy* or *the divided Roman empire*—The *second objection* is, that without the least authority he pronounces *the earth* in this particular part of the prophecy to mean *France*. *The earth*, as is sufficiently evident from the general context, means throughout the whole Apocalypse *the Roman empire*. This appears no where more clearly than in the present chapter, where *all they that dwell upon the earth* are described as worshipping, or devoting themselves to the apostate principles of *the ten-horned beast*.\* Yet does Mr. Galloway declare, that *the earth*, in a subsequent part of this very chapter, means *France*—The *third objection* is, that, according to the analogy of figurative language, *France* cannot be symbolized by a *beast*. A *beast* is an *universal empire*, either *temporal* or *spiritual*: and, when it denotes a *temporal universal empire*, its *horns* are kingdoms. *France* however is only *one of the ten horns* of *the great Roman beast*; and therefore most assuredly never can be represented by the symbol of a *new and distinct beast*. Were this the case, St. John would be at open variance with Daniel. The Hebrew prophet expressly maintains, that there shall arise *no fifth temporal beast*, but that *the fourth* or *Roman beast*, shall be *the last*. Now, if *France* be *the two-horned beast* of the Apocalypse, we must conclude that it will become a *fifth universal empire* altogether distinct from *the ancient Roman empire*; otherwise it will not be a *beast*, but only a *horn*: and, if it *do* become a *beast* or *universal empire*, then it will be *the fifth*; the existence of which Daniel plainly denies, asserting that *the ten-*

\* Rev. xiii. 3, 9.

horned beast or divided Roman empire under its last head will be immediately succeeded by the triumphant reign of Christ. So that, let the matter be viewed in what light it may, Revolutionary France cannot be the second apocalyptic beast—The fourth objection is, that the French Republic cannot be denominated a false prophet. The second beast however is the false prophet of the Revelation. Therefore the French Republic cannot be the second beast—The fifth objection is, that, if the wonders performed by the second beast means only the French victories, it does not appear how he could deceive them that dwell upon the earth with such wonders as these. The miracles, wrought by the beast, are immediately connected with his bringing down fire from heaven, and his giving life and utterance to an image: and by these miracles, thus performed, he is said to deceive the world. Such is the simple assertion of the prophet; an assertion, which no critical art can torture to mean Gallic military exploits—The last objection, which I shall make, is to the notion, that we are to seek for the number of the beast in the name Ludovicus. This notion is perfectly untenable even according to Mr. Galloway's own scheme. He supposes, that the number 666, is the number of the second beast, of that beast in short which he conceives to be the French Republic. Let us for a moment allow that he is right in this supposition, and discuss the point accordingly. St. John informs us, that the second beast should permit no man either to buy or to sell, "save he that had the mark, or the name of the beast, or the number of his name." Hence it is evident, that the name of the beast (supposing with Mr. Galloway that the second beast is here intended), which comprehends his mystic number, should be something so peculiarly dear to him, that he should compel all his votaries, in some manner or another, to bear it, under pain of a severe interdict. But has this been the case with the chaotic republic and the name Ludovicus? Has she forbidden all to buy or sell, except those who bore, or (to admit the lowest sense) who revered, the name of her last unfortunate sovereign? Is it not notorious to the whole world, that her conduct has been exactly the reverse? So far from none being per-

mitted by her to exercise the common rights of society except the royalists, or (to bestow upon them the name of their king) *the Ludovicians*, these of all others are the very persons whom she has formally proscribed. We may reasonably then conclude, that, although the word *Ludovicus* happens to contain *the number 666*, it is not on that account alone *the name of the beast*, any more than various other words which may possibly contain the same number. Thus it appears, that, even upon Mr. Galloway's own principles, *Ludovicus* cannot be *the name of the beast*: much less therefore can it be that mysterious name; when we find that he has completely mistaken *the one beast* for *the other*, attributing to *the second beast* the name which in reality belongs to *the first*. What St. John says in his particular description of *the name*, is certainly ambiguous; insomuch that, had he said nothing more upon the subject, it might have been a matter of doubt, whether *the name* was the name of *the first* or of *the second beast*. But he has amply cleared up this point in various other passages, where he plainly intimates, that *the name* is the name of *that beast* to whom *an image* was made.\* But *the beast*, to whom *an image* was made, is *the first beast*: consequently *the name* is the name of *the first beast*, and not of *the second*, as Mr. Galloway erroneously supposes. Arguing then with him, either upon his own principles, or upon the real state of the case, we shall find it equally impossible to admit that *Ludovicus* is *the name of the beast*.†

On these grounds I am constrained to think, that both Mr. Kett and Mr. Galloway have erred in their respec-

\* See Rev. xiv. 11—xv. 2.—xix. 20. and xx. 4.

† Both Mr. Galloway and Mr. Kett are of opinion, that *the two horned beast of the earth* is the same as *the beast of the bottomless pit*, which makes war upon *the witnesses*. This opinion I have already shewn to be entirely erroneous. (See Galloway's Comment. p. 162—208, and Hist. the Interp. Vol. i. p. 391) Their sentiments upon this point must necessarily lead them both into the strange notion, that *the faithful witnesses of God* are *the popish clergy* who were murdered and banished by the atheistical republicans of France. Mr. Galloway accordingly avows, without hesitation, that *the saints of God*, who are mentioned by Daniel as worn out by *the little horn*, and who are evidently the same as *the apocryptic witnesses*, are *those very popish clergy*. The impropriety and erroneousness of such a notion has already been so fully pointed out, that it is superfluous now to resume the subject.

tive interpretations of the prophetic character of *the second beast and the image*.\*

Bp. Newton's scheme is much less objectionable. That valuable commentator clearly saw, that *the two apocalyptic beasts* instead of being at utter enmity with each other, were united in the closest bonds of friendship. Having therefore adopted the opinion that *the first beast was the Papacy*, he concluded that *the second was the Roman Church*; thus injudiciously separating

\* Mr. Sharpe supposes *the second beast to be the secular Roman empire under Justinian*. Justinian however was the representative of *the sixth head of the first beast*. Hence it is manifest, that Mr Sharpe makes *the second beast to be in fact the same as the first*. Independent of this palpable tautology, which the prophet carefully guards us against, by assuring us that *the second beast was another beast*, the Emperor Justinian neither performed any miracles for the purpose of deceiving those that dwell upon *the earth*, nor can he or any of his successors be termed a *false prophet*. In short, whatever power be intended by *the second beast or the false prophet*, it must be some power at *this present moment* in existence, because *the false prophet* is not to be destroyed *till the battle of Armageddon, at the expiration of the 1260 years*. (Rev. xix 20.) *The second beast* therefore cannot be *the Empire of Justinian*, because that has long since been subverted by the Turks. Yet does Mr. Sharpe censure all preceding commentators, as having entirely misunderstood the character of *the second beast*, because they apply it to *the Pope himself*: he ought rather to have said *the Roman clergy*, for I doubt whether any commentators ever supposed *the Pope himself* to be intended by *the second beast*. Append. to *An Inquiry into the Description of Babylon*, p. 8—6.

Mr. Bicheno endeavours to prove, that *the second beast is the tyranny exercised by the Capets since the time of Louis XIV. and that the image is the system of persecution adopted by them against the Protestants*. The memory of him who revoked the edict of Nantz I detest as much as Mr. Bicheno himself can do; but mere abhorrence is no argument. It will be superfluous to discuss this scheme at large, when a single word is sufficient to overturn the whole fabric. *The second beast or the false prophet*, for so Mr. Bicheno very justly maintains their identity, is to be overthrown at *the battle of Armageddon under the last vial*; and *the Ottoman empire*, for so Mr. Bicheno with equal propriety understands *the mystic Euphrates*, is to be subverted under *the sixth vial*. But *the Ottoman empire* is not yet subverted; therefore *the sixth vial* is not yet poured out: and, if *the sixth vial* be not yet poured out, of course *the seventh* is not: and, if *the seventh* be not, *the false prophet* is not yet overthrown: and, if he be not yet overthrown, he is now in existence. *The tyranny of the Capets* however is already overthrown; therefore *that tyranny* cannot be *the second beast*. Signs of the times, Part I. p. 17—25.

Mr. Lowman thinks, that *the second beast symbolizes the German ecclesiastical electors, prince-bishops, baronial-abbots, and other ecclesiastico-empirical states that resemble in their constitution the bishopric of Rome united with St. Peter's patrimony*. Independent of every other objection that might be made to this scheme, it has received, like the foregoing one of Mr. Bicheno, a *practical confutation*. The recently adopted system of *secularization*, for the purpose of *indemnifying* (as it is called) those German temporal princes who have been despoiled of their territories by the robberies of France, has effectually slain this supposed *second beast* previous to *the war of Armageddon under the seventh vial*, to which period his overthrow is assigned by the prophet. Hence it is manifest, that *the second beast* certainly cannot be what Mr. Lowman supposes him to be. Paraphr. in loc.



what ought never to have been divided, and thus rending (as it were) *the head from the body*.\* The fact is, what might appear a contradiction till it was actually fulfilled, *the two beasts are two universal empires*, not only existing together each under its proper and distinct head, but mutually supporting and strengthening each other. Daniel however declares, that *the ten-horned beast is the last universal empire*; and yet St. John represents *this very beast* as co-existing with *another beast*, or *another universal empire*: for, that *the two beasts are two powers perfectly distinct from each other*, is manifest, not only from their different symbolical conformation, but from the express words of the prophet: "I beheld," says he, "*another beast.*" Hence it is plain, that *the second apocalyptic beast* cannot be a *temporal universal empire*: both because it is physically impossible, that *two temporal empires*, each universal so far as *the Church* is concerned, should exist together; and because, if *the second beast* of the Apocalypse were a *temporal empire*, it would be a *fifth temporal empire*, whereas Daniel declares that there shall only be *four*. But, if *the second beast* be not a *temporal empire*, it must be a *spiritual empire*; for nothing but a *spiritual empire* can co-exist with a *temporal empire*. Accordingly we find this to be the very case; for St. John, as if to prevent the possibility of error, explicitly informs us, that *the second beast* should be a *false prophet*,† or an *ecclesiastical power*: which, under the presence of a divine commission, should grievously corrupt the genuine Gospel of Christ.‡

Here then we have a plain prediction of *some spiritual power*, which should come in the name of God as a sound evangelical prophet or preacher; which should arrogate to itself *universal or catholic* authority in religious matters; which should co-exist upon the most friendly terms with *the ten-horned temporal empire*, instigating it to per-

\* Mr. Mede more judiciously supposes *the second beast* to be *the Roman Pontiff with his clergy*. "Bestia bicornis, sive pseudopropheta, pontifex est Romanus cum suo clero." Com. Apoc. in loc.

† Compare Rev. xiii. 12—17 with Rev. xix. 20.

‡ "The false prophet," says Bp. Newton very justly, "is a *body or succession of men propagating false doctrines, and teaching lies for sacred truths.*" *The second beast* is manifestly styled a *false prophet* in direct opposition to *the two mystic witnesses*, who are *the true prophets of God*

acute, during the space of *42 prophetic months, or 1260 years*, all such as should dare to dispute its usurped domination; and which, in short, should solve the symbolical problem of *two contemporary beasts*, by exhibiting to the world the singular spectacle of *a complete empire within an empire*. Where we are to look for this power, since *the great Roman beast* was divided into *ten horns*, and during the period of his existence under *his last secular head, the Carlovingian line of feudal Emperors*, let the impartial voice of history determine; and that voice without hesitation will declare, that *the catholic church of Rome* the *spiritual empire* of which *the Pope is the allowed head*, can alone answer to the prophetic description of such a power.\* At its first rise, the *Papacy* appears in the book of Daniel only as *a little horn* springing out of *the first or secular beast*: but *that little horn* is represented as soon becoming exceeding powerful, and as influencing the actions of *the whole beast*. When *the saints* were given into its hand in *the year 606*, the *papal kingdom* became an *universal spiritual empire*; and, as such, it is represented by St. John under the symbol of *a distinct beast* having *a proper head and horns* of his own. That *the little horn of the Roman beast* typifies *the same power as the second apocalyptic beast*, is manifest indeed from this circumstance. Daniel, who fully delineates the character of *the little horn*, is entirely silent respecting *the two-horned beast*; and St. John, who as fully delineates the character of *the two-horned beast*, is entirely silent respecting *the little horn*. Accordingly we find, that *the little horn, and the two-horned beast*, act precisely

\* The Papists, by a wonderful fatality, have constantly styled themselves *Catholics*, and their particular church *the Catholic Church*; thus holding themselves forth as members of the body of *the second beast*, or *catholic ecclesiastical empire*. In this sense of the word, we readily concede to them the title of *Catholics*; in its genuine sense, as importing *members of the spiritual body of Christ*, we claim the title no less than themselves. These pretended *Catholics* the Church of England uniformly denominates *Papists*; and, as I have no inclination to uncatholicise myself, I have throughout the present work adopted her phraseology in preference to the more fashionable one of the day. I freely allow, that the Papists are members of *the catholic beast*; but I cannot bring myself to style them *Catholics*, as if they were *the only members of the true catholic church*. If protestants, in the height of modern liberality, grant that none but *the adherents of the Papacy* are *real Catholics*, they do indeed plead guilty to the less courteous appellation of *Heretics*, with which I am not aware that the Papists have ever ceased to honour us.

in the same capacity; each exercising all the power of *the first beast* before him, each being a *false seer* or *prophet*, and each perishing in one common destruction with *the first* or *secular beast*.\*

I. *The second beast sprung up out of the earth, and is described as being another beast perfectly distinct from the first*—In the language of the Apocalypse, *the earth* denotes *the Roman Empire*: † *the spiritual power* therefore, symbolized by *the beast*, must be sought for within the limits of *that empire*. There accordingly we find *the ecclesiastical empire of the Pope*. *The sixth head of the temporal beast* long claimed and exercised supremacy over *the Church*: but, in *the year 606*, the tyrant Phocas constituted Pope Boniface *supreme head in spirituals*, and bestowed upon him the title of *Universal Bishop*. In this year then *the second beast, or the universal empire of the Pope*, arose out of *the earth*: and it has ever been the policy of its ruler to separate it from *the temporal empire*, to keep it perfectly distinct as an *imperium in imperio*, and never suffer it to lose its prophetic character of “*another beast*.” To cite history for the purpose of proving so well known a fact, seems almost superfluous; nevertheless I cannot refrain from noticing a single incident which amply explains the nature of this policy of the *Popes*.

\* Compare Dan. vii. 8, 11, 21, 25, 26. with Rev. xiii. 5, 7, 12, 15, 16, 17, and xix. 20.

+ Mr. Mede and Bp. Newton suppose, that *the beast rising out of the earth* means, that *the power typified by the beast should grow up like a plant silently and without noise*, intimating further that “*the greatest prelates have often been raised from monks and men of the lowest birth and parentage*.” Mr. Whitaker and Dr. Zouch, confining without any just warrant the character of *the beast* to *the monastic orders*, think that the phrase implies *his rise in the East*; and Mr. Whitaker adds, that it may partly allude to the rise of those orders in *times of peace and prosperity*. Both these interpretations seem to me to be needless, not to say unauthorised, refinements. Since *the earth* throughout the whole Apocalypse means *the Roman empire*, and no where more decidedly so than in the present chapter, what occasion is there to annex to it here a fresh idea? The prophet had just before declared, that *the whole earth* wondered after *the great Roman beast*, and that all that dwell upon *the earth* should worship him; (Rev. xiii. 3, 8.) and he now proceeds to inform us, that he beheld *another beast* coming up out of *the earth*, (Rev. xiii. 11.) teaching us afterwards that *this other beast* should deceive those that dwelt on *the earth*. (Rev. xiii. 14.) Now it is only reasonable to suppose, that what the word *earth* means in one part of a chapter, it should mean in another. Since then *the earth* which wondered after *the Roman beast* can only mean *those who dwell upon the earth*, and since *those who dwell upon the earth* can only mean *the inhabitants of the Roman empire*: we must surely conclude, that, when a *beast* is said to come up out of *this very earth*, *the Roman empire* is here likewise intended.

When *Edward the first* of England wished to impose a tax upon the Clergy, "*Boniface the eighth*, who had succeeded *Celestine* in the papal throne, was determined to resume the authority, which had been for some time relaxed by his predecessors, and to become the protector of the spiritual order, against all invaders. For this purpose he issued very early in his pontificate a general bull, prohibiting all princes from levying without his consent any taxes upon the clergy, and all clergymen from submitting to such impositions: and he threatened both of them with the penalties of excommunication in case of disobedience. No sooner therefore had the king made his demand on the clergy of the fifth of their moveables, than they entrenched themselves under the bull of *Pope Boniface*, and pleaded conscience in refusing to comply with the requisition. Edward avoided proceeding immediately to extremities on this account; but, having given orders to lock up all their granaries and barns, and prohibited all rent to be paid to them, he appointed a new synod to confer with him upon his demand. The primate, not intimidated by Edward's resolution, plainly told him, that the clergy owed obedience to two sovereigns, their spiritual and their temporal; but their duty bound them to a much stricter attachment to the former than to the latter: they could not therefore comply with his commands, which were directly contrary to the positive prohibition of the sovereign pontiff."\* The subsequent steps taken by Edward to enforce obedience it is needless here to detail: enough has been said to shew in what manner *the second beast* which sprung out of *the earth*, was "*another beast*."

2. *He had two horns like a lamb*—As *the secular beast* is represented with *seven heads* and *ten horns*, so *the ecclesiastical beast* appears with only *one head* and *two horns*. Now, since we have already seen, that *the secular beast* under his last head is *the divided Roman empire* under the line of *Carlovingian emperors*; *the ecclesiastical beast* under his single head, who has co-existed and co-operated with *the secular beast*, must necessarily be *the corrupt*

\* Mod. Univ. Hist. Vol. xxxix. p. 205, 206.

church of Rome under the line of those pretended universal bishops, the Popes. And here we cannot but observe the wonderful exactness with which the two principal apocalyptic symbols, the first, and the second beast, are contrived. The Roman empire, having existed under seven different constitutions, is described by a beast with seven heads; but the catholic church of Rome, never having existed under more than one form of government, namely the papal, is therefore described by a beast with only one head.

This head however is furnished with two horns. In the language of symbols, horns are kingdoms: consequently the horns of an ecclesiastical beast must be ecclesiastical kingdoms. Now I know not what idea we can annex to an ecclesiastical kingdom, subservient to the head of an ecclesiastical empire, except that of a regularly organized body of ecclesiastics subject primarily to their own immediate superior, and ultimately to the head of the whole empire. If the church of Rome then be intended by the second apocalyptic beast, and the Pope, by the head of that beast, it must comprehend two such ecclesiastical kingdoms; that is to say, it must comprehend two regularly organized bodies of ecclesiastics, distinct from each other, and subject primarily to their respective superiors, and ultimately to the Pope. Mr. Whitaker and Dr. Zouch suppose that the two horns are the monks, who were at first divided into two classes: the Cenobites, who (to adopt the language of Mr. Gibbon) "lived under a common and regular discipline; and the Anachorets, who indulged their unsocial, independent, fanaticism." And Mr. Whitaker adds, that in a later age the papal authority was more especially supported by two mendicant orders of monks, the Dominicans and Franciscans—This opinion seems to me by no means tenable for various reasons—Monasticism first arose in the East about the year 305, and thence passed into the West. The second apocalyptic beast however, or the catholic empire of the Pope, did not spring up out of the earth till the year 606. Consequently the original two-fold division of the monks in the East cannot make them the two horns of a beast, which sprung up, long after that division, in the West—But it

may be said, that, although their extraction be *oriental*, there is no inconsistency in supposing that they might afterwards become *horns of the beast*, when they had extended themselves *westward*, and mightily exerted themselves in support of the papal authority. Here then another objection presents itself. I readily allow, that the character of *the Cenobites* perfectly answers to the character of *an ecclesiastical horn or kingdom*. They were *a regularly organized body of men; bound by certain laws, and subject first to their superior, and in after ages through him to the Pope*. But I can discover none of the characteristics of *a horn in the Anachorets*. These, so far from being united under a settled government, and from professing obedience to a superior, “renounced the convent as they had renounced the world;” and, plunging into the deepest solitudes of the desert far from the haunts of men, “indulged their unsocial, *independent*, fanaticism.” Such being the case, *the Anachorets* can with no more propriety be esteemed *a horn or regular ecclesiastical government*, than *men in a nomade state* can be considered as constituting *a regular secular government*—Perhaps this part of the scheme may be given up, and it may be asserted that *the Dominicans and Franciscans* are *the two horns* exclusively, neither of those two orders being liable to be charged with the disqualification of *the Anachorets*. Here again fresh objections still arise. Both those orders are comparatively of a late date: and are we to suppose, notwithstanding the early rise of monasticism, that *the beast* had *no horns* till the days of Dominic and Francis? Or even, if we venture to adopt such a supposition, were *the Dominicans and Franciscans* the *only* orders? That they were the most *conspicuous* orders during three centuries is no doubt perfectly true, but they were certainly very far from standing *alone*. As *the ten horns of the secular beast* represent precisely that number of kingdoms, though some of them were strong and some weak; so, arguing at least from analogy, had *the horns of the ecclesiastical beast* been designed to represent *the monastic orders*, there would surely have been just as many *horns* as there were *orders*, though some of those were strong and some weak—In opposition then to

this scheme, which seems to me to be clogged with too many difficulties to be admissible, I am more inclined to think with Bp. Newton, that *the two horns are the Romish clergy, regular and secular.* *The first* of these classes comprehends *all the various monastic orders*; *the second* comprehends *the whole body of parochial clergy.* *These two classes* I conceive to be *the two ecclesiastical horns or kingdoms of the catholic empire of the Pope.* In every particular they answer to the character of *horns*, being *two distinct regularly organized bodies, subject first to their own particular superiors, and ultimately to the Pope, the head of the whole empire.*

The manner in which these *two ecclesiastical kingdoms of the papal empire* were erected, will best appear by adverting to history.

“The imperious pontiffs,” says Mosheim, “always fond of exerting their authority, exempted by degrees *the monastic orders* from the jurisdiction of the bishops. *The monks*, in return for this important service, devoted themselves wholly to advance the interests, and to maintain the dignity of *the bishop of Rome.* They made his cause their own; and represented him as a sort of god to the ignorant multitude, over whom they had gained a prodigious ascendant by the notion that generally prevailed of the sanctity of *the monastic order.*”\* The same historian further observes, “*The monastic orders and religious societies* have always been considered by *the Roman pontiffs* as the principal support of their authority and dominion. It is chiefly by them that they rule the Church, maintain their influence on the minds of the people, and augment the number of their votaries.”† Of this the following passage affords a remarkable instance.

“The power of *the Dominicans and Franciscans* greatly surpassed that of the other two orders, and rendered them singularly conspicuous in the eyes of the world. During three centuries these two fraternities governed, with an almost universal and absolute sway, both church and state; filled the most eminent posts ecclesiastical and civil; taught in the universities and churches with

\* Mosheim's Eccles. Hist. Vol. ii. p. 172\*

+ Ibid. Vol. iv. p. 184.

an authority, before which all opposition was silent ; and maintained the pretended majesty of *the Roman pontiff's* against kings, princes, bishops, and heretics, with incredible ardour and success. *The Dominicans* and *Franciscans* were before the Reformation what *the Jesuits* have been since that happy and glorious period ; the very soul of the hierarchy, the engines of the state, the secret springs of the motions of the one and of the other, and the authors and directors of every great and important event both in the religious and political world.\* The complete distinctness of *this first horn* or *ecclesiastical kingdom of the beast* from the other, by means of their exemption from episcopal jurisdiction, will appear yet more evidently from the following passage. “ While *the pontiff's* accumulated upon *the mendicants* the most honourable distinctions and the most valuable privileges which they had to bestow, they exposed them still more and more to the envy and hatred of the rest of the clergy ; and this hatred was considerably increased by the audacious arrogance that discovered itself every where in the conduct of these supercilious orders. They had the presumption to declare publicly, that they had a divine impulse and commission to illustrate and maintain the religion of Jesus ; they treated with the utmost insolence and contempt all the different ranks and orders of the priesthood ; they affirmed without a blush, that the true method of obtaining salvation was revealed to them alone ; proclaimed with ostentation the superior efficacy and virtue of their indulgencies ; and vaunted, beyond measure, their interests at the court of heaven, and their familiar connections with the Supreme Being, the Virgin Mary, and the saints in glory. By these impious wiles they so deluded and captivated the miserable and blinded multitude, that they would not intrust any others but the mendicants with the care of their souls, their spiritual and eternal concerns.”† Thus it appears, that *the monastic orders* constituted a well organized body, governed by their own laws, exempt from episcopal jurisdiction, subject to *their respective generals or superiors*, but pay-

\* Mosheim's Eccles. Hist. Vol. iii. p. 195.

† Ibid. p. 204.



ing at the same time an implicit obedience to *the Pope*. In short they perfectly answer to every idea that we can form of *an ecclesiastical kingdom* under the control of *the head of an ecclesiastical empire*.

*The second horn of the beast* I suppose to be *the secular popish clergy*. As *the monks* were subject, first to *the superiors of their orders*, and ultimately to *the Pope*; so *the secular or parochial clergy* were subject, first to *their respective bishops*, and ultimately to *the sovereign pontiff*. Various preparatory steps were taken towards the erecting of *this second ecclesiastical horn or kingdom* before *the year 606*, when *the Pope* was declared *universal Bishop*, and whence therefore I date the rise of *the second beast or the papal catholic empire*. The decrees of the Emperors, and the metropolitan dignity of Rome, gradually conferred upon *the Popes* an archi-episcopal authority over the western bishops, previous to the time when they were formally declared by Phocas *the head of the universal Church*.\* In *the eighth century* Germany was reduced under the yoke by an English friar named *Boniface*, whom *Gregory the third* consecrated Archbishop of Mentz; constituting him at the same time his vicar, with full power to call councils, and to constitute bishops in those places, which were by his assistance converted to the Christian faith. In the first of these councils, Boniface presiding in quality of legate of the Roman chair, the clergy signed a certain confession of faith, whereby they obliged themselves, not only to maintain the catholic faith, but also to remain in constant union with *the Roman church*, and to be obedient to the successors of St. Peter. "This Boniface," says Puffendorff, "was the first, who put it upon the bishops of Germany to receive the episcopal pall from *the Pope*, who sent it to the bishops of France without their request, thereby to unite them with the Roman chair. And, when once these ornaments were become customary amongst them, they were put upon them afterwards as of absolute necessity; and the episcopal function was forbidden to be

\* The reader will find a very circumstantial account of the manner in which *the Bishops of Rome* gradually extended their authority over the West, in Sir Isaac Newton's *Observ. on Daniel*, chap. viii.

exercised by them before they had received these ornaments.\* The same author further observes, " Besides this, *the Popes* assumed to themselves an authority of giving leave to the bishops to remove from one episcopal see to another, and obliged all the western bishops to receive their confirmation from Rome, for which they were obliged to pay a certain sum of money as an acknowledgment, which was since converted to annats. *The Popes* also, by making void the decisions of the provincial synods or assemblies, overthrew their authority: wherefore, when every body plainly perceived that the decrees of these assemblies could produce no other effects but to be continually annulled by *the Popes*, without so much as hearkening to any reasons, they were by degrees quite abolished. *Pope Gregory the seventh* also forced the bishops to swear an oath of fealty to *the Pope*, and by a decree *forbad*† that none should dare to condemn any one that had appealed to *the Pope*. They were also not forgetful in sending legates or nuncios to all places; whose business was to exercise in the name of *the Pope* the same authority which had formerly belonged to the bishops, metropolitans, and provincial assemblies."‡ In this passage mention is made of the oath of fealty exacted by *Gregory the seventh* from the bishops. A similar oath has been imposed, even since the Reformation, by *Pius the fourth* on all the beneficed clergy. He decreed, that they should all swear true obedience to *the Roman pontiff*, the successor of St. Peter, and vicar of Jesus Christ.§ In short, how completely *the clergy under their bishops* became *one of the two ecclesiastical kingdoms of the papal beast*, will best appear from the following oath, set forth by order of *Pope Clement the eighth* to be taken by all bishops at their consecration, and by all metropolitans at their instalment.

" I N. elect of the church of N. from henceforward will be faithful and obedient to St. Peter the Apostle, and to the holy Roman church, and to our lord, the lord N. Pope N. and to his successors canonically coming in:

\* *Introduct. to Hist. of Eur.* cited by Whitaker, p. 404. † *Enacted.*

‡ *Introduct. to Hist. of Eur.* cited by Whitaker, p. 406. § *Ibid.* p. 407.

I will neither advise, consent, or do any thing, that they may lose life or member, or that their persons may be seized, or hands any wise laid upon them, or any injuries offered to them under any pretence whatsoever. The counsel, which they shall intrust me withal, by themselves, their messengers, or letters, I will not knowingly reveal to any to their prejudice. I will help them to defend and keep the Roman Papacy and the royalties of St. Peter, saving my order, against all men. The legate of the apostolic see, going and coming, I will honourably treat and help in his necessities. The rights, honours, privileges, and authority, of the holy Roman church, of our lord *the Pope*, and his foresaid successors, I will endeavour to preserve, defend, increase, and advance. I will not be in any counsel, action, or treaty, in which shall be plotted against our said lord, and the said Roman church, any thing to the hurt or prejudice of their persons, right, honour, state, or power; and, if I shall know any such thing to be treated or agitated by any whatsoever, I will hinder it to my power; and, as soon as I can, will signify it to our said lord, or to some other by whom it may come to his knowledge. The rules of the holy fathers, the apostolic decrees, ordinances, or disposals, reservations, provisions, and mandates, I will observe with all my might, and cause to be observed by others. Heretics, schismatics, and rebels to our said lord, or his foresaid successors, I will to my power persecute and oppose.”\*

As for the precise steps, by which *this ecclesiastical kingdom* was finally and perfectly organized, they are well pointed out by lord Lyttelton in his *history of Henry the second*. “It was now an established notion,” says he, “that all metropolitans were only the vicars or rather viceroys of *the Pope* in their several provinces; and the pall was the ensign of their office. This was too lightly given way to by kings, and proved in its consequences one of the deepest arts, by which the policy of the court of Rome supported its power. For thus all the greatest prelates, who might have affected an independ-

\* Whitaker's Comment. p. 408.

ence on that see, had another object of ambition set up, namely, an independence on their own sovereigns, and an imparted share of the papal dominion over all temporal powers." And again: "Henry the first did not enough consider, how much the design of detaching the clergy from any dependence upon their own sovereign, and from all ties to their country, was promoted by forcing them to a life of celibacy: but concurred with the see of Rome, and with Anselm its minister, in imposing that yoke upon the English church, which till then had always refused it—He was also prevailed upon to suffer *a legate a latere*, the Cardinal of Crema, to preside in a council held at London upon this and other matters, in derogation to the metropolitan rights of the archbishop of Canterbury; thereby confirming that dangerous and degrading subjection to *the Bishop of Rome*, which his father had brought upon the church of England."\* There was yet another step, by which *the second ecclesiastical kingdom of the papal empire* was both completed, and kept in subjection. Well knowing the truth of the maxim, *Divide and rule*, the artful pontiff's dexterously contrived to play off *the one kingdom* against *the other*, to govern *the secular clergy* by the instrumentality of *the regular*. "Whenever any bishop," says Puffendorf, "attempted any thing against *the Pope's* authority, *the mendicant friars* with their clamour and noise pursued him every where like so many hounds, and rendered him odious to the common people, amongst whom they were in great veneration through their outward appearance of holiness; and from thence it came to pass, that *the bishops*, who opposed *the Pope's* authority, never could make a great party among the common people. Besides this, *the friars* always kept a watchful eye over the actions of *the bishops*, giving continual advices concerning them to their generals residing at Rome, whereby *the Popes* were enabled to oppose timely any design intended against their authority. And *these friars* proved the main obstacle, why *the bishops* could not so effectually oppose *the Pope's* authority which he assumed over them; so

\* Hist. of Henry II. cited by Whitaker, p. 410, 411.

that, being destitute of means to help themselves, they were forced to follow the current.”\*

The *regular and secular clergy* then, under *their respective generals and bishops*, are *the two horns* or *ecclesiastical kingdoms* of *the papal catholic empire*. These *horns* appeared to the prophet to be of a different form from those of *the first* or *temporal beast*: they resemble *the horns of a lamb*. Now, when we recollect that *the second beast* is styled *a false prophet*, we can scarcely doubt but that the symbol was so constructed in allusion to his spiritual character. Accordingly *the two ecclesiastical horns* claimed to be the only servants of the Lamb of God, and affected to be like him in meekness and humility. Solemnly devoting themselves to a life of celibacy, and ever engaged in a round of religious ceremonies, they appeared to the deluded populace to be saints indeed, far removed from all the cares and vanities of this transitory world. And, in order that this impression might not be too soon worn off, new saints were at seasonable intervals added to the calendar; and their names enrolled along with those of the real servants of the Lamb, the holy Apostles of the primitive Church. Even *the sovereign pontiff* himself, who had a look more stout than his fellows, delighted nevertheless to style himself, with sanctified hypocrisy, *the servant of the servants* of God.†

3. *But, notwithstanding his lamb-like appearance, the beast spake as a dragon*—The church of Rome, like a true child of that old serpent the devil, forcibly established and supported idolatry; claimed a proud superiority over all temporal dominion; advanced her interests with all the wily cunning of the serpent; anathematized and persecuted to death the faithful servants of Christ; and esteemed every lie and every imposture, which ad-

\* Hist. of Henry II. cited by Whitaker, p. 416.

† We may, if we please, suppose *the cardinals* to constitute *the body of the second beast*; and we shall then have *the whole Romish Hierarchy* completely portrayed. “Prælati Romanenses in Universitate Pragensi congregati, contra Johannem Hussum et alios affirmant (in quarto suo decreto seu articulo), quod collegium cardinalium Romæ sunt corpus Ecclesiæ. Cui respondet Johannes Hussus, Christum esse caput Ecclesiæ, omnesque fideles Christianos corpus esse Ecclesiæ Christi. Cui replicant Prælati processu longo et taciti pleno, ostendentes, quomodo Papa sit caput, et quomodo cardinalium collegium solum, et non ceteri Christiani, sint corpus Ecclesiæ.” Act. et Monument. A. D. 1414. p. 389, 390, 391, cited by Potter, Interp. num. 666. Cap. xix. p. 121.

vanced her authority, a laudable and even pious fraud. That *no faith is to be kept with heretics*, is a well known maxim of this genuine offspring of the father of lies : that *kings excommunicated by the Pope, may be deposed and murdered by their subjects*, is another of her maxims : and that *the end sanctifies the means, that it is lawful to do evil that good may come*, has been the avowed principle of the Jesuits.\* Her draconine cruelty and ferocity need no proofs. Where *pagan Rome* hath slain her thousands *papal Rome* hath slain her ten thousands. “The fourth council of Lateran,” says Bb. Burnet, “decreed, that all heretics should be delivered to the secular power to be extirpated—If a man had but spoken a light word against any of the constitutions of the church, he was seized on by the bishop’s officers : and, if any taught their children the Lord’s prayer, the ten commandments, and the Apostles’ creed, in the vulgar tongue,† that was criminal enough to bring them to the stake, as it did six men and a woman at Coventry in the Passion week 1519.”‡ Here it may be observed, that, while *the first or secular beast* is represented as making war with *the saints*, and overcoming them, it is no where said that *the second or ecclesiastical beast*, and *the image* which he set up, should do more than *cause* them to be killed. The above-cited decree of the council of Lateran shews how exact the prophecy has been in this particular. *The little horn* hath always worn out *the saints* by *causing* them to be killed, or by *delivering them over to the secular arm*,§

\* The maxims of the Jesuits are these, “That actions intrinsically evil, and directly contrary to the divine laws, may be innocently performed by those who have so much power over their own minds, as to join, even ideally, a good end to this wicked action, or (to speak in the style of the Jesuits,) who are capable of directing their intention aright” (Mosheim’s Eccles Hist. Cent. 17. Sect. 2. p. 1. cited by Whitaker.) Thus it appears, that the Jesuits were the prototypes of Weishaupt’s diabolical sect of Illuminati.

† In direct opposition to this abominable system of keeping the people in profound ignorance, the church of England specially charges all sponsors to provide that the child, for whom they have been sureties, “may learn the Creed, the Lord’s Prayer, and the ten Commandments, in the vulgar tongue, and all other things which a Christian ought to know and believe to his soul’s health.” Office of Baptism.

‡ Hist. of Reformation cited by Whitaker, p. 419.

§ On this occasion, the Inquisitors, with a disgusting affectation of lamb-like meekness, are wont to beseech the civil magistrates to shew mercy to those infortunate victims whom they themselves have given up to be consigned to the flames.

not by *literally slaying them itself*. "Who can make any computation, or even frame any conception, of the numbers of pious Christians, who have fallen a sacrifice to the bigotry and cruelty of Rome? Mede hath observed from good authorities, that in the war with the Waldenses and Albigenses, there perished of these poor creatures in France alone *a million*. From the first institution of the Jesuits to *the year 1480*, that is in little more than *thirty years*, 900,000 orthodox Christians were slain. In the Netherlands alone, the Duke of Alva boasted, that within *a few years* he had dispatched to the amount of 36,000 souls, and those all by the hand of the common executioner. In the space of scarce *thirty years*, the Inquisition destroyed, by various kinds of tortures, 150,000 Christians. Sanders himself confesses, that an innumerable multitude of Lollards and Sacramentarians were burnt throughout all Europe; who yet, he says, were not put to death by *the Pope and Bishops*, but by *the civil magistrates*; which perfectly agrees with this prophecy; for of *the secular beast*\* it is said, that he should make war with *the saints* and overcome them."†

4. *He exerciseth all the power of the first beast before him*—Cardinals, Prelates, and Monks, were long the prime ministers of the European sovereigns: and the names of Wolsey, Ximenes, Richelieu, and Mazarine, are handed down to posterity as the most intriguing and ambitious of statesmen. *The second beast* indeed is properly "an ecclesiastical person, but he intermixeth himself much in civil affairs. He is the prime minister, adviser, and mover of *the first beast*.‡ He holdeth *imperium in imperio*, an *empire within an empire*; claimeth a temporal authority, as well as a spiritual; hath not only the principal direction of the temporal powers, but often engageth

\* It is not unworthy of notice, that Bp Newton here speaks of *the first beast* as being, what he really is, *the secular Roman empire*, as contradistinguished from *the second beast* or *the Roman church*.

† Bp. Newton's Diss: rt. on Rev. xiii.

‡ Here again the Bishop speaks of *the first beast* as being *the secular empire*. Thus does his original opinion force its: If, as it were, upon him, notwithstanding all that he had subsequently said respecting the identity of *the papal little horn* and *the first beast*.

them in his service, and enforceth his canons and decrees with the sword of the civil magistrate.”\*

5. *He causeth the earth and all that dwell therein to worship the first beast whose deadly wound was healed*—The nature of this worship of *the secular beast* I have already considered. It will be sufficient therefore at present to observe, that, since it is impossible for Daniel's *fourth beast* or *the Roman empire* to be literally worshipped, the adoration here spoken of must mean a devotion to those principles by which the empire was equally made a *beast* both under its *pagan* and its *papal* emperors, both under its *sixth head* and its *last*. Those principles consisted in *the worship of images*, and in *the persecution of the saints*: and it was *the second beast*, who by his influence caused *the whole Roman earth* once more to adopt them under *Poperly*, as it had heretofore adopted them under *Paganism*: it was *the second beast*, who made *an image* for the *first*, and caused all men to fall down and worship it.†

\* Bp Newton's Dissert. on Rev. xiii.

† I have adopted this interpretation of the worship paid to *the first* or *secular beast*, not as being free from all objections, but as that, which after an attentive consideration of the subject, appears to me liable to the fewest. The interpretation proposed by Bp. Newton, is to my mind very unsatisfactory. “As the *first beast* concurs to maintain the authority of the *second*, so he in return confirms and maintains the sovereignty and dominion of the *first beast* over his subjects; and causeth the earth, and them who dwell therein, to worship the *first beast*, whose deadly wound was healed. He supports tyranny, as he is by tyranny supported. He enslaves the consciences, as the *first beast* subjugates the bodies of men” (Dissert. on Rev. xiii.) Hence it appears that the Bishop conceives the worship, which was paid to *the secular beast* at the instigation of *the ecclesiastical beast*, to be merely *civil worship*, so far increased as to become *passive obedience*. Now, bad as tyranny in the state may be, the whole criminality of it must be ascribed to *the governors*, not surely to *the governed*, to those who patiently submit themselves like the primitive Christians to every ordinance of man, however tyrannical, for the Lord's sake, lest by resisting they should receive damnation. Were nothing more than meant by *worshipping the beast* than *an unresisting submission to civil tyranny*, or (as Mr. Whiston, cited by the Bishop, styles it) “*a blind obedience*,” the worshippers of *the beast* would never have been censured by the prophet for *yielding* such submission, however severely he might have animadverted upon *the two beasts* for *recommending* and *exacting* it. “If any man worship the beast and his image,—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 and ever; and they have no rest day nor night, who worship the beast and his image.” (Rev. xiv. 9, 10, 11.) Can we suppose, that so severe a punishment as eternal damnation “will be inflicted upon those who suffer *their bodies* to be subjugated by *the first beast*?” It is plain, that *the worship of the beast* is connected with *the worship of his image*; and that this worship is something so offensive in the eyes of God as to incur the penalty of hell fire; can it then mean nothing more than *submitting to “the sovereignty*



6. *He doeth great wonders, in order that he may make fire come down from heaven on the earth in the sight of men*—“Miracles, visions, and revelations, are the mighty boast of the church of Rome, the contrivances of an artful cunning clergy to impose upon an ignorant laity.” These wonders *the beast* did partly in order that he might make fire come down from *heaven* upon *earth*; and partly, as we shall hereafter see, with a view so to deceive mankind as to induce them to set up *an image* and worship it. *Heaven* is a symbol of *the church*, and *the earth* of *the Roman empire*. *The darting therefore of fire out of the church upon the secular empire* must mean *solemn interdicts* and *excommunications* pronounced against those who dared to oppose the authority of *the beast*. History furnishes many memorable examples of such ecclesiastical censures. The whole kingdom of England was laid under an interdict in the reign of king John: and numerous are the other European sovereigns, against whom *the Popes* have pronounced sentence of excommunication and deposition.\* The submission of the people to this exorbitant stretch of power was founded upon their implicit belief in the sanctity, authority, and infallibility, of *the Roman bishop* and *his hierarchy*: and this belief was kept up by pretended miracles, which (it was asserted) none but members of *the holy catholic church* could perform: hence it is said, that *the beast*

*and dominion of the first beast?* It may be remarked, that Bp. Newton here again speaks of *the first beast* as being, not *the Papacy*, but *the secular Roman empire*: and it may further be remarked, that his present interpretation of *the worship paid to the beast* by no means accords with that which he had previously given, and which I believe to be the true one. “*All the world wondered after the beast, and they worshipped the dragon which gave power unto the beast, and they worshipped the beast, saying, Who is like unto the beast? Who is able to make war with him?* No kingdom or empire was like that of *the beast*; it had not a parallel upon earth, and it was in vain for any to resist or oppose it; it prevailed and triumphed over all; and all the world, in submitting thus to the religion of *the beast*, did in effect submit again to the religion of *the dragon*, in being the old idolatry with new names. *The worshipping of demons and idols* is in effect *the worshipping of devils*.” (Dissert. on Rev. xiii.) Here we see a plain reason why *the worship of the beast* is threatened with eternal damnation: it consists in embracing those principles, which constituted alike *the bestiality* of the *pagan* and *papal Roman empires*; not in paying *civil homage to the beast*.

\* Brightman has the following curious remark on this part of the prophecy. “Hildebrandus, in epistola ad Germanos, Henricum quartum excommunicatione sua percussum, *afflatum fulmine dixit: nec temerè, Spiritu procut dubio gubernante linguam, ut olim Caiphæ, quo mundus intelligeret, quò bestia faceret ignem de caelo descendere.*” Apoc. Apoc. Fol. 215.

did great wonders, in order that he might bring down fire from *heaven upon earth*; or, in other words, that none might dispute his right and power of excommunication. I know not any better comment upon this part of the prophecy than the use which was made of the miracles said to have been wrought at the shrine of Archbishop Becket. During the schism in *the church of Rome*, that turbulent prelate had espoused the cause of Pope Alexander against his competitor; and after his death he became a wonder-working saint. Such being the case, the litigated point was soon decided. "Whereas many," says John of Salisbury, "doubted whether Alexander was the true Pope or not, the miracles of Becket decided that question in his favour, as *they could not have been done by one engaged in a schism.*"\* Thus was Alexander confirmed by miracles in his full right and title to anathematize his rival, and to hurl the thunder-bolts of the church at all his opponents. Nor has this claim to supernatural gifts been made solely during the thick darkness of the middle ages: an anonymous Popish writer even of the last century, cited by Mr. Whitaker, insists upon the miraculous powers of *the church of Rome* down to the then present time, and enumerates many miracles which he avers to have been performed since the era of the Reformation. At the conclusion of his catalogue of saints endowed with such powers, he observes, that "all the persons so conspicuous for these supernatural gifts were *zealous members of the catholic church* ;† meaning doubtless to intimate, that, if *the catholic church* (so the Papists think proper to denominate *the church of Rome*) were not *the only true church*, its members would not have possessed those gifts. Here then we have another instance of the manner in which *the church of Rome* proved itself to be *the only true church* by lying wonders. When that point was once established; when the strong faith of a determined Papist once admitted the reality of those miracles; and when once he drew from them the desired conclusion, that, since none but members of *the true church* could perform them, *the church of Rome*, whose members *did* perform

\* Whitaker's Comment. p. 391, 392.

† Ibid. p. 395—399.

them, must doubtless be *the only true church*: the rest would follow of course: no salvation can be had out of *the true church*; therefore *the Church of Rome* possesses an undoubted power to anathematize and excommunicate all heretics.

7. *He deceiveth them that dwell on the earth, by means of those miracles which he had power to do in the sight of the beast: saying to them that dwell on the earth, that they should make an image for the beast, which had the wound by a sword, and did live. And he had power to give life unto the image of the beast, 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*—Before the import of this passage can be determined, its *literal* meaning must be ascertained. The expression *the image of the beast*, and the expression *the beast and his image*, which elsewhere occurs, are both ambiguous; inasmuch as they may signify either *the image, in the sense of the effigies of the beast*, or *the image, which belongs to the beast*. Thus *the image of Cesar* upon the Roman coin means doubtless *the effigies of Cesar*;\* whereas *the image of Micah* certainly means *the image which belonged to Micah*, the image which he had made for himself to be his god.† Had no other expressions then occurred in the Apocalypse except *the image of the beast* and *the beast and his image*, we should have been unable positively to determine what precise idea we ought to annex to *his image*; but all ambiguity seems to be removed by the manner in which the Apostle introduces his account of it. It is said, *the second beast* so deceived the inhabitants of the earth by his false miracles, that he induced them to make an image *to* or *for* the first beast. Now it is surely putting a very great force upon language to suppose that *the making an image for the beast* can signify *the making a representation of him*. The prohibition in the decalogue relative to idolatry is couched in the following terms: “Thou shalt not make *unto thee* any graven image.”‡ Here it is manifest, that *the making an image to a person’s self* means *the making an image*

\* Matt. xxii. 19, 20, 21.

† Judges xviii. 31.

‡ Exod. xx. 4.

*for his own use and worship*; it is only natural therefore to suppose, that *the making an image to the beast means the making an image for the use and worship of the beast*; and consequently that *the image of the beast imports, not the effigies of the beast, but the image which the beast adored.*

That such is the proper interpretation of the expression will yet further appear, if we consider the context of the whole passage. It was by false miracles that *the ecclesiastical beast* induced the inhabitants of the earth to set up this image for *the secular beast*. Accordingly, as we are informed by Bp. Newton, "miracles are thought so necessary and essential, that they are reckoned among the notes of the catholic church; and they are alledged principally in support of purgatory, prayers for the dead, *the worship of saints, images, and relics*, and the like (as they are called) catholic doctrines."\*

The difficulty consists, not so much in proving this point, as in selecting some out of the many proofs which offer themselves to our attention. "The first introduction," says Mr. Gibbon, "of a symbolic worship was in the veneration of the cross and of relics. The saints and martyrs, whose intercession was implored, were seated on the right hand of God; but the gracious, *and often supernatural favours*, which, in the popular belief, were showered around their tomb, *conveyed an unquestionable sanction* of the devout pilgrims, who visited, and touched, and kissed, these lifeless remains, the memorials of their merits and sufferings—*The scruples of reason or piety were silenced by the strong evidence of visions and miracles: and the pictures which speak, and move, and bleed, must be endowed with a divine energy, and may be considered as the proper objects of religious adoration*—Before the end of *the sixth century*, images, *made without hands* (in Greek it is a single word), were propagated in the camps and cities of the eastern empire: they were *the objects of worship and the instruments of miracles*: and, in the hour of danger or tumult, their venerable presence could revive the hope, rekindle

\* Bp. Newton's Dissert. on Rev. xiii.

the courage, or repress the fury of the Roman legions.\* One of the grand idols of the Romanists, as it is well known, is *the Virgin Mary*. "They beg of her," says Jurieu, "in express terms whatever is desired from God; heaven, pardon of sin, grace, repentance, victory of the devil. It is not enough to pray to the virgin, you must adore her: every knee must bow to her, adoring her as sovereign queen of men and angels. And this adoration is not to be mere external adoration, but internal—On account of her holiness men owe *dulia* to her; on account of her maternal relation, they owe her *hyperdulia*: and, because she touched our Saviour, the adoration of *latria* is due to her. Those, who well perform these services though never so negligent of their duty towards God, though villains, robbers, debauchees; they cannot be damned because they have been clients of the virgin. This they prove by innumerable examples of those whom the virgin hath by *strange miracles* brought back, as it were, from the gates of hell, because they had been her votaries. And, as an evidence how pleasing this adoration is to the virgin, she hath wrought more miracles within these last seven or eight hundred years, than God hath wrought since the creation, by Moses and the prophets, by Jesus Christ and his apostles, and by all the saints together. Her images have spoken, they have sung, they have resisted the fire and the hammer, they have soared in the air like birds, they have sweat

\* History of Decline and Fall, Vol. ix. p. 114—120. Mr. Gibbon observes, that before the end of the sixth century images were in very general use. This may be thought to contradict what I have said relative to the proper date of *the great Apostacy*. I then however observed, and I may here observe again, that superstition had for some time been gradually creeping into the Church previous to the years 606 and 607; but it is necessary to date a prophetic series of years from a fixed and determinate era when some overt act has been committed. This overt act is declared by the prophet to be *the establishment of the Pop's supremacy, or the deliverin' up of the saints into his hand*. Now it is observable, that whatever approaches there might be to image-worship in the course of the sixth century, idolatry was not openly established by the authority of the Roman Pontiff till the year 607; the very year after that in which the saints had been delivered into the hand of the *little horn*, and consequently from which the 160 years are to be dated. Accordingly Mr. Gibbon very truly observes respecting the period of which he is speaking, "as the worship of images had never been established by any general or positive law, its progress in the Eastern empire had been retarded or accelerated, by the differences of men and manners, the local degrees of refinement, and the personal characters of the bishops." Ibid. p. 122.

blood, and oil and milk have run from them. Some of them have been turned into flesh; they 'ave wep lamented, grined; they have made the lame to walk, the blind to see, the deaf to hear. They have cure: all kinds of diseases, and wrought all sorts of prodigies. For these reasons, people will go to the end of the world to visit these conserated images. They kiss,\* fall down before them, and render them an external worship, accompanied with a most fervent internal devotion. They rub their chaplets or beads, and their handkerchiefs, upon these images; and wear about them these chaplets and cloths, which have touched the images of the virgin; and believe, that they are relics which have a virtue to preserve from all evils. That, which we have discoursed concerning the Virgin, may be applied to saints proportionably. There is no folly or extravagance that we have now related, but every order of monks say such like of their founder and author: the Cordeliers and Capuchins, of their St. Francis; the Jacopins, of their St. Dominic; and, in general of all the pretended saints of their orders, they are more holy than seraphim; they raise the dead; they heal all diseases; the whole creation is subject to them.†” Another of the Popish idols is *the consecrated wafer* or *sacramental bread*, the worship of which naturally followed the monstrous doctrine of *transubstantiation*. This likewise hath been honoured by *its own proper miracles*. A saint, named *Malachi*, was employed by *the Pope* to convert the Irish to the discipline and canons of *the church*

\* “ Yet I have left me seven thousand in Israel, all the knees which have not bowed unto Baal, and every mouth which hath not kissed him” (1 Kings xix 18) “ And now they sin more and more, and have made them molten images of their silver, and idols according to their own understanding, all of it the work of the crafts-men: they say of them, let the men that sacrifice kiss the calves:” that is the statues of Moloch and Baal. (Hos xiii 2.) The excuse, which Papists are wont to make for their idolatry, effectually proves them to be idolaters. They deny that they *worship the images*; asserting, that they only *kiss* them, and *bow down* before them, in token (as the council of Trent expresses it) of their “ *worshipping the saints*, whose likeness images do bear.” What is this but explicitly acknowledging, that they *worship deities*, through the medium of certain faithful representations of them? So perfectly does the idolatry of the *exiled papal beast* resemble the idolatry of *the old pagan beast* that was wounded to death by the sword of the Spirit, that the ancient heathens gave precisely the same reason for *worshipping their images* that the modern Papists do for *worshipping theirs*. Their language was, as we learn from Arnobius, “ Not that brass, gold, silver, and the like materials of statues are gods; but that though they be invisible gods are honoured and worshipped.”

† Cited by Whitaker, p. 341.

of Rome: and, in order to further this laudable undertaking, he received, say the Papists, *the power of working miracles in as eminent a degree as any of the ancient saints of the church*. One of these miracles was the punishment by sudden death of a man, whom the saint could not convince of *the real presence in the sacrament*.\* A yet more stupendous proof of the truth of this doctrine was vouchsafed to the foundress of the reformation of the discalced Carmelites in *the sixteenth century*. In one of her works, called *The way of perfection*, “she declares that our Lord was, many times, pleased to let her see him in the sacred host. In particular, going one day to receive the blessed sacrament, she saw him in great majesty, in the hands of the priest, in the host which he was going to administer to her. At the same time she understood by a vision, that this same priest was in a state of sin, which troubled her exceedingly. But, says she, our Lord himself said unto me, that I should pray for him; and told me, that he had suffered what I had seen, that I might understand what power and force the words of consecration have; and that God would not be kept from thence, how wicked soever the priest were who pronounced them.”† For these enormous lies this woman was sainted.—In fine, the worship of images which began very early to infect the church, and which was first openly established by *Boniface the fourth* in the year 607, was ultimately confirmed by the second council of Nice, in the year 787. The decrees of this council, which is justly called by Mr. Mede *the idolatrous council*, contain some curious narratives, full of fabulous invention, adapted to the promotion of image-worship, the purpose for which this misnamed *theopneust assembly* met together.‡

As for the manner in which they that dwelt upon the earth were induced by *the two-horned beast* to espouse the cause of image-worship, it has already been shewn in part by the preceding account of Popish miracles wrought for that express purpose, and will yet further appear from the famous contest between *Gregory the*

\* Whitaker's Comment. p. 393.

† Ibid. p. 239.

‡ Zouch on the Prophecies, p. 215, 216.

*second and the Emperor Leo* respecting the worship of bodily representations of our Lord, his saints, and martyrs. *The Emperor* had suppressed idolatry at Constantinople and in the East, and attempted to do the same in his Italian dominions. Upon this, *Gregory* informs him, that he exceeds his proper commission by interfering in spiritual matters : and teaches him, that, although the sword of justice is in the hands of the magistrate, the more formidable weapon of excommunication is intrusted to the clergy, who will not spare a heretic even though he be seated upon a throne.—“You accuse the catholics of idolatry,” says he in one of his epistles to *Leo*, “and by the accusation you betray your own impiety and ignorance.” He then proceeds to point out to the undiscerning *Emperor* the ingenious Popish distinction between *pagan idols* and *Christian images*. “The former were the fanciful representations of phantoms or demons, at a time when the true God had not manifested his person in any visible likeness. The latter are the genuine forms of Christ, his mother, and his saints, *who had approved, by a crowd of miracles, the innocence and merit of this relative worship.*” The difference indeed between *idols* and *images*, hard as it is to be comprehended by the less subtle intellect of a heretic, is, according to *Gregory* so clear, that the very children would be provoked to cast their horn-books at the head of the imperial enemy of so catholic a mode of adoration. “You assault us, O tyrant, with a carnal and military hand—You declare, with foolish arrogance, I will dispatch my orders to Rome; I will break in pieces the image of St. Peter—Are you ignorant, that *the Popes* are the bond of union, the mediators of peace, between the East and the West? The eyes of the nations are fixed on our humility : and they revere, as a god upon earth, the Apostle St. Peter, whose image you threaten to destroy. The remote and interior kingdoms of the West present their homage to Christ and his vicegerent ; and we now prepare to visit one of their most powerful monarchs, who desires to receive from our hands the sacrament of baptism. The barbarians have submitted to the yoke of the Gospel, while you alone are deaf to the voice of



the shepherd. These pious barbarians are kindled into rage: they thirst to avenge the persecution of the East. Abandon your rash and fatal enterprize; reflect, tremble, and repent. If you persist, we are innocent of the blood that will be spilt in the contest: may it fall on your own head." The truth of this declaration *the Emperor* soon experienced to his cost. "The first assault of *Leo* against the images of Constantinople had been witnessed by a crowd of strangers from Italy and the West, who related with grief and indignation the sacrilege of *the Emperor*. But, on the reception of his proscriptive edict, they trembled for their domestic deities. The images of Christ and the Virgin, of the angels, martyrs, and saints, were abolished in all the churches of Italy: and a strong alternative was proposed to *the Roman Pontiff*, the royal favour as the price of his compliance, degradation and exile as the penalty of his disobedience. Neither zeal nor policy allowed him to hesitate. Without depending on prayers or miracles, he boldly armed against the public enemy; and his pastoral letters admonished the Italians of their danger and their duty. At this signal, Ravenna, Venice, and the cities of the Exarchate and Pentapolis, adhered to the cause of religion; their military force by sea and land consisted, for the most part, of the natives; and the spirit of patriotism and zeal was transfused into the mercenary strangers. The Italians swore to live and die in the defence of *the Pope* and *the holy images*; the Roman people were devoted to their father; and even the Lombards were ambitious to share the merit and advantage of this holy war." The issue of the struggle was the ruin of *the Emperor's* affairs in Italy, and the complete triumph of the catholic idolaters. Nor was a *miracle* wanting, in this grand contest, to decide the orthodoxy of *image-worship*. To restore his dominion in Italy, *Leo* invaded the Exarchate, and prepared to lay siege to Ravenna. Upon this occasion, "the women and clergy, in sackcloth and ashes, lay prostrate in prayer; the men were in arms for the defence of their country: and the event of a battle was preferred to the slow miseries of a siege. In a hard fought day, as the two armies alternately yielded and advanced, a phantom was

*seen, a voice was heard*, and Ravenna was victorious by the assurance of victory. The strangers retreated to their ships, but the populous sea-coast poured forth a multitude of boats; the waters of the Po were so deeply infected with blood, that during six years the public prejudice abstained from the fish of the river; and the institution of an annual feast perpetuated the worship of images, and the abhorrence of the Greek tyrant. Amidst the triumph of the catholic arms, *the Roman Pontiff* convened a synod of ninety-three bishops against the heresy of the Iconoclasts; and with their consent pronounced a general excommunication against all, who by word or deed should attack the tradition of the fathers and the images of the saints.\*

It is further said, that *the second beast* had power to give life to *the image*, so that *the image* should speak, and cause the death of those who refused to worship it. We have already noticed some marvellous instances of the speaking and moving statues of *the Virgin*; and I doubt not but that they *did* appear to the deluded populace both to speak and to move. The prophecy teaches us, that it was *the ecclesiastical beast* that enabled them to perform these functions of rational and animal life; and the event has abundantly proved the truth of the prediction. The ridiculous puppets, which were held forth as gods to the blind adoration of *the secular beast*, were so contrived with internal springs as to be easily worked by a concealed operator; whose voice at proper intervals seemed to issue from the mouth of the miraculous image.† At the Reformation, nothing tended so much to wean the people from their attachment to idolatrous superstition as the public exposure of these contemptible tricks of the Popish ecclesiastics. “For their images,” says Bp. Burnet, “some of them were brought to London, and were there at St. Paul’s cross, in the sight of the people, broken; that they might be fully convinced

\* Hist. of Decline and Fall, Vol. ix. p. 112—141.

† I strongly suspect, that the inimitable Cervantes had some such images as these in his eye, when he wrote his account of *the wonderful enchanted head*. Be this as it may, nothing can afford a better explanation of the talking images of the Papists. See *Don Quixote*, Part II. chap. 62.

of the juggling impostures of the monks : and, in particular, the crucifix of Boxley in Kent, commonly called *the rood of grace* ; to which many pilgrimages had been made, because it was observed sometimes to bow, and to lift itself up, to shake, and to stir head, hands, and feet, and to roll the eyes, move the lips, and to bend the brows : all which were looked on by the abused multitude as the effects of a divine power.\* These were now publicly discovered to have been cheats : for the springs were shewed, by which all these motions were made. Upon which John Hilsey, then Bishop of Rochester, made a sermon, and broke the rood in pieces. There was also another famous imposture discovered at Hales in Gloucestershire, where the blood of Christ was shewed in a vial of crystal, which the people sometimes saw, but sometimes they could not see it : so that they were made believe, that they were not capable of so signal a favour, as long as they were in mortal sin ; and so continued to make presents, till they had bribed heaven to give them a sight of so blessed a relic. This was now discovered to be the blood of a duck, which they renewed every week : and the one side of the vial was so thick, that there was no seeing through it ; but the other was clear and transparent : and it was so placed near the altar that one in a secret place behind could turn either side of it outward. So that, when they had drained the pilgrims that came thither of all they had brought with them, then they afforded them the favour of turning the clear side outward ; who upon that went home very well satisfied with their journey, and the expence they had been at.†

To these idols, thus impiously set up to be the gods of the Christian church, it may probably be said with truth, that no fewer human victims have been immolated than to the demons of Paganism. One special mark of heresy was *a refusal to worship images* ; and that refusal, like

\* Similar vile mummeries have actually been exhibited even in the present generation, when one might have thought that well-deserved ridicule, if not religious principle, would have effectually put an end to them. In *the year 1796* various miraculous appearances are asserted to have been observed at Rome : pictures of madonnas opened and shut their eyes ; images of saints altered their position ; and crucifixes moved their eyelids! Zouch on Prophecy, p. 180.

† Hist. of Reform. Vol. I. p. 243, cited by Whitaker and Zouch.

the similar refusal of the primitive Christians to adore the idols of the Gentiles, never failed to subject the martyrs under *Popery*, those second men of understanding mentioned by Daniel,\* to the horrors of the most dreadful of deaths.† While every impurity and abomination both in practice and doctrine was tolerated and sanctioned by *the adulterous church of Rome*; those holy and godly men, whose sole crime was a determined rejection of the poisoned cup of *the mystic harlot*, were inhumanly persecuted and tormented. “Blessed however are the dead which die in the Lord, for they rest from their labours, and their works do follow them.”

In this interpretation of *the image* I have followed Dr. Zouch, infinitely preferring it to that proposed by Bp. Newton. His Lordship, from an idea that *this image* was to be *some power* which should be a sort of representation or effigies of the wounded imperial head of the *secular beast*, endeavours to prove that it is *the Pope*; who, says he, “is the most perfect likeness and resemblance of the ancient Roman Emperors.” Now, whatever degree of similarity there may be between *the Emperors* and *the Popes*, I can find no warrant in the plain letter of the text for such an exposition of the prophecy relative to *the image*. As I have already observed, the making an image *to* or *for* that beast whose head was wounded with the sword (a periphrastic mode of pointing out *the secular beast*, in order that we may certainly know *what beast* is here intended by the Apostle) can scarcely mean the setting up a representation of the beast. And, that such is *not* the meaning of the passage, will, I think, undeniably appear, if we consider the strange confusion which this interpretation if admitted must necessarily introduce. Bp. Newton supposes, that *the last head of the secular beast* is *the Pope*, and that *the two-horned beast* is *the Romish hierarchy*. If then *the two-horned beast* be *the Romish hierarchy*, *the head of that beast* must undoubtedly be *the Pope*; for *the Romish*

\* Dan. xi. 35.

† See Bp. Newton's account of *the Witnesses*. One of the crimes, for which those convicted of heresy were condemned is almost invariably a refusal to pray to dead saints, angels, and their images.

.....  
 hierarchy has no other head except *the Pope*. In this case therefore, *the head of the first beast*, and *the head of the second beast*, will both equally be *the Pope*: and yet, according to the Bishop's scheme, *the image is the Pope* likewise: consequently *the image of the beast* is at once the same as *the head of the ecclesiastical beast*, and as *the secular beast under its last head*, for St. John identifies *the last head* with *the whole secular beast*. His Lordship himself indeed does not make this assertion *totidem verbis*, though he assuredly makes it *in fact*; but Mr. Mede, whose scheme is the same, *expressly and unreservedly* maintains the identity of *the image* and of *the secular beast under his last head*.\* To confute this opinion, it seems to me to be only necessary, that any unprejudiced person should attentively read those passages of the Apocalypse, in which *the two beasts* and *the image of the first beast* are mentioned together; for such a person must, I apprehend, be convinced, that, *whatever* they may be designed to symbolize, *the heads of the two beasts* and *the image* cannot all symbolize *the same thing*. The expression *the beast and his image*, which perpetually occurs in the Apocalypse,† obviously implies, that *the beast is one thing*, and that *the image is another*. To suppose otherwise makes the prophet use a most singular kind of tautology: for, if *the first beast* and *his image* be *the same*, both equally symbolizing *the Pope*, then the expression *the beast and his image* is precisely equivalent to *the Pope and the Pope*. So again: *the two beasts* and *the image* are all described at large in one chapter; and *the second beast* is plainly distinguished from *the first*, both by the general tenor of the description, and by its being styled *another beast*: can we then reasonably suppose, that *these two different beasts* have a head in common, and that *that head* is the very same as *a certain image* which *the second beast* causes to be made to *the first beast*. Nay more: *the first beast*, *his image*, and *the second beast* under the name of *the false prophet*, are all mentioned together in a single verse. "And *the beast* was taken,

\* "Bestia Romana capitis novissimi est imago bestiae sexto capite mactata." Comment. Apoc. in best. bicorn.

† See Rev. xiv. 9, 11. xvi. 2. xix. 20.

and with him *the false prophet* that wrought miracles before him, with which he deceived them that had received the mark of the beast, and them that worshipped *his image*. These both were cast alive into a lake of fire burning with brimstone.”\* Can any one from this passage reasonably infer, that *the beas' under his last head* is the same as *his image*, and that *both* are the same as *the head of the second beast or the false prophet*? It is worthy of notice, that, although St. John here makes joint mention of *the two beasts* and *the image*, he only states, that *these both* (in the original it is *these two*) were cast into the lake of fire. Hence we may infer, both that *the image* was *not* cast into the fiery lake; and that *the two beasts* are really *two distinct beasts*, not *two* (as the scheme of Bp. Newton necessarily supposes) *subsisting under a common head*. Let us then only adopt the mode of interpretation which I have been endeavouring to establish, and we shall immediately perceive the exact propriety of the language here used by the prophet. *The secular beast* under his *last or patricio-imperial head* (whatever family may be the representative of *this head* at that time), the great supporter of the abominations of *Popery* and the cruel persecutor of *the saints*; and *the ecclesiastical bea t* under his *spiritual head the Pope*, the deceiver of the whole earth and the diabolical promoter of *the first beast's* persecutions: *these two* main enemies of the Messiah are taken in open rebellion against his authority, and cast into the lake of fire. But *the image*, which was a mere senseless tool of monastic imposture, and therefore incapable of punishment, is neither said to be engaged in this rebellion, nor to incur the divine vengeance, like its contrivers and worshippers.†

\* Rev. xix. 20.

† Mr. Whitaker's sentiments respecting *the image of the beast* are nearly the same as those of Mr. Mede and Bp. Newton. He supposes *the image* to mean *the Papal authority and empire actually established over the world by the instrumentality of the monastic orders*. Every objection, that has been made to this scheme of Mr. Mede and the Bishop, applies with equal force to that of Mr. Whitaker. Sir Isaac Newton thinks that *the making an image to the beast* means *only the assembling a body of men, or the calling a council of men, like the beast in point of exigence*. This opinion seems to me to accord very ill with the simple language of St. John. I cannot but think indeed, that the whole of Sir Isaac's explanation of this prophecy is radically erroneous. His idea, that *the second apocalyptic beast is the Greek church* entirely violates the order and regularity of the

There have been other opinions respecting *the image* besides this of Bp. Newton. Some have supposed it to be *the Carlovingian empire*, the express image of *the old Roman empire*. But *the Carlovingian empire* is *the Roman empire* under its last head, and therefore cannot be *the image*, which is represented as something quite distinct from *the beast*. Moreover *the making an image*, to or for *the beast* cannot mean *the making a representation* of him. Others again have fancied, that *the image* is *the inquisition*. This opinion however is as little tenable as the former. *The inquisition* is neither a graven image, if the passage be interpreted in this sense, as I think it must; nor will it be an easy matter to discover any resemblance between *that iniquitous court* and *the Roman Cesars*, if the passage be interpreted in the manner proposed by Bp. Newton.\* In short, every exposition of the prophecy relative to *the image*, excepting that which I have here adopted from Dr. Zouch, appears to me to be clogged with far too many difficulties to be admissible.

8. *He caused all, both small and great, rich and poor, free and bond, to receive a mark in their right hand, or in their foreheads: and that no man might buy or sell save he that had the mark or the name of the (secular) 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*—We have found, that in every particular hitherto considered, the character of *the second apocalyptic beast* perfectly accords with that of *the catholic church of Rome*, the *spiritual empire regular and secular*, of which *the Pope* is *the head*. Two points yet remain to be investigated: I mean *the peculiar name* and *the peculiar mark* of *the first beast*, which *the second beast* required the whole Roman world to bear as a badge of ecclesiastical communion.

In order that this enquiry may be satisfactorily prosecuted, the sound rule, which I have hitherto endeavoured to observe, must in the present case also be steadily attended to. *No name*, though it may possibly comprehend *the number 666*, can be *the name of the beast*, un-

prediction: for *the little book* treats entirely of the affairs of the West. See Observ. on the Apocalypse, Chap. 8. and Addenda to Observ.

\* See Bp. Newton's Dissert. on Rev. xii.

less it equally answers in all other particulars, to the prophetic description of that name.

From the description itself we learn, that *four things* must concur in *the mysterious name* of which we are in quest: 1. it must be the name of *the Empire* symbolized by *the ten-horned beast*; 2. it must be the name of *some individual man*;\* 3. it must be a name, borne, along with *some superstitious badge or mark*, by every member of *the be st*, as a test of spiritual communion with his colleague *the second beast*, and under pain of a severe ecclesiastical interdict; 4. and it must be a name, which comprehends in its numerical letters *the precise sum of 666*.

Various names have been pitched upon as *this name of the beast*; but, before we adopt any of them, we must enquire whether they will accurately correspond with St. John's description of it. Two of the papal titles, *Vicarius Filii Dei*, and *Vicarius Dei generalis in terris*, have each been found to comprehend *the number 666*: but yet neither of them can be *the name* intended by the Apostle; because neither of them is *the name of the temporal beast*, neither of them is *the proper name of a man*, and neither of them can obviously be borne by *each individual Papist*. The Hebrew word *Romiith*, or *the Roman beast*, has likewise been found to contain *the same number 666*: † but yet this can as little be *the apocalyptic name of the beast*, as either of the others; for, although every Papist delights to term himself *a Roman catholic*, yet *Romiith* is certainly not the name of any *man*. ‡

\* Bp. Newton supposes *the number of a man* to mean nothing more than a *method of numbering practisid among men*. I prefer the interpretation here adopted, both as being the most obvious meaning of the expression, and as suiting better to the designed obscurity of an enigma. Since *the number of the beast is the number of the name of the beast*, it seems most natural to conclude, that *the number of a man is the number of the name of a man*: and, since *these two numbers are the same*, the *two names* which contain them, *that of the beast* and *that of the man*, must be the same likewise.

† ר	.....	200
ו	.....	6
ד	.....	40
י	.....	10
י	.....	10
ת	.....	400
		666

† Mr Lowman supposes, that *the number 666* is the number of years to be computed from the time when St. John saw this vision to the complete estab-



I conceive then, that the apostle designed to intimate in this confessedly difficult passage, that we should seek out *some name*, which should at once be *the name of an empire, the name of its supposed founder; and the name of every individual in that empire*. This identity of appellation is very frequently found to occur, particularly in the early ages of the world: thus *Ashur* is equally the name of *Assyria*, of *the father of the Assyrians*, and of *every individual Assyrian*; thus also *Misraim* is equally the name of *Egypt*, of *the father of the Egyptians*, and of *every individual Egyptian*; and thus, to descend to modern times, *Ottoman* or *Ohman* is equally the name of *the Turkish empire*, of *its founder*, and of *every individual Turk*. Now, had the prophet said nothing more than this respecting *the name of the beast*, we might for ever have wearied ourselves with endeavouring to discover it;

lishment of the *Papacy* as a *temporal power* about the year 756, at which time he conceives it to have become *the beast of the sea* under his last head. Respecting this opinion it will be sufficient to observe, that, even if *the papacy* were *the beast of the sea*, which to me seems utterly impossible, it would still be altogether irreconcilable with the plain language of the prophecy. None were either to buy or sell but those that bore *the name of the beast*, and together with it *the number of his name*; a number moreover, that is *the number of a man*. How is all this fulfilled, if 666 be merely *a term of years*? How can *a term of years* be *the number of the beast's name*? How can it be shewn, that none were allowed to buy or sell except those that bore *this term of years* as included in *the name of the beast*?

There is a most curious treatise by Mr. Potter on the number 666; in which he goes on the principle of extracting the square root, and of applying it when so extracted to a wonderful variety of matters connected with *Apocry*. He supposes indeed *the ten-horned beast* to be *the Papacy*; but his system, if it be tenable, will apply with nearly equal force to *the secular papal Roman empire*. I can promise the reader entertainment of a very singular nature from this work; though, like myself, he may possibly rise from the perusal of it unconvinced. It is one of the most ingenious productions that I ever met with; but it strikes me nevertheless as being too elaborate and far fetched, independent of various objections that might be urged against it. I think it right to mention, that Mr. Potter will not allow *the number* to be *the number of a name*, and that he thence denies the propriety of discovering it by numerical letters in the name *Latinus* or in other similar names. In this point he is certainly mistaken; for St. John most unequivocally declares, that *the number of the beast* is "the number of his name" (Ver. 17.) Mr. Mede bestows a very high and very well deserved encomium on this work of Mr. Potter.

The modes in which the Romanists have computed this number, are sufficiently whimsical. Feardeustius discovers it in the word *Mammetis*, for so he thinks proper to spell the name of *Mohammed*. He likewise finds it in *Martin Lauter*, which he says was the original way of spelling Luther's name. (Lownman's Paraph. in loc.) This last idea is considerably enlarged by Lindanus and Bellarmine. *Martin Lauter* produces the number in Saxon: *David Chitrcus* and *Beza antitheus*, in Greek; and *John Calvin*, in Hebrew. Cornel. a Lap. Comment. in Apoc. in loc.) They refrain however very judiciously from specifying *the seven heads and ten horns* either of *Mohammed*, *Luther*, *Chitrcus*, *Beza*, or *Calvin*.

because numerous indeed are the names, which, like *Ashur*, *Mizraim*, and *Ottoman*, bear triple significations: hence he informs us, that *the name*, to which he alludes, should not only bear *this triple signification*, but should likewise contain in its numerical letters *the precise sum of 666*.

Irenæus, the disciple of Polycarp, who lived not very long after St. John himself, has been much more happy in pitching upon *the name of the beast*, than in assigning the proper reasons *why* that *particular appellation* ought to be pitched upon in preference to all others. "The name *Lateinos*," says he, "contains the number 666;" "and it is very likely that this may be *the name*, because the last kingdom is so called, for they are *Latinus* who now reign: but in this we will not glory."\* Bp. Newton has adopted the opinion of Irenæus, which I believe to be perfectly just; yet, what is something remarkable, neither has *he* assigned the *real cause*, *why Latinus*, or, according to its ancient orthography both Latin and Greek, *Lateinos* is *the very name of the beast* intended by the Apostle. I shall endeavour therefore, agreeably to the deductions made from the apocalyptic description of it, to point out *why Latinus*, and *Latinus* alone, is *the name* of which we are in quest.

*The ten-horned beast*, whose name is declared to contain the number 666, is certainly *the temporal Roman empire*. Of this *Empire* the *second* founder indeed was *Romulus*; but its *first* real or fictitious founder was *Latinus*, the ancient king of Latium. *Latinus* therefore is the name of a *man*. It is likewise the peculiar name of *the Western or divided Roman empire*, and the distinguishing appellation of *every individual in that Empire*. Here it is observable, that 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* or a *Roman*. Preserved however it carefully was,† though not so frequently used as the other; inso-

\* Iren. Lib. 5. Cap. 50 p. 449. cited by Bp. Newton.

† ——— Latio: genus unde *Latinus*,  
Albanique patres, atque altæ mania Romæ.

— — — — —  
Nec puer illæc quisquam de gente *Latinos*  
In tantum spe tollit avos ——— Virgil.

.....

much that, although the people were styled *Romans*, their language was denominated *Latin*. But, when by the arms of the northern nations the *Roman empire* was divided into *ten kingdoms*; when, by setting up a *spiritual tyrant* in the Church, and by lapsing into papal idolatry, it again became a *beast*; when *Rome* was governed by her bishops under the wing of a new line of Emperors; and when Greece, formerly her instructor in the arts and sciences, was now become her rival both in imperial and ecclesiastical domination, the old gentile name of *Latin* was revived, and has ever since been the peculiar distinguishing title of the *papal Roman empire* both *temporal* and *spiritual*. Such accordingly is the general appellation which the inhabitants of the West bear in the Eastern parts of the world: the particular names of *Spaniards*, *French*, and *Italians*, are swallowed up in the common title of *Latins*. Hence Mr. Gibbon, in his account of the crusades, terms, with strict propriety, the people of the western empire *Latins*: and gives us, under this name, the history of the five *Latin Emperors* of Constantinople.\* Hence also, though the Papists are wont absurdly to style themselves *Roman catholics*, the *real* name of their community, as contradistinguished from the *Greek church*, the *Armenian church*, or the *Abyssinian church*, is certainly the *Latin church*. Thus Thevenot, in his account of mount Sinai, speaks of two churches, one for the *Greeks*, and the other for the *Latins*: and thus Ricaut, throughout his *state of the Greek and Armenian churches*, discriminates the *Romanists* from all other professors of Christianity, by the appellation of *Latins*.† The Papists, as Dr. Henry More aptly expresses it, “*latinize* in every thing. Mass, prayers, hymns, litanies, canons, decretals, bulls, are conceived in *Latin*. The Papal councils speak in *Latin*. Women themselves pray in *Latin*. Nor is the Scripture read in any other language, under Popery, than *Latin*. Wherefore the council of Trent commanded the *vulgar Latin* to be the only authentic version: nor do their doctors doubt to

\* Hist. of Decline and Fall, Vol. ii. p. 243—304.

† Cited by Mr. Granville Sharpe in his *appendix to three tracts*, p. 126. I am indebted to this gentleman for the idea, that *Latinus* in the name of *that particular man* whose appellation contains the same number as the name of the *beast*.

prefer it to the Hebrew and Greek text itself, which was written by the prophets and apostles. In short, all things are *Latin*; the Pope having communicated his language to the people under his dominion, as the mark and character of his empire.”\*

Here then we have a name, which completely answers in every respect to *the apocalyptic name of the beast*. *Lateinos* is at once *the name of a man, the title of an empire, and the distinguishing appellation of every individual in that empire*: and, when the sum of its numerical letters is taken in the Greek language, the language in which the Apocalypse is written, and in which therefore the calculation ought evidently to be made,† it will amount precisely to 666.‡ On these grounds then I do not hesitate to assert, that *Latinus*, and *nothing but Latinus* is *the name of the beast*; for, in no other word, descriptive of *the revived temporal beast, or the Papal Roman empire*, can such a fatal concurrence of circumstances be discovered.

With regard to *the mark of the beast*, I think with Sir Isaac Newton that it is *the cross*. This symbol has been abused by *the Papists* to the purposes both of *the most injernal cruelties*, and of *the most childish superstition* §

\* *Mystery of Iniquity*, Part 2. B. 1 Chap. 15. and Molinæi Vates, p. 300 cited by Bp. Newton. “Hoc nomine (*Latinus*), post imperii divisionem et decem reges in provinciis ejus exortos, neque prius, pseudo-propheta Romanus. cum reliquis Occidentis incolis, discriminis ergo appellatus est. Namque Græci et reliqui Orientales seipsos solos *Romanos* dici voluere; nos, cum pontifice nostro, et sub eo episcopis, regibus, dynastis, fatali quodam instinctu *Laiinos* dixere. Et hæc distinctio *Græcæ Latineque* ecclesiæ adeo insignis erat, ut in generalibus conciliis Occidentales patres sive episcopi *Latini*, reliqui vero *Græci* discriminatim appellarentur.” Pol. Synop. in loc.

† I cannot but wonder, that any should have thought of seeking *the name of the beast* in a different language from *the Greek*. It is scarcely probable that St. John should *write* in one language, and mean *the calculation* to be made in another.

‡ A . . . . .	30
A . . . . .	1
T . . . . .	300
E . . . . .	5
I . . . . .	10
N . . . . .	50
O . . . . .	70
Σ . . . . .	200

---

666

§ When our dissenting brethren censure us for using *the sign of the cross* in the baptismal ceremony, because it is used likewise by the papists, they ought

*The cruelties*, that have been perpetrated under its sanction are notorious. I am strongly inclined to believe, that when St. John beheld *the secular beast* making war upon *the saints*, he beheld him likewise with astonishment bearing the badge of *the cross*: for this was the very symbol worn by all those, who at the instigation of *the Pope* undertook those diabolical expeditions against pretended heretics, which were thence denominated *crusades*. In the time of *Innocent the third*, it was alledged against the unfortunate Waldenses and Albigenses, that they had cast the books of the Gospel into the common sewers in the sight of the bishops and priests. On the score of this lying accusation *the zealous pontiff*, cut to the heart by such profaneness, determined to extirpate them with fire and sword. Accordingly he proclaimed a solemn *crusade* against them, and sent preachers into all the regions of the West, injoining both sovereign princes and other Christian people, that, for the remission of their sins, they should forthwith sign themselves with *the cross*, and under that holy symbol should extirpate the pest which had invaded the Church.\* *The secular b ast*,

to consider that the use of it is either innocent or not innocent, exactly according as it is religious or not religious. It was only by a vain and cruel abuse of *the sign of the cross*, that it became *the mark of the beast*: had a circle, or a square, been thought by the papists more convenient for their purpose, either of those figures would in that case have been as much *the mark of the beast* as a *cross*. If indeed the church of England either proclaimed a *crusade* against the dissenters, or laid any mysterious weight upon *the use of the cross in baptism*, she certainly would not in these respects have purified herself from the corruptions of *the papal beast*; but, concerning all her ceremonies, and therefore *the use of the cross in baptism*, among the rest, nothing can be more moderate and rational than the language which she uses. "In these our doings we condemn no other nations, nor prescribe any thing but to our own people only: for we think it convenient, that every country should use such ceremonies as they shall think best to the setting forth of God's honour and glory, and to the reducing of the people to a most perfect and godly living, without error or superstition." Hence it appears, that she only wishes "all things to be done decently and in order;" and that, if other protestant churches dislike *the sign of the cross in baptism*, she would by no means impose upon them the use of it, as an indispensable term of spiritual communion in a common Lord. She disapproves indeed of the endless *cruciform* evolutions of the Papists; but she can discover no reason, why *their* vain mummeries should make it sinful or superstitious in *her* ministers to sign a newly baptized child "with the sign of the cross, in token that hereafter he shall not be ashamed to confess the faith of *Christ crucified*." Hence, "to take away all scruple concerning *the sign of the cross* in baptism," she refers us for the true explication thereof, and the just reasons for the retaining of it, to the 30th Canon.

\* "Papa Innocentius, his auditis," (namely the false accusations preferred against the Waldenses) "non mediocriter condoluit Qui, missis prelatoribus ad omnes regiones occidentis, principibus aliisque populis Christianis, in

faithful to the commands of his colleague, immediately assumed this badge : and ere long, throughout France alone, there were slain of the Reformed, according to Vitrings, *ten hundred thousand men*.

*The childish superstition*, to which the sign of *the cross* has been prostituted, is scarcely less notorious. On this *the Lubric of the Roman Missal* will be the best commentary. In consecrating the baptismal water, the priest is directed to divide it, in the form of *a cross*, with his extended hand, which he is immediately to wipe with a cloth. Afterwards he is again to touch the water with his hand: next he is to make *three crosses* upon the font : and then he is to divide the water with his hand, pouring it out, *cross-wise*, to the four parts of the world. Having duly gone through this process, muttering all the while in such a manner as not to be heard by the bystanders, he is to change his voice, and recite a short prayer in the tone of reading. The prayer being ended, he breathes three times upon the water in the form of *a cross* ; and then, resuming the low muttering tone of his former incantation, he drops a little wax into the water. Thrice he drops this wax into the water, and thrice he takes it out ; blowing, at its last immersion, three times upon the water in the *cruciform* figure of the Greek letter  $\Psi$  Psi. Lastly, he mixes oil and cream with the water, moving his hand to and fro in the shape of *a cross* ; and the consecrated *commixtio*, as it is termed, is thought to be then duly prepared for the administration of the sacrament of baptism. Nor is *the cross* used in this absurdly superstitious manner throughout the initiatory rite of Christianity alone. Holy eggs and holy candles, holy salt and holy water, go through a somewhat similar ceremony ; and are marked, in a similar manner, with the sign of *the cross*. Nay, even when not immediately engaged in performing the rites of his multifarious adoration, let a Papist be assailed either by natural or super-

suorum remissionem peccatorum injunxit, ut se cruce signarent ad hanc pestem extirpandum." (Matt Paris Hist. Mag. Angl. p. 241. cited by Mr. Sharpe.) This same badge of *the cross* will probably be again assumed in *the last holy war*, undertaken by *the beast* and *the false prophet*, seemingly against *the prote-tants* and *the Jews*. (Rev. xix. 19, 20.) Of this war more will be said hereafter.

natural terrors, and he will forthwith almost mechanically commence the operation of *crossing* himself in various parts of his body.\*

Such is the wonderful accuracy of the whole prophecy respecting both *the name* and *the mark* of *the beast*— Though the ancient Romans called themselves *Latins*, yet they were better known by the appellation of *Romans*. When *the Empire* was divided, both the *eastern* and the *western* members of it still denominated themselves *Romans*; but, for the sake of distinction, *its western branch* was henceforth styled *the Latin empire*, and *its eastern branch* the *Greek empire*. *The revived beast* however, “that was, and is not, and yet is,” is in a special manner, under his last head, *the Latin empire*: and it is *the peculiar name* of *this indentical revived beast*, which (the prophet tells us) comprehends *the number 666*. Now *the peculiar name* of *that beast* is *Latinus*: and *Latinus* exactly contains *the number 666*. Can we doubt then of *Latinus* being *the name* intended by St. John?—As for *the mark of the beast*, which I conceive to be *the cross*, this *mark*, no less than *the name Latinus*, is peculiar to *the beast that is*, or *the papal Roman empire*, as contradistinguished from *the beast that was*, or *the pagan Roman empire*. *The ancient Roman beast* despised *the cross*: but *the revived Roman or Latin beast* made it his peculiar badge not only in religious but civil matters, introducing it into his standards, blazoning it in the armorial bearings of many of his great men,† and displaying it upon the crowns of *all his ten horns*; insomuch that *the crescent* is not more *the mark of Turkey*, or *the dragon of*

\* Missal. Roman. edit. Plantin. p. 273—285. Cited by Mr Sharpe. Mrs. Bowdler thinks, that *the name of blasphemy*, which she supposes to mean *apostacy*, and which St. John beheld written upon *the heads of the beast*, is *the mark* in question. I am far from disliking her idea; and many may very probably prefer it to that which I have adopted from Sir Isaac Newton. According to this interpretation, none are permitted to buy or sell except those who are implicated in *the predicted blasphemy or apostacy* with which *the man of sin* has tainted *the Latin empire*. Practical Observ. on the Rev. p. 35.

† “That, which made *this ordina y* so considerable, and so frequently used in heraldry, was the ancient expeditions into the Holy Land, and the holy wars for the pilgrims, after their pilgrimage, took *the cross* for their cognizance, and the ensign of that war was *the cross*; and therefore these expeditions were called *Croissades*. In these wars, the Scots carried *St. Andrew’s cross*; the French, *a cross argent*; the English *a cross or*; the Germans, *sables*; the Italians, *azure*; the Spaniards, *gules*.” Gaillim’s Heraldry, p. 31.

*China*, than the much abused symbol of *the cross* is of *the papal Latin empire*—*The name then of the beast is Latinus ; the number of his name is 666 ; and his mark, † the cross*

With his description of *the name of the revived beast*, the prophet interweaves an intimation of the extreme jealousy with which *the ecclesiastical beast* should regard every opposition to his authority. All, who refused to bear the name of *Latins* or *Romans*, and to receive *the mark of the cross*, as badges of their communion with him, and as an acknowledgment of his supremacy, should be allowed neither to buy nor to sell.

No one can be ignorant of the tremendous interdicts and excommunications of *the Pope*. St. John however does more than merely speak of them in *general* terms ; he points out *the precise mode* of their operation. Bp. Newton has collected a variety of instances in which the predicted tyranny of *the ecclesiastical beast* has received even a *literal* accomplishment. “ If any,” says he, “ dissent from the stated and authorized forms of the Latin church, they are condemned and excommunicated as heretics ; and, in consequence of that, they are no longer suffered to buy or sell : they are interdicted from traffic and commerce, and all the benefits of civil society. So Roger Hoveden relates of *William the Conqueror*, that he was so dutiful to *the Pope*, that he would not permit any one in his power to buy or sell any thing, whom he found disobedient to the apostolic see. So the canon of the council of Lateran under *Pope Alexander the third*, made against the Waldenses and Albigenses, enjoins upon pain of anathema, that no man presume to entertain or cherish them in his house or land, or exercise traffic with them. The synod of Tours in France under *the same Pope*, orders, under the like intermination, that no man should presume to receive or assist them, no not so much as to hold any communion with them in buying or selling ; that, being deprived of the comfort of humanity,\* they may be compelled to repent of the error of their

\* Such are the convincing arguments used by Papists against those whom they are pleased to style *heretics*. The same pains and penalties appear to be still attached to excommunication in Ireland, so far as the Popish priests are



ways. *Pope Martin the fifth*, in his bull set out after the council of Constance, commands in like manner, that they permit not the heretics to have houses in their districts, or enter into contracts, or carry on commerce, or enjoy the comforts of humanity with Christians.”\*

The sum then of the whole is this. *The two apocalyptic beasts are the two contemporary Roman Empires, temporal and spiritual, each subsisting under its proper head. The last head of the one, under which it will go into perdition, is its double head, the patricio-imperial line of the Carolingian Emperors: the sole head of the other is the line of Popes from the year 606, when the saint's were formally given into the hand of the little horn, and when the period of 1260 days commenced. These two Empires mutually support each other in their joint tyrannical persecution of the witnesses: and are primarily, though unconsciously, influenced in their proceedings by the infernal serpent.*

In order that the close connection of *the two empires* may the more evidently appear, St. John gives us a complete double, though united, symbol of them both, as they stand leagued together till their final destruction under *the last vial* at the termination of *the 1260 years*.

“And there came unto me one of the seven angels, which had the seven vials, and talked with me, saying unto me, Come hither; I will shew unto thee the judgment of the great whore, that sitteth upon many waters: 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. So he carried me away in the spirit into the wilderness; and I saw a woman sit upon a scarlet coloured beast, full of names of blasphemy, having seven heads and ten horns. And the woman was arrayed in purple and scarlet colour, and decked with gold and precious stones and pearls, having a golden cup in her hand, full of abominations and filthi-

able to enforce them. In the debate in the house of Lords (May 10th 1805.) on what has been insidiously termed *the catholic emancipation*, Lord Redesdale publicly declared, that he knew a protestant gentleman, who had saved an unfortunate man under a popish sentence of excommunication from starving in the streets.

\* Bp. Newton's Dissert. on Rev. xiii.

ness of her fornication. And upon her forehead was a name, written, Mystery, Babylon the great, the mother of harlots and abominations of the earth. And I saw the woman drunken with the blood of the saints, and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus : and, when I saw her, I wondered with great admiration.”

Here again we behold *the great secular Roman beast seven-headed and ten-horned*, now represented as closely leagued with *a mystic harlot*, in the same manner as he was before connected with *the two-horned beast*. The reason is this: *a harlot* is only another symbol of an *apostate idolatrous church*: both *the woman* and *the second beast* equally typify *the spiritual empire of the Papacy*. In the former symbol, *Popery* was described as the co-adjutor and instigator of *the temporal beast*: in the present symbol, it is represented in the plenitude of its power riding triumphantly upon the neck of kings, and exalting its authority far above that of its secular colleague.\*

*The great whore is said to sit upon many waters—These waters* are explained by the angel to mean *peoples, and multitudes, and nations, and tongues*. *The sitting therefore of the whore upon many waters* is precisely equivalent to *her sitting upon the beast*; for *the beast* symbolizes *the divided Roman empire*, and consequently *all the waters* or *nations* which it comprehends.

*She is the whore, with whom the kings of the earth have committed fornication, and with whose intoxicating cup all their subjects have been intoxicated—The kings of the earth* are *the kings within the precincts of the Roman earth or empire*: and *the fornication*, which they have committed with *the whore*, is *spiritual fornication*, or an idolatrous apostacy from the simplicity of the Gospel. As *the kings* or *horns of the secular beast* supported with all their might the corruptions of *the whore*, so were their

\* The construction of this compound hieroglyphic furnishes another argument, in addition to those already adduced, to prove that *the ten-horned beast* cannot be *the Papacy*. *The harlot* is evidently a distinct power from *the beast* upon which she rides. But *the harlot* is *the Papacy*. Therefore *the beast* cannot be *the Papacy* likewise. It is not unworthy of observation, that the love of system has actually led some commentators to assert expressly, that *the beast* is the same as *his rider*. “Idem Antichristus per mulierem et per bestiam spectandus producitur” Pol. Synop. in loc.

subjects made drunk with her poisonous doctrines. None escaped, but *the two mystic witnesses* : and their refusal to partake of the wine of her fornication was the cause of all the persecution which they endured both from *the kings* and from *the inhabitants of the Roman earth*, who had tasted of her maddening cup.

*The place, where St. John beheld the whore riding upon her scarlet beast, was the wilderness*—He saw *the woman*, once the chaste spouse of Christ, now polluted with *spiritual fornication*, and preferring *the wilderness* of error, sin, and delusion, to her former appointed place, *the inclosed vineyard\** of the Church. He saw her, so far from testifying any shame on account of her adulteries, glorying and triumphing with the brazen front of a determined strumpet in her manifold abominations. He saw her advancing yet another step in iniquity ; and, instead of possessing the comparative innocence of resting satisfied with her own whoredoms alone, labouring to make proselytes to her fornications, tyrannizing over the struggling conscience of the irresolute, and “ drunken with the blood of the saints and martyrs of Jesus.” When he saw a church of Christ thus fallen from her high estate, thus apostate, thus corrupted, thus persecuting the faithful with even more bitterness than pagan Rome ; well might he wonder with exceeding great admiration. To a primitive believer the thing would seem as it were impossible ; and St. John, who doubtless like the other prophets fully understood the *general* meaning of his own symbolical language, was probably at a loss to conceive how his prediction could ever be accomplished in a professed church of his meek and lowly master.†

*Upon the forehead of the whore was written, Mystery, Babylon the great, the mother of harlots and abominations of the earth*—Hence we may conclude, that *Babylon* was not her *real*, but only her *mystic*, name. Accordingly, when the angel teaches St. John “ *the mystery of*

\* Isaiah v. xxvii.

† St. John, with the books of the ancient prophets before him, could not but know, that a *harlot* was the type of an *apostate and idolatrous church*. The days of Aholah and Aholamah were now past ; Israel was no longer the church of the Lord. St. John therefore would be certain, that *the scarlet whore* must mean some future *Christian church* : hence naturally arose his great admiration. See Ezek. xvi. and xxiii.

the woman, and of the beast that carrieth her," he explicitly informs him, that "the woman, which he saw, is that great city which reigneth over the kings of the earth." *This great city* however can be nothing but *the emperre of Rome*. *Pagan Rome* it cannot be *in the days of the harlot*; because *pagan Rome* was rather *the learner* than *the teacher* of idolatry. If then it be not *pagan Rome*, it must be *papal Rome*. This point is yet further evident from the manner in which the angel speaks of *the ten kings*. He tells the prophet, that they had not received their kingdom *as yet*, but should receive power along with *the beast* in one apocalyptic season: and he adds, that they should give their power and strength to *the revived beast*; or, in other words, that they should be *the secular beast's* engines of persecution,\* and should uphold with all their might the new system of idolatry, by the establishment of which *the beast*, that was not, ascended afresh out of the bottomless pit. *The ten kings* therefore, who were *yet future* in the days of St. John, and who erected their thrones upon the ruins of the ancient empire, who first gave their power to *the beast*, and who afterwards should hate *the whore*, their former paramour, have manifestly been contemporary, not with *pagan*, but with *papal, Rome*: *the whore* therefore cannot be *pagan*, but must be *papal, Rome*.†

Thus it appears, that this grand compound hieroglyphic of *the woman and her beast* represents *the whole of the great city which reigneth over the kings of the earth*; *the woman* symbolizing *its spiritual empire*, and *her beast* symbolizing *its temporal empire*: that is to say, this complete hieroglyphic exhibits to us at one view *the two co-existing Roman empires*, which the prophet had before described separately under the symbols of *two friendly contemporary beasts*, leagued together for the purpose of erecting both a civil and an ecclesiastical

\* "It was given unto him (*the secular beast*) to make war with the saints and to overcome them" (Rev. xiii. 7). This he did, at the instigation indeed of *the second beast*, but through the instrumentality of his own *ten horns*.

† The reader will find the whole character of *the harlot* excellently elucidated by Bp. Newton in his Dissertation upon this part of the Apocalypse.

tyranny over the minds as well as over the bodies of men.\*

## SECTION V.

*The history of the true Church during the period of the great Apostacy—The harvest and vintage of God's wrath.*

After this account of the persecution of the witnesses, the war of the dragon, and the rise and tyranny of the two beasts, St. John proceeds to describe the state of the true Church during the same period of 1260 years; its great contest with the mystic Babylon at the time of the Reformation; and the judgments of God upon his enemies during the two grand periods comprised under the seventh trumpet, namely, the harvest and the vintage of God's wrath.

“And I looked, and lo, a Lamb stood on the mount Zion, and with him an hundred forty and four thousand, having his Father's name written in their foreheads. And I heard a voice from heaven, as the voice of many waters, and as the voice of a great thunder: and I heard the voice of harpers harping with their harps. And they sung, as it were a new song before the throne and before the four beasts, and the elders; and no man could learn that song, but the hundred and forty and four thousand, 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

\* Mr. Galloway singularly fancies, that the great whore means the confederacy of the beast, the false prophet, and the kings of the earth. This opinion of his runs directly counter both to symbolical propriety, and to the plain declaration of St. John. A whore is the symbol of a degenerate and corrupt church, and is never used to typify a conspiracy: the seven-headed and ten-horned beast, upon which she is sitting, is manifestly the great Roman beast, which had already been described in the 15th chapter of the Revelation; and the Apostle explicitly tells us, that the whore is “that great city which reigneth over the kings of the earth.” Hence it is manifest, that she must be the Roman empire either pagan or papal. Consequently she cannot be a confederacy, as Mr. Galloway supposes, of Papists, Mohammedans, and Infidels. What is scarcely fair in a professed discussion of a prophecy, Mr. Galloway omits all that part of it which makes against his system. He quotes the 17th chapter of the Revelation, which fully describes the whore and her beast, only as far as the 6th verse. See Comment. p. 276.

first fruits unto God, and to the Lamb. And in their mouth was found no guile: for they are without fault before the throne of God."

Hitherto we have beheld only the gloomy side of the affairs of *the Church*, the troubles and persecutions which she experienced from *the dragon and the two beasts*; we are now invited to contemplate that paradox, which real Christianity can alone explain. The 144,000, here mentioned, are the spiritual descendants of the twelve Apostles, apostolically multiplied. They are the immediate successors of the 144,000 sealed servants of God,\* who bore their testimony to the truths of the Gospel in the days of Paganism; and who "came out of great tribulation," to enjoy a short respite from their troubles in the tranquil age of Constantine.† They are the same in short as *the two witnesses*, or *the line of faithful believers*, whom God supported by the invisible though powerful agency of his Spirit through the whole term of the reign of *the beasts*. In the particular history of *the Apostacy* itself, they are described as oppressed and prophesying in sackcloth: here they are represented in a state of exultation and triumph, as rejoicing in that "joy which no man taketh from them." The two accounts therefore, when put together, exhibit them to us, like the primitive Christians, as "sorrowful yet always rejoicing," as "rejoicing in tribulation," and as even "exceeding joyful in tribulation." That this exultation is purely of a spiritual nature, and that it subsists along with great temporal adversity, is evident both from the preceding external history of *the witnesses*, and from the intimations which are given, even in the present chapter itself, that *the Church* is still in a suffering state notwithstanding her triumphant spiritual joy in the Lamb.‡

The 144,000 appeared to the Apostle as standing on *the mount Zion*, or in *the true Church*, because they constituted *the persecuted Church in the wilderness*:§ and, as *the followers of the beast have the mark and name of*

\* They are said to have been sealed in the age of Constantine, to separate them, as I have already observed, from the many that then began to "cleave to them with flatteries." Dan. xi. 34.

† Rev. vii.

‡ See Rev. xiv. 12, 13.

§ Rev. xii. 6, 14.

*the beast* ; so have these *the seal of God* impressed,\* and *the name of God* written, on their foreheads. They alone are able to learn the new song of the heavenly harpers, because they alone are the worshippers of the one true God through the one true mediator Jesus Christ ; the adherents of *the Apostacy* offering up their devotions to other objects, and through other mediators. They are virgins, undefiled with women, inasmuch as they are free from the pollutions of idolatry ; which is spiritual whoredom, and adultery. They follow the Lamb whithersoever he goeth, resolutely adhering to the religion of Christ in troublesome times as well as in prosperous ones, and fleeing into sequestered vallies and wild deserts rather than relinquish their profession of the Gospel. They are redeemed from among men, being rescued by the Almighty power of divine grace from the corruptions and abominations of Babylon ; and they are consecrated as the first fruits of Christianity unto God and the Lamb, an earnest and assurance of a more plentiful harvest first at the era of the Reformation, and afterwards at the yet more glorious era of the Millennium. In their mouth was found no guile : inasmuch as they handle not the word of God deceitfully, like Popish venders of indulgences, and preachers of purgatory, human merit, and idolatry ; but faithfully, and simply, declare the way of everlasting life. And they are without fault before the throne of God, having washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb ; God not imputing their trespasses unto them, but accounting them as if they had never sinned, through the imputed righteousness of Christ, who was made sin for them, in order that they might be made the righteousness of God in him.

By these 144,000, I understand peculiarly *the depressed Church in the wilderness* previous to the time of *the Reformation* : for history sufficiently demonstrates, that there have been in every age some faithful worshippers, who consented not to *the general Apostacy*, but who prophesied, although in sackcloth, against its abominations. These however went on their way in comparative obscurity, rejoicing that they were accounted wor-

thy to suffer for the name of the Lord Jesus. They make no very prominent figure in history, nor were they able to shake the deep-rooted authority of *the man of sin*. Hence they are represented only as prophesying in sack-cloth, and as patiently exulting in their sufferings on mount Zion in the presence of the Lamb. We must next turn our eyes to those more efficacious and decisive measures which forced the papal tyrant to tremble upon his usurped throne for his now disputed authority.\*

“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.”

The appearance of *the angel*, or *Christian minister*,† here mentioned, is sudden and unexpected. While the 144,000 are humbly singing the song of the Lamb in despised obscurity, this servant of God boldly shews himself in the very midst of *the symbolical heaven*, a conspicuous object to the whole world, armed only with the everlasting Gospel; which he openly preaches to them that dwell on *the earth*, or *the Roman empire*, loudly calling unto all nations to fear God and worship him only.

This striking and peculiar type will be found precisely to answer in every particular to *the dawn of the Reformation*. When the 144,000 had long rejoiced in their sufferings, and had long separated themselves from the communion of *the man of sin*, in order that they might “follow the Lamb whithersoever he goeth; when a reformation of the glaring corruptions of *Popery* was little likely to originate in *the symbolical heaven* either *ecclesiastical* or *secular*; then it was that Luther first stepped forward. “While the Roman pontiff,” says the historian Mosheim, “slumbered in security at the head of the Church, and saw nothing throughout the vast ex-

\* See Bp. Newton's Dissert. on Rev. xiv. In the exposition of the first part of this chapter, I have followed his Lordship; in that of the succeeding verses I am obliged to dissent from him.

† See Rev. i. 20.



.....

tent of his dominion but tranquillity and submission; and while the worthy and pious professors of genuine Christianity almost despaired of seeing that Reformation, on which their most ardent desires and expectations were bent; an obscure and inconsiderable person arose on a sudden, in *the year 1517*, and laid the foundation of the long expected change, by opposing with undaunted resolution his single force to the torrent of papal ambition and despotism.”\*

*The angel is represented as bearing the everlasting Gospel*—Accordingly *the Gospel* was the only instrument which his antitype Luther used in opposing the fury and machinations of his enemies, and in spreading the light of the Reformation. After the appearance of a special edict of *Leo the tenth*, in which he commanded his spiritual subjects to acknowledge his power of delivering from all the punishments due to sin and transgressions of every kind, and when the iniquitous traffic of indulgences was at its height; then did Luther raise his warning voice, and call upon the whole earth to turn away from those vanities unto one God and one mediator between God and man, to worship him only who made heaven and earth. Not content however with barely maintaining this evangelical tenet, he speedily turned the powerful two-edged sword of the Gospel against his antagonists, by publishing a German translation of the Bible; “the different parts of which,” says Mosheim, “being successively and gradually spread among the people, produced a sudden and almost incredible effect, and extirpated, root and branch, the erroneous principles and superstitious doctrines of the Church of Rome from the minds of a prodigious number of persons.” Thus accurately did the type of *an angel bearing the Gospel* answer to the proceedings of the great reformer Luther: and it is worthy of notice, that the Reformation itself, which he was one main cause of introducing, and which was in reality a republication of the long-concealed Gospel, has been actually so termed in a history of its progress quoted by Mosheim.† The

\* Eccles. Hist. Cent. 16. Sect. 1. Chap. 2.

† Historia Evangelii renovati.

rapidity, with which it afterwards spread among the kindreds, tongues, and nations, is sufficiently well known; and its progress is further pointed out in *the type of the two angels* who appeared to the prophet as closely following *the first*.

*The angel is seen to fly in the midst of heaven*—In the language of symbols, *heaven* signifies either *the Church* or *the State*, according as it is taken in a *spiritual* or in a *secular* sense. Now it is worthy of notice, that in both these senses the type accurately corresponds with the history of Luther. He was an Augustine monk; and, at the commencement of the Reformation, had not, like the Waldenses and Hussites, separated himself from the Church of Rome. On the contrary, he raised his voice in *the very midst of the ecclesiastical heaven*; and, at the first, was by no means inclined, either to quit the communion, or directly oppose the authority, of *the Pope*. Many prior attempts had been made to bring about a reformation from *without* the western Church: but the only one, which proved in any degree successful, was made from *within* it.\* So again, if *the heaven*, in which *the angel* was seen to fly, be understood in a *secular* sense, the type will in this case also be found equally applicable to the Saxon reformer. “Contrary to the general fate of the preachers of new tenets, it was Luther’s lot to proclaim his doctrine in the midst of *the figurative heavens*, before *the emperor* and *the princes of the empire*, assembled in open diet. Patronized from the first by princes, the Reformation was introduced into the countries where it took place by the authority of the sovereigns themselves; not by a party first gained among the subjects, too powerful for the sovereign to resist.”†

“And there followed another angel, saying, Babylon is fallen, is fallen, that great city, because she made all nations drink of the wine of the wrath of her fornication.”

By this *second angel* I conceive Calvin and the members of the different reformed‡ continental churches to

\* I mean not to say, that *no* prior attempts had been made from within it, but that none had been made successfully.

† Whitaker’s Comment. p. 432.

‡ I use the word *reformed* as it is familiarly used in contradistinction to *Lutheran*.

be peculiarly intended. The preaching of Luther, hostile as it eventually proved to papal tyranny, was not originally so direct and undisguised an attack upon it as that of *the second angel*. Strongly under the influence of habits formed by a monastic education, he long hesitated entirely to throw off the yoke. When the open declaration of his opinions had raised him many enemies, though he firmly refused to recant without conviction, yet he addressed himself by letters, written in the most submissive and respectful terms, to *the Roman Pontiff* and to several of the bishops, shewing them the uprightness of his intentions, as well as the justice of his cause, and declaring his readiness to change his sentiments as soon as he should see them fairly proved to be erroneous." His own account of the state of his mind during this period will best shew with what extreme difficulty it extricated itself from the trammels of blind obedience to *the see of Rome*. "I found myself," says he, "involved in the controversy of indulgences alone, and as it were by surprise. And, when it became impossible for me to retreat, I made many concessions to *the Pope*; not however in many important points; but certainly, at that time, I adored him in earnest. In fact how despised and wretched a monk was I then! Whereas, in regard to *the Pope*, how great was his majesty! The potentates of the earth dreaded his nod. How distressed my heart was in that year, (1517) and the following; how submissive my mind was to the hierarchy, not feignedly but really! Nay, how I was almost driven to despair through the agitations of care, and fear, and doubt, those secure spirits little know, who at this day insult the majesty of *the Pope* with much pride and arrogance! But I, who then alone sustained the danger, was not so certain, not so confident. I was ignorant of many things, which now by the grace of God I understand. I disputed, and I was open to conviction. Not finding satisfaction in the books of theologians and canonists, I wished to consult the living members of the Church itself. There were indeed some godly souls, who entirely approved my propositions; but I did not consider their authority as of weight with me in spiritual concerns. *The*

popes, cardinals, bishops, and monks, were the objects of my confidence. At length, after I became enabled to answer every objection that could be brought against me from the Scriptures, one difficulty still remained, and only one; namely, that *the Church ought to be obeyed*.\* By the grace of Christ, I at last overcame this difficulty also.† Such was the conflict which took place in the mind of Luther. But Calvin and the succeeding reformers treated *the Church of Rome* with an indignant roughness from the very beginning. Adopting the language of the Waldenses, who had avowedly separated themselves from her communion in obedience to the prophetic exhortation,‡ they scrupled not to apply to her the name of *Babylon*, and to denounce against her in the words of the Apocalypse the future dreadful judgments of God. “By the same figure of speech, that *the first angel* cried, that *the hour of his judgment is come*, this *second angel* proclaims that *Babylon is fallen*. The sentence is as certain, as if it were already executed:”§ whence, after the manner of the ancient prophets, the present tense is used instead of the future.|| By the light of Scripture, the daring usurpations, the rank idolatry, and the blasphemous pretensions of *the Papacy*, were detected and exposed. That undefinable dread of its heavenly authority, which at first so strongly influenced the mind of Luther, was unknown and unfelt by subsequent preachers: and, in the height of their zeal, even exceeding their warrant, while they justly branded *Rome* with the name of *Babylon*, they prematurely stigmatized *the Pope* with that of *Antichrist*.

“And the 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 God, which is poured out without mixture into the cup of his indignation; and he

\* “I saw another angel fly in the midst of heaven.”

† Cited by Milner. Eccles. Hist. Vol. iv. p. 331.

‡ “Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues.” Rev. xvii. 4.

§ Bp. Newton's Dissert. on Rev. xiv.

|| “Babylon is fallen, is fallen.” Isaiah xxi. 9. See Bp. Newton's Dissert. on Rev. xiv.

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.

As *the first and second angels* represent *the Lutheran and Calvinistic churches of the continent*, so I apprehend *the third angel* typifies *the insular church of England*; which is not professedly in all points either *Lutheran* or *Calvinistic*, and which has justly merited and obtained the glorious title of *the bulwark of the Reformation*.\* The description, which is given of the office of *the third angel*, accurately corresponds with the part which *the Anglican church* has taken in the contest with the adherents of *Popery*. For more than a century after the Reformation the writings of the English divines continued to denounce the vengeance of heaven against those who still partook of the abominations of *the apostate Roman beast* after all the warnings which they had received; and the ablest expositors of those prophecies, which relate to the corrupt tyranny of *the mystic Babylon*, have been children or fathers of our national Church. Of these it will be sufficient to mention the illustrious name of *Meade*; who, by his successful application of many of the predictions of *Daniel* and *St. John* to *Popery*, loudly called upon the whole world to come out of *the harlot city*, lest they should “drink of the wine of the wrath of God.”

“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, and their works do follow them.”

\* *The presbyteral and Calvinistic church of Scotland* must be considered as a member of *the second angel*, inasmuch as, although insular herself, she has derived both her discipline and doctrine from the reformed churches of the continent: while the venerable, though depressed, *episcopal church of Scotland*, may be esteemed, in a similar manner, a member of *the third angel*, being the same both in doctrine and discipline as *the church of England*, though, so far as her present line of episcopal succession is concerned, of later origin. See *Skinner's Eccles. Hist. of Scotland*.

Gloriously successful as the Reformation eventually was, the patience of *the saints* was severely exercised during its progress. It was a season of great trial and persecution : and many of *them of understanding* perished in trying, and in purging, and in making white, their apostate brethren.\* Great was the increase which the noble army of the martyrs then received. They overcame *the dragon*, not by the arm of flesh, but “by the blood of the Lamb, and by the word of their testimony ; and they loved not their lives unto death.”† Hence they had need of that consolatory declaration, “Blessed are the dead who die in the Lord from henceforth.” By their preaching, the gloomy fears of purgatory were dispelled ; and the pious learned to build with confidence upon the assurance of the Spirit, that, whenever they depart hence and are no more seen, “they rest from their labours, and their works do follow them.”‡

“ And I looked, and behold, a white cloud ; and upon the cloud one sat, 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 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, which had power over fire ; and cried with a loud cry 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 winepress of the wrath of God. And the winepress was trodden without the city ; and blood came out of the winepress even unto the horse bridles, by the space of a thousand and six hundred furlongs.”

\* Dan. xi. 35.

† Rev. xii. 11

‡ For the substance of these remarks upon the characters of *the three angels*, I am indebted to Mr. Whitaker ; whose mode of interpreting this particular portion of the Apocalypse I very much prefer to that adopted by Bp. Newton. See Whitaker's Comment. p. 430—436.

Having passed the epoch of the Reformation, we now advance into the times of God's last judgments upon his enemies, the days of *the third noe-trumpet*. Two remarkable periods of the most conspicuous of these judgments, *the several steps of the whole* of which are afterwards described under *the seven vials*, are here arranged under two grand divisions, figuratively styled *the harvest* and *the vintage*. In the days of Bp. Newton, *the third noe-trumpet* had not begun to sound; none therefore of *the vials* were then poured out. Hence his Lordship justly observed, "What particular events are signified by *this harvest* and *vintage*, it appears impossible for any man to determine; time alone can with certainty discover, for these things are yet in futurity. Only it may be observed, that *these two signal judgments* will as certainly come as *harvest* and *vintage* succeed in their season; and in the course of providence, *the one* will precede *the other*, as, in the course of nature, *the harvest* is before *the vintage*; and *the latter* will greatly surpass *the former*, and be attended with a more terrible destruction of God's enemies."\* But, although *both these signal judgments* were future when Bp. Newton wrote, it has been our lot to hear the voice of *the third noe*, and to behold in *the French Revolution* the dreadful scenes of *the harvest*. Still however a more dreadful prospect extends before us. The days of *the vintage* are yet future: for the time hath not yet arrived, when the great controversy of God with the nations shall be carried on *between the two seas*, in the neighbourhood of *the glorious holy mountain*, in the blood-stained vale of *Megiddo*, in the land whose space extends *a thousand and six hundred furlongs*.†

\* Dissert. on Rev. xiv.

† After a long consideration of the subject, I rest in the opinion of Mede, Newton, Lowman, Doddridge, and Bengelius, that *the apocalyptic harvest* denotes a *harvest*, not of mercy, but of *wrath*. Mr. Mede, who has elaborately and minutely discussed the point, observes, that the idea of a *harvest* includes *three things*; *the reaping of the corn*, *the gathering of it in*, and *the threshing of it*: whence it is made a type in Scripture of *two direct opposites*; of *destruction* when *the reaping and the threshing* are considered; of *restoration and salvation* when *the in-gathering* is considered. (Comment. Apoc. in Messerm.) Now the context of *the apocalyptic harvest* seems to me most definitely to teach us, that a *harvest of judgment* is intended. Throughout the whole book of Revelation, with the exception of a few passages which sufficiently explain themselves, *the earth* is used as a symbol of *the Roman empire pagan and papal*.

Such are the contents of *the little book*. Its several chapters, running parallel to each other in point of time, jointly furnish a complete prophetic history of the *Western Apostacy* during the whole period of the 1260 years, under all the three woe-trumpets. It principally however exhibits the *corruptions of Popery* under the two first woe-trumpets: the third is but briefly touched upon, and that only to prevent a break in the period of 1260 years.

Upon *this earth* all the vials of God's wrath are poured out, whatever subsequent distinction may be made in their effusion. (Rev. xvi. 1.) It is *the vine of this earth* that is to be gathered, when her grapes are fully ripe; and it is *the ripe harvest of this self-same earth* that is to be reaped, when the time for reaping is come. Here we may note, that it is not, as in our Lord's parable (Matt. xiii 24, 38), said to be *the harvest of a field*, which is afterwards formally explained to mean *the whole world*: but, as the sickle is thrust into the earth to gather *the vine of the earth*, so is the sickle likewise thrust into the earth to reap *the harvest of the earth*. If then *the earth* mean the *Roman empire* in the case of the *vintage*, which cannot reasonably be doubted, since those that are cast into the *winepress* are the *Roman beast*, the *false prophet*, and the *kings of that same earth*, and since (according to the acknowledged principles of symbolical imagery) *the vine of the earth* must denote *the corrupt church of the mystic Babylon*, whose abominations,—whose *ripe clusters* of iniquity,—will eventually occasion the ruin of its supporter *the secular beast* (Dan. vii. 11.); if, I say, *the earth* mean the *Roman empire* in the case of the *vintage*, must we not conclude from the almost studied similarity of phraseology used by the prophet, that *the earth* means likewise *the Roman empire* in the case of the *harvest*? And, if this be allowed, what idea can we annex to the *reaping of the harvest of the corrupt Roman empire*, which, like *the grapes* of that same empire, is declared to be ripe, except that of *some tremendous judgment* that should precede the *vintage*, and more or less affect the *whole empire*? In such an opinion also I am the more confirmed by finding, that a *judgment about to befall Babylon*, the constant apocalyptic type of the *Roman church and empire*, is by Jeremiah expressly termed a *harvest*. (See Jerem. li. 33.) This difference indeed there is between the two prophets, that Jeremiah dwells upon *the third part of the harvest, the threshing*; while St. John selects the imagery of *the first part, the reaping*: yet I cannot but think, that the context of both passages sufficiently shews, that a *harvest of judgment, not of mercy*, is intended. *The apocalyptic harvest*, by being confined to *the earth or the Roman empire*, cannot denote either the *general m-gathering of Judah and Israel*, or the *universal influx of the gentiles to the millennial church*; and since, like *the vintage*, it is exclusively confined to *the idolatrous and persecuting Roman empire*, since in both cases the sickle is equally thrust into *this empire*; I feel myself compelled to conclude, that, like *the vintage*, it denotes *some signal judgment*. This judgment I suppose to be *the first part of the third woe*; a *woe*, which must be expected to mark a period in history no less striking than the successive founding of *the Saracenic and Turkish empires*; a *woe*, which is ushered in by an event no less singular than definite, *the fall of a tenth part of the great Roman city*, or of *one of the ten original Catholico-Roman monarchies* by an earthquake. This judgment in short I suppose to be the horrors of the second French revolution, and its immediate consequences, commencing on the 12th of August, 1792, and ushered in by the fall of the monarchy both arbitrary and limited which at that time was the only one that remained of the ten original kingdoms: a revolution, which in these consequences, or (to adopt the prophetic phraseology) *during the reaping of the harvest of the earth*, has been felt to the remotest parts of *the Roman empire*.



As the *little book* comprehends the whole of this period, a point which itself repeatedly insists upon,\* it was necessary to notice the sounding of the *third woe-trumpet*; which, like its two fellows, is included in the 1260 years.† The prophet therefore does notice it, briefly informing us that it should be immediately preceded, and as it were introduced, by a *great earthquake* which should occasion the fall of a *tenth part of the Latin city*; and that it should principally consist of *two tremendous manifestations* of God's wrath, *two seasons* of peculiar misery, *the harvest* and *the vintage*. A more particular account of these matters he reserves for future consideration under the pouring out of the *seven vials*: and the account itself he places, not in the *little book*, but in the *larger book* of the Apocalypse, inasmuch as it concerns not merely the *western*, but likewise the *eastern Apostacy*, and affects indeed more or less even the whole world. The 15th chapter of the Revelation therefore must be considered as chronologically succeeding the 9th, the intermediate chapters being a parenthetical history of the *West*, and constituting what St. John terms a *little book* together with an *introduction* to it. In the 9th chapter, we have an account of the *two first woes in the East*: in the 15th, the prophet begins to describe the effects of the *last woe*. Hence it is manifest, that the intermediate space must necessarily be occupied by the *little book* and its *introduction*. Let us now attend the prophet in his account of the effusion of the *vials*, which are all comprehended under the *third woe*, and which must be divided into three classes: the *vials of the harvest*, the *intermediate vials*, and the *vial of the vintage*.

\* See Rev. xi. 2, 3. xii. 6, 14. xiii. 5.

† At least so far included, that six out of its seven vials are comprehended within the 1260 years. The last vial, or that which contains the season of the vintage, seems to be poured out as soon as the 1260 years expire; and it coincides with what Daniel calls the time of the end, or the period of God's great controversy with the nations.

## CHAPTER XI.

*Concerning the effects of the last woe-trumpet, the pouring out of the seven vials, and the restoration of the Jews.*

THE prophet, having separately detailed the effects of *the two first woe-trumpets* in the *East* and in the *West*, and having briefly touched upon the sounding of *the third*, now proceeds to give us a more full account of the miseries which it should produce. For this purpose he divides it into *seven periods*, which he distinguishes by the pouring out of *seven vials*; and, to shew us that they are all comprehended under *the last woe-trumpet*, the commencement of the blast of which he had already announced, he styles them *the seven last plagues*. They are in fact the same, I apprehend, as *the seven thunders*, the roll of which St. John heard, when he had finished his account of *the second woe-trumpet* as afflicting *the East*. Conceiving rightly that in point of time they were the next in order to the events which he had last detailed, he seems to have supposed that they were *immediately\** to succeed them, and therefore prepared himself to write their history: but the great angel, having yet to reveal to him the contemporary effects of *the two first woe-trumpets* in the *West*, and to bring down *the second woe-trumpet* to its complete termination, commanded him to “ seal them up and to write them not;” swearing solemnly by the Almighty, that “ their time was not yet, but in the days of the voice of the seventh angel.” Those days are now come. We have seen, that *the great earthquake* at the close of *the second woe* is *the French revolution* in the year 1789: and we have likewise seen, that *the third woe* came quickly after in the year 1792, when the reign of Gallic liberty and equality commenced. Then it was, that the voice of *the seventh angel*, or *the third woe-angel*, began to be heard: consequently

\* The 9th chapter of the Revelation terminates in the year 1672 with the siege of Cambrée; namely at the end of the hour, the day, the month, and the year, for which the Turkish horsemen had been prepared; whereas the second woe does not terminate till the year 1789; and the third woe, which comprehends the seven vials, does not begin to sound till the year 1792.

we may then expect, that *the seven thunders* would begin to roar, and that *the seven vials*, full of the last plagues of an offended God, would begin to be poured out.\*

The history of *the two first woe-trumpets* is given in a *two-fold order*, as affecting equally both *the East* and *the West*: but the history of *the third* is given only in a *single order*, inasmuch as *some of its vials* are poured upon *the one branch of the Roman empire*, and *others* upon *the other branch*; all of them not equally extending to *the whole empire*, as was the case with *the first and second woe-trumpets*. It may likewise be observed, that the contents of *one vial* are not represented as being *fully* poured out before another *begins* to be emptied; though it is evident, that they *commence* in regular chronological succession. In this respect there is a striking difference between *the vials* and *the woe-trumpets*. We are explicitly informed by the prophet, that the blast of *the first woe-trumpet* entirely ceases before *the second* begins to sound; and that of *the second*, in a similar manner, before *the third* begins to sound: † but it is no where said, that *each vial* is emptied, before *its successor* begins to be poured out. Hence it is not unreasonable to conclude,

\* Mr. Whitaker singularly fancies, that *the last woe-trumpet*, or *the seventh trumpet*, is the same as *the last trump at the day of judgment* mentioned by St. Paul. I have not met with any commentator who agrees with him in this opinion, except the Jesuit Cornelius à Lapide. As for *the vials*, he supposes many of them to have been long since poured out: and maintains that they will *all* be poured out before the sounding of *the last woe*, “after which he has never been taught to look for any thing but the resurrection and its awful consequences.” Thus he plainly makes *the seven last plagues* precede *the last woe*; and teaches us that *the last of the three woes*, whereof *the two first* are the woes of *the Saracens* and *the Turks*, is *the making all the kingdoms of this world the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ*. This I have ever been accustomed to consider as a *blessing* rather than a *woe*: whence I have been induced to prefer the opinion of Mr. Mede, Bp. Newton, and Sir Isaac Newton, to that of Mr. Whitaker and Cornelius à Lapide; namely, that *the woeful part of the seventh trumpet* precedes its *joyful part*, and that it will bring much misery upon the earth ere the nations are converted to Christianity and brought into the pale of the Millennial Church. Since moreover *the seventh trumpet* is represented as *the last woe*, and since *the seven vials* are said to be *the last plagues*, I conclude with Bp. Newton that they must synchronize: otherwise there will be *two last* displays of God’s wrath. Mr. Whitaker says, that *the seven vials* are denominated *the last plagues*, because in them is filled up the wrath of God; and thinks, that we ought to be cautious of considering them as termed *last* merely in *point of time*. Bp. Newton, on the contrary, argues, that they must be *last in point of time*; because the wrath of God would *not* be filled up in them, if there were others *beside* them. See Mr. Whitaker’s Letter to Dr. Ogilvie, p. 33.—Comment. p. 44.—Bp. Newton’s Dissert. on Rev. x.

† See Rev. ix. 12, 13. and x. 14, 15.

that *two* or *more* of the *vials* may be pouring out at the same time, though the effusion of *one* commenced before that of *another*.

Besides the division of *the third woe-trumpet* into *the seven vials*, it is represented as comprehending likewise *two grand periods* of peculiar distress, figuratively termed by St. John *the harvest* and *the vintage*. *The harvest* occupies, I conceive, *the beginning* of *the third woe-trumpet*, or the earlier part of *the last days* of atheistical infidelity. It symbolizes the miseries inflicted upon mankind by the tyranny of *Antichrist*, and synchronizes with the first half of Daniel's account of *the king* who magnified himself above every god.\* *This period* comprehends *the three first vials*. *The vintage*, on the other hand, occupies the termination of *the third woe-trumpet*, or *the time of the end*. It relates to the great controversy of God with the nations, and the entire overthrow of *Papery* and *Infidelity*. *This period* synchronizes with the second half of Daniel's account of *the atheistical king* :† and is comprehended under *the seventh vial, the vial*, as it may be termed, *of consummation*. *The fourth, fifth, and sixth, vials* are poured out in the intermediate space between *the vials of the harvest* and *the vial of the vintage* ; and *the last* of these three may be considered as preparing the way for the final manifestation of God's wrath. Thus it appears, that, agreeably to the analogy of *the natural harvest* and *vintage*, some time will intervene between *the figurative harvest* and *vintage* ; that this time will be marked by the pouring out, at certain indefinite periods, of *the fourth, the fifth, and the sixth, vials* : and that at length, when *the mystery of God* is about to be accomplished, when *the waters of the Euphrates* are completely dried up, when a way has been prepared for *the kings of the East*, and when *the great confederacy* has begun to be put in motion by the secret agency of the three unclean spirits, *the last tremendous vial of the vintage* will be poured out at the close of *the 1260 years*.

Subsequent to his account of *the seven vials*, St. John gives us a more enlarged prophetic history of *the vintage*, prefacing it with a description of *the scarlet whore* pre-

\* Dan. xi. 36—39.

† Dan. xi. 40—45. xii. 1.

vious to her being overtaken by the judgments of God. The events, which he particularizes, are *the overthrow of Babylon, the battle of the kings of the earth, and the utter destruction of the beast and the false prophet*. All these events are to be comprehended under *the last vial*, as is manifest from this consideration. *The seven vials* are expressly said to be *the last plagues*: but, if the events in question be *not* comprehended under some one of them, *the vials* certainly are not *the last plagues*; because, in that case, they will be *prior* to those events: whence I conclude, that the events must necessarily be comprehended under some one of them. But, since the events are described as terminating the present order of things previous to the Millennium, and since *the last vial of the last trumpet of the last seal* cannot but be considered as *the vial of consummation*, the events must unavoidably belong to *the last vial*.

These preliminary observations being made, I shall proceed to a particular consideration of *each distinct vial*.

#### SECTION I.

##### *Concerning the vials of the harvest.*

*The two first woe-trumpets* described the rise of the *two-fold Apostacy, Papal and Mohammedan*, and the plenitude of power to which it speedily attained: *the third* introduces the reign of *Antichrist*; and, after having foretold under *the vials of the harvest* the miseries with which he should afflict mankind, predicts under *the vial of the vintage* the downfall of *the Apostacy* and the total overthrow of all God's enemies.

We have already seen, that *the third woe-trumpet* began to sound on *the 12th of August, 1792*, immediately after the limited monarchy of France was overthrown, and when the tyrannical reign of liberty and equality commenced. This being the case, we must look for the pouring out of *all the seven vials*, which form so many distinct periods of *the third woe-trumpet*, posterior to *the 1. th of August, 1792*; observing however, that *the harvest itself* must be considered as commencing, not merely

with *the first vial*, but with the earliest blast of *the trumpet*, and that the miseries previously produced by the fall of *the tenth part of the Latin city* may be esteemed (to make the allegory complete) *the first fruits of the harvest*.

“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 upon the earth: and there fell a noisome and grievous sore upon the men which had the mark of the beast, and upon them which worshipped his image.”

*The earth is the Roman empire: the men, who bear the mark of the beast, and worship his image, are the once superstitious, but non-atheistical, members of the Latin Empire and Church: and the noisome and grievous sore, which is represented as first openly breaking out after the great earthquake which overthrew a tenth part of the city, and after the commencement of the reign of anarchy at the first blast of the third woe-trumpet, is the delusive spirit of atheism, or that gross lie of Antichrist, the denial of the Father and the Son.\**

Since this imagery is borrowed from *natural* maladies, for the right understanding of it we must consider how such maladies operate upon the human frame. As the *humours* then, which at length produce a *sore* in the *body natural*, secretly work for some time previous to their eruption; so the *humours*, which produced *this figurative sore* in the *body politic*, had long been concocting previous to its *open appearance*. *Atheism* indeed existed in the very days of the Apostles; for even then were there *many Antichrists*, even then was *the spirit of Antichrist* in the world: but it began to be more systematically

\* This mode of expression is perfectly agreeable to the scriptural practice of describing *spiritual* by *natural* maladies. (See Isaiah. i. 5, 6) Sir Isaac Newton supposes, that “*a durable plague of war* is signified by *a sore and pain*.” and Mr. Bicheno has followed him in this opinion, applying the effusion of *the first vial*, which he thinks like myself was poured out in the autumn of the year 1792, to the calamities which the confederates of Pilsnitz experienced from the arms of the French republic. But I cannot find, that we have any authority for annexing such an idea to the word *sore*. In 2 Chron. vi. 28, it is used in a general sense, including war indeed, but including likewise many other calamities. Signs of the times, Part. III. p. 166, 167.

disseminated by *the dragon*, that original father of all lies, when he quitted his old station in *the figurative heaven of the Latin church*, and took a more advantageous position upon *the earth*. For a season *the noisome sore* broke out only upon a few individuals; but, in the course of the latter half of *the eighteenth century*, the infernal ingenuity of Voltaire and his associates spread *the poisonous humour* far and wide throughout Europe. Still however we did not behold the full effect of the devil's labours upon *the Roman earth*. According to the sure word of prophecy, *the great earthquake of the French Revolution* was to take place in *the year 1789*, and *the third woe-trumpet* was publicly to introduce *the anarchical principles of Antichrist* on the *12th of August, 1792*, ere *the noisome sore of Atheism* broke out under *the first vial*. But, when that memorable *12th of August* was past, and when on the no less memorable *26th of the same month*, an open profession of *Atheism* was made by a whole nation once zealously devoted to the papal superstition, then was *the first vial* poured out upon *the earth*, then commenced *the eruption of the noisome sore*. At this period, in consequence of the success of *the French revolution*, corresponding societies and atheistical clubs were every where held fearlessly and undisguisedly. All Europe seemed to have drunk deep of the cup of trembling. Scarcely a Christian was to be found within the limits of *the papal Latin earth*: and, in protestant countries, many, who had clean escaped from them that live in error, had been allured, through the lusts of the flesh, by vain promises of liberty, of a lawless freedom from all restraint both civil and religious, to forsake the religion of their fathers. At this period, moreover, the project of converting all the kingdoms of the earth into atheistical republics framed after the model of the misshapen democracy of France, was unreservedly and triumphantly avowed by infidel demagogues, and loudly and incessantly applauded by the populace throughout *the whole great Roman city*. When all these signs of the times concurred together, when *the poisonous humours* were perfectly concocted, then it was that *the noisome sore* broke out. *The principles of Antichrist*

were now publicly developed in the face of the whole world: and, since all the prophetic periods of the Apocalypse are dated, not from the secret cogitations of the heart which are known only to the Almighty, but from some overt and prominent display of those cogitations reduced to actual practice, and manifested to the eyes of all men; to what era shall we look for *the first undisguised avowal of national Atheism. for the first open eruption of the noisome sore predicted under the sixth vial, except the 26th of August, 1792, on which day the denial of a God was for the first time formally established by law?*

“And the second angel poured out his vial upon the sea: and it became as the blood of a dead man; and every living soul died in the sea.”

The pouring out of *this vial* immediately succeeds that of *the first*: and it relates, I conceive, to *the dreadful massacres of revolutionary France*, which commenced early in *the September of the year 1792*;\* massacres, which, extending from the metropolis to the provinces, converted that unhappy country into one great slaughter-house. *The sea* symbolizes *a nation in a violent state of effervescence and revolution*: and, when it is said to become *as the blood of a dead man*, we are evidently led to conclude, that the nation thus convulsed with intestine discord is deeply stained with the blood of its slaughtered citizens. That such has been in an eminent degree the case with France, in consequence of her being infected with *the noisome sore of Atheism*, we have all unhappily beheld, as it were, with our own eyes. We have seen murder accumulated upon murder; and the life of man, which every civilized legislature has hitherto regarded of the utmost importance, considered as a thing of no value. Of so little consequence did it appear in the eyes of Marat, *the friend of the people*, that he scrupled not to assert, that, in order to cement liberty, the national club ought to strike off 200,000 heads. During *the reign*

\* The massacres, which took place *before* this time, are not comprehended under *the second vial*, because they were perpetrated *previous* to the sounding of *the third* *trumpet* on the 12th of August, 1792. They being on the contrary to *the great earthquake* of the first revolution, which commenced in the year 1789, and the last shock of which produced, together with the downfall of the limited monarchy of France, the atrocities of *the 10th of August, 1792*.



of terror, as it was emphatically termed, "the revolutionary tribunal added daily, for a long time, new victims to the thousands who had fallen on the fatal days of August and September. Here the mockery of justice was complete; for, in the condemnation of the accused, the conviction of the jury, without the examination of witnesses, or even the confession of the prisoner, was declared sufficient to establish guilt." As for the privilege of extending mercy to the condemned, it was contemptuously disclaimed: and all applications for pardon were rejected with the declaration, that the enlightened government of republican France possessed no such power.\* It was esteemed indeed a sufficient crime to be suspected of being a suspicious person. "In such a state of society, when fortune, honour, and life, depended upon the caprice of sanguinary individuals, it is not surprising that private assassinations were frequently perpetrated with impunity; and, from *the torpor and insensibility* that prevailed,† were regarded as trivial acts. Suicide likewise became the resource of the unfortunate, especially of those who had renounced every idea of religion, of the superintendance of a Providence, and of a future existence. Thus those, who escaped from the tribunal of the ruling faction, perished by their own hands. Valazé stabbed himself; Echelle and Condorcet preferred poison; L'Huillier killed himself in prison; Rebecqui drowned himself: they were both agents in the atrocities of Avignon, and *the second of September*. Hidon, and the academician Champfort, fell by their own hands. Such also was the end of Roland, who was one of the principal actors in the revolution of *the tenth of August*—In the short space of two years, almost every individual of the principal actors in that revolution was brought to a violent end. Danton and Westerman, the

\* "I fly far off," said the poet Klopstock, "from the cries of that execrable tribunal, which murders, not only the victim, but which murders also the mercy of the people." Well then might Dumourier observe in his address to his own countrymen, "If the despotism of a single individual be dangerous to liberty, how much more odious must be that of seven hundred men, many of whom are void of principles, without morals, and who have been able to reach that supremacy by cabals or crimes alone."

†—"it became as the blood of a dead man."

one who directed, and the other who executed, the counsels of the insurgents, perished on the same day, and on the same scaffold. A similar fate befell many of those, who decreed the death or imprisonment of the king. Of the 693 members of the Convention, who voted that the king was guilty, seven were assassinated, eight were suicides, thirty-four were proscribed, ninety-two were imprisoned, and sixty-five were guillotined. The addition of those, who have since suffered in various ways, will swell this account to a far greater number. Thus, for a considerable time, in the interior of France each recent event surpassed in horror that which preceded it; and the metropolis was the centre of massacre, atheism, and anarchy. The conduct of the governors and the governed was equally an outrage to all decorum, humanity, and consistency of conduct.—In short, it appears, that there have been two millions of persons murdered in France, since it has called itself a republic.\* After the downfall of Robespierre, the effusion of blood began to abate: for the vial of the second angel was then exhausted. France, however, was previously converted into a vast *Acehiana*; or, to use the strong language of prophecy, its revolutionary sea “became as the blood 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 became blood. And I heard the angel of the waters say, Thou art righteous, O Lord, which art, and wast, and shalt be, 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 another out of the altar say, Even so, Lord God Almighty, true and righteous are thy judgments.”

As the sea signifies a nation in a violent state of revo-

\* Kett's Hist. the Inter. Vol. ii. p. 243—252.

† Mr. Bicheno supposes this second vial to have begun to be poured out on the sea in the year 1793, when, as he thinks proper to express it, “the maritime countries joined the Antichristian tyrants in their crusade against the liberties of France, and when the naval power of Europe was put into motion.” (Signs of the times, Part iii p. 158.) He has no warrant for explaining a *symbolical* prophecy literally; more especially since he himself had explained the effusion of the first vial not literally but symbolically.

lutionary tumult, so rivers and fountains symbolize kingdoms and their heads existing in the opposite state of a regular and settled government. These mystic streams are the different powers of the papal Latin empire; which were now to receive, by the unheard of inroads of a barbarous republican enemy, the due reward of their former persecutions of the saints. By a long and bloody war, the whole constitution of the Germanic body has been shaken to its very centre; and its emperor, the successor and representative of Charles the fifth, that great enemy of the witnesses, and of the pejured Sigismund, that wretched tool of papal malice, trembling for the safety of his capital, has been compelled to sue for an ignominious peace with the republic of France. In the course of the same war papal Italy has been overrun and pillaged of every thing valuable: Savoy, the ancient parent and persecutor of the Waldenses, has been wrested from its sovereign, nothing in a manner being left to him but the empty title of a king: Spain, after suffering for a time the horrors of war, has been reduced in effect to the state of a mere vassal province of France: the renegade inhabitants of the United Provinces, who preferred their self to their God, and whose polluted presses had long teemed with the blasphemous productions of Voltaire and his associates, have been first duped into a revolution, and have ever since been plundered and harassed by their unrelenting tyrants; and the Helvetic confederacy, in name partly papal and partly protestant, but in reality tainted with atheism to its very core,\* has been dissolved; its citizens have been massacred; and its territory has been plundered, by the infernal cruelty and harpy rapacity of republican banditti. Future historians will speak of this unparalleled war with astonishment. They will describe Europe as bleeding at every pore, and trembling for the fate of every civilized government. They will detail battle after battle, massacre after massacre, campaign after campaign. They will represent fer-

\* "Holland was the grand asylum of infidelity in the North, the nursery and chief propagator of its works, by the licentious liberty allowed to the press"—and, as for Switzerland, D'Alembert and Voltaire boasted, that "in Calvin's own town there were but a few beggarly fellows who believed in Christ, and that from Geneva to Berne not a Christian was to be found"

tile provinces wasted with fire and sword, and they will speak with horror of rapes, and murders, of pillage, and extortion,\* of prisoners deliberately put to death in cold blood, and of wounded soldiers systematically poisoned by their apostate commander. But, while they present this dreadful scroll of human calamities to the sickening attention of posterity, they will not fail to attest, that these heavy judgments of the Lord have principally fallen upon *the rivers and fountains of the papal Roman empire*. Protestant states, that have in any measure preserved the faith of their ancestors, have in a manner been exempt. Self-defence and wanton provocations compelled *England* to enter into the contest. Her firmness, under Providence, blasted all the designs of her malicious enemy against *herself*, and drove him back to his own shores disgraced and vanquished, with his navy shattered and with his mariners disheartened. But *her hapless allies*, already devoted by the just judgment of God to drink in *their* turn torrents of blood, inasmuch as they have heretofore profusely shed the blood of saints and prophets, it exceeded her power to save. The mighty arm of the Lord snatched *her* from impending destruction, and withered the boasted strength of her foe when directed against *herself*: but the angel of the waters, while *she* was preserved in the midst of wide-extending havoc and desolation, sternly denounced the vengeance of heaven against *her popish confederates*. "They have

\* Such was the rapacity of the republican tyrants, that "two years had been sufficient to place the countries conquered by France," the Netherlands, Holland, and the states situated between the Meuse and the Rhine, "on a level with herself, and to reduce them to one common equality of death and misery—These countries, but a short time before so rich and so abundant, were exhausted," by bearing the whole burden of maintaining the French army; "their whole specie was absorbed by contributions, their manufactures were suspended, and their produce consumed." (Hist. of the Campaign of 1796. p. 4.) The same work contains a very full account of the various robberies systematically committed by the French in Germany and Italy. (See p. 44, 70, 241, 247, 248, 250, 254, 256, 364, 365, 366.) In short, the order given by the Directory to their generals was, that "they should maintain their troops by victory;" and order so faithfully obeyed by Buonapartè, that he "had no hesitation to say, in the proclamation which he made to his soldiers in entering into Carinthia, that all the expences of the army of Italy, during eleven months, had been paid by the conquered countries, and that he had besides sent 30 millions of livres to France." (Ibid. p. 5, 366.) These were some of the blessings of republican fraternity!

shed the blood of saints and prophets, and thou hast given them blood to drink; for they are worthy.”\*

From what has been said it appears, that *the three first vials* relate to *the French Revolution*, describing at once *the principles* upon which it was founded, and *the miseries*, both *internal* and *external*, which it has produced. This *transcendent revolution*, which more or less has affected *the whole Roman Empire*, I conceive to be *the first period of the third woe-trumpet*, which St. John figuratively describes under the image of *a harvest*; a harvest not of mercy, but of God's wrath against the nations. After *this figurative harvest* has been gathered in, there is to be a sort of pause between it and the commencement of *the vintage*. The affairs of the world are in some measure to return to their old channel: yet they are not to return so smoothly, but that *the interval* between *the harvest* and *the vintage* will be marked by certain important events. These events are predicted under *the three following vials*.

## SECTION II.

*Concerning the three intermediate vials.*

The reader must decide for himself how far it is probable, that *three out of the seven vials* have already been poured out at the commencement of *the last woe-trumpet*, constituting jointly *that grand period* of it, which by St. John is styled *the harvest*, and by which I understand *the French Revolution*. *The concluding vial* is reserved

\* Mr. Galloway whimsically supposes, that *the angel of the waters* is *the maritime sovereign of Great Britain*. In the well-deserved encomiums, which he bestows upon our revered monarch, I heartily concur, though I cannot think that he is meant by *the angel of the waters*. This angel is manifestly no other than *the angel*, who had just poured out his vial upon *the waters of the rivers and fountains*; whence he is naturally styled *the angel of the waters*, or *the angel whose influence affected the waters*. Mr. Galloway appears to me to have been by no means successful in his interpretation of any of *the vials*, excepting *the sixth*, which he rightly applies to *Turkey*. In his elucidation of *the third*, he has been peculiarly unhappy. Entirely quitting the language of symbols, he fancies that *the rivers and fountains* mean *Germany*, for no other reason but because *that country is well watered with abundance of large streams*. In a sermon, which I published some years ago upon *the pouring out of the vials*, I was right in my general idea respecting them, but in more than one instance wrong in my particular application of them.

for the end of it, or the termination of *the 1260 years*; and comprehends *the second grand period of the vintage*. As for *the fourth, fifth, and sixth, vials*, I consider them as occupying *the intermedia e space* between *the harvest* and *the vintage*; and am inclined to view *the sixth vial* in the light of a harbinger and precursor of *the last*. Like a herald it prepares the way, and makes every thing ready for the final tremendous manifestation of God's righteous judgments upon his enemies.

“ And the fourth angel poured out his vial upon the sun; and power was given unto him to scorch men with fire. And men were scorched with great heat, and blasphemed the name of God, which hath power over these plagues; and they repented not to give him glory.”

In the language of symbols, *the sun of a kingdom* is *the government of that kingdom*; and *the sun of an empire*, if it be a divided empire, is *the government of the most powerful state within that empire*. When *the political sun* shines with a steady lustre, and yields a salutary warmth, it is a blessing to a people. But, when it glares with a fierce and unnatural heat, scorching all the productions of human industry with the intolerable blaze of a portentous tyranny, it is the heaviest curse which can befall a nation.

Since the whole prophecy of the Apocalypse relates to *the Roman empire*, the *sun* mentioned under this *vial* must be *the sun of the Roman firmament*: since the pouring out of *all the vials* takes place long posterior to the division of *the empire*, this *sun* must be *the sun of the divided empire*: and since *the three first vials* have carried us to the end of *the harvest* or *the anarchical horrors of the French Revolution*, this *sun* must mean *the government of that state within the limits of the empire* which at the *present* era is the most powerful. The prediction then of *the fourth vial* obviously intimates, that the frantic scenes of *the harvest* should be succeeded by *a systematic military tyranny*, which should be exercised over a considerable part of *the Roman empire* by the government of the most powerful state then existing within its limits. The world, exhausted with the miseries of *the symbolical harvest*, and wearied with the wild struggles of licentious

anarchy, should tamely submit to the lawless domination of an unrelenting despot. In pointing out *the particular government* intended by *this scorching sun of the Latin or Papal firmament*, the reader will doubtless have anticipated me. The present Popish states are France, Austria, Spain, Portugal, Naples, Sardinia, and Etruria. Of these, I apprehend, no one will be inclined to deny, that France is by many degrees the most powerful; and consequently that *its government* must inevitably be esteemed *the sun* of the system\*. To observe then the accurate completion of the prophecy of *the fourth vial*, in which it is said that power was given to this *sun* to scorch men with fire, and that they were scorched with great heat, we have only to cast our eyes over the continent. A system of tyranny, hitherto unknown in Europe except in the worst periods of the Roman history, has been established, and is now acted upon by him who styles himself *Emperor of the French*: and *the scorching rays* of military despotism are, at this moment, felt, more or less, throughout France, Holland, Switzerland, Italy, Spain, and the west of Germany. A regular plan of making each man a spy upon his neighbour, destroys all the comfort and all the confidence of social life; and France, with her de-

\* Should the present usurper of the throne of France, who already emulates the imperial rank of Austria, or should any successor of his at some future period, proclaim himself *Emperor of the Romans*, and thus transfer the crown of Charlemagne from Germany to France, as it was heretofore transferred from France to Germany; he would then, like Charlemagne, be the representative of *the last head of the beast*. Buonaparté is already in fact master of Italy, and appears to be upon the eve of reviving the ancient kingdom of Lombardy.

Since this note was written, the usurper of the throne of the Bourbons has formally proclaimed himself *king of Italy*, and has encircled his brows with the ancient iron crown of the Lombard sovereigns. Thus is one of the great maxims of German jurisprudence completely overturned; namely, "that the prince, who was elected *Emperor* in the German diet, acquired from that instant the subject kingdoms of Italy and Rome." (See Gibbon's Hist. of Decline and Fall, Vol. ix. p. 191.) May not the voice of ambition soon whisper in the ear of the new sovereign of Italy, that the right of electing a *Roman Emperor* belongs, not to the princes of Germany, but (as it was in the days of Charlemagne) to the senate and people of Rome? As for *the Pope*, he is ready to give his sanction to any new dignity which Buonaparté may think proper to assume. May, 1805.

I have now to add, that the disastrous termination of the campaign of 1805 has made the chief of the French government *the undoubted representative of Charlemagne*, and consequently *the last head of the beast*. The house of Austria seems tacitly to have exchanged the title of *Emperor of the Romans*, for that of *Emperor of Austria*: and, although Buonaparté has not yet formally assumed it, it can add nothing to his power when he does assume it, for he is already *the controlled emperor of the western continental Roman world*. June 3, 1805.

graded provinces, or, as they are termed with diplomatic mockery, *allies*, groans under the weight of endless requisitions, levies, and extortions, at once tormented herself, and the savage tormentor of others.\*

It is not unlikely, that the influence of *this vial* will extend to the very commencement of *the vintage*.† The violence of democratical and atheistical madness, that dreadful *harvest* of God's wrath, has now abated: but, since part of the business of *the intermediate vials* is first to prepare *that popish and infidel confederacy* which will be finally broken in the days of *the vintage*, and afterwards to collect *the kings of the Latin earth* to the great battle of the Lord at Armageddon; *the sun of military tyranny* will most probably glare with unabated violence to *the very time of the end*, and be the principal immediate instrument both of forming and directing *that confederacy*.‡

The effect, produced both by *these plagues* and by *the following ones*, will only be blasphemy and hardness of heart, instead of a reformation of principles and practice.

\* Even before the era of the Revolution, and previous to the vast acquisition of power made by France since that convulsion, the sovereigns of the Capetian dynasty were so conscious of their preponderating influence in Europe, that with a kind of arrogant fatality, they assumed for their distinguishing badge *the sun*, with this motto, *Nec pluribus impar, alone equal to many*. This notion of superiority indeed was so familiar to Frenchmen, that the health of his sovereign is said to have been once proposed by a French Ambassador to Lord Stair, and the very name of *the sun*. With the same idea no doubt the largest ship in the French navy was called *the royal sun*. Upon *this sun*, or *the government of France*, we have now beheld *the fourth vial* poured out, enabling it to scorch men with fire.

† Since this was written in the year 1801, the sphere of the influence of *this scorching sun* has been tremendously increased; and there is now scarcely any part of the *western Roman Empire* unaffected by its intolerable blaze. June 3, 1806.

‡ Mr. Sharpe thinks, that *the scorching of the Sun* means *unlimited monarchy in general*, operating in the keeping up of standing armies and martial law; and he censures the government of England for preferring regular troops to militia. Independent of his unwarrantable extension of the symbol from *the figurative sun of the European commonwealth* to *every separate star of its firmament*, I cannot but think him a little unreasonable in his animadversions. It would certainly be a very happy thing for the country, if a standing army could be dispensed with; but, since it is our misfortune, not our fault, to live in the immediate neighbourhood of a horde of ferocious and well-trained banditti, we must as we value our liberty and independence, be well prepared for their reception. A traveller finds it much more agreeable to pursue his journey without the incumbrance of arms, and without the fear of molestation; but, if his track be through a country infested by robbers, he must either submit to the inconvenience of bearing weapons, or to the still greater inconvenience of being plundered. Were the nation defended by none but brave impeccably disciplined troops, it would be ill able to cope with antagonists perhaps not less brave, and with every advantage of discipline.



*The earthquake, which overthrew the tenth part of the city, caused, as we have seen, the remnant of the seed of the woman to give glory unto the Lord: but the effusion of the vials upon God's enemies produces not the least tendency to repentance. We must not therefore look for any further reformation from Popery;\** for *the vials* are instruments of God's wrath, not of his mercy. France accordingly has *nominally* returned, like a dog to its vomit, to her old alliance with the blasphemous corruptions of *Popery*; but, according to every account of eye-witnesses, she still *really* and *individually* strengthens herself in the yet more blasphemous abominations of *Antichrist*.

Yet, although there will be no further reformation, it does not appear, that the inspired writers give any intimations of some still more dreadful persecution of *the witnesses*, than that which they have already undergone from *the two Latin beasts*: on the contrary, Scripture seems to me at least rather to lead to a directly opposite opinion. I mean not indeed to deny, that *individual* protestants, those for instance who reside in *popish* countries, may experience persecution: *these* will continue to prophesy in sackcloth, to *the very end of the 1260 days*. I would only be understood to intimate, that I can discover no warrant for expecting that *Protestantism in general*, as *nationally* professed, will ever be so far subdued by *Popery*, as to undergo throughout the whole world a *grand universal persecution*. The troubles, produced by incessant war with *the atheisticalo-papal powers*, will be the great means of purifying *the Church*: not, I think, any persecution resembling those of *the Pagan Emperors* or *the Roman Pontiffs* in the plenitude of their power.

I am led to form this opinion by observing, that *all the vials of the last woe-trumpet* are represented as being poured out upon *the Papal and Mohammedan Roman empire*;† upon *those, that have the mark of the beast*: upon *those, that have shed the blood of saints and pro*

\* I have already stated other grounds, besides this, when treating of *the seven-horned beast*, for adopting such an opinion.

† "Phialæ omnes," says Mr. Mede, "in bestiam (scil. Romanam) effunduntur." (Com. Apoc. in loc.) "Go your ways, and pour out the vials of the wrath of God upon *the earth*." (Rev. xvi. 1.) *The earth* throughout the Apocalypse denotes *the Roman empire*.

phets ; upon those, that have blasphem'd the name of God by reason of the no some sore of atheism : upon the seat and kingdom of the beast. None of these particulars are descriptive of such protes'tant states, as have held fast the faith of their ancestors, and have not apostatized, like Holland, Switzerland, and protestant Germany, to the lye of *Antichrist*. The last plagues, comprehended under the third woe-trumpet, are poured out *only* upon papists, blaspheming atheists, and Mohammed-ns : and although under the seventh vial " there shall be a time of trouble, such as never was since there was a nation ;" yet it is a time of trouble to none but the *beast*, the *false prophet*, and the *congregated kings of the Roman earth*. At the glorious era of the *Reformation*, the voice of the Lord called aloud from heaven, " Come out of the mystic Babylon, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues " Surely then we must unavoidably conclude, that those, who *did* come out of her, who *obeyed* the warning voice, who *ceased* to be partakers of her sins, who suffered themselves not *a second time to be deluded* by the yet more gross lie of atheism, *will likewise receive not of her plagues*. Whether the mighty king of the North, who is neither papist nor protes'tant, and whose ample territories are without the limits of the great Latin city, be destined to inflict, " at the time of the end," its death-wound upon the spiritual empire of Mohammed, events alone can determine. The position of his dominions gives him immediate access to the realms of both Persia and Turkey : but upon this point I presume not to be wise above what is written. It is however written, that, although the dragon shall direct the rage of his favourite minister *Antichrist* against the remnant of the seed of the woman ;\* yet the vials shall be exclusively poured out upon the enemies of God. Hence I conjecture,† that this final attempt of the dragon will totally fail of success, because it exceeds the peculiar commission of the infidel

\* Rev. xii. 17.

† I may do more indeed than merely conjecture that such will be the case : the complete failure of this last attempt of the dragon is expressly predicted in the overthrow of the false prophet and his adherents at the battle of Armageddon, in the region between the two seas.

*king*: and hence I conclude, that, as the great protestant states of Europe have hitherto been marvellously preserved amidst the plagues of *the fatal Babylon*, so they will be preserved even to *the time of the end*.

“And the fifth angel poured out his vial upon the seat of the beast: and his kingdom was full of darkness, and they gnawed their tongues for pain, and blasphemed the God of heaven, because of their pains and their sores, and repented not of their deeds.”

In the Apocalypse mention is made of *two beasts*, the *secular* and the *ecclesiastical*; and it might be doubted which of the two was here intended, were we not assisted in our inquiries by the general context of the whole prophecy. Whenever *the beast* is simply mentioned, by way of *eminence* as it were, I believe it will invariably be found, that *the ten-horned* or *secular beast* is meant,\* not *the two-horned* or *ecclesiastical beast*. In addition to this general proof, the particular context of the present passage may be adduced. The angel is said to pour *his vial upon the seat of the beast*. Now *the first beast* is expressly said to have had *a seat* or *throne* given him by *the dragon*; because, although *nominally* Christian, he exercised his secular authority, like his predecessor *the pagan emperour*, in persecuting *the Church of God* † whereas no mention is made of *the seat of the second beast*, and for this plain reason; the secular authority of *the Pope* was confined within the narrow limits of an Italian principality, and all the persecutions which he ever excited against the faithful were carried into effect ‡ by *the first beast* through the instrumentality either of his *last head* or of his *ten horns*. † Hence I think it manifest, that *the beast*, upon whose *seat* the *present vial* is poured, is *the first* or *secular beast*.

What is precisely meant by this judgment it is impossible at present to determine with any certainty, mas-

\* See Rev. xiv. 9, 11. xvi. 2. xix. 19.

† Rev. xii. 2.

‡ All the different martyrs, who were persecuted to death as heretics, after they had been found guilty by the ecclesiastical courts, were formally delivered over to the secular arm for punishment. “It is not lawful for us to put any man to death,” was the constant language of *the two-horned beast*, as it heretofore was of the Jewish priests when demanding the death of Christ. Sometimes even, with a crocodile affectation of clemency, *the secular beast* was besought by his merciful colleague not to deal too harshly with the condemned.

much as it is yet future. If however we may argue from analogy, since *the giving of a seat or throne to the beast by the dragon* evidently means *the investing him with the same secular power of making war with the saints, as that exercised by him while in his pagan state*, the pouring out of a vial upon that seat so as to fill his whole kingdom with darkness, seems most naturally to represent some grievous calamity which should materially affect that secular power of persecution, and fill his whole kingdom with contumacious and confusion.

The beast here spoken of is the beast under his last head: but what power will be that last head, when the present vial is poured out, must be determined by the event.\*

\* I have already observed, that the last head of the beast is by the Apostle termed the beast himself.

Since this was written, the battle of Austerlitz has been fought, and possibly the fifth vial has been poured out. From the ambiguous nature of the *Carlovingian head of the beast*, which has sometimes been attached to one kingdom and family, and sometimes to another, I dare not even now positively say, that the effusion of the fifth vial has commenced; but I am strongly inclined to believe that it has commenced, and that the house of Austria now feels its baleful effects. This vial is said to be poured out on the throne or secular authority of the beast under his last head, the representative of which previous to the late campaign was the German emperor of the Romans; and it produces the effect of filling his kingdom with darkness. Let the reader turn his eyes to the present state of that unfortunate prince, and of (what anciently and indeed till very lately properly constituted his kingdom) Germany and Italy; and he will behold the power of the imperial throne subverted, and the Emperor degraded to the condition of a mere king of Austria, elbowed out of his empire, stripped even of his hereditary dominions, and trembling at the nod of an implacable enemy, who seems even now to be meditating his entire destruction; he will behold Germany passing under the yoke of a new Charlemagne, and parcelled out according to the sovereign pleasure of a daring usurper, its ancient constitution annihilated, and itself full of political darkness and confusion; he will behold Italy equally degraded, equally dark, equally confused. And what is the consequence of these calamities? "They gnawed their tongues for pain, and blasphemed the God of heaven because of their pains, and their sores, and repented not of their deeds." And do we find any thing like a reformation in Germany and Italy? They present only the hideous spectacle of the abominations of Popery, blended with blasphemies of Infidelity.

Though I scruple not to say, that there are strong reasons for believing that the fifth vial has begun to be poured out, I repeat that I am unwilling at present positively to make such an assertion. Whenever the waters of the mystic Euphrates are completely dried up under the sixth vial, we shall then know with certainty that the fifth vial, which precedes it, must have been poured out; we shall, then consequently be able to determine, whether the fifth vial was poured out at the close of the year 1805, or whether it relates to some yet future calamity about to befall the present Carlovingian head of the beast. This last however I fear we have not much reason to expect. The fall of the Turkish monarchy will throw a wonderful light on the study of the apocalypse; because it will definitely teach us in what part of it we are now living, and will prove that all the five first vials (let them relate to what they may) must have been previously poured out. If no events therefore, answering to those describ-

“And the sixth angel poured out his vial upon the great river Euphrates; and the water thereof was dried up, that the way of the kings from the East might be prepared. And I saw three unclean spirits like frogs 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. For they are the spirits of devils, working miracles, which go forth unto the kings of the earth and of the whole world, to gather them to the battle of that great day of God Almighty. Behold, I come as a thief. Blessed is he, that watcheth, and keepeth his garments, lest he walk naked, and they see his shame. And he gathered them together into a place, called in the Hebrew tongue Armageddon.”

Under *the sixth trumpet*, the four Turkish sultanies, *the mystic waters of the Ottoman empire*, issued from *the river Euphrates*: under *the sixth vial*, the *waters of the same Euphrates* are to be completely dried up. We cannot therefore reasonably doubt, that *the symbolical Euphrates* means in both cases *the same power*.\*

*River* ed under *the fifth vial* shall take place between the present time and the downfall of *the Turkish monarchy*, I hesitate not to say, that *that vial*, which immediately succeeds the commencement of the scorching military tyranny predicted under *the fourth*, must have begun to be poured out in the late disastrous campaign. June 3, 1806.

\* Since this was written, I have seen a paper in *the Christian Observer for January 1805*, in which *the Euphrates*, here mentioned by the prophet, is connected with *Rome*; on the ground that *the literal Euphrates* is connected with *the literal Babylon*: whence it is argued, that *the drying up of the Euphrates* implies *the impending destruction of Antichristian Rome*. Had the writer attended to the uniformity and strict exactness of the apocalyptic language, he would probably not have hazarded such a conjecture. *The mystic streams of the Euphrates under the sixth trumpet* manifestly relate to *the infancy of the Turkish empire*: *the drying up therefore of those mystic streams under the sixth vial* must relate to *its destruction*. So again: if *the Euphrates of the sixth vial* is to be connected with *Rome*, *the Euphrates of the sixth trumpet* must likewise be connected with *Rome*; for, unless we violate completely the definiteness of the whole Revelation, what *the Euphrates* means in *one passage*, it must mean in *another*. Consequently, if *the Euphrates of the sixth vial* be *the papal nations of the Roman empire*, or (what the writer of this paper seems to insinuate) *the influence of the Papacy over those nations*; then we must conclude, unless we are willing to give up all consistency of language in the Apocalypse, that *the Euphrates of the sixth trumpet* means *the same*; in which case we shall at length arrive at the absurd position, that *the four Turkish sultanies* issued from *the Papal nations of the Roman empire*, or that *the Turkish monarchy* originated from *the influence of the Papacy*. The fact is, as I have already abundantly shewn, *river*s typify *nations*; and, when a *particular river* is mentioned, *the nation upon its banks* is intended. *The Euphrates therefore of the sixth trumpet* is the symbol of *the Turkish monarchy*: whence it will follow, that *the Euphrates of the sixth*

ers typify nations; and, when a particular river is specified, the nation immediately connected with that river is obviously intended. Such being the case, as the issuing forth of the four vials, those mystic waters of the Euphrates which deluged the Eastern Empire, denotes the rise of the Turkish power, so the drying up of those waters must evidently denote its subversion. Now, since the drying up or evaporation of water is a slow process, we may naturally conclude, that the expression points out, not merely the subversion of the Turkish power in the general, but the particular mode of that subversion by the slow consumption of its political strength, and by the gradual wasting away of its people. When the sixth angel however poured out his vial upon the figurative Euphrates, we read that its waters were completely dried up, insomuch that a way was prepared for the kings from the East. Hence it is manifest, when we consider the slow process of evaporating natural water, that we may expect the waters of the Ottoman empire to begin to be dried up many years previous to their final exhaustion under the sixth vial.\*

The prelude to the pouring out of this vial we may behold with our own eyes. Let us only advert to the present state of the Turkish power, and we shall be convinced, that for some years the symbolical Euphratèan waters have been gradually drying up. The approaching termination indeed of the Ottoman empire is so manifest, that even those, whose attention is solely directed to politics, are sufficiently aware that the time of its extinction cannot be very far distant. Of late it has been preserved rather by the jealousy of the great European powers, than by any physical strength of its own: and it doubtless will be preserved by the hand of Providence till his own appointed season shall approach for preparing a way for the kings from the East, and for gathering to-

\* It must be the same. Unless this be allowed, St. John uses the same symbol in different senses, and consequently puts an entire end to all certainty of interpretation. (See the beginning of Chap. ii. of the present work.) The writer of this paper seems to have taken his idea from some of the commentaries cited by Pole. See Synop. in loc.

\* See Whitaker's Comment. p. 189, et infra.

gether *the kings of the Latin world* to the battle of the great day of God Almighty \*

Not only however has *the political strength* of Turkey begun to be dried up, but, as it were designed that nothing should be wanting to the exact completion of the prophecy, even its *population* has likewise begun to diminish. This singular circumstance is noticed by Mr. Eton. After some enquiry into the causes of it, he adds, "It is therefore reasonable to conclude, that depopulation could not formerly have made so rapid a progress as at present: and that, in a century more, things remaining in their present situation, the Turkish empire will be nearly extinct. It is worthy of remark, that the Curds in the mountains, and other independent tribes who do not mix with the Turks, are exempt from the mortality occasioned by all the calamities, which afflict the countries more immediately subject to the Porte." †

Nor yet does *the empire of the Euphratèan waters* submit without a struggle to its fate. "Many attempts have been made within the last century, principally by French officers, to renew the ancient military spirit of the Turks, and to instruct them in European tractics. Gazi Hassan, the celebrated Pasha, tried with unlimited power, for nineteen years, to inspire his own spirit into the troops; but he found all his efforts ineffectual." ‡

Who *the kings from the East* are, for whom a way is

\* Russia has more than once appeared to be on the very eve of swallowing up Turkey; and yet she has always been prevented from accomplishing her sufficiently evident designs. It is a singular circumstance, that the Turks themselves forebode their future overthrow at the hands of the Russian monarchy "The lower orders," says Mr. Eton, in his survey of the Turkish empire, "are at the present day persuaded, that the Russian standard will enter Constantinople through a certain gate, said to be pointed out by an ancient prophecy; and the great men are so far from opposing this weakness by superior energy that they look to the Asiatic shore as a secure retreat from the fury of the conquerors."

Whenever *the waters of the mystic Euphrates* are dried up, we shall then be able to decide with certainty what is intended by *the pouring out of the fifth vial upon the seat of the beast*, inasmuch as *the pouring out of that vial precedes the downfall of the Turkish empire under the sixth*.

It may not be improper to observe, that *the vial* is not said to be poured out for the purpose of drying up *the waters of the Euphrates*, but only to mark the period when they were dried up, that a way might be prepared for *the kings from the East*. Hence we are not to imagine, that *the vial* is already poured out, because *the waters* have already begun to be dried up: but we must consider this exhaustion of them only as a *prelude* to the pouring of it out.

† Eton's Survey of the Turkish Empire, p. 270.

‡ Ibid. Chap. 5.

prepared by the annihilation of *the Turkish empire*, it is impossible to say before the event takes place. The most probable *conjecture* is, that *the lost ten tribes of Israel* are intended. It is a very remarkable circumstance, that precisely at the present era, an era marked so strongly by the signs of the times, as to give us every reason to believe, that we are living in the predicted *last days* of Antichristian blasphemy, and that *the 1260 years* are rapidly drawing near to their termination : it is, I say, a remarkable circumstance, that, at this very era, a people should begin to attract our notice in the East Indies, which appear to be a fragment either of *the lost ten tribes*, or of *the Jews* that never returned from the Babylonian captivity. The late Mr. Vansittart was the first, I believe, who brought forward to public notice the traditions of *the Afghans* or *Rohillas*. Having met with a Persian abridgment of the *Asrarul Afghinah*, or *the secrets of the Afghans*, he was induced to translate it, and to transmit it to Sir William Jones, then president of the Asiatic society ; who subjoined the following note to it. “ This account of *the Afghans* may lead to a very interesting discovery. We learn from Esdras, that *the ten tribes*, after a wandering journey, came to a country called *Arsareth* ; where we may suppose they settled.\* Now *the Afghans* are said, by the best Persian historians, to be descended from *the Jews* ; they have traditions among themselves of such a descent ; and it is even asserted, that their families are distinguished by the names of Jewish tribes, although, since their conversion to *the Islam*, they studiously conceal their origin. The *Pushto* language, of which I have seen a dictionary, has a manifest resemblance to the *Chaldaic* ; and a considerable district under their dominion is called *Hazareh* or *Hazaret*, which might easily have been changed into the word used by Esdras. I strongly recommend an enquiry into the literature and history of *the Afghans*.”†

From this interesting note of that great linguist we learn four very curious particulars relative to *the Afghans* : 1. that they have a tradition among themselves, that they are of Jewish origin, although not very forward to ac-

\* 2 Esdras xiii. 40—47.

† Asiatic Researches, Vol. ii. Numb. 4.



knowledge their descent ; 2. that this is not a mere vague tradition, known only to themselves, and ridiculed by their neighbours, but that the best Persian historians, with whose empire they have always been connected, assert the very same ; 3. that a considerable district under their dominion is to this day called *Muzaret*, a word nearly resembling *Arsareth*, which (according to the apocryphal Esdras, whoever he might be, and at whatever period he might live) was the name of the country into which *the ten tribes* retired : 4. and that their language has a manifest resemblance to the *Chaldaic*.

Before I entirely quit this part of my subject, I shall notice a coincidence, which is at least curious, if it deserve no better name. Mr. Mede conjectures, that *the kings*, for whom the exhaustion of *the mystic Euphrates* is to prepare a way, are *the Jews*. Had he said *Israelites* throughout, as he does at first, he would perhaps have expressed himself with greater accuracy : for, if the passage do at all allude to *the restoration of the house of Jacob*, it relates more probably to *the ten tribes* than to *Judah*. But why should either *the Israelites* or *the Jews* be styled *kings* ? Such a title accords very ill with the present condition of *the Jews*, and still worse with that of *the Israelites*, if they be so entirely lost and swallowed up, as some have imagined. Mr. Mede does not attempt to solve this difficulty. If however it should eventually prove that *the Afghans* are *really* the remains of *the ten tribes*, and if St. John speak of the restoration of those *ten tribes* under the name of *kings from the east*, we shall immediately perceive *the* singularly exact propriety with which he styles them *kings*. The whole race of *the Afghans* denominate themselves even to the present day, in their Chaldaic dialect, *Melic*, or, with their plural termination, *Melchim*, in English, *kings*. They consider themselves as a royal nation ; and, according to their own tradition, claim their proud title of *Melic* from a grant of Mohammed, whose religion they profess. If then they be of Hebrew extraction, *the drying up of the mystic Euphra'es*, or *the subversion of the Ottoman empire*, would undoubtedly prepare a way for them both literally and morally. A power would be removed, whose dominions

now stretch between Persia and Palestine; and one great branch of that false religion, by which *the Afghans* are at present deluded, would be broken off. According to Mr. Vansittart, the sects of *the Afghans* are very numerous; and they appear to be a nation formidable at once for its population and its bravery.

While a way is preparing for *the kings from the East* by the downfall of *the Ottoman power*, the diabolical influence of three unclean spirits will be actively though imperceptibly employed in gathering together *the kings of the earth* and of *the whole world*, or of *the papal Latin empire* and *the Roman world*, to the battle of the great day of God Almighty. *The battle itself* is evidently that which takes place under the *next vial*, and which is detailed with wonderful sublimity by the inspired prophet. *Here* the dreadful preparations for it commence: *there* they are completed, and *the battle* is fought.\* From the

\* Mr. Sharpe thinks, that the preparations have already commenced: but he appears to be a little premature in this opinion, for *the sixth vial* is certainly not yet poured out under which the preparations are to be begun, inasmuch as *the waters of the mystic Euphrates* are not yet dried up.

But, although the preparations for *the battle of Armageddon* cannot yet have commenced, because St. John places them under *the sixth vial*, and subsequent to the exhaustion of *the mystic Euphrates*; the prelude to those preparations seems to have commenced, even since this Work was first published in the beginning of the present year. Among the other signs of the times by which the passing generation is so awfully marked, there is one of so gigantic a magnitude, of so peculiar a nature, and yet of so very recent an origin, that it painfully arrests the unwilling attention even of the most careless observer; a sign so closely connected moreover with the downfall of *the Ottoman empire*, that one can scarcely avoid prognosticating that downfall not to be very far distant. It is predicted, that, at some indefinite period after the exhaustion of *the Euphratèan waters*, three unclean spirits should go forth to gather *the kings of the Roman world* to the battle of the great day of God Almighty: and it afterwards appears that *these kings* are associated together, subject to the guidance of *the beast under his last or Carlovingian head*, and in close connection with *the false prophet*. (Compare Rev. xvi. 13—16. with Rev. xix. 19, 20.) Here we may observe, that the three unclean spirits are not said simply to gather *the kings together*, or to form them into a confederacy, but to gather them together to the battle of the Lord: whence we may, and indeed must, conclude, that *the confederacy* itself is formed previous to its being gathered by the unclean spirits to Armageddon; and that these spirits use it unconsciously as their tool, when it is thus formed. At what precise period it will be formed is no where said. For any thing that appears to the contrary, it may be simply formed either before or after the exhaustion of *the Euphratèan waters*. The event alone can determine; but the previous probability is, that it will be formed at no very remote period from that exhaustion, either prior to it, or posterior to it. Now the chief of this confederacy is declared to be *the Roman beast under his last or Carlovingian head*; and one member of it is declared to be *the false prophet or the Papacy*. But, unless I greatly mistake, recent events have identified *the infidel king*, who is to undertake an expedi-

sources, whence the impure spirits are said to issue, it appears, that *the beast* and *the false prophet*, for a season at variance by reason of the atheistical principles adopted by the former, will then be more closely leagued together than ever; and that they will jointly meditate some grand expedition against *the woman* and *the remnant of her seed*, which however, as we shall presently see under *the succeeding vial*, will end only in their own confusion and utter destruction.\*

## SECTION III.

*Concerning the vial of the vintage.*

We are now arrived at *the vial of consummation*, which Mr. Mede very justly supposes to synchronize with *the*

tion into Palestine at *the time of the end*, with *the Roman beast* under his last head, who is to do the very same in conjunction with a formidable confederacy. Do we behold then any appearance of such a confederacy as that described by St. John; namely, a confederacy of the beast under his Carlovingian head, the false Romish prophet, and the vassal kings of the enslaved Latin earth? Do we behold it likewise at the very time when we had reason to suppose it would appear; namely, when the *Euphratean waters* were rapidly drying up, and when their complete exhaustion seemed to be at no very great distance? Is there any answer necessary to these questions? If there be, view the modern Charlemagne first leaguering himself with the *Papacy*, and then creating at pleasure a host of *vassal kings*. View him extending his dominion over the greatest part of *Germany*, over *Holland*, over *Italy*, over *Spain*. View him surrounding himself with *regal slaves*, who depend upon his nod, and exist only by his will. Lastly hear him, as if unconsciously impelled to bear his testimony to the truth of prophecy; hear him unreservedly avow himself to be *the federal head* of his creatures; hear him proclaim to all *Europe*, that their mock sovereignties are mere *federal states of France*; hear the political system, of which he is the author, expressly styled in his degraded senate a *confederacy* and a *pious league*. What other idea can we form of *the coalition* described by St. John? In every particular, local and chronological, *this new coalition*, unheard of, unthought of, but the other day, exactly answers to it. Even now rumours are afloat, that the seat of *the false prophet* is to be removed from *Rome*, and that the new empire is to be inaugurated by another imperial coronation in the seven-hilled city. If so what title will be chosen but that of *Emperor of the Romans*? And for what purpose would that title be chosen, but as authorizing all the ancient claims of the Augustan emperors? The demands made upon *Turkey* by the *sovereign of Venice* will be as nothing, if we may judge from the inordinate ambition of the man, when compared with the demands made upon the whole world by the *Emperor of the Franco-Romans* June 4, 1806.

\* Since these *three unclean spirits* are said to work miracles, the great boast of the apostate man of sin, it is not improbable, that the *visible* agents, whom they will employ on this occasion will be certain popish emissaries, who partly at least by false miracles will induce the infatuated adherents of the Church of Rome to embark in the expedition "Pugnare se putant pro Christi vicario, pro gloria Dei, et pro ecclesia: revera autem pugnabunt cum Deo" (Pol. Synop. in loc.) Mr. Mann of the Charter House conjectured some years since, that the *three unclean spirits* were the *Dominicans*, the *Franciscans*, and the *Jesuits*. (See Bp. Newton's Dissert. on Rev. xvi.) I should rather have said, that these, or some other orders of monks, may be supposed to be the *polls* of the *three unclean spirits*.

*vintage*. The reason is manifest: *the vintage* is the last event predicted in *the little book*, which extends, as itself repeatedly declares, through *the whole 1260 years*; and *the last vial* is poured out at the expiration of that period: consequently *the last vial* can only contain an enlarged account of *the vintage*: for, as Mr. Mede naturally observes, there cannot be *two* different catastrophes of the *same* drama.\*

“And the seventh angel poured out his vial into the air: and there came a great voice out of the temple of heaven, from the throne, saying, It is done. And there were voices, and thunders, and lightnings; and there was a great earthquake, such as was not since men were upon the earth, so mighty an earthquake and so great. And the great city was divided into three parts; and the cities of the nations fell: and great Babylon came in remembrance before God, to give unto her the cup of the wine of the fierceness of his wrath. And every island fled away, and the mountains were not found. And there fell upon men a great hail out of heaven, every stone about the weight of a talent: and men blasphemed God because of the plague of the hail: for the plague thereof was exceeding great.”

Bp. Newton very justly observes, that, “as *the seventh seal*, and *the seventh trumpet*, contained many more particulars than any of *the former seals* and *former trumpets*; so *the seventh vial* contains more than any of *the former vials*.” It is *the vial of the vintage*; the conclusion of *the grand drama of 1260 years*; the *time of the end*. When it shall be poured out, the great controversy of God with the nations will commence; his ancient people will begin to be restored; and the sentence of destruction will go forth against *the beast* and *the false prophet*, even while they are in the very midst of their temporary success, and while they are vainly flattering themselves with the hope of a complete victory over the Church of God. Such being its contents, it is said to be poured out into *the air*, in allusion to the dreadful *storms* of political *thunder* and *lightning* which it will produce.†

\* See Mede's Comment. Apoc. in Vindemiam.

† See the preceding chapter on *the symbolical language of prophecy*.

Three important events are comprehended under it: the earthquake, by which the great city is divided into three parts; the overthrow of Babylon, and the battle of Armageddon, to which the kings of the earth had begun to gather themselves together under the preceding vial.

Here it may be proper to remind the reader, that the seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth chapters of the Apocalypse, all belong to the last vial; and are in fact only a more enlarged account of some of the most prominent events contained by it.\* The seventeenth chapter opens with a description of the great scarlet whore, who had long tyrannized over the faithful, and who was now about to be destroyed for ever. It fully sets forth the mystery of her union with her beast, of her name Babylon, of the three-fold state of her beast, of the rise of the beast's last head, and of the flourishing condition of the woman while the ten kings gave their power to the beast, and made war upon the Lamb, by persecuting his disciples. And it intimates that a great change should nevertheless take place in the sentiments of those kings, so that they should afterwards hate the whore, and make her naked, and eat her flesh, and burn her with fire. This intimation seems to be given as it were by the way, and must not therefore be confined merely to the days of the last vial. It is in fact a sort of climax, extending from the era of the Reformation down to the final destruction of the whore. She was first made naked and desolate by the alienation of the Abbey lands in protestant countries, and by the withdrawing of whole nations from her communion. Her very flesh was next eaten by the sale of the Church lands in revolutionary France, by the secularization of the German ecclesiastical electorates and monastic principalities, and by the temporary erection of an atheistical republic in her capital. But she will not be utterly burnt with fire till the time of the end, till the fatal day of Armageddon.† The ten kings however, as

\* See the introductory chapter of this work.

† In the same battle with the little horn or the harlot the Roman beast under his last head will perish. "I beheld then because of the voice of the great words which the horn spake: I beheld, even till the beast was slain, and his body destroyed, and given to the burning flame" (Dan. vii. 11.) I apprehend, that the explanatory words of the angel addressed to Daniel mean precisely the same as the particular passage in the Apocalypse now under consideration.

Bp. Newton rightly observes, cannot literally mean *all* the ten kings, but only *a certain part* of them; for some are afterwards described as leagued with *the beast*, and as fighting and perishing in the cause of *the false prophet*:\* consequently those, who are friendly to *the whore*, cannot be among the number of those who are instruments in the hand of God of finally burning her with fire—*The eighteenth chapter* contains an account of the *final overthrow of Babylon*—And *the nineteenth chapter* describes the battle of *Armageddon*.

1. *The earthquake*, by which *the great city* is divided into *three parts*, manifestly signifies, according to the usual import of prophetic language, *some very great revolution*, by which *the Latin empire* shall either be divided into *three sovereignties*, or into *three prefectures*, like *the ancient Roman empire*. At the period when *the French monarchy* was overthrown, *the city* was already divided into *several different parts*, symbolized by *the ten horns of the beast*. Hence it is said, that, in *that earthquake*, *a tenth part of the city* fell. But here, by this yet *future earthquake*, *the Latin city* is to be divided only into *three parts*.† What the precise meaning of this prediction is, and how *the city* will be divided into *three parts*, time alone can discover.

2. The fall of *the spiritual Babylon*, described at large in *the eighteenth chapter of the Apocalypse*, relates to the same event as the destruction of *the little horn of Daniel's fourth beast*: they both equally predict *the complete subversion of the Papacy*. This is not to take place till af-

\* They shall take away his dominion, to consume and to destroy it unto the end." (Dan. vii. 26.) The dominion of *the horn* began to be taken away at the Reformation, when many of the kings withdrew their realms from the spiritual jurisdiction of *the Pope*; but it will not be entirely consumed and destroyed till the end, until the words of God shall be fulfilled.

† Rev. xix. 19.

‡ Mr. Kett imagines that *the earthquake*, by which *the great city* was divided into three parts, is *the Reformation*; and that *the three parts*, intended by the prophet, are *the three confessions* (as they are called) *Popish, Lutheran, and Calvinistic*. (Vol. i. p. 413.) We cannot however admit *this earthquake* to have any connection with that important period, unless by a manifest violation of St. John's prophetic chronology. *The earthquake*, which divides *the city* into three parts, takes place under *the last vial*: whereas *the reformation* is contemporary with *the war of the beast against the witnesses*, and happened under *the sixth trumpet*, before any one of *all the seven vials* was poured out. Mr. Kett, as if conscious that this objection would be made to his scheme, endeavours to invalidate it: but, I think, quite unsuccessfully.

ter the end of *the 1260 years*,\* when *the witnesses* shall have ceased to prophesy in sackcloth, and when in one apocalyptic season *the judgment of Babylon* is come.

3. Exactly contemporary with the fall of *the spiritual Babylon*, or *the adulterous church of Rome*, will be the overthrow of its supporter *the secular Babylon*, or *the ten-horned Roman beast* † The power of both will be broken in *the same battle of Armageddon*. This is abundantly manifest from the concurring testimony both of Daniel and St. John. We learn from the former of these prophets, that *the last* or *Roman beast* is to be slain, and his body destroyed and given to the burning flame, because of the voice of the great words which *his little horn* spake; and that the reign of *this little horn* is exactly to continue *1260 years*. We learn from the latter of them, that the same *ten-horned Roman beast* is to practise prosperously, in his revived or idolatrous state, the very same period of *42 months* or *1260 years*; and that he is to be destroyed, along with his colleague *the false prophet* or *two-horned beast*, in their last great battle against *the Word of God*. Now *the two-horned beast* or *false prophet* is *the same ecclesiastical power* as *the harlot* or *spiritual Babylon*: consequently, if *the spiritual Babylon* were fallen *before* this battle, it is evident that *the false prophet* could not, along with *the temporal beast*, have been engaged in it. Hence it appears, that *the fall of the spiritual Babylon* and *the battle of Armageddon* will be precisely contemporary, both taking place together after the termination of *the 1260 years*.‡

\* Probably at the end of 30 years after that period, or at the end of Daniel's 1290 years.

† I have already stated that *Babylon* means *the whole Roman empire* both temporal and spiritual: *the temporal Babylon* being the same as *the ten-horned beast*: and *the spiritual Babylon* as *the two-horned beast*.

‡ Mr. Mede separates *the fall of Babylon* from the overthrow of *the false prophet*, and imagines that in point of time it will precede it. This opinion is built upon the idea, that *Babylon* is *the literal city* of Rome, instead of *the whole papal empire*. I cannot think, that it is by any means well founded, or that it at all harmonizes with the general language of the Apocalypse, in which *the great city* universally means, not *the literal city*, but *the empire, of Rome*. This being the case, whenever *the beast* and *the false prophet* are routed at Armageddon, *the temporal and spiritual Roman empire, or the mystic Babylon*, will be overthrown. Mr. Mede places *the fall of Babylon* under *the fifth vial*, and *the destruction of the beast and the false prophet* under *the last*. Comment. Apoc. in Phial. V. et VII.

As for the battle of Armageddon, in which the *beast* and the *false prophet* are to be overthrown, I take it to be the concluding event of the *time of trouble* such as never was since there was a nation, mentioned by Daniel. It is the same likewise as the *dreadful slaughter of the Gentiles in the neighbourhood of Jerusalem*, predicted in such forcible terms by Zechariah and Joel. This will sufficiently appear from comparing, as I shall presently do, all these different prophecies together. At the close of the *time of trouble* foretold by Daniel, the *infidel king* is to come to his end, none helping him; and at the beginning of the *time of trouble*, which synchronizes with the first effusion of the seventh vial, and with the termination of the 1260 years, the restoration of the Jews is to commence. At the period of the great battle of the nations, described by Zechariah and Joel, which synchronizes with the destruction of the infidel king and the battle of Armageddon, the Jews are represented as having been brought back to their own country. While, in the battle of Armageddon, predicted by St. John, which I apprehend to be the last event under the seventh vial, the *beast*, the *false prophet*, and the *kings of the Latin earth*, are to be completely routed with dreadful slaughter by the Almighty Word of God; and an end is for ever to be put to their tyrannical and persecuting domination over the Church.

The *beast*, who is to take so active a part in this last great struggle, is the same septimo-octave head as that, which St. John had before identified even with the whole *beast himself*.\* To which horn of the *beast* the dignity of the *Carlovingian Emperorship of the western Roman world* will then be attached, it is impossible to determine before the event. Humanly speaking, it seems upon the eve of quitting for ever the *horn of Austria*. Should this be the case, and should it once more revert to France along with the *old Carlovingian sovereignty of Italy*,†

\* Rev. xvii. 11.

† Since this was written in the year 1804, the *Carlovingian sovereignty of Italy* has reverted to France. May, 1805.

And I may now add, that yet more recently the *Carlovingian Emperorship of the West* has been transferred to France; consequently the *Infidel king* and the *first head of the beast* are now identified. June 5, 1806.



the *infidel king*, at the close of *the great apostatic drama*, would be identified with *the last head of the beast*. As for *the false prophet*, who is to be one of his allies in this impious war, we have already beheld a political reconciliation, or, as it is styled, a *concordat* between him and *Antichrist* ;\* the contrariety therefore of *Infidelity* to *Poperly* will be no impediment to the accomplishment of the prophecy, that *the beast* and *the false prophet* shall be taken banded in arms together. And, with regard to the possibility of uniting all the Popish powers in one common confederacy, the growing influence of *papistico-infidel France*, and the ease with which she compels the surrounding vassal states to take up arms in her cause, sufficiently shew, even without the aid of prophecy, that such an union is not only *possible*, but *probable*.†

*The preceding vial* testifies, that, after this *confederacy* has been formed, it will be gathered together by secret diabolical agency to *Armageddon*, subsequently to the downfall of *the Ottoman empire* : and there is every reason to believe, that it will be directed at once against *the converted Jews* now beginning to be restored by the prevailing maritime power of the day, and against their protectors, *the protestant maritime states*, which keep the commandments of God, and which have the testimony of Jesus Christ. Hence it will probably be a sort of infernal league or crusade of *all the atheistical-papal powers* against *the converted Jews* and their defenders *the Protestants* ; of *the South* against *the North* of Europe ; of *the dragon and his adherents* against *the symbolical woman and the remnant of her seed*. *The time of the end* however is not yet arrived : and few probably of the present generation will live to behold even *the beginning of the restoration of the Jews* and *the commencement of the Antichristian expedition to Palestine*, still less therefore *the*

\* It may be observed, that Bp. Newton here again considers *the beast* not as *the Papacy*, but as *the temporal Latin empire* ; while he justly conceives *the false prophet* to mean *the ecclesiastical power of the Pope*. “ These enemies are *the beast* and *the false prophet*, the Antichristian powers *civil* and *ecclesiastical*, with their armies gathered together, their adherents and followers combined and determined to support idolatry, and to oppose all reformation.” Dissert. on Rev. xix.

† I have already observed in a preceding note, that, since this was written, we have reason to believe that *the bestial confederacy* has begun to be formed. June 5, 1806.

*dreadful confusion of Armageddon* with which that expedition terminates.\* Whether at this period *the infidel king* is, or is not, to have become, like his predecessor Charlemagne,† *the last head of the beast*, who shall venture now to determine? This at least is certain, that he will be a very principal actor in “the time of trouble such as never was since there was a nation.”

As I have more than once hinted at the probability of *the last head of the beast*, or *the Gothic Patricio-Emperorship of the Romans*, becoming at *the time of the end* attached to *the horn of France*, as it heretofore was in the days of Charlemagne, I shall here simply state the declarations of concurring prophecies relative to this subject, and leave the reader to draw his own conclusions.

Daniel predicts, that, at *the time of the end*, or *the close of the 1260 years*, *the infidel king* shall engage in a war of extermination under the pretext of religion; that, in the prosecution of this nefarious project, he shall invade Palestine, and occupy *the glorious holy mountain*; but that eventually he shall perish between *the two seas*, namely, *the Dead sea*, and *the Mediterranean sea*. The prophet, absorbed as it were in contemplating the vast power of this impious monster, does not notice any confederates with whom he might be leagued; but speaks merely of *the king himself*, as being the very life and soul of the whole expedition, as being peculiarly both its contriver and executor.

Such is the prediction of Daniel. In a similar manner, St. John declares, that, under *the last vial*, and consequently after *the close of the same 1260 years*, a grand confederacy of *the beast*, *the false prophet*, and *the kings of the Latin earth*, shall be utterly overthrown at *Megid-*

\* I speak of course on the supposition that I am right in my date of the 1260 years. Should I be so mistaken as that they terminate earlier than I apprehend, the events of *the last vial* and of Daniel's *time of unexampled trouble* will of course happen so much earlier.

† Buonapartè affects, upon all occasions, to ape the style and dignity of Charlemagne: and no moderation of character, which he has yet displayed, gives us any reason to doubt that he wishes to tread in the steps of that ambitious conqueror. It is almost superfluous to remind the reader, that *the infidel king* is not the individual Buonapartè, nor any other individual, but *the infidel kingdom or power of France*.

I have already stated, that *the infidel king* may now be considered an identified with *the Carlsvingian head of the beast*. June 5, 1806.

*do.\** which is a town situated between *the two seas* of *Palestine*; and that *the wine-press of the vintage* shall be trodden in a region extending 1600 furlongs, which is the exact measure of *the Holy land*.

Thus it appears, that, as Daniel's *infidel king* is to be the grand projector and manager of a *religious war*, and is to perish in *Palestine* between *the two seas* after *the close of the 1260 years*; so *the apocalyptic beast*, that is to say, *the beast under his last head*, is likewise, as it appears from his union with *the false prophet*, to be the main promoter and manager of a *religious war*; which, precisely like *the religious war of the infidel king*, is to take place after *the close of the 1260 years*, and is to be decided in *Palestine* or *the land which extends 1600 furlongs*, and at *Megiddo*, a town of that land which is situated *between the seas*.

So exact a correspondence both of *time, place, and circumstance*, evidently shews, that *the war of the infidel king* is the same as *the war of the beast and the false prophet*: and, from Daniel's prediction, we can scarcely consider *the king* only as an *inferior* actor, only as one of the *subordinate* kings represented by St. John as leagued with *the beast*. The conclusion to be drawn from these premises I leave to the cautious reader.†

To return from this digression; if I be right in thinking, that *the gathering together of the kings of the Latin earth to the battle of Armageddon* is an *expedition of a confederacy of popish infidels against the converted Jews*

\* *Armageddon* signifies *the destruction of Megiddo*.

† The first edition of this work was published just as the intelligence of the fatally decisive battle of *Austerlitz* arrived. The rumours of a directly opposite purport, that prevailed while the last sheets were printing, had led me to conclude that the time was not yet arrived when *the wilful tyrant* should be identified with *the Carlovigian head of the beast*; for, though I certainly expected, for the reasons assigned above, that sooner or later that time would arrive, I had no warrant from prophecy to say when it would arrive. At length we received intelligence of the disastrous issue of a campaign, which has made the atrocious wretch, whom I doubt not to be an instrument of vengeance in the hand of a justly offended God, the *undisputed representative of Charlemagne*, the *uncontrolled Emperor of the western Roman world*. Till this period, *the chief of the house of Austria* was the *representative of Charlemagne*; but his influence is now annihilated in *Germany*, and he is totally driven out of every part of *Italy*. Dispossessed even of a considerable part of his hereditary dominions, he seems tacitly to have resigned his ancient title, now to him nothing but a title, and to have assumed instead of it that of *Emperor* (which in his case is virtually the same as only *King*) of *Austria*. June 5. 1806

supported by the professors of evangelical Protestantism, the opinion, that *the witnesses* will not be subjected to the horrors of some future persecution, receives a most abundant confirmation.\* *The beast and the false prophet* indeed shall surely gather their forces together, but not by the Lord: for no weapon, hereafter formed against the Gospel, shall prosper; and whosoever shall gather together against it shall fall. *The 1260 years* of oppression will then have elapsed; and the great controversy of Jehovah with his enemies will then have commenced. Every project of *the beast, the false prophet, and the congregated kings*, will be baffled: and sudden destruction will come upon them unawares as a thief in the night. Through the aid of the great captain of their salvation, those, who have come out of *Babylon*, shall be completely victorious; and the united tyranny of *Poperly and Atheism* shall for ever be destroyed.

Having now briefly considered *the three grand events* comprehended under *the last vial*; namely, *the division of the great city into three parts, the fall of the spiritual Babylon, and the battle of Armageddon*; I shall bring together into one point of view the four prophecies of St. John, Daniel, Zechariah, and Joel, relative to the awful events with which *the 1260 years* will conclude; in order that, by comparing them with each other, a yet stronger light may be thrown upon this period, which is destined to witness not only *the overthrow of the Antichristian faction*, but likewise *the restoration of the Jews*.

1. "And I saw heaven opened, and behold a white horse; and he, that sat upon him, was called Faithful and True, and in righteousness he doth judge and make war. And his eyes were as a flame of fire, and on his head were many crowns; and he had a name written, that no man knew but he himself. And he was clothed with a vesture dipped in blood: and his name is called the Word of God. And the armies, which were in heaven, followed him upon white horses, clothed in fine

\* At least it receives confirmation, so far as protestant countries are confirmed; though *the two witnesses*, scattered through popish regions, will continue to prophesy in sackcloth to the time of the end. This distinction I have already stated very fully.

linen, white and clean. And out of his mouth goeth a sharp sword that with it he should smite the nations : and he shall rule them with a rod of iron, and he treadeth the winepress of the fierceness and wrath of Almighty God. And he hath on his vesture and on his thigh a name written King of kings and Lord of lords. And I saw an angel standing in the sun : and he cried with a loud voice, saying to all the fowls that fly in the midst of heaven, Come and gather yourselves together unto the supper of the great God ; that ye may eat the flesh of kings, and the flesh of captains, and the flesh of mighty men, and the flesh of horses, and of them that sit on them, and the flesh of all men both free and bond, both small and great. And I saw the beast, and the kings of the earth, and their armies, gathered together to make war against him that sat on the horse, and against his army. And the beast was taken, and with him the false prophet that wrought miracles before him, with which he deceived them that had received the mark of the beast, and them that worshipped his image. These both were cast alive into a lake of fire burning with brimstone. And the remnant were slain with the sword of him that sat upon the horse, which sword proceeded out of his mouth : and all the fowls were filled with their flesh.”\*

2. “ I beheld, till the thrones were set, 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. 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. I beheld then because of the voice of the great words which the *little* horn spake : I beheld, even till the beast was slain, and his body destroyed, and given to the burning flame —The little horn shall wear out the saints of the Most High ;—and they shall be given into his hand until a time, and times, and the dividing of time. But the

\* Rev. xix. 11—21.

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

"And a king shall do according to his will:—And at the time of the end a king of the south shall butt at him: and a king of the north shall come against him like a whirlwind with chariots, and with horsemen, and many ships. Yet he shall enter into the countries, and shall overflow, and pass over, and shall enter into the glorious land, and many countries shall be overthrown: but these shall escape out of his hand, even Edom, and Moab, and the chief of the children of Ammon. He shall stretch forth his hand also upon the countries; and the land of Egypt shall not escape. But he shall have power over the treasures of gold and silver, and over all the precious things of Egypt: and the Libyans and the Ethiopians shall be at his steps. But tidings out of the east and out of the north shall trouble him: therefore he shall go forth with great fury to destroy, and to devote many to utter destruction under the pretext of religion. And he shall plant the curtains of his pavilions between the seas in the glorious holy mountain; yet he shall come to his end and none shall help him. And at that time shall Michael stand up, the great prince which standeth for the children of thy people; and there shall be a time of trouble, such as never was since there was a nation, even to that same time: and at that time thy people shall be delivered, every one that shall be found written in the book."\*

3. "Behold, I will make Jerusalem a cup of trembling unto all the people roundabout, when they shall be in the siege both against Judah and Jerusalem. And in that day will I make Jerusalem a burthensome stone for all people: all, that burthen themselves with it, shall be cut in pieces, though all the people of the earth be gath-

ered together against it. In that day, saith the Lord, I will smite every horse with astonishment, and his rider with madness: and I will open mine eyes upon the house of Judah, and will smite every horse of the people with blindness. And the governors of Judah shall say in their heart, The inhabitants of Jerusalem shall be my strength in the Lord of hosts their God. In that day will I make the governors of Judah like an hearth of fire among the wood, and like a torch of fire in a sheaf; and they shall devour all the people round about, on the right hand and on the left: and Jerusalem shall be inhabited again in her own place, even in Jerusalem. The Lord also shall save the tents of Judah first, that the glory of the house of David, and the glory of the inhabitants of Jerusalem do not magnify themselves against Judah. In that day shall the Lord defend the inhabitants of Jerusalem; and he, that is feeble among them, at that day shall be as David; and the house of David shall be as God, as the angel of the Lord before them. And it shall come to pass in that day, that I will seek to destroy all the nations that come against Jerusalem. And I will pour upon the house of David, and upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the spirit of grace and of supplications: and they shall look upon me whom they have pierced, and they shall mourn for him, as one that mourneth for his only son, and shall be in bitterness for him, as one that is in bitterness for his first born. In that day shall there be a great mourning in Jerusalem, as the mourning of the vintage shouting of Rimmon in the valley of Megiddon. And the land shall mourn every family apart—All the families that remain, every family apart, and their wives apart. In that day there shall be a fountain opened to the house of David, and to the inhabitants of Jerusalem for sin and for uncleanness—And one shall say unto him, What are these wounds in thine hands? then he shall answer, Those with which I was wounded in the house of my friends.—In that day shall there be upon the bells of the horses, Holiness unto the Lord: and the pots in the Lord's house shall be like the bowls before the altar. Yea, every pot in Jerusalem and in Judah shall be holiness unto the Lord of hosts.

and all they, that sacrifice, shall come and take of them, and see the therein : and in that day there shall be no more a trafficker in the house of the Lord of hosts.\*

4. “ Blow ye the trumpet in Zion, and sound an alarm in my holy mountain : let all the inhabitants of the land tremble : for the day of the Lord cometh, for it is nigh at hand : a day of darkness, and of gloominess, a day of clouds and of thick darkness, as the morning spread upon the mountains : a great people and a strong ; there hath not been ever the like, neither shall there be any more after it, even to the years of many generations † A fire devourth before them : and behind them a flame burneth : the land is as the garden of Eden before them, and behind them a desolate wilderness ; yea, and nothing shall escape them—Before their faces the people shall be much pained : all faces shall gather blackness—They shall run to and fro in the city : they shall run upon the wall : they shall climb up upon the houses ; they shall enter in at the windows like a thief. The earth shall quake before them : the heavens shall tremble : the sun and moon shall be dark, and the stars shall withdraw their shining. And the Lord shall utter his voice before his army : for his camp is very great : for he is strong, that executeth his word : for the day of the Lord is great and very terrible ; and who can abide it?—Then will the Lord be jealous for his land, and pity his people. Yea, the Lord will answer, and say unto his people, Behold, I will send you corn, and wine, and oil ; and ye

\* Zechar. xii. xiii. xiv.

† I apprehend, that by this expression we must understand *the last attempt of Sennacherib against the Lamb at the close of the Millennium* ; when, after “ the years of many generations,” subsequent to the outrages of “ the great and strong people” here predicted, he shall stir up from the four quarters of the earth the nations styled by St. John *Gog and Magog*. Meanwhile, during the millennium rest, there shall be none like that strong people, till the years of its many generations shall have fully elapsed. The *Gog and Magog*, mentioned by St. John, are evidently the same as the *Gog and Magog*, predicted by Ezekiel. The expedition of *Sennacherib* against Palestine bears a strong resemblance in many points to the expedition of the *Infidel King and the false prophet*. Yet it certifiably differs from *them*, both because St. John informs us that it shall take place at the close of the Millennium ; and because Ezekiel, in strict correspondence with him, asserts that it shall be directed against the Jews so long after their restoration to their own land, that they should be dwelling there in all the confidence of a respecting security. (See Black. xxviii. 8, 11, 12, 14.) The war of *Gog and Magog* is fully discussed in my unpublished Work on the *Restoration of Israel and the Millennium of Christ*.



shall be satisfied therewith: and I will no more make you a reproach among the heathen. But I will remove far off from you the northern army, and will drive him into a land barren and desolate, with his face toward the east sea, and his hinder part toward the utmost sea: and his stink shall come up, and his ill savour shall come up, because he hath done great things—Be glad then ye children of Zion, and rejoice in the Lord your God—And ye shall know that I am in the midst of Israel, and that I am the Lord your God, and none else: and my people shall never be ashamed. And it shall come to pass afterwards, that I will pour out my spirit upon all flesh; and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, your old men shall dream dreams, your young men shall see visions.\* And I will shew wonders in the heavens and in the earth, blood, and fire, and pillars of smoke. The sun shall be turned into darkness, and the moon into blood, before the great and the terrible day of the Lord come. And it shall come to pass, that, whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be delivered: for in mount Zion and in Jerusalem shall be deliverance, as the Lord hath said, and in the remnant whom the Lord shall call. For, behold, in those days, and at that time, when I shall bring again the captivity of Judah and Jerusalem, I will also gather all nations, and will bring them down into the valley of Jehoshaphat, and will plead with them there for my people, and for my heritage Israel, whom they have scattered among the nations, and parted my land.—The children also of Judah, and the children of Jerusalem, have ye sold unto the sons of the Ionim,† that ye might remove them

This is applied by St. Peter to the *effusion of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost*, though strictly relating to the *era of the restoration of the Jews and the glorious period of the millennium*. The *first advent* of Christ is frequently considered by the inspired writers as a sort of type of his *second advent*, whence we find, that predictions, which properly belong to the *one period*, are often applied by anticipation to the *other*. Thus, in a similar manner, the apostles apply the prophecy of David, in the *second Psalm*, to the *conspiracy of the chief priests with Herod and Pontius Pilate against our Lord*: yet, if any one will compare that *second Psalm* with the *description of the Word of God routing his congregated enemies in the nineteenth chapter of the Apocalypse*, he will be convinced, that it does not receive its ultimate accomplishment till the *second advent*, whether literal or spiritual, at the commencement of the *millennium*.

† By these *Ionim* seem to be meant *all the various worshippers of the Ionah, or Netic dore*, both in the East and in the West: not the *Ionians of Greece* as

far from their border. Behold, I will raise them out of the place whither ye have sold them, and will return your recompence upon your own head: and I will sell your sons and your daughters into the hand of the children of Judah, and they shall sell them to the Sabeans, to a people far off: for the Lord hath spoken it. Proclaim ye this among the Gentiles: Sanctify\* war, wake up the mighty men; let all the men of war draw near; let them come up. Beat your plowshares into swords, and your pruning hooks into spears: let the weak say, I am strong. Assemble yourselves, and come, all ye nations, and gather yourselves together round about: thither cause thy mighty ones to come down, O Lord. Let the nations be wakened, and come up to the valley of Jehoshaphat: for there will I sit to judge all the nations round about. Put ye in the sickle, for the harvest is ripe: come, get you down, for the press is full, the fats overflow; for their wickedness is great. Multitudes, multitudes, in the valley of concision. The sun and the moon shall be darkened, and the stars shall withdraw their shining. The Lord also shall roar out of Zion, and utter his voice from Jerusalem; and the heavens and the earth shall shake: but the Lord will be the hope of his people, and the strength of the children of Israel. So shall ye know, that I am the Lord your God dwelling in Zion my holy mountain: then shall Jerusalem be holy, and there shall no strangers pass through her any more."†

Such are *the four most remarkable prophecies*, which treat of the events that are to take place at the close of *the 1260 years*.‡ Those of Daniel and St. John are strictly chronological ones, and are therefore in some measure their own interpreters: and, as for those of Zechariah and Joel, although they be not marked by the chronologi-

*clusively.* *The dispersion of the Jews* extends nearly to the whole world: and so widely, in old times, did *the worship of the Jonah* also extend. I have already considered the subject in a *Dissertation on the Mysteries of the Cabiri*.

\* So the word is properly rendered in the margin of our translation of the Bible.

† Joel ii. iii.

‡ To discuss *all* the prophecies relative to those events would occupy too large a portion of a Work like the present, which professes to treat peculiarly of the events comprehended *within* the 1260 years. *The restoration of Israel and the overthrow of Antichrist*, which are here very briefly noticed, are considered at large in my unpublished Work, which is professedly dedicated to that purpose.

ical numbers and the long-continued and connected series of events which form so striking a feature of the other predictions, yet they contain within them facts which are amply sufficient to shew at what era they will be accomplished. They both foretell *the restoration of the Jews*: consequently all the matters, of which they speak as connected with *that restoration*, must be the same matters as those of which Daniel speaks as being similarly connected with it. Hence it will follow, that *the destruction of the nations in the vicinity of Jerusalem*, predicted by Zechariah as contemporary with *the restoration of the Jews*, must be the same as *the overthrow of the infidel king in Palestine*, predicted by Daniel as likewise contemporary with *the restoration of the Jews*. Hence also it will follow, that *the fierce people* symbolized by a *flight of locusts*, so accurately described at the beginning of the prediction of Joel, as spreading desolation wherever they come, as wonderfully succeeding in all their enterprizes, as running to and fro in the great city, as scaling the walls of fenced cities with open violence, as entering insidiously in at the windows like a thief, as causing tremendous revolutions in the political heavens; that *this fierce people* can be no other than *the people of Daniel's infidel king*, who are to commence their reign of havoc and plunder under *the third woe-trumpet*, during the comparatively short time which the devil hath before the termination of *the 1260 years*, before the commencement of *the restoration of the Jews*.\* It will likewise follow, that *the invasion of Palestine by the northern army*, or *the army of Antichrist entering it by way of the north*, is the same as *the similar expedition of the infidel king*: and that *the destruction of this northern army with its face to the eastern sea, and its hinder part towards the utmost sea*, is the same event as *the destruction of the infidel king, after he has planted the curtains of his pavilions between the seas in the glorious holy mountain*; for

\* Since the first edition of this work was published, I have read Chandler's Paraphrase of Joel, and am more convinced than ever I was, that this *locust-army* cannot mean a *flight of mere literal locusts* as he supposes, but must denote, like the parallel prophecy in Rev. ix. a *flight of symbolical locusts*; which *symbolical locusts* the whole context of the prediction teaches us must mean *the desolating armies of Antichrist*. This point is fully discussed in my unpublished Work on the *Restoration of Israel*.

.....  
 in both cases, the scene is equally laid in the neighbourhood of Jerusalem between *the eastern or dead sea, and the western or Mediterranean sea*. It will lastly follow, that *the great battle of the nation, in the valley of Jehoshaphat, is the same as the great battle of the beast, the false prophet, and the kings, at Armageddon*; and as the conclusion of *the time of unexampled trouble*, during which Daniel, like Joel, predicts that *the restoration of the Jews will take place*.

It appears then from these concurring prophecies, that the final war of *the beast and the false prophet* against the Gospel, though probably first raging with great violence in Europe, during *the earthquake by which the Latin city is divided into three parts, and by which the islands and mountains or smaller states of the empire are swallowed up into some grand scheme of iniquitous partition*: or, in the language of Joel, during *the time that wonders are shewn in the heavens and in the earth, blood, and fire, and pillars of smoke*: the final war will manifestly be decided in *Palestine between the two seas*.\*

The corresponding and joint declaration of Daniel, Zechariah, and Joel, relative to *the country* which is ultimately to be the seat of *this last war*, is confirmed in a very remarkable manner by St. John. In his brief account of *the vintage*, under which *Popery and Infidelity* are for ever destroyed, he informs us, that *the wine-press, meaning the wine-press of Armageddon, should be trodden without the city, and that blood should come out of it, even to the horses' bridles, by the space of 1600 furlongs*. Both these descriptive marks perfectly correspond with *the land of Palestine*; the land, in which by the unanimous testimony of the prophets the last great controversy of the Lord will be carried on. In one sense, that country is *within* the great city; and, in another sense, *without* it. It is *within* it, if *the whole Roman empire* be considered, as including both *its proper seat in the West, and its Eastern conquests from the third or Macedonian beast*.

\* "I have an unfashionable partiality," says Bp. Horsley, "for the opinions of antiquity. I think there is ground in the prophecies for the notion of the early fathers, that *Palestine* is the stage, on which *Antichrist*, in the height of his iniquity, will perish." Letter on the 18th chap. of Isaiah.

But it is *without* it if *the revived* or *Latin empire* be considered, because *that empire* was confined exclusively to *the West*. Hence we find it said, in perfect harmony with this supposition, that our Lord was crucified *in* the great city;\* because he suffered during the existence of *the ancient Roman empire*, which comprehended the sovereignty both of *the East* and of *the West*. And hence we moreover find it said, that *the wine-press of Armageddon* should be trodden *without* the city, because at the time when this event is to happen, *the East* should not form a part of the sovereignty of *the revived or Latin empire*: and history accordingly testifies, that it never did form any part of it † This land, *without* the city, where the figurative wine-press is to be trodden, is described by St. John as extending 1600 *furlongs*: and all the other prophets declare, that the land in question is *Palestine*: hence we are naturally led to expect, that *Palestine* should extend 1600 *furlongs*. Now it is highly worthy of observation, that the length of *that region between the two seas* which is destined to witness the fall of *Antichrist* and his congregated host, if a line be drawn along the sea-shore from its southern to its northern frontier, amounts exactly to 1600 *Jewish Risin* or *Stadia*.‡

Not merely *the land* however is pointed out, where this great battle is to be fought, but even *the very place in that land*. Zechariah, as we have seen, fixes in *general* terms the scene of action in *Palestine* and in *the neighbourhood of Jerusalem*: Joel likewise fixes the scene of

\* Rev. xi 8.

† The temporary prevalence of the Latins in the East, during the time of the crusades, forms a solitary exception to this general rule.

‡ See D'Anville's Map of Palestine with scales of measures. This coincidence between *the length of Palestine* and *the 1600 stadia* was noticed by Jerome; and it probably was one reason why the fathers rightly believed, that *Antichrist* should perish in that country. Mr. Mede mentions the circumstance: but, from an idea that *the city* means *the literal city of Rome*, instead of *the Roman empire*, he supposes, contrary to the express declarations of all the prophecies which treat of the subject, that *the last great war* will be decided *without* the walls of *Rome* and in *the territories of the Pope*; and thence observes, that *the measure of Peter's patrimony*, from the walls of Rome to the last mouth of the Po, is 1600 *furlongs* (Comment Apoc in Mindemiam.) Upon this it will be sufficient to observe, that the whole length of the papal dominions is considerably more than 1600 *furlongs*: and, even if the coincidence had been exact, nothing would have been proved thereby, because the prophets unanimously direct our attention to quite another country, namely, *Palestine*, which is found to be precisely 1600 *furlongs* in length. See Pol. Synop. in loc.

action in *Palestine*, declaring that *the northern army* shall be destroyed *between the two seas*: Daniel no less explicitly affirms, that *the infidel king*, after having planted the curtains of his pavilions *between the seas* in the glorious holy mountain, shall come to his end, none being able to help him: and St. John asserts, that *the wine-press* shall be trodden *in a land which extends 1600 furlongs*—In addition to this general statement of *the country*, where these events are to happen, Joel further informs us, that *the battle of the nations* shall not only be fought *between the two seas*, but in *the valley of Jehoshaphat*; and St. John predicts very definitely, that *this same battle* shall not only be fought in *a land which extends 1600 furlongs*, but in *a certain place of that land called Armageddon*—*The valley of Jehoshaphat* therefore, and *Armageddon*, are one and the same region—Now the word *Jehoshaphat* signifies *the judgment of the Lord*, and *the valley of the battle* is indifferently styled by Joel *the valley of Jehoshaphat* or *the judgment of the Lord*, and *the valley of concision or destruction*. It is plain therefore, that *this* is not *the proper*, but only *a descriptive*,\* name of the place; that is, of *some place or other between the two seas*—Here then St. John steps forward, and furnishes us with *the literal proper name* of the region, which is thus to be made the scene of the just judgment of the Lord. *Armageddon* signifies *the destruction of Megiddo*: and *Megiddo* is a town situate *between the two seas*, in the half-tribe of Manasseth, at a small distance from the shores of the Mediterranean.† In the valley of this place, Josiah lost his life in his fatal encounter with Pharaoh king

\* That *Jehoshaphat* is only a descriptive name of the place, is evident from the context:—"the valley of Jehoshaphat, for there will I (*Jehovah*) sit to judge the nations round about,"

† *Armageddon* is the abbreviated compound of ארמגדון ארמגדון *Arma-Mageddon*, *the devoting to utter destruction at Megiddo*. "Hic itaque, crasis est, ut in nomine ארמגדון ארמגדון &c." See Pol. Synop. in loc. I prefer this derivation of the word to that proposed by Calmet. He conceives it to be compounded of *Ar* and *Megiddon*, and thence to signify *the mountain of Megiddo*. Such a supposition however by no means tallies either with the ordinary language of Scripture employed in speaking of Megiddo, or with the parallel prophecy in the book of Joel. *The valley of Megiddo* is twice spoken of: (2 Chron. xxxv. 22. Zechar. xii. 11) *the mountain of Megiddo* never, and, agreeably to this phraseology, the future stage of the great battle of Armageddon is termed by Joel *the valley*, not *the mountain*, of Jehoshaphat. Hence I think it scarcely probable that *Armageddon* should signify *the mountain of Megiddo*.

of Egypt: and it appears, that *this valley of the destruction of Megiddo*, or, as it is termed by Joel, *this valley of the judgment of the Lord*, is hereafter to be the scene of a yet more dreadful conflict.

I have observed, that *the gathering together of the kings of the earth to the battle of Armageddon*, may possibly mean *the gathering together of some great confederacy of the infidel popish powers against the converted Jews supported by the arms of Protestantism*, to the place appointed for their destruction. This conjecture is strengthened by a certain peculiarity of expression, which the Holy Spirit taught both Joel and Daniel to adopt in their respective predictions concerning the great troubles about to come to pass at the end of *the 1260 years*. Joel describes the proclamation, by which the nations are to be gathered together, as inviting them *to sanctify war*: and Daniel represents *the infidel tyrant* as going forth in great wrath *to devote, under the pretext of religion*, many to utter destruction.\* From these expressions I am much inclined to think, that the gathering together of *the beast, the false prophet, and the kings of the Latin earth*, will be for the purpose of undertaking what a Papist would denominate *a holy war*: that is to say, a war somewhat similar to *the ancient holy crusade* against the Waldenses of Provence; a war entered into under the cognizance of *the cross* for the pious purpose of exterminating all those whom *the Church of Rome* thinks proper to denominate *heretics*.† This infamous prostitution of the sa-

\* Such is the proper meaning of the word **הָרַעַם** *Hareem*, here used. Though Bp. Newton, I am persuaded, interprets the whole of this prophecy very erroneously, yet he is perfectly right in what he says respecting the verb *Hareem*. "The original word, which we translate *utterly to make away*, signifies *to anathematize, to consecrate, to devote to utter perdition*; so that it strongly implies, that this war should be made upon a religious account" (Dissert. XVII.) **הָרַעַם**. Anathematizavit, anathemate vel anathemati, internecioni, perditioni, devovit: consecravit, devotum effecit. (Buxtorf. Lexic.) **הָרַעַם**. Occidit, disperdidit, devastavit, morti addixit, anathematizavit, anathemati subjecit. Calas. Concord.

† Mr. Whitaker's idea, that *Jerusalem is ultimately to be the seat of the Pope*, is perhaps not altogether *improbable*; but I cannot find, that there is any express warrant for such a supposition in Scripture. Mr. Whitaker refers to Rev. xi. 7. 8. in confirmation of his opinion; but this passage affords no proof. Jerusalem is never styled *the great city*. That title is exclusively applied to *the Roman empire*, which is here likewise intended. (Com. p. 44.) Mr. Whitaker, since this was written, has laboured in a pamphlet, which he has published against me, to prove that *the great city means Jerusalem*; but

cred name of religion will however be amply repayed upon their own head. The *Arma*, or *destroying anathema*, which *the false prophet* shall fulminate against his enemies, and which his zealous coadjutor, *the atheistical papal tyrant*, will go forth in great fury to put in execution against those whom he hath religiously devoted to destruction, shall prove an *Arma* only to themselves. Accordingly we find, what is somewhat remarkable, that the same word *Arma*, the radical verb of which Daniel uses to express the manner in which *the infidel king* should go forth in his wrath, is united by St. John in composition with the proper name *Megiddo*: as if he wished to intimate, that they, who had pronounced an *Arma* against all their opponents, should themselves feel the baleful effects of the Lord's *Arma* at *Arma-Megiddo*.\* The very league of *the false prophet* indeed with *the beast* and *the kings of the earth*, might alone lead us to conclude, that this war should be a *religious war*: for, if it were a war undertaken only upon common principles, it is not easy to assign a reason why *the false prophet* should be evidently so much interested in its success.

The following, as far as I am able to collect from prophecy, seems to be the order, in which the great events that begin to take place at the close of *the 1260 years* will succeed each other.†

At the pouring out of *the seventh vial*, *the great Latin city* will be divided into *three parts*; and the expedition of *the wilful king* against Palestine, predicted by Daniel,‡ will commence. *The 1260 years* having now expired, *the restoration of the Jews* will likewise commence: for it is declared, that their restoration shall at once be contemporary with *the time of unexampled trouble* which marks *the time of the end*, and shall begin to take place

he appears to me to have completely failed in establishing his position, in which indeed he runs counter to the opinion of Mede, Newton, and all our best commentators.

\* Mr Fleming has much the same remark. After observing that *Arma* signifies both an *anathema* and a *slaughter*, he adds, "that both *the anathemas* darted against the saints by the Romanists, and *their armies* made use of against them, may be here alluded to" Apoc. Key, p. 63.

† I purposely give only a very brief statement of these matters, and omit all references to particular prophecies, as I propose to discuss them at large in a separate work on *the Restoration of Israel and the overthrow of the Antichristian confederacy*.



so soon as *the three times and a half* terminate. One great body of *the Jews* will be converted and restored by the instrumentality of *some mighty maritime nation of faithful worshippers*, and therefore by *some maritime nation hostile to the views and principles of Antichrist*.\*

\* Bp Horsley's translation of the 18th chapter of Isaiah, and some of his remarks upon the prophecy contained in it, are so remarkably apposite to the plan of the present work, that I shall take the liberty of transcribing them.

ISAIAH XVIII.

1. Ho ! land spreading wide the shadow of (thy) wings which are beyond the rivers of Cush.

2. Accustomed to send messengers by sea, even in bulrush vessels upon the surface of the waters ! Go, swift messengers, unto a nation dragged away and plucked, unto a people wonderful from their beginning hitherto, a nation expecting, expecting, and trampled under foot, whose land rivers have spoiled :

3. All the inhabitants of the world, and dwellers upon earth, shall see the lifting up, as it were, of a banner upon the mountains ; and shall hear the sounding, as it were, of a trumpet.

4. For thus saith Jehovah unto me ; I will sit still, (but I will keep my eye upon my prepared habitation,) as the parching heat just before lightning, as the dewy cloud in the heat of harvest.

5. For, afore the harvest, when the bud is coming to perfection, and the blossom is become a juicy berry, he will cut off the useless shoots with pruning hooks ; and the bill shall take away the luxuriant branches.

6. They shall be left together to the bird of prey of the mountains, and to the beasts of the earth. And upon it shall the bird of prey summer, and all the beasts of the earth upon it shall winter.

7. At that season a present shall be led to Jehovah of hosts, a people dragged away and plucked ; even of a people wonderful from their beginning hitherto : a nation expecting, expecting, and trampled under foot, whose land rivers have spoiled, unto the place of the name of Jehovah of hosts, Mount Zion.

COMMENTARY.

*The shadow of thy wings.*] The shadow of wings is a very usual image in prophetic language for protection afforded by the stronger to the weak. God's protection of his servants is described by their being safe under the shadow of his wings. And, in this passage, the broad shadowing wings may be intended to characterize some great people, who should be famous for the protection they should give to those, whom they received into their alliance ; and I cannot but think this the most simple and natural exposition of the expression.

*To send messengers.*] The original word צִירִים may be taken for persons employed between nation and nation, for the purposes either of negotiation or commerce.

*Bulrush vessels.*] Navigable vessels are certainly meant—If the country spoken to be distant from Egypt, vessels of bulrush are only used as an apt image, on account of their levity ; for quick sailing vessels of any material. The country therefore, to which the prophet calls, is characterized as one, which in the days of the completion of this prophecy should be a great maritime and commercial power, forming remote alliances, making distant voyages to all parts of the world with expedition and security, and in the habit of affording protection to their friends and allies. Where this country is to be found, is not otherwise said, than that it will be remote from Judæa, and with respect to that country beyond the Cushian streams.

*A nation dragged away.*] The dispersed Jews : a nation dragged away from its proper seat, and plucked of its wealth and power : a people wonderful from

Those consequently, who are thus converted and brought back by sea, must clearly be such *Jews*, as were either scattered through the dominions and colonies of *the maritime power*, or through those of other smaller *maritime*

the beginning to this very time for the special providence, which ever has attended them, and directed their fortunes; a nation still lingering in expectation of the Messiah, who so long since came, and was rejected by them, and now is coming again in glory; a nation universally trampled under foot; whose land *rivers*, armies of foreign invaders, the Assyrians, Babylonians, Syro-Macedonians, Romans, Saracens, and Turks, have over-run and depopulated.

[*It that season a present shall be led.*] Immediately after the purgation of the Church, at the very time, when the bird of prey with all the beasts of the earth, Antichrist with his rebel rout, shall have fixed his seat between the seas, in the holy mountain, a present shall be brought; the nation, described in ver. 2 as those to whom the swift messengers are sent, after their long infidelity, shall be brought as a present unto Jehovah. (Compare lxxv. 0.) They shall be converted to the acknowledgment of the truth, and they shall be brought to the place of the name of Jehovah, to mount Zion: they shall be settled in peace and prosperity, in the land of their original inheritance—This then is the sum of this prophecy, and the substance of the message sent to the people dragged away and plucked. That, in the latter ages, after a long suspension of the visible interpositions of Providence, God, who all the while regards that dwelling place which he will never abandon, and is at all times directing the events of the world to the accomplishment of his own purposes of wisdom and mercy; immediately before the final gathering of his elect from the four winds of heaven, will purify his Church by such signal judgments, as shall rouse the attention of the whole world, and, in the end, strike all nations with religious awe. At this period, the apostate faction will occupy the Holy Land. This faction will certainly be an instrument of those judgments, by which the Church will be purified. That purification therefore is not at all inconsistent with the seeming prosperity of the affairs of the atheistical confederacy. But after such duration as God shall see fit to allow to the plenitude of its power, the Jews, converted to the faith of Christ, will be unexpectedly restored to their ancient possessions. The swift messengers will certainly have a considerable share, as instruments in the hand of God, in the restoration of the chosen people: otherwise, to what purpose are they called upon (ver. 1.) to receive their commission from the prophet? It will perhaps be some part of their business to afford the Jews the assistance and protection of their fleets. This seems to be insinuated in the imagery of the first verse. But the principal part, they will have to act, will be that of the carriers of God's message to his people. This character seems to describe some christian country, where the prophecies, relating to the latter ages, will meet with particular attention; where the literal sense of those, which promise the restoration of the Jewish people, will be strenuously upheld; and where these will be so successfully expounded, as to be the principal means, by God's blessing, of removing the veil from the hearts of the Israelites. Those, who shall thus be the instruments of this blessed work, may well be described, in the figured language of prophecy, as the carriers of God's message to his people. The situation of the country, destined to so high an office, is not otherwise described in the prophecy, than by this circumstance; that it is to be beyond the rivers of Cush: that is, far to the West of Judæa, if these rivers of Cush are to be understood, as they have been generally understood, of the Nile and other Ethiopian rivers; far to the East, if of the Tigris and Euphrates. The one, or the other, they must denote; but which, is uncertain. It will be natural to ask of what importance is this circumstance in the character of the country; which, if it be any thing, is a geographical character, and yet leaves the particular situation so much undetermined, that we know not in what quarter of the world to look for the country intended, whether in the

nations in alliance with and professing the same faith as *the great naval power* itself. Another considerable body of *the Jews* there is reason to believe will be restored by land, and in an unconverted state, by *the Antichristian faction*: and that for mere political purposes. Those consequently, who are thus brought back, must be such *Jews* as are scattered through the territories of *the infidel king* and his *vassal allies*.

Daniel has given us a wonderfully minute account of the progress of *the Antichristian confederacy* to Palestine: which, as might naturally be expected from the circumstance of *the maritime power* commanding at sea, is plainly by land. This expedition of *the infidel king*, which we must conclude, both from local and chronological evidence, to be the same as the expedition of *the beast under his last head, the false prophet, and the kings of the Latin earth*, will at its first setting out be opposed by *two kings of the south and the north*. Now, if *the infidel king* be *France*, he must, in his attempt to invade *the holy land* from his empire in the West, necessarily pass through *Turkey*. Here therefore most probably will be the first collision. *The Ottoman power*, as we learn from St. John, will have previously fallen under *the sixth apocalyptic vial*: but in whose hands *Turkey* and *Asia minor* will then be, no one can at present with certainty determine. In spite however of all the opposition made by *the two kings*, *Antichrist* will enter into the countries, overflowing them like a resistless torrent; will pass over the narrow channel of the Constantinopolitan sea; and will force his way into *Palestine*. Such being his progress, he must unavoidably enter *the holy land* from the north:

East Indies, or in the western parts of Africa or Europe, or in America? I answer, that the full importance of this circumstance will not appear, till the completion of the prophecy shall discover it. But it had, as I conceive, a temporary importance at the time of the delivery of the prophecy; namely, that it excluded Egypt. The Jews of Isaiah's time, by a perverse policy, were on all occasions courting the alliance of the Egyptians, in opposition to God's express injunctions by his prophets to the contrary. Isaiah therefore, as if he would discourage the hope of aid from Egypt at any time, tells them, that the foreign alliance, which God prepares for them in the latter times, is not that of Egypt, which he teaches them at all times to renounce and to despise, but that of a country far remote; as every country must, that lies either West of the Nile, or East of the Tigris. Bp of St. Asaph's Letter on Isaiah xviii.

hence his invasion is so frequently spoken of as proceeding from that quarter.

Successful in his first attempt, and having placed his allies *the unconverted Jews* in Jerusalem and its vicinity, he will next direct his steps towards *Egypt*. *Edom*, and *Moab*, and the chief of the children of *Ammon*, will nevertheless escape out of his hand. For this they have to thank, not his moderation and clemency, but merely their local situation. A map will best explain the reason of their security. The districts, which those nations formerly occupied, lie so far to the east, as to be entirely out of the way of any army which is passing from *Judæa* into *Egypt*. But, over other countries more closely adjoining to *Egypt*, he will stretch forth his hand: and, while *Egypt* is unable to escape his marauding rapacity, those, whom Daniel calls *the Lubim* and *the Cushim*, will be compelled to attend his steps, and probably either augment his armies or perform the more menial offices of his camp.

In the midst of his African conquests, he will be troubled by tidings out of the east and the north. What these tidings are, Daniel does not positively determine: but the subsequent context plainly shews, that they must relate to the approach of some new enemy, and to some disagreeable intelligence respecting Jerusalem. From these *data*, and by the assistance of other parallel prophecies, we may form no improbable *conjecture* at least respecting those tidings out of the east and out of the north, which are described as so grievously troubling *Antichrist*. We left *the great maritime power* bringing by sea its allies, *the converted Jews*, as a present to the Lord of hosts, to mount Zion. Now, in whatever part of the world this power may be situated, whether far beyond the eastern or the western Cushæan streams, it is plain that its navy can only approach *Palestine* by the way of the Mediterranean sea. Such then will indisputably be its course. The maritime expedition, which we may conceive to set sail at some indefinite period after the close of *the 1260 years*, in order that we may allow a sufficient space of time for the collecting together and converting such of *the Jews* as are destined to be restored by the agency of

*the great naval power*, at length reaches *Palestine*: but *the believing Jews*, and their protectors, find themselves opposed by *the unbelieving Jews*, and the troops which *Antichrist* had left behind him to garrison Jerusalem and other strong-holds. Apparently after no trifling bloodshed, and (if I judge rightly from some prophecies) when *the converted Jews* had suffered very considerably, the eyes of their unconverted brethren will unexpectedly be opened; they will spiritually look upon him whom they have pierced; and throwing off the base yoke of *Antichrist*, they will cordially join such of their nation as had embraced christianity, and had allied themselves to *the faithful maritime power*. Thus will the Lord bring to salvation *the tents of Judah* first; or that body of *the Jews*, who are attached to the army of *the great maritime nation*, and who have not yet acquired a permanent settlement in cities: and afterwards *the house of David*, and *the inhabitants of Jerusalem*; or those *Jews*, who have been restored in an unconverted state, and have been placed in their ancient metropolis by *Antichrist*.

At the period when these events happen, and that they *will* happen may be collected with sufficient clearness, we may suppose *Antichrist* to be in Egypt and Lybia: for to what other time, in the course of his whole progress, can we with equal propriety ascribe them? Thus situated, he would plainly receive the intelligence from the north and from the east. From the north and the north-east he would learn, by means of some light vessels, first that the navy of *the maritime power* was approaching, and afterwards that it had safely reached the coast of *Palestine*: from the east and the north-east he would learn, by means of his own fugitive troops which had been stationed in *Judæa*, that *the maritime power* had completely succeeded in its first attempt, that it had brought back a large body of *converted Jews*, and that those who had been restored by *Antichrist* in an unconverted state had suddenly embraced the faith of protestant christianity, and had revolted from him to their already believing brethren. Unless we admit, that either this or something like it will be the case, we shall find it no easy matter to account for the fury with which

*Antichrist* is represented as returning into *Judæa*, which he had already subdued, and as besieging Jerusalem, which he had already given to his allies *the unconverted Jews*. For, that certain unbelieving Jews *will* be converted in Jerusalem, is plainly asserted by Zechariah: and, that the city will afterwards be besieged and taken, is asserted both by Zechariah and Daniel. But *all those Jews*, who are restored by *the maritime power*, will return in a converted state, as is manifest from the language used by Isaiah :\* by whom then can *the unconverted Jews* have been restored, except by *Antichrist*, who will make himself master of the whole land of *Palestine*; and why should he afterwards besiege them in Jerusalem, except on account of their conversion, mentioned by Zechariah, and their revolt from his cause? for, if they had not revolted from him after their conversion, no reason can be assigned why he should so bitterly attack them.

Troubled with such unpleasant tidings from the east and from the north, *Antichrist* hastily quits *Egypt* and *Lybia*, and retraces his steps to *Judæa*. Going forth in the height of his fury, he threatens to destroy all such as should oppose him: and, calling in the aid of Popish bigotry, he sanctifies his expedition by representing it as a holy crusade against heretics; and, with banners blessed by *the false prophet*, who (as we have reason to believe from the Apocalypset) will be his attendant, he devotes many to utter extermination under the blasphemous pretext of religion. His wonted success at first attends him. He besieges Jerusalem, now occupied by his enemies, and takes it. Here he exercises his usual barbarity; a barbarity, increased ten-fold by the defection of his late allies. The houses are rifled, and the women are ravished, by his licentious soldiery. Half of the inhabitants are made captive: but the other half are permitted still to remain in the city, under the control most probably of a strong garrison. Thus does he plant the curtains of his tents between the seas in the glorious holy mountain: and thus is Jerusalem, now for the last time, trodden down of the Gentiles.

During these disasters, the troops of *the maritime power*

\* See the preceding extract from Bp. Horsley.

† Rev. xix. 19, 20

er appear to have retreated towards the sea-shore, in order that they may be able to regain their ships, if all further resistance should prove fruitless. Here they would doubtless be joined by the great body of their allies, *the first converted Jews*, and by such of those that were afterwards converted, as were able to effect their escape from the rage of *Antichrist*. To this devoted host the tyrant now directs his attention. Anticipating an easy victory over his last enemies, either by suddenly cutting them off from their ships, or by compelling them to re-embark, and with proud exultation looking forward to the uncontrolled empire of the civilized world, he leaves Jerusalem, and advances with his whole army to Megiddo. Between this town and the sea we may suppose the troops of *the maritime power* and *the Jews* to have taken their position, hopeless probably of victory from their vast disparity in numbers to the huge hosts of their enemy. But the battle is not always to the strong, nor the race to the swift. At this anxious moment, the glory of the Lord is suddenly manifested in the midst of Jerusalem, and Jehovah himself becometh a wall of fire around her. The Almighty Word of God goeth forth, like a man of war, in the greatness of his strength; and all his saints, the innumerable armies of heaven, are with him. His awful commission is from the Most High. For, after the manifestation of the glory, the Lord of hosts sendeth him unto the nations that have spoiled his ancient people; that he may shake his hand over them, that they may become a spoil unto those whom they had made their servants, that they may know that the Lord of hosts hath sent him, that they may learn by bitter experience that he who toucheth *Judah* toucheth the apple of his eye. The tremendous vision halts for a moment on the mount of Olives; which, like Sinai of old, acknowledges a present God, and with a mighty earthquake cleaves asunder in the midst. It then advances to the valley of Megiddo, and hovers over the heads of the palsied troops of *Antichrist*. The divine word displays himself to the assembled nations. The faithful look up with awful wonder, knowing that their redemption draweth nigh. Every eye seeth him: and

they also, his kindred after the flesh, which pierced him now behold him in his glory. He cometh with clouds; and all the kindreds of *the Latin earth* wail because of him. He descendeth in his wrath: he treadeth the wine-press in the fury of his indignation: his garments are sprinkled with the blood of his enemies.\*

It appears from comparing various prophecies together, that the overthrow of *the Antichristian confederacy* will be effected partly by supernatural and partly by natural agency. Christ will indeed tread the wine-press alone, for to his sole might will the victory be owing: yet will he likewise use the *instrumentality* of others. While he miraculously smites his enemies with a dreadful plague, so that their flesh shall consume away while they stand upon their feet, and their eyes shall consume away in their holes, and their tongue shall consume away in their mouth; he will send likewise among them a great tumult from the Lord, so that they shall lay hold every one on the hand of his neighbour, and his hand shall rise up against the hand of his neighbour. *Judah* also, summoned to the dreadful task of vengeance by his God, shall take an active part in the destruction of his enemies: for, in that day, the Lord will make the governors of *Judah* like a hearth of fire among the wood, and like a torch of fire in a sheaf; and they shall devour all the people round about, on the right hand and on the left. Thus will *Antichrist* come to his end, and none shall help him. Thus will *the beast now under his last head* be taken, and with him *the false prophet* that wrought miracles before him, with which he deceived them that had received the mark of *the beast*, and them that worshipped his image. These both will be cast alive into a lake of fire burning with brimstone: and the remnant will be slain with the sword of that Almighty Conqueror who sitteth upon the white horse, the sword

\* After a long and attentive examination of the subject, I rest in Mr. Mede's opinion, that there will be some preternatural manifestation of the Messiah, though I cannot think that he assigns to it its proper place in the succession of events. He supposes, that it will be *the cause* of the conversion of *the Jews*: whereas, according as matters appear to me, they will be *previously* converted; and Christ will be revealed, not to turn *them* to the faith, but to execute judgment upon his *enemies*. See Isaiah lxiii. 1—6. Dan. vii. 9, 10, 11. Joel ii. 16. Zechar. ii. 8—11. xiv. 3, 4, 12, 13. 2 Thess. ii. 8. Rev. xix. 11—21.



that proceedeth out of his mouth; and all the fowls will be filled with their flesh.

Since *the Jews* are to be restored in the midst of war and bloodshed, or, as Daniel expresses it, during a time of trouble such as never was since there was a nation, we may reasonably suppose that great numbers of them will perish. Accordingly we find, that their return from the countries of their dispersion is expressly compared by Ezekiel to their ancient exodus from Egypt. As God pleaded with their fathers in the wilderness of the land of Egypt; so will he likewise plead with them, causing them to pass under the rod, and purging out from among them the rebels. It is probable indeed, that only a small part of the first generation of those that are restored will quietly sit down under their own vines and under their own fig-trees. One whole generation of *the Israelites*, that were brought out of Egypt, perished in the course of *forty years* in the wilderness: and there is reason to think, that the conversion and restoration of *Judah*, and the expedition and destruction of *Antichrist*, will occupy a period of not less than *30 years*. The swift messengers of *the great maritime power* will begin the work of *converting* the Jews, that is to say such Jews as are scattered through the countries subject to their influence. *Antichrist* mean while will collect the *unconverted* Jews from those parts of the isles, or the regions of Europe,\* which are under his immediate control, for the purpose of bringing them back in an *unbelieving* state to their own country: but whether *he*, or whether *the maritime power*, will absolutely *begin* the work of *restoring* the ancient people of God, cannot, I think, be certainly gathered from Scripture.† *His* plan will be a plan of pure

\* By *the isles of the Gentiles* the Jews understood *all those countries which they could not reach from Palestine except by sea*. Hence the name was given to *Europe*, in contradistinction to *Asia*, which to them was strictly continental. See Mede's Works, Book I. Disc. 49. p. 272.

† That *the maritime power*, mystically termed by Isaiah *the ships of Tarshish*, will be *the first*, or (as the original expression is rendered by the LXX and in the Latin translation of the Arabic version) *among the first*, to attempt the conversion of the Jews; and that they will *afterwards* bring back to Palestine such as shall be converted by their instrumentality, seems to be revealed with sufficient plainness: but it is no where, I believe, positively declared, that they shall begin the work of *restoring* the Jews. Since *part of them* are to be brought back by *Antichrist* in an *unconverted* state, and *part by the maritime power* in a *converted* state, it certainly is possible that *Antichrist* may begin to

Machiavelian policy : and, considering the frailty of human nature, it is much to be feared that the plan of *the maritime power*, strenuously as that power will exert itself in *converting* no less than in *collecting* the Jews, will be somewhat alloyed by worldly motives, and will not be adopted simply from a desire to promote the glory of God. Most probably politics will have taken such a turn at that eventful period, as to make it seem to be the interest of both those great powers to attempt the restoration of *the Jews*. Thus doubly brought back by two mighty contending nations, and thus plunged into the midst of perils and of war during the space of 30 years (for so long a time will, I think, intervene between the first effusion of *the seventh vial* at the close of *the 1260 years*, when they begin to be restored, and the destruction of *Antichrist* at Megiddo), *the Jews* must inevitably suffer many calamities ; and we are taught accordingly by Ezekiel, that such will assuredly be the case.

When the army of *Antichrist* is miraculously overthrown, the Lord, who forgetteth not mercy even in the midst of judgment, will not make an entire end ; but will spare some of the least guilty of his enemies, reserving them for the noblest purposes. Zechariah teaches us, that even so much as *a third part* shall be spared. These may be supposed to be less hardened in wickedness than their associates ; and to have taken a part in the expedition, either through the inveterate prejudices of a Popish education (the expedition having been blessed and sanctified by *the false prophet*), or through the tyrannical compulsion which we have already beheld *Antichristian France* begin to exercise over her degraded allies. Nor will they only be spared : plucked as brands out of the burning, they will likewise be converted by the mercy of God to a zealous profession of genuine Christianity.

Thus wonderfully preserved and converted, they will restore *the one division* previous to the restoration or even the conversion of *the other division*. Most probably however the two events will be nearly, if not altogether, contemporary. The prophecy, contained in Isaiah lx. 8, 9. relates solely to *the restoration of the converted Jews*, because they are declared to be brought unto the name of the Lord : and we are taught, that some power, mystically termed *the ship of Tarshish*, shall be among the first to undertake this great enterprise.

become proper instruments to accomplish the yet unfulfilled purposes of the Most High. Scattered over the face of the whole earth, they will carry every where the tidings of their own defeat, of the marvellous power of the Lord, and of the restoration of *Judah*. Meanwhile there is some reason to suppose, that the awful apparition of *the Shechinah* will still remain suspended over Jerusalem, visible at once from its stupendous height to a whole hemisphere, and bearing ample attestation to the veracity of the fugitives.\* Nor will they carry their message in vain. *Judah* is indeed restored: but *the lost ten tribes of Israel* are still dispersed through the extensive regions of the north and of the east. These, according to the sure word of prophecy, however they may be now concealed from mortal knowledge, will be found again, and will be brought back into the country of their fathers. All nations and all tongues shall come and see the glory of the Lord; for he will set among them a sign, even the sign of the Son of man, the sign of the illuminated *Shechinah*; and will send unto them those that have escaped from the slaughter of *the Antichristian Confederacy*, that they may declare his glory among the nations. Convinced by ocular demonstration that God doth indeed reign in Zion, and at once divinely impelled and enabled both to seek out from among them and to find the long-lost sheep of *the house of Israel*, they will bring by land, in vast caravans, all *the brethren of Judah* for an offering unto the Lord, as *the great maritime power* had already brought *the converted Jews* for a present unto the Lord to his holy mountain. Then shall the stick of *Joseph* be united for ever with the stick of *Judah*: *Ephraim* shall be no more a separate people: but the whole house of *Jacob* shall become one nation under one king, even the mystic David, Jesus the Messiah.

The various prophecies, which speak of the restoration of *the ten tribes*, certainly cannot relate to the restoration of those detached individuals out of them, who returned with *Judah* from the Babylonian captivity. This is man-

\* I apprehend it was from passages of this import, that Mr. Mede supposed that *the Jews* would be converted by a supernatural manifestation of Christ. Had he said *the ten tribes*, instead of *the Jews*, I believe he would have approached very near to the truth.

ifest, both because their restoration is represented as perfectly distinct from the restoration of *Judah*, and because it is placed at once subsequent to that event and to the overthrow of *Antichrist*. In fact, the converted fugitives from the army of *Antichrist* are described as being greatly instrumental in bringing about the restoration of *the ten tribes*. Hence their restoration is plainly future; and hence we cannot, with any degree of consistency, apply the predictions which foretell it to the return of a few individuals from Babylon with *Judah*. Of *the Jews*, who were carried away captive to Babylon, only a very small part, according to Houbigant not more than a hundredth part, returned to their own country. Those, who were left behind, will doubtless, at the time of the second advent, be brought back along with their brethren of *the ten tribes*; just as those individuals of *the ten tribes* who returned with *Judah* from Babylon, and (adhering to him notwithstanding the Samaritan schism) were afterwards scattered with him by the Romans, will be brought back with their brethren *the Jews*. So far, but no further, the otherwise distinct restorations of *Judah* and *Joseph* will in some measure be mingled together. This circumstance is very accurately noted by Ezekiel, even when predicting the two-fold restoration of *Judah* and *Joseph*, and their subsequent union under one king. He speaks neither of *Judah* nor *Joseph* simply; but styles the one division *Judah, and the children of Israel his companions*, and the other division *Joseph, and all the house of Israel his companions*; thus plainly intimating, that *some* of the children of *Israel* shall return with *Judah*; but that members of *all* the tribes, not of the kingdom of the *ten* tribes only, but of *all* the tribes, shall return with *Joseph*.\*

I have stated that the restoration of *Judah* will commence at the close of *the 1260 years*, and have intimated it to be probable that it will not be completely effected till a period of *30 additional years* shall likewise have expired. This conjecture is founded upon a remarkable chronological passage in the book of Daniel. The prophet teaches us, that *75 years* will intervene between the expiration of the *1260 years* and the commencement

\* See Bp. Horsley's *Hosea*, p. 59, 60.

of the Millennium: and these 75 years he divides, without specifying any reason for such a division, into 30 years and 45 years. What particular event will happen at the era of the division, we undoubtedly cannot determine with any degree of certainty; because Daniel has left it wholly undetermined: but we must conclude, that the point of the division will be marked by some signal event; otherwise how can we rationally account for its having been made? Now, when we find by comparing prophecy with prophecy, that the restoration of *Judah* will precede the restoration of *Israel*, and that the restoration of *Israel* will not even so much as commence till the restoration of at least the main body of *Judah* is completed, and till the power of *Antichrist* is broken: it is at least highly probable, that the 30 years will be occupied in the conversion and restoration of *Judah*, in the great earthquake or political convulsion that divides the *Latin empire* into three parts, in the wars of *Antichrist* with the kings of the South and the North, in his grand expedition against *Palestine* and *Egypt*, and in the contemporary naval expedition of the maritime power undertaken for the purpose of bringing back the converted Jews; that the 30 years will close with the complete overthrow of *Antichrist* in the valley of *Megiddo*, an event than which one cannot conceive one better calculated to mark a signal chronological epoch; and that the 45 years will be employed in the wanderings of those who escaped from the rout of the *Antichristian army*, and who will carry every where the tidings of God's supernatural interference, and in the subsequent conversion and restoration of the whole house of *Israel*. I wish this to be understood only as a conjecture; for it would be folly to speak positively before the event.

When the 45 years shall have expired, when the whole family of *Jacob* shall have been converted and restored, and when the stick of *Judah* shall have united itself forever with the stick of *Joseph*; then will commence the season of *millennian blessedness*. We have reason to suppose, that the ancient people of God, now converted to the faith of Christ, will be greatly instrumental in spreading the glad tidings of the Gospel among the heathen

nations, already prepared to receive it by so many supernatural interpositions of Providence, and by beholding with their own eyes the glory of the Lord permanently manifested over Jerusalem. According to the united testimony of many of the prophets, *Israel*, after his restoration, will be sown among *the Gentiles*; and will thus be made, in a wonderful manner, from first to last, the seed of the Church. This preaching of the Gospel by *the converted Israelites*, unlike the preaching of it by that first handful only of seed, the Hebrew Apostles of our Lord, will, I apprehend, be totally unattended by persecution or opposition: for all trials of that nature would be incompatible with the predicted peace and blessedness of the Millennial Church. God will incline the hearts of *the Gentiles* to receive the word gladly. Great shall be the day of *Jezrael*. For, if the fall of *the Jews* be the riches of the world, and the diminishing of them the riches of *the Gentiles*; how much more their fulness? Nay, instead of opposing or slighting the truth, so eager shall the heathens be to receive it, that out of all the languages of the nations ten men shall lay hold of the skirt of only one Jew, declaring, with a holy vehemence, their full determination to go with him, inasmuch as they have heard that God is with him of a truth. In short, the whole world shall press eagerly to Jerusalem to behold the glory of the Lord, and to receive instruction from the lips of his servants. All nations shall flow, like a mighty torrent, to his holy mountain, assured that he will teach them of his ways, and cause them to walk in his paths; that the law shall go forth out of Zion, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem.

It is not impossible, that some may feel a curiosity to know *what nation* is intended by *the great maritime power* destined to take so conspicuous a part in the conversion and restoration of *Judah*. On this point their curiosity cannot be gratified; at least, not with any degree of precision. Yet, although we presume not to say, that *this* or *that particular modern nation* is intended; we may, by comparing prophecy with prophecy, ascertain both the region in which that nation is to be sought, and

the religious character of that nation. The result of such a comparison is briefly as follows: that *the maritime power* must not only be sought for *generally* in the *West*, but *particularly* in the *isles of the Gentiles* or *Europe*; and, not only *generally* in the *isles of the Gentiles* or *Europe*, but *particularly* in the *believing isles of the Gentiles* or *protestant Europe*.\* Further than this I cannot find that we have any authority to advance, and therefore I shall not attempt to advance further: but I shall content myself with resting in the conclusion, that *the maritime power* will be *that state of protestant Europe which shall possess a decided naval superiority at the time when the 1260 years shall expire*. This mighty *maritime power*, and other smaller *protestant maritime powers* its allies described by the prophet under the general name of *the isles of the Gentiles*,† will clearly be the agents in converting and restoring those *Jews* who are not under the influence of *Antichrist*.

From what has been said concerning the events which are to take place at the close of *the 1260 years*, the following positions may, I think, be collected.

1. *The Jews* most certainly *will* be restored.
2. They will as certainly be converted to Christianity.
3. They will begin to be restored as soon as *the 1260 years* shall have expired.‡
4. They will be restored in *two great divisions*.
5. *The first* of these divisions will be restored in a converted state by *the prevailing protestant maritime power* of the day.
6. *The second* will be restored in an unconverted state, and in opposition to the views of *the maritime power*, by a *confederacy* consisting of the

\* This comparison is drawn out at length in my unpublished Work on the restoration of Israel and the overthrow of Antichrist.

† Isaiah ix 9. That part of the *isles of the Gentiles* is of course here spoken of, which is not subject to the control of Antichrist.

‡ Since Daniel declares, that *the Jews* will begin to be restored at the end of *the 1260 years*, and since our Lord no less expressly predicts that "Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles, until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled;" it is manifest, that *those times* will begin to be fulfilled, so soon as *the 1260 years* shall have expired, and that they will be completely fulfilled when *the Antichristian confederacy* is broken, and when *the Jews* are wholly restored. Thus wonderfully do both these prophecies harmonize with St. John's description of *the final battle of Armageddon* and *the vintage*; as well as with the parallel predictions of Joel, Zechariah, and others of the ancient prophets. *The fulness of the Gentiles*, mentioned by St. Paul as the era of *the restoration of the Jews*, must therefore mean *their attaining to that height of wickedness which should mark the period when their times should be fulfilled*. Rom. xi. 25.

*Roman beast under his last head, the false prophet, and the vassal kings of the earth or Latin empire.* 7. *The confederacy*, one member of which is certainly *the atheis'tico-papal king*, having sanctified their war by proclamation, will successfully invade *Palestine* by land, will occupy *Egypt*, will return and sack *Jerusalem*, and will plant the curtains of their pavilions between the seas in the glorious holy mountain. 8. Their triumph however after this last exploit will be but short. Assembling themselves together at *Megiddo*, they will suddenly be overthrown by the divine Word of God, and will be agitated by such a preternatural confusion as to draw every man his sword against his fellow : so that the bulk of this *migh'ty northern army* shall miserably perish between the seas of *Palestine* ; and *the infidel tyrant* himself come to his end, none being able to help him. 9. *The Latin city* will be divided by *an earthquake* into *three parts* at the first effusion of *the seventh vial* ; *the earthquake*, *the expedition of Antichrist*, and *the rout at Armageddon*, being equally comprehended under *the same vial*. 10. *Two* out of *three parts* of *the bestial confederacy* will be destroyed at *Megiddo*. 11. The power of *the beast* and *the false prophet* will be for ever broken by their last decisive overthrow in *the valley of the Lord's judgment*. 12. *The third part* of *the bestial confederacy* will be spared, and converted. 13. This *third part* will be scattered among the nations, and will be instrumental in preparing the way for the restoration and conversion of *the ten tribes*. 14. *The ten tribes* will be restored, and will be for ever united with *the tribe of Judah*, so as to form with it only one nation. 15. At the end of *75 years*, after the termination of *the 1260 years*, the season of *millennian rest* will commence.\*

\* Though I am unable to assent to the ingenious Mr. King's scheme of apocalyptic interpretation, his remarks upon *Palestine*, considered as the centre of the millennian empire of Christ upon earth, are highly worthy of notice. "How capable this country is of a more universal intercourse, than any other with all parts of the earth, is most remarkable ; and deserves well to be considered, when we read the numerous prophecies which speak of its future splendour and greatness, when its people shall at length be gathered from all parts of the earth unto which they are scattered, and be restored to their own land. There is no region in the world, to which an access from all parts is so open. By means of the Black sea, and the Mediterranean, there is an easy approach from all parts of Europe, from a great part of Africa, and from America. By



*All these matters* are clearly predicted by the prophets. *The manner*, in which they will be accomplished, affords a vast field for conjecture: but *their accomplishment itself* is no vain speculation: in God's own good time, *that* must take place: *how* it will take place, we know not *beyond what is revealed*. Respecting the yet future and mysterious *Millennium*, the less that is said upon the subject the better. Unable myself to form the slightest conception of its *specific* nature, I shall weary neither my own nor my reader's patience with premature remarks upon it. That it *will* be a season of great blessedness is certain: further than this we know nothing *definitely*. "The secret things belong unto the Lord our God: but those things which are revealed belong unto us and to our children for ever, that we may do all the words of this Law."\*



## CHAPTER XII.

*Recapitulation and Conclusion.*

FROM what has been said we learn, that *the 1260 days* are *the appointed hour of the powers of darkness*, the space of time allotted for the prevalence both of *Popery* and *Mohammedism*, and for the short-lived triumph of *Antichrist*.

In *the year 606*, *the saints* seem to have been first given by the secular power of the *Roman empire* into the

means of the Red sea, and the Persian gulph, and the well-known roads from thence, there is an approach from the rest of Africa, from the East Indies, and from the Isles. And lastly, by means of the Caspian, the Lake or sea of Baykall, and the near communication of many great rivers, the approach is facilitated from all the northern parts of Tartary. In short, if a skilful geographer were to sit down to devise the fittest spot on the globe for universal empire; or rather, a spot, where all the great intercourses of human life should universally centre; and from whence the extended effects of universal benevolence and good-will should flow to all parts of the earth; and where universal and united homage should be paid, with one consent, to the Most High; he could not find another so well suited, in all circumstances, as that which is with emphasis called *The Holy Land*. These observations perhaps may not deserve great weight, but they ought not to be wholly neglected; especially when it is considered, how many passages of Scripture there are, which plainly declare, that the time *shall* at length come, when Zion shall be the joy of the whole earth." Note to Hymns to the Supreme Being, p. 126.

\* Deut. xxix. 29.

hand of *the Papal little horn*; consequently from this year *the 1260 days* ought most probably to be computed. *The desolating transgression of the Mohammedan little horn* however is destined to prevail during the same space of time, that *the Papal little horn* is permitted to reign. Hence, in order that *the two periods of 1260 years each* might be made to synchronize together, it seemed necessary, that *the desolating transgression of Mohammedism* should first make its appearance in the very year that *the saints* were delivered into the hand of *the Papal little horn*. Accordingly we find, that it *did* first make its appearance in that year; for *the year 606* is the most proper date of *the Mohammedan imposture*, because in that year Mohammed first retired to the cave of Hera.

1. *The Papal horn* arose, as we have seen, at the precise time when Daniel predicted that it should rise; namely, while *the Roman empire* was falling asunder, and while *ten independent kingdoms* were springing up out of its ruins. It arose gradually and almost imperceptibly among and behind *the ten horns of the fourth beast*; three of which were successively eradicated before it, and by their fall gave it an opportunity of becoming a temporal no less than a spiritual power. For some time after its rise it was only an ecclesiastical *kingdom*: but that kingdom, though small at first, continued perpetually to increase in size; till, in *the year 606*, when *the Pope* was declared *Universal Bishop and supreme head of the catholic Church*, it became a mighty ecclesiastical *empire*. At this era, which seems to be the proper date of *the 1260 years*, and the epoch when *the old Pagan Roman beast* which had been mortally wounded by *the Sword of the Spirit* under *his sixth head*, revived under *the same sixth head*, by setting up a spiritual tyrant in the Church, and by relapsing into idolatry. St. John first introduces upon the stage *the power* which Daniel symbolizes by *the little horn of the fourth beast*. That power however was now become *an universal empire*, instead of being, what it had hitherto been, *a limited ecclesiastical kingdom*. Hence the Apostle, instead of representing *the ten-horned beast* as having likewise *a little horn*, describes him as attended by *a second beast*.

whose character precisely answers to that of *the little horn*. By the instigation of this corrupt spiritual power, *the ten-horned beast*, or *the secular Roman empire*, wages war with *the saints* during the period of *the 1260 days*, through the instrumentality either of *his last head* or *his ten horns*.

2. *The desolating transgression of Mohammedism* arose in the same year that *the Papal horn* became an *universal spiritual empire*. A few years after its rise, it acquired its predicted character of *a little horn of the Macedonian he-goat*; and soon, agreeably to the prophecy, waxed exceeding great toward the south, and toward the east, and toward the pleasant land. In the course of its progress it cast down many of the symbolical *stars*, or *Christian pastors*, to the ground; took away *the daily sacrifice* of praise and thanksgiving; polluted *the spiritual sanctuary*; and presumed to magnify itself against even *the Prince of princes*. As for its character, it was notorious for trampling upon the truth; for prospering in a wonderful manner; for making its appearance exactly when the transgressors were come to the full by publicly re-establishing idolatry; for teaching dark sentences; for being mighty not through its own unaided power; for exterminating its opponents with the utmost barbarity; for persecuting with peculiar violence the people of the Holy Ones; for advancing itself by craft; and for destroying many while in a state of negligent security.

In the Apocalypse a more full account is given of *the agents* by whom *this apostate religion* should be propagated. *A fallen star* opens *the bottomless pit*, and lets out *the destroying king of the locusts*. *These locusts* are permitted to continue their ravages during the space of *five prophetic months* or *150 years*; which is found from history to be the precise period allotted to the continuation of the Saracenic incursions. *The locusts* are succeeded by an immense body of *horsemen* under *four leaders* from the banks of *the Euphrates*; whose commission is limited to *an hour and a day and month and a year*, or *391 years and 15 days*, and who are empowered to kill *a third part of men* or *the Roman empire*, which their predecessors *the Saracenic locusts* had only been permitted to torment.

History accordingly teaches us, that *the Saracens* were succeeded by *the Turks*; who came under *four leaders* from the banks of *the Euphrates*; whose armies consisted almost entirely of *cavalry*; whose career of conquest exactly continued *391 years*; and who subverted *the Constantinopolitan empire*, which *the Saracens*, severely as they harassed it, had never been able to effect.

*The Mohammedan little horn itself, or the religion of Mohammed*, is to prevail to the end of *2200 years* from the invasion of Asia by Alexander the great; which is found to bring us down exactly to *the year 1866*, and thus to allow precisely *1260 years* for the triumphs of *Mohammedism*, reckoning from its commencement in *the year 606*.

3. After the era of *the Reformation*, and in *the last days* of atheism and insubordination, but previous to the commencement of *the time of the end, the infidel king*, according to the sure word of prophecy, was destined to arise; that *Antichrist*, who was alike to deny both the Father and the Son; that audacious tyrant who should magnify himself above every god, who should speak marvellous things against the God of gods, who should neither regard the God of his fathers nor the desire of women, who should nevertheless honour a foreign god and acknowledge gods protectors, and who should be allowed to prosper till the indignation be accomplished.

As the contemporary rise and progress of *Popery* and *Mohammedism* is described in the Apocalypse under *the two first woe-trumpets*, so the appearance of *the great Antichrist* is announced by *the third*. His full development however is to be immediately preceded by the last event of *the second woe-trumpet*, a tremendous *earthquake* by which *a tenth part of the great Latin city, or one of the ten horns of the Roman beast*, is to be overthrown. *This last woe*, which extends beyond the termination of *the 1260 years* at least to the end of *the seventh vial*, if not to the commencement of *the Millennium*, comprehends the periods of *the harvest* and *the vintage*.

Thus, *after the epoch of the Reformation*, and immediately after *the French Revolution of the year 1789*, we have seen the manifestation of a terrific monster, which

alike set at defiance the laws both of God and man. We have beheld scenes of carnage and impiety, which well deserve to be ushered in by a *distinct woe-trumpet*, and which may justly claim to themselves the title of a *harvest of God's wrath*. These scenes have at length passed away, like the distempered and fantastic visions of a sick man; and *the sun of military tyranny* has begun to scorch the irreclaimable inhabitants of *the Papal Roman empire* with an intolerable heat. The madness of *the harvest* therefore is past; and we must expect in due season the commencement of *the vintage*, in which the enemies of God will be finally destroyed for ever.

At present we are living under *the fourth vial*;\* and from the great length of time which both *Popery* and *Mohammedism* have continued, we cannot be very far removed from the end of *the 1260 days*, whatever be the precise year from which they ought to be dated. The year, which I have fixed upon for their date, is *the year 606*; a year marked by so singular a combination of circumstances, that I know not how any other can with equal propriety be selected. If then I be right in my opinion, we are now removed but little more than *60 years* from the commencement of *the time of the end* and of *the vintage of God's wrath*. Be this however as it may, we are undoubtedly living in *the last days of blasphemous infidelity*, in that awful period which is *the peculiar reign of Antichrist*. The signs of the times all concur to teach us, that we are fast approaching towards the catastrophe of the great drama. We have seen the unexpected union of *Infidelity* and *Popery*; an union, no doubt preparatory to *the predicted final league of the beast, the false prophet, and the kings of the papal earth*,† We have seen measures taken, as it were, towards making *the atheistical king* the *last head of the beast*.‡ We have seen *Palestine*, the predicted stage on which *Antichrist* with his congregated vassals is doomed to perish,

\* I have already stated it to be not *improbable*, that *the fifth vial* may have been poured out since this Work was first published. June 10, 1806.

† This *confederacy* seems now actually to have begun to be formed. June 10, 1806.

‡ There is reason to believe, that *the atheistical king* is now become *the last* or *Carlovingian head of the beast*. June 10, 1806

brought forward in a remarkable manner to public notice, and becoming at once a subject of political discussion and an object of hostile invasion. We have seen *the kings* devouring the flesh of *the great whore*, and making her naked and desolate, though her spiritual empire over the minds of men still continues. We have seen, and may now see, *the waters of the mystic Euphrates* rapidly drying up, previous to their final complete exhaustion under *the sixth vial*. And we have seen of late years, what I cannot but consider as at least one of the minor signs of the times, an unusual and laudable attention paid, in this protestant country, to the predictions of the ancient prophets. Although the book be sealed, and will not be fully understood, till *the time of the end*; yet, as that time is now approaching, many run to and fro, and knowledge is increased. Of the wicked indeed, of those who are either members of *the great Apostacy*, or have been tainted with the blasphemous impieties of *Antichrist*, none shall understand; but the spiritually wise children of *the symbolical woman*, they who profess the same evangelical principles as those who perished at the era of *the Reformation* in trying, in purging, and in making white, their apostate brethren, these shall understand.\*

\* Compare Dan. xii. 3, 9, 10. with xi. 35. *The wise*, here mentioned, are evidently the same as *those men of understanding*, some of whom, at the time of *the Reformation*, should perish in attempting to propagate the truth. To these spiritually wise children alone shall it be given of their heavenly Father to understand the signs of the times: their opponents, through ignorance or contempt of them, will suddenly pull down swift destruction on their own heads. I know not any better comment upon the words of the prophet than the sciolist Voltaire's pert remark, that the great Sir Isaac Newton wrote his comment on the Revelation, to console mankind for his superiority over them in other respects. With regard to *an attention paid to the prophecies being one of the signs of the times*, the opinion of Sir Isaac Newton and Bp. Horsley will at least exempt me from the charge of fancifulness in enumerating it among them. "Amongst the interpreters of the last age," says Sir Isaac "there is scarce one of note who hath not made some discoveries worth knowing: and thence I seem to gather, that God is about opening these mysteries." In a similar manner, the Bishop remarks, that the character of *the maritime people* destined to take the lead in *the restoration of Judah* "seems to describe some Christian country, where the prophecies, relating to the latter ages, will meet with particular attention; where the literal sense of those, which promise the restoration of the Jewish people, will be strenuously upheld; and where these will be so successfully expounded, as to be the principal means, by God's blessing, of removing the veil from the hearts of the Israelites." It cannot but be pleasing to the serious reader to observe the different estimation in which prophecy is now held throughout the protestant kingdom of England, from what it was by the Jews previous to the sacking of Jerusalem.

As yet we have beheld no signs of *the restoration of Judah*: nor, to all appearance, shall we behold any, till *the three times and a half* draw very near to their termination.\*

But, when that famous period shall have expired, then will commence the wars of *Antichrist* with *the kings of the south and the north*, and the restoration of *the unconverted Jews* through his instrumentality. Then will the Lord call unto the land spreading wide the shadow of its wings, which is beyond the rivers of Cush, accustomed to send messengers by sea, even in quick-sailing vessels upon the surface of the waters. Then shall the swift messengers go unto a nation, dragged away and plucked, unto a people wonderful from the beginning hitherto, a nation expecting, expecting, and trampled under foot, whose land rivers have spoiled. Then shall all the inhabitants of the world, and dwellers upon earth, see the lifting up, as it were, of a banner upon the mountains: and shall hear the sounding, as it were, of a trumpet. In spite of the opposition of *the atheistico-papal confederacy*, the *great maritime power* of the day shall take the lead in *the restoration of the converted of Judah*: while the enemies of the Lord, notwithstanding their invasion of Palestine, and notwithstanding their temporary success against Jerusalem, bent only upon the accomplishment of their own schemes, and unconsciously subject to the influence of Satanical delusion,† will madly rush on to

We are informed by Josephus, that in his days it was no uncommon thing to hear his hardened countrymen ridicule the oracles of their ancient prophets, which they had already defied by crucifying the Messiah. Καίπερ αἰετοῦ μὲν ἐν πάσι αὐτοῖς θεσμός ἀιθρηπῶν, ἐγγελατο δὲ τὰ θεῖα, καὶ τὸς μὲν προφήτων θεσμοῦς ὡσπερ ἀγρυπτικῆς λογοποιίας ἐχλευαζόν. (Joseph de Bell. Judaic. L. 4. C. 6.) What a singular resemblance there is between this state of the Jews and that of the French at the time of their boasted Revolution

\* Since this was written, Buonaparté has begun to assemble *the Jews* in a grand council at Paris. Whether it will lead to their restoration, time alone can determine: at present we have certainly no right to say that it will. The avowed plan of the usurper is to incorporate them with his other subjects: his *real plan* may be something different. It is said that *the Jews* of Frankfort have impiously hailed him as their expected Messiah. Though I do not suppose the *individual* Buonaparté to be *Antichrist*, it is worthy of notice that Popish commentators have adopted the belief of some of the fathers, that whenever *Antichrist* should appear, *the Jews* would acknowledge him as their Messiah, and attempt to procure their restoration by his instrumentality. See Calmel's Dict. Vox *Antichrist*—Cornelius à Lapide's Comment. in Dan. vii. Rev. 22. Nov. 20, 1806.

† Rev. xvi. 13, 14.

their own destruction in the valley of Megiddo, in the region between the two seas, the region whose limits extend 1600 furlongs.

On the whole, it is reasonable to conclude, that the time is not very far distant, when the symbolical *heaven* and *earth* shall pass away, and when *the personal Word* shall begin to tread *the wine-press* of the fierceness and wrath of Almighty God. Never were there more awful times than these of *the third woe-trumpet*. All civilized government has been in a state of commotion; and the powers of Europe have been shaken to their very centre. The end however is not yet. The calamities of *the harvest* are but the harbingers of those which shall take place under *the last vial* during the period of *the vintage*.

For ourselves, we have only to labour, through the grace of God and the assistance of his Holy Spirit, that we may be prepared to meet the Lord at his coming. Death, whensoever it shall arrest our progress, will assuredly be the end of the world to each of us. We pervert the study of prophecy, if we make it only a mere curious speculation. We ought rather so to read the oracles of God, as to profit by them in all holiness of life and conversation. Neither a hearty reprobation of the cruelties and corruptions of *Popery*; nor an abhorrence of the impious imposture of *Mohammedism*; nor a detestation of the diabolical principles of *Antichrist*; are alone sufficient to prepare us for the kingdom of heaven. We must beware, lest we have a name that we live, and are dead. We must be watchful, and strengthen the things which remain that are ready to die; lest our works be not found perfect before God.\* It will be but small comfort to each of us as individuals, that our country is preserved amidst the wreck of nations to fulfil the future high purposes of the Almighty, if we through our own negligence fall short of the promised reward. In fine, our eternal interests will be but little benefited by the study of prophecy, unless we pursue it in the manner which the apostle himself hath proposed to us. "Blessed is he that readeth, and they that hear the words of this prophecy, and *keep these things which are written therein*: for the time is at hand."†

\* Rev. iii. 1, 2.

† Rev. i. 3.



## APPENDIX.

WHEN the first edition of this Dissertation was published, I had not had an opportunity of perusing the recently printed work of Archdeacon Woodhouse on the Apocalypse; but it would be unpardonable, considering the plan which I have adopted, to suffer a second edition to make its appearance without noticing it. The thanks of every biblical student are due to the learned author for his very clear and convincing *Dissertation on the divine Origin of the Apocalypse*, and likewise for many valuable remarks and much sound criticism, contained in his notes on the book. I feel myself peculiarly gratified and interested at finding several of my own positions maintained and established by a writer, with whom I have not the honour of being acquainted, and whose work I had not read at the time when my own was published. Thus, we are both agreed, that *Mohammedism constitutes one half of a grand apostacy from the purity of Christianity*; \* that the *apostacy, the great city*

\* The position, that *Mohammedism is a Christian apostacy*, is so ably treated by the Archdeacon, that I cannot refrain from strengthening what I have already said on the subject with his quotations and arguments.

“*Mohammed did not pretend to deliver any new religion, but to revive the old one.—He allowed both the Old and New Testaments, and that both Moses and Jesus were prophets sent from God* (Fideaux's Life of Mohamad, p. 18, 19.); that *Jesus, son of Mary, is the word and a spirit sent from God, a redeemer of all that believe in him.* (Sale's Koran, p. 19, 56, 65. Ockley's Hist. of Saracens II. Mohammed represents himself as the Paraclete or Comforter sent by Jesus Christ, John xvi. 7. (Wheaton, p. 168.) So, in Mohammed's ascent to heaven, as invented in the Koran, with the patriarchs and prophets confess their inferiority to him by intruding his prayers, in the seventh heaven he sees Jesus, whose superiority the false prophet acknowledges by commending himself to his prayers. (Sale's Koran, p. 17. Fideaux's Life of Mohammed, p. 55.) *Faith in the divine books is a necessary article of the Mohammedan creed; and among these is the Gospel given to Issa or Jesus, which they assert to be corrupted by the Christian. If any Jew is willing to become a Mohammedan, he must first believe in Christ: and this question is asked him, Dost thou believe that Christ was born of a virgin by the blast of the inspiration of God, and that he was the last of the Jewish prophets? If he answers in the affirmative, he is made a Mohammedan.* (Retford on Moham. preface 25, 71.) *Mohammed arose to establish a new religion, which came pretty near to the Jewish, and was not entirely different from that of several sects of Christians, which got him a great many followers.* (Leibnitz's Letter, 1706.) *The impostor Mohammed confessed that Jesus was born of the Virgin Mary, that he was the Word of God sent from heaven, the Spirit of God declared in the miracles of the Gospel, the prophet of God, whose office it was to deliver the Gospel and to clear the way of truth, who is to come to judgment and to destroy Antichrist and convert the Jews.* It is also he taught, that the Gospel of Christ, and the law of Moses and all the prophecies are to be believed. And thus he was rather inclined to the Christians than to the Jews. (Spanhem Introd. ad hist. sec. vii. p. 609.) *Mohammedism began as a Christian heresy, acknowledging Christ for a prophet, a greater than Moses, born of a Virgin, the Word of God.* (Reau's Ottoman empire, p. 138.) Sale asserts the Mohammedan religion to be not only a Christian heresy, but an improvement upon the very corrupt idolatrous system of the Jews and Christians of those times. (Prelim. p. 15.) Joseph Mede affirms, that the Mohammedans are nearer to Christianity than many of the ancient heresies, the Corinthians, Gnostics, Manichees. (Works, p. 64.) *Whatever good is to be found in the Mohammedan religion (and so very good doctrines and precepts there undeniably are in it,) is in no small measure owing to Christianity; for Mohammedism is a perverted system, made up for the most part of Judaism and Christianity; and, if it be considered in the most favourable view, might possibly be accounted a sort of Christian*

denotes, not merely *the town of Rome*, but *a corrupt communion*; \* that *the holy city* is not the *literal Jerusalem*, but *the Christian church*; † that *the first beast* of the apocalypse is not the *Papacy*, but *the Roman empire*; ‡ that *the deadly wound of his breast* denotes *his conversion to Christianity* under Constantine, and that *his revival* means *his relapsing into idolatry*; § that *the little horn of Daniel's fourth beast* cannot be the same as the *first apocalyptic beast*; in other words that it cannot be the same as the *beast himself* of which it is only a *member* (as some commentators have singularly supposed,) but that it is the same as the *second apocalyptic beast* or *the false prophet*; ¶ that *the deadly wound and revival of the first apocalyptic beast* is enigmatically described by the phrase *was, and is not, and yet is*; \* that *the time of the end* denotes *the expiration of the 1260 years*;

**Heresy.** *If the Gospel had never been preached, it may be questioned whether Mohammedism would have existed.* (Dr. Jortin's first charge.) *The Mussulmans are already a sort of heterodox Christians. They are Christians, if Locke reasons justly, because they firmly believe the immaculate conception, divine character, and miracles of the Messiah: but they are heathen in denying vehemently his character of Son, and his equality, as God, with the Father, of whose unity and attributes they entertain and express the most awful ideas, which they consider our doctrine as perfect blasphemy, and insist that our copies of the Scriptures have been corrupted both by Jews and Christians.* Sir William Jones in Asiatic Researches, Vol. I p. 63.

"These are such testimonies as have occurred to me in no very extensive course of reading. They are derived from authors, who for the most part enjoyed favourable opportunities of examining the Mohammedan tenets; and they exhibit that religion as rising upon the basis of true religion, corrupted, even like the papal, to serve the purposes of a worldly and diabolical tyranny. In the Mohammedan religion are these articles, all evidently derived from the Christian, and constituting in it a great superiority above any thing that paganism or mere philosophy have been able to produce; the belief of the existence of one all-wise, all-good, all-powerful, God; of the immortality of the soul; of future rewards and punishments to be distributed by Jesus; of the acceptance of prayer, of self-humiliation, of almsgiving; of the obligation to morality in almost all its branches. Take from Mohammedism one article, in which it differs from all religions generally admitted to be Christian, the belief of Mohammed's divine mission; and little will then be found in it, which may not be discovered in the profession of many acknowledged Christians. Nay, perhaps it may appear, that the creeds of two bodies of Christians will supply every thing which is to be found in Mohammedism, excepting belief in the pretended prophet of Mecca.

"On the whole, when we consider the origin of Mohammedism, and its near affinity to corrupted Christianity; when we reflect also on the amazing extent of this superstitious domination, which occupies nearly as large a portion of the globe, as that possessed by Christians, comprizing vast regions in ancient Greece and Asia Minor, in Syria, in Persia, in the Indies, in Tartary, in Egypt, and Africa, which were once Christian: we shall readily admit, that, if not a Christian heresy, it is at least a Christian apostacy." Apocalypse translated, p. 36—370.

\* P. 293, 301, 412, 418. † P. 86. ‡ P. 32—38, 42—432.

§ P. 36, 45, 46, 428, 436. ¶ P. 332—336.

\* P. 426—48. The Archdeacon argues very forcibly against those who with Mede would ascribe the fulfilment of this mysterious phrase to the age in which the vision was delivered. "These words of the angel, describing the beast, *He was, and is not, and yet is*, appear to me in no wise applicable to the tyranny seated at Rome, at the time of the vision when the angel spake them. This was the time of the Emperor Domitian, when a cruel persecution raged against the Church, when St. John himself was actually suffering banishment in Patmos for the word of God and the testimony of Jesus. Such a time can in no wise agree with the representation, that the beast *was, and is not*. It is therefore probable, that the time, in which the beast is said to have been, and not to be, and yet to be, is the time

that the apocalyptic dragon cannot mean *pagan Rome*, but must typify the devil;\* that the period of 1260 years, or at least a period of 1260 years, ought most probably to be dated from the year 606;† and consequently that we are rapidly approaching to the catastrophe of the great apostatic drama.‡ In these points I have the satisfaction of find-

when he ariseth again after his wound, to exercise dominion under the direction of the harlot. This time was not arrived when St. John saw the vision in Patmos; but, though future in this sense, it was present in another, as belonging to the vision then under exhibition: for the beast was then present in exhibition before St. John, and in the act of re-ascending to power. This will appear more probable to those, who read forward from this passage to the end of the 8th verse, where the admiration of the inhabitants of the earth is spoken of as yet future; and yet this admiration is fixed upon this same object—the beast which was, and is not, and yet is."

\* This point is excellently discussed by the Archdeacon, "On consulting the writings of the commentators most approved in this country, I find, that by the *Dragon* is generally understood the *pagan and persecuting power of Imperial Rome*. But, I trust, a few observations will shew the fallacy of this notion.

"Where an interpretation is expressly given in the vision, as in ch. i. 20; v. 6, 9; xvii. 7; that interpretation *must* be used as the key to the mystery, in preference to all interpretations suggested by the imagination of man. Now in the 2d verse of this chapter (Rev. xiii.) such an interpretation is presented; the dragon is there expressly declared to be *that ancient serpent called the devil*; known by the name of  $\Delta\iota\alpha\beta\delta\lambda\omicron\varsigma$  in the Greek, and of *Satan* in the Hebrew; *who deceiveth the whole world*. Here are his names, and his acknowledged character. No words can more completely express them. No Roman emperor, nor succession of emperors can answer to this description. The same dragon appears again in ch. xx. 2. and (as it were to prevent mistake) he is there described in *the very same words*. But this re-appearance of the same dragon is in a very late period of the apocalyptic history; long after the expiration of the 1260 days or years; and even after the wild beast and false prophet, who derive their power from the dragon during this period, are come to their end. And the dragon is upon the scene long after these times, and continues in action even at the end of another long period, a period of a thousand years. He there pursues his ancient artifices, *deceiving the nations*, even till his final catastrophe, in ch. xx. 10, when the warfare of the Church is finished. Can this dragon then be an emperor of Rome? or any race, or dynasty, of emperors? Can he be any other than that ancient and eternal enemy of the Christian Church, who in this, as in all other scriptural accounts, is represented as the original contriver of *all* the mischief which shall befall it. In this drama, he acts the same consistent part from beginning to end. He is introduced to early notice as warring against the Church, ch. ii. 10, 13.—In the succeeding conflicts, the Church is attacked by his agents; by the wild beast and false prophet, who derive their power from him: and at length he himself is described, as leading the nations against the camp of the saints. Nothing appears more plain than the meaning of this symbol. The only appearances, which may seem to favour the application of it to Imperial Rome are, the seven crowned heads, and the ten horns of the dragon. But—the seven mountains and ten horns, of the latter Roman empire are fitly attributed to Satan, because during the period of 1260 years, and perhaps beyond it, he makes use of the Roman empire, its capital city, and ten kings or kingdoms, as the instruments of his successful attack on the Christian Church. The dragon therefore appears to me, as he did to Venerable Bede eleven centuries ago, to be *Diabolus, potentia terreni mundi armatus*." P. 321—326

† P. 360. The Archdeacon thinks, that there are more than one period of 1260 years. (p. 339—344.) He by no means appears to me to prove his point.

‡ Nearly all the more recent commentators on prophecy, with whose writings I am acquainted, seem to agree in the belief that we cannot be far removed from the end of the 1260 years. The very phraseology used by the Archdeacon most forti-

ing myself supported by the authority of the Archdeacon; but in various other matters I am unable to agree with him.

The first objections, which I have to urge, are of a *general* nature; afterwards I may descend to *particulars*.

I. My *general* objections are to the Archdeacon's principle of applying the apocalyptic prophecies, when carried to the length to which he carries it; and to his system of arranging the Apocalypse itself, on which a great part of his subsequent interpretations is founded.

1. He conceives the prophecies of the Apocalypse "to be applicable principally, if not solely, to the fates and fortunes of the Christian Church."\* Agreeably to this system, he interprets the six first seals, and the four first trumpets, as relating solely to ecclesiastical matters: and rejects at once both the usual chronological arrangement of them, and the almost universal supposition that the four first trumpets predict the calamities brought upon the Roman empire by the incursions of the various Gothic tribes and the final complete subversion of its western division. The principle is undoubtedly a just one if adopted with moderation; but the Archdeacon does not advance any arguments in favour of carrying it to the length which he does, that are at all satisfactory to my own mind. The affairs of the Church, both Levitical and Christian, have been more or less connected, from very early ages, with empires and kingdoms hostile to the cause of true religion: hence, although the Church is the *main* end of prophecy, yet, circumstanced as it has always been, it seems nearly impossible to foretell the fates of the Church without likewise foretelling the fates of the great powers connected with it. Nevertheless, the Church being the *ultimate* scope of prophecy, we have no occasion to go into "the wide field of universal history"† to search for doubtful interpretations; we must confine ourselves to that portion of it, which *alone* is connected with the Church. Accordingly we find, that no nations are particularized in prophecy excepting those with which the Church either has been or will be concerned. Moab, Edom, Amalek, Nineveh, Tyre, Egypt, the four great empires, and a yet future confederacy denominated Gog and Magog, are all very fully noticed; while the mighty monarchies of China and Hindostan are totally overlooked. Now, when we must acknowledge such to be the case with the Old Testament, why are we to conclude that the apocalyptic predictions are framed upon a different principle? and, since throughout the whole of the Revelation the Church is connected with Daniel's *fourth* beast or the Roman empire, why are we to suppose that that empire is never spoken of except when the *ten-horned* beast is specially introduced, that is to say, except during the period of the 1260 years.

The Archdeacon's interpretation of the seals I shall consider hereaf-

ly brought to my recollection a conversation which I once had on this subject with the late Bp. Horsley. His Lordship avowed it to be his opinion, that, before the present century elapsed, the prophecies respecting the destruction of the Roman beast and the overthrow of the Antichristian faction would be no longer a sealed book. "The days will come," says the Archdeacon, "and seem at no very great distance (the present century may perhaps disclose them), when, the beast and false prophet being removed, and Babylon sunk for ever, the devil, that ancient foe, shall be deprived of his wonted influence." P. 470.

\* Pref. p. xiii. xiv.

† Ibid. p. xv.

ter; at present I shall confine myself to that of *the trumpets*. *The four first* of these he will not allow to relate to *the overthrow of the Western empire*, on the ground that the subject of the Apocalypse is *the fates and fortunes of the Christian Church*.\* But are not those fates and fortunes most closely connected with *the overthrow of the Western empire*? According to the usual interpretation of *the four first trumpets* and *the tyranny of the two beasts during the period of the 1260 years*, every thing appears in strict chronological order, and the one succession of events arises naturally out of the other. St. Paul teaches us, that, when *he that letted*, or *the Western empire*, should be taken away, then should *the man of sin* be revealed. Now what is the particular portion of the Apocalypse which we are now considering except an enlarged repetition of St. Paul's prediction? *He that letted* is taken away; and *the man of sin* forthwith rears his head:—*the Western empire* is taken away by the operation of *the four first trumpets*; and *the great apostacy of 1260 days*, the reign of the false prophet and his temporal supporter, shortly commences. The one is preparatory to the other: *the four trumpets* are merely the prelude to what may be termed the grand subject of the Apocalypse, *a wonderful tyranny exercised within the Church itself by the upholders of the Apostacy, and a contemporary Apostacy in the eastern world scarcely less wonderful than that in the western*. St. Paul and St. John are perfectly in unison: they alike connect *the downfall of the empire* with *the fates of the Church*. Thus, even independent of the Archdeacon's chronological arrangement which shall presently be discussed, I see not why the old interpretation of *the four trumpets*, or at least *the great outlines* of that interpretation, ought to be rejected.

The Archdeacon however brings an argument against such an interpretation of *the four trumpets* from the *homogeneity* of *all the seven trumpets*. He insists most justly, that what the *nature* of one is the *nature* of them all must be: and observes that Mede, in order to make them homogeneal, interprets *the fifth* and *the sixth trumpets* as relating to *the attacks made upon the empire by the Saracens and Turks*, as he had already referred *the four first* to *the attacks previously made upon the empire by the Gothic tribes*. But he adds, that *the seventh trumpet* announces “most clearly the victory obtained by Christ and his Church, not over the Roman empire, but over the powers of hell, and of Antichrist, and a corrupt world; over the dragon, the beast, the false prophet, and in process of time (for the seventh trumpet continues to the end) over death and hell. If then, under the seventh trumpet, the warfare of the Christian Church be so clearly represented (and in this all writers are agreed,) what are we to think of the six? How must *they* be interpreted, so as to appear homogeneal? Are they to be accounted, with Mede and his followers, the successive shocks, by which the *Roman empire* fell under the Goths and Vandals? *Homogeneity* forbids. They must therefore be supposed to contain *the warfare of the Christian Church*. And this warfare may be successful under the seventh and last trumpet, when it had been unsuccessful before, yet the *homogeneity* be consistently preserved. For the question is not concerning *the success*, but concerning *the warfare*. And the trumpets may be deemed homogeneal. if they all

\* P. 218—222.

represent *the same warfare* (viz. of the powers of hell, and of the Antichristian world, against the Church of Christ) whatever may be the event.\* That the object of *the seventh trumpet* is to introduce the victory obtained by Christ and his Church, and to usher in the happy period of the Millennium, few will be disposed to deny: but the question is, *how* is this desirable object accomplished? The Archdeacon himself allows, by the triumph of the Church over those instruments of hell, *Antichrist, the beast, and the false prophet*. Now, whether I be right or wrong in my own notions of *Antichrist*, what is this but a triumph over the *Roman empire* and *the apostate communion inseparably connected with it*? Accordingly we find, that *the seventh trumpet*, after conducting us through *six of its vials*, all of which are poured out upon God's enemies, magnificently introduces under *the seventh vial* the judgment of *the great harlot*, the downfall of *Babylon*, and the complete destruction of *the beast* along with *the false prophet* and his *confederated kings*; in other words, *the overthrow of the papal Roman empire both secular and temporal*. How then is the *homogeneity of the trumpets* violated by Mede's exposition? Under *the four first*, the western empire falls; under *the two next*, the eastern empire follows the fate of its more ancient half; under *the last*, *the revived beast* or *papal empire* is utterly broken, and prepares a way by its overthrow for the millennial reign of the Messiah. In short, as matters appear to me, if we argue backwards from *the seventh trumpet*, *homogeneity*, instead of forbidding, *requires* us to refer all *the six first trumpets* to different attacks upon the *Roman empire*, the *final ruin* of which is ushered in by *the seventh*.

2. But my objection to the Archdeacon's arrangement of the *Apocalypse*, on which a great part of his subsequent interpretations necessarily depends, is infinitely stronger than to *his very limited system of applying the prophecies*. It appears to me to be so extremely arbitrary, and to introduce so much confusion into *the three septenaries of the seals, the trumpets, and the vials*, that, if it be adopted, I see not what certainty we can ever have, that a clue to the right interpretation of the *Apocalypse* is attainable.

The Archdeacon supposes, that *the six first seals* give a general sketch of the contents of the whole book, and that they extend from *the time of our Saviour's ascension* even to *the great day of the Lord's vengeance*, a description of which day is exhibited under *the sixth seal*.† Having thus arrived at the consummation of all things, how are we to dispose of *the seventh seal*? The Archdeacon conceives, that the *same* history of the Church begins anew under it; that the connection, which had hitherto united *the seals*, is broken; that *the seventh seal* stands apart, containing all *the seven trumpets*; and that the renewed history, comprehended under this *seventh seal*, begins "from the earliest times of Christianity, or to speak more properly, from the period when our Lord left the world in person, and committed the Church to the guidance of his apostles. From this time the first seal takes its commencement; from this also, the first trumpet."‡ Hence it is manifest, since *the seventh seal* brings us back, for the purpose of introducing *the seven trumpets*, to the very same period at which *the first seal* was opened, that *the opening of the seventh seal*

\* P. 202.

† P. 135, 174, 196.

‡ P. 197, 200.

synchronizes, in the judgment of the Archdeacon, with *the opening of the first seal*, and that *the seventh seal* singly comprehends exactly the same space of time as *all the six first seals* conjointly.

*The seventh seal* then introduces and contains within itself, *all the seven trumpets*, the *first six* of which constitute the Archdeacon's second series of prophetic history, as *the first six seals* had constituted his first series: and these two serieses are in a great measure, though not altogether, commensurate; for, though they both alike begin from *the ascension of our Lord*, *the six seals* carry us to *the day of judgment*, whereas *the six trumpets* only carry us to the end of the 1260 years.\*

The third series is of course that of *the vials*, which the Archdeacon arranges under *the seventh trumpet*, as he had previously arranged *the seven trumpets*, under *the seventh seal*. But where is the place of *the seventh trumpet*, and consequently of *the first vial*? The Archdeacon does not bring back *the seventh trumpet* and *the first vial* to *the ascension of our Lord*, as he had previously brought back *the seventh seal* and *the first trumpet*, but only to the beginning of *the times of the beast* or *the 1260 years*; through the whole of which he supposes *the seventh trumpet* and *its component vials* to extend. He conceives however, that *the sixth trumpet* introduces *Mohammedism* in the year 606, and reaches to the downfall of Mohammedism at the close of *the 1260 years*. Consequently *the beginning of the seventh trumpet* exactly synchronizes with *the beginning of the sixth trumpet*; but *the seventh* extends beyond *the sixth*, and reaches, like *the sixth seal* and *the seventh seal*, to *the final consummation of all things*.†

In brief, the chronological arrangement of the Archdeacon's three serieses is as follows. The first is that of *the six seals*; and it reaches from *the ascension of our Lord* to *the day of judgment*. The second is that of *the six trumpets*, introduced by and comprehended under *the seventh seal*; and it reaches from *the ascension of our Lord* to *the termination of the 1260 years*. The third is that of *the seven vials*, introduced by and comprehended under *the seventh trumpet*; and it reaches from *the commencement of the times of the beast* or *the 1260 years* to *the day of judgment*.

Now it is impossible not to see, that the whole of this arrangement is purely arbitrary, and consequently that the various interpretations built upon it must in a great measure be arbitrary likewise. The Apocalypse must either be *one continued prophecy*, like each of those delivered by Daniel; in which case (with the single exception, as all commentators are agreed, of the episode contained in the little book) we must admit it, unless we be willing to give up all certainty of interpretation, to be strictly chronological: or it must be *a book containing several perfectly distinct and detached prophecies*, like the whole book of Daniel, each of which, for any thing that appears to the contrary, may either exactly synchronize or not exactly synchronize with its fellows. If the former opinion be just, the Archdeacon's scheme immediately falls to the ground; for then all *the seven trumpets* must necessarily be posterior in point of time to the opening of all *the seven seals*, and in a similar manner all *the seven vials* to the sounding of all *the seven trumpets*. If the latter opinion be just,

\* P. 273, 274.

† P. 308, 399, 400, 401, 252—273, 274, 309, 360.

then the question is, *how* are we to divide the Apocalypse into distinct prophecies? The only system, that to my own mind at least seems at all plausible, would be to suppose that each of *the three septenaries of the seals, the trumpets, and the vials*, forms a distinct prophecy. If we divide the Apocalypse at all, we must attend to the Apostle's own arrangement; and *homogeneity* plainly forbids us to separate *the seals from the seals, the trumpets from the trumpets, or the vials from the vials*. So again; as *homogeneity* requires us to attend to the Apostle's own arrangement in case of a division, it equally requires us to suppose that these *three distinct prophecies* exactly coincide with each other in point of chronology: otherwise, what commentator shall pretend, without any clue to guide him, to determine the commencement of each? But *the seals*, as all agree, commence either from the ascension of our Lord, or at least from some era in the Apostle's own life-time: therefore, if we divide the Apocalypse, *homogeneity* requires us to conclude that *the trumpets and the vials* commence likewise from the same era. Accordingly I have somewhere met with a commentator, whose work I have not at present by me, and whose name I cannot recollect, that proceeds upon this very principle. He divides the Apocalypse into the three prophecies of *the seals, the trumpets, and the vials*; and supposes, that all these prophecies run exactly parallel with each other, extending alike from *the age of St. John to the end of the world*. To *this* scheme, when examined in detail, the Archdeacon, as well as myself, will probably see insurmountable objections. Sir Isaac Newton adopts a somewhat different plan. He arranges all *the seven trumpets* under *the seventh seal*, and supposes them chronologically to succeed *the six first seals*; thus making *the seals and the trumpets* one continued prophecy: but when he arrives at *the vials*, he conceives them to be *only the trumpets repeated*; thus making *the vials* a detached prophecy synchronizing with *the trumpets*.\* Nothing can be more manifest in this plan than its arbitrary violation of *homogeneity*. What warrant can we have for asserting, that *the seals and the trumpets* form jointly a continued prophecy, but that *the vials* form a distinct separate prophecy synchronizing with that part of the former prophecy which is comprehended under *the trumpets*? But, if Sir Isaac violate *homogeneity* in his arrangement of the Apocalypse, much more surely does the Archdeacon: for he not only separates *the seventh seal and the seventh trumpet* from their respective predecessors, but divides the Apocalypse into three distinct prophecies, not one of which exactly synchronizes with another.

A violation of *homogeneity* however is not the only objection to the Archdeacon's arrangement. It seems to me to involve in itself more than one obvious contradiction. For what reason is *the seventh seal* styled *the seventh*? The most natural answer is, because it succeeds *the six first seals*. Now, according to the Archdeacon's arrangement, it does not succeed them: for *the opening of it* exactly synchronizes with *the opening of the first*, and therefore of course precedes *the opening of the remaining five*, although the contents of *the seventh seal* itself are chronologically commensurate with the contents of all *the other six*. But, if *the opening of the seventh seal* synchronize

\* Observ. on the Apoc. p. 251, 293, 295.



with the opening of the first and therefore precede the opening of the remaining five, with what propriety can it be styled the seventh seal? The same remark applies to his arrangement of the trumpets. The first sounding of the seventh trumpet, which introduces the seven vials, exactly synchronizes the first sounding of the sixth; although, in point of duration, the seventh trumpet extends beyond the sixth. Such, according to the Archdeacon, being the case, why should one be termed the seventh rather than the other. The three last trumpets are moreover styled the three woes. How then can the seventh trumpet be the third woe, if it in a great measure synchronize with the second woe? I am aware, that the Archdeacon does not consider the seventh trumpet as being itself the third woe, but only as introducing, at some period or other of its sounding, that third woe.\* Such a supposition however is forbidden by homogeneity; for, since the fifth and the sixth trumpets manifestly introduce at their very earliest blast the first and second woes, we seem bound to conclude that the seventh trumpet should similarly introduce at its earliest blast the third woe. In this case then the second and the third woes exactly commence together: whence we are compelled to inquire, both why they should be styled second and third, and what event or series of events is intended by the one and what by the other? Nor is even this the only difficulty. The seventh trumpet is represented as beginning to sound after the expiration of the second woe, and as introducing quickly the third woe. It is likewise represented as beginning to sound after the death and revival of the witnesses; which must take place either (as Mede thinks) at the end of the 1260 years; or (as I am rather inclined to believe) toward the end of them. The Archdeacon himself thinks it most probable, that these events are yet to come.† Now, in either of these cases, how can the seventh trumpet succeed the death and revival of the witnesses, if it begin to sound at the very commencement of the 1260 years; that is to say at the very commencement of their prophesying?

Hitherto I have argued on the supposition, that it is allowable to divide the Apocalypse into distinct predictions; and have only attempted to shew, that it is next to impossible to fix upon any unobjectionable method of dividing it. I shall now proceed to maintain, that the system of dividing it rests upon no solid foundation. If we carefully read the Apocalypse itself, we shall find no indications of any such division as that which forms the very basis of the Archdeacon's scheme of interpretation. St. John only specifies a single division of his subject, the greater book and the little book. This division therefore must be allowed; and accordingly has been allowed by perhaps every commentator. But the very circumstance of such a division being specified leads us almost necessarily to conclude, that no other division was intended by the Apostle: for, if it had been intended, why was it not similarly specified? The Archdeacon draws an analogical argument from the distinct prophecies of Daniel, in favour of the system of dividing the Apocalypse. After treating of his first series, that of the first six seals which he supposes to extend from the ascension of Christ to the day of judgment, he adds, "Such appears to be this general outline of the Christian history. Many im-

\* P. 409, note.

† P. 302, 303.

portant intervals yet remain to be filled up under the seventh seal, which will be found to contain *all* the prophecies remaining; and, by tracing the history over again, to supply many events which were only touched upon before. This method of divine prediction, presenting at first a general *sketch* or outline, and afterwards a more complete and finished colouring of events, is not peculiar to this prophetic book. It is the just observation of Sir Isaac Newton, that *the prophecies of Daniel are all of them related to each other; and that every following prophecy adds something new to the former.* We may add to this observation, that the *same* empires in Daniel are represented by various types and symbols. The four parts of the image, and the four beasts, are varied symbols of the *same* empires. The bear and the he-goat, in different visions, represent the same original: and so do the ram and the leopard. We are not therefore to be surprised, when we find the same history of the Church beginning anew, and appearing under other, yet corresponding, types; thus filling up the outlines which had been traced before.\* This analogical argument appears to me to be inconclusive, on account of the defectiveness of parallelism between the *manifestly distinct* prophecies of Daniel and the *only supposed distinct* prophecies of St. John. Who for instance can doubt even momentarily of the complete distinctness of the two visions of *the image* and *the four beasts*, although they plainly treat of *the same four empires*? The one is seen by Nubuchadnezzar; the other, by Daniel himself: hence the line of distinction is so indelibly drawn between them, that we cannot for a moment suppose either that *the feet of the image* belongs to the prophecy of *the four beasts*, or that *the first beast* belongs to the prophecy of *the image*. Much the same remark applies to the three chronological visions seen *all* by Daniel. He beheld that of *the four beasts* in the first year of Belshazzar, that of *the ram and the he-goat*, in the third year of Belshazzar, “*after that which appeared unto him at the first;*” and that of *the things noted in the Scripture of truth*, in the third year of Cyrus.† Thus it is plain, that we can neither doubt *the distinctness* of these visions, nor hesitate *where* to draw the line of distinction between them. But will any one say, that the same positive directions are given us for dividing the Apocalypse into distinct prophecies? The whole is evidently revealed to St. John in *one single* vision, on *one single* Lord’s day, and *in one and the same* isle of Patmos.‡ He does not exhibit himself, like Daniel, as awaking from one vision, and afterwards at a considerable interval of time as beholding another: but he describes himself as seeing the whole *at once*, although the different objects, which passed in review before him, appeared sometimes to be stationed in heaven, sometimes to emerge out of the sea, sometimes to occupy the land, and sometimes to be placed in the wilderness. Such being the case, how can we fairly argue from the distinct visions of Daniel, each of which nearly repeats the same portion of history, that the Apocalypse ought likewise to be divided into distinct visions? And what commentator, who proceeds upon this system, can justly require us to accept *his* particular division of the book; a division, which must be altogether arbitrary because unsanctioned by St. John? If the Apocalypse is

\* P. 197.

† Dan. vii. 1.—viii. 1.—x. 1.

‡ Rev. i. 9, 10.

to be divided (a point which can never be proved, and which indeed the whole structure of the book seems to me to disprove,) how can the Archdeacon pronounce, with even an appearance of certainty, that he has discovered the proper mode of dividing it? When I am told that the first division comprehends *the six first seals*; the second division, *the sixth first trumpets* ushered in by *the seventh seal*; and the third division, *the seven vials* ushered in by *the seventh trumpet*; I feel myself walking on very unstable ground; for, if the Apocalypse be divided at all, it seems unnatural to separate *one seal* and *one trumpet* from their respective fellows. But, even granting that the Apocalypse *ought* to be divided, and further granting that the Archdeacon's division is the right one; it still does not follow, that his *interpretation* ought to be admitted. If *the six first seals* constitute the first series, what right have we to say that the second series, introduced by *the seventh seal*, chronologically commences from *the self same era* as the first? If St. John *himself* had specified the Archdeacon's division, and *told* us that his second vision commenced with *the seventh seal*, as the second historical vision recorded by Daniel commences with *the winged lion*: should we on *that* account have any right to conclude, that St. John's second vision ought to be computed from the same era as his first? Would it not, on the contrary, be more natural to suppose, that, since his first vision was that of *the six seals*, and since his second vision was introduced by *the seventh seal*, the first chronologically *succeeded* the second, instead of *commencing* and *running parallel* with it? In fact, if we once allow the propriety of dividing the Apocalypse, and of supposing that the first division is a sketch of what is more largely predicted under the second division, as the prophecy of *the image* in Daniel is a sketch of the prophecy of *the four beasts*, we seem to preclude the possibility of its ever being satisfactorily explained by an uninspired commentator: for, in this case, *who* is to divide it; and where shall we find any two expositors, that write upon this plan, who will agree in their *mode* of division? There is, for obvious reasons, *no* discrepancy between commentators in determining where each of Daniel's four prophecies both *begins* and *ends*: but can we expect the same freedom from discrepancy, if they attempt to divide the Apocalypse into distinct visions agreeably to the analogy of Daniel's predictions?

On these grounds I feel myself compelled to adhere to the common opinion, that the Apocalypse, with the already mentioned and universally allowed exception of the little book, is *one continued vision*; and, if such an opinion be well founded, since *the septenary of the seals* precedes *the septenary of the trumpets*, and *the septenary of the trumpets* the *septenary of the vials*, each of these *septenaries* must, as Bp. Newton argues, chronologically *precede* the other. Whether we suppose *the last seal* absolutely to *comprehend* as well as to *introduce* the *seven trumpets*, and *the last trumpet* in a similar manner *the seven vials*, is of no great consequence so far as the *chronological* arrangement of the Apocalypse is concerned; though I think there is reason for admitting, with Bp. Newton, the propriety of such a supposition. For what does *the seventh seal* contain, unless we conceive it to contain *the seven trumpets*; and where shall we find *the third woe* announced under *the seventh trumpet*, if we do not find it

under the seven vials, those seven last plagues in which is filled up the wrath of God? But if once we adopt the belief of the continuity and indivisibility of the *Apocalypse* (always excepting the little book) it is plain, that by far the greater part of the Archdeacon's interpretations cannot be admitted, because they are founded upon its non continuity and divisibility.

II. I shall now proceed to offer a few observations on some particular expositions of the Archdeacon, premising that it is not my intention to notice every little matter in which I happen to dissent from him.

1. His exposition of the *first six seals* I of course cannot admit; because extending as it does from the ascension of our Lord to the day of judgment, it seems to me to militate against the whole chronology of the *Apocalypse*. Yet his principle of expounding the four first seals is so very satisfactory, that I cannot but think it highly deserving of serious attention; and, if I mistake not, the Archdeacon himself points out what is probably the right interpretation of them. Till now I never met with any thing satisfactory on the subject: and I forbore to treat of it in my own Dissertation, both on that account, and because it has no connection with the 1260 days to the consideration of which I was peculiarly directing my attention. Hence I merely stated in a note, that I could not believe with Bp. Newton that the rider on the white horse under the first seal could symbolize the age of *Vespasian*, because the homogeneity of the *Apocalypse* required us to suppose him the same as the rider on the white horse described in the 19th chapter. But that rider is plainly the Messiah: whence I inferred with Mede, that the other rider must be the Messiah likewise; and that his going forth conquering and to conquer denoted the rapid propagation of the Gospel in the pure apostolical age. Yet, though I approved of Mede's interpretation of the first seal, I could not but see his inconsistency in referring the three riders in the three succeeding seals to classes of Roman emperors: for homogeneity as the Archdeacon very justly and forcibly argues, requires us to suppose that there must be some degree of analogy, some common bond of connection, between all the four riders and all the four horses under the four first seals. Bp. Newton avoids the inconsistency of Mede, by interpreting the four riders to denote four successive classes of Roman emperors; but then he equally though in a different manner, violates homogeneity by teaching us, that the rider on the white horse in the 19th chapter is Christ, but that the rider on the white horse of the first seal represents the age of *Vespasian*. I entirely agree with the Archdeacon, that the 19th chapter must be our clue for interpreting the four first seals; and consequently, since the first seal must relate to the spiritual victories of Christ in the apostolical age, the three other seals must depict three successive states of the Church. These four periods the Archdeacon does not attempt precisely to divide from each other, observing both truly and beautifully that the progress of corruption was gradual, and that its tints melted into each other like the colours of the rainbow. The first period is that of primitive Christianity: the second is that of internal dissensions leading to bloodshed: the third is that of spiritual bondage and a dearth of religious knowledge: and the fourth is that of persecution. The Archdeacon thinks that the vengeful character of the second seal is.

\* Rev. xv. 1. See Bp. Newton's very able Dissert. on Rev. xv.

to be seen distinctly in the fourth century, though its commencement may be fixed from the end of the second century : that the abuses of *the third seal* did not arrive at their height till the end of the fourth and the beginning of the fifth centuries, though their origin may be traced so early as in the second century : and that the persecution of *the fourth*, though it did not attain its utmost horror till the twelfth century, began in some measure, under the influence of *the second seal*, with the reign of Constantine, increased under that of Theodosius, and seems to have been in positive existence, at least so far as edicts in favour of persecution are concerned, under that of Honorius. The cry of the martyrs, described in *the fifth seal*, he supposes to be the cry of all those who have suffered in the cause of Christ, whether by the instrumentality of pagans or papists. And their cry is at length heard, and produces the opening of *the sixth seal*, which ushers in *the awful day of general retribution*. The Archdeacon argues, and I think with much appearance of reason, that *the rider of the third seal* does not carry a pair of balances (as we read in our common translation,) but a yoke, expressive of that *spiritual bondage*, which commenced indeed in the second century, but was fully matured by the agents of Popery : and, agreeably to this exposition, he conceives the dearth to be, “not a famine of bread nor a thirst of water, but of hearing the words of the Lord.”

Let us now see, whether an interpretation of *the seals* cannot be given, founded upon the Archdeacon’s own principle of *homogeneity*, and yet according with what I believe to be the right chronological arrangement of the Apocalypse.

I am not aware, that we are *necessarily* bound to suppose that each apocalyptic period terminates precisely when another commences. St. John indeed expressly tells us, that *the first woe* ceases before *the second* begins, and that *the second* ceases before *the third* begins : whence we *must* conclude, that the three periods of *the three last trumpets* are not only *successive*, but that each *entirely expires* before the commencement of another. Respecting *the duration* of all the other periods he is totally silent : whence, although we are obliged to suppose them *successive* in point of commencement, it is by no means equally clear that we are obliged to look upon one as *terminated* when another *begins*. As far as induction goes, we may rather infer the contrary : for it seems needless for the Apostle so carefully to inform us, that *each woe* terminates before *its successor* commences, if such were likewise the case with every other apocalyptic period. We may conclude then, that the influence both of each seal and of each vial *probably* extends into the *peculiar* period of its successor.

On these grounds, suppose we say, with the Archdeacon, that *the first seal* represents *the age of primitive christianity* : that *the second* represents *that of fiery zeal without knowledge*, commencing towards “the end of the second century when the western rulers of the Church, and the wise and moderate Irenæus, were seen to interpose and exhort the furious bishop of Rome to cultivate Christian peace,” and extending so far as to include the schism of the Donatists and the bitter fruits of the Arian controversy : and that *the third* represents *that of spiritual bondage and religious dearth*, which began like its predecessor in the second century, but extends

through all the worst periods of popery. Suppose we further say, slightly varying from the Archdeacon, that *the fourth* exhibits to us what may emphatically be termed *the age of persecution*, not indeed of persecution *inflicted by* the Church, but of persecution *suffered by* the Church. This may be conceived to commence about the year 302 or 304 with the dreadful and general persecution of Diocletian. Other persecutions indeed there had been before this; but none either of equal violence or of equal extent, none under which the Church could appear so emphatically subject to the powers of death and hell, none under which the slaughter was so great as to cause *the symbolical horse* to assume a hue pale and livid-green like that of a half putrid corpse.\* The consequences both of all the other persecutions, and we may suppose peculiarly of the Diocletian one, are exhibited to us under *the fifth seal*. St. John beholds the souls of the martyrs under the altar, and hears them crying with a loud voice for the just vengeance of heaven against their persecutors. Their prayer is heard, and is in a measure answered under *the sixth seal*; though it will not be completely answered until the great day of retribution, "until their fellow servants also, and their brethren, that should be killed as they were," in subsequent days of popish bigotry, "should be fulfilled." *The sixth seal* is opened; and, at the very time when the affairs of the Church appear at the lowest ebb, the reign of persecuting paganism is suddenly brought to an end, and christianity is publicly embraced and supported by Constantine. This great revolution is portrayed indeed under images borrowed from *the day of judgment*: but, although the Archdeacon applies *the sixth seal* literally to *the day of judgment itself*, he is too skilful a biblical critic not to know that the very images which it exhibits are repeatedly used by the ancient prophets, and even by our Lord himself, to describe *the fates of empires*. The reason seems in some measure at least to be this; *the downfall of any false religion* or of *any antichristian empire* may be considered as an apt type of *the last day*, when retribution will be fully dealt out to all the enemies of God.†

*The first seal* then exhibits the Church of a spotless white colour, and under the influence of a heavenly rider. *The second* exhibits her of a red colour, and under the influence of a spirit of fiery zeal and internal discord. *The third* exhibits her as changed to black, and beginning to be subjected to a grievous yoke of will-worship, and to experience the horror of a spiritual famine. *The fourth* exhibits her

\* "There were other persecutions before, but this was by far the most considerable, the tenth and last general persecution, which was begun by Diocletian, and continued by others, and lasted longer and extended farther and was sharper and more bloody than any or all preceding; and therefore this was particularly predicted. Eusebius and Lactantius, who were two eye-witnesses, have written large accounts of it. Orosius asserts, that this persecution was longer and more cruel than all the past; for it raged incessantly for ten years by burning the churches, proscribing the innocent, and slaying the martyrs. Sulpicius Severus too describes it as the most bitter persecution, which for ten years together depopulated the people of God; at which time all the world almost was stained with the sacred blood of the martyrs, and was never more exhausted by any wars. So that this became a memorable era to the Christians, under the name of *the era of Diocletian*, or as it is otherwise called, *the era of martyrs*." Bp. Newton's Dissert. on Seal V.

† See Mede, Bp. Newton, and the Archdeacon.

under the last and most dreadful persecution of paganism, as having assumed a livid cadaverous hue, as bestridden by death, and pursued by hell, as experiencing the excision of a fourth part of her members throughout *the whole Apocalyptic earth or the Roman empire*, and we may add as falling into danger of the second death through constrained apostacy. *The fifth* exhibits to us the souls of the martyrs; and represents their blood, like that of Abel, as crying to God for vengeance upon their persecutors. And *the sixth* symbolically describes *the overthrow of paganism and the establishment of Christianity*.

*The seventh seal* introduces *the septenary of the trumpets*. We are now arrived at the days of Constantine: but St. Paul had predicted, that *a great apostacy* should take place, and that a power which he styles *the man of sin* should be revealed, after *he that letted*, or *the Western Roman empire*, had been taken out of the way. In exact accordance with this prophecy of St. Paul, St. John proceeds to describe under *the four first trumpets* the removal of *him that letted*; and then, at the sounding of *the fifth*, the *great apostacy* in both its branches commences in the self-same year, and *the man of sin* is revealed.

Such is the interpretation, which I give of this part of the Apocalypse, and which appears to me to accord better with its probable chronological arrangement than that brought forward by the Archdeacon.

2. After my general objections to the Archdeacon's arrangement, it may be almost superfluous to state, that, if there be any cogency in those objections, his application of *the fifth trumpet* or *the first woe* to the *Gnostics* must be deemed inadmissible. Yet, since he has objected to the common exposition of *this trumpet* as relating to *the rise of Mohammedism and the ravages of the Saracens*, it may be expedient to say a few words on the subject.

The Archdeacon supposes, that *the sixth trumpet* or *the second woe* does not relate exclusively to *the Turks*, as most modern commentators have imagined, but to *all the professors of Mohammedism*, Saracens as well as Turks; and consequently that it begins to sound in *the year 606*, whence *the rise of Mohammedism* is most properly dated. Such an exposition of *the two first woes* does not seem to me to accord with the Archdeacon's own very excellent principle of *homogeneity*. In addition to *the fifth and sixth trumpets* being alike styled *woes*, the prophecies contained under each of them bear a most striking resemblance to each other, insomuch that there is nothing else in the whole Apocalypse that is at all similar either to the one or to the other of them. Yet, besides their being represented as *successive* and as constituting *two distinct woes*, there is a sufficient degree of *difference* between them to shew plainly that they cannot relate precisely to the *same people* and the *same event*. Now, independent of *the Gnostics* not harmonizing with the chronology of the Apocalypse (if there be any force in my general objection,) I cannot but think *homogeneity* violated by referring the one prophecy to *the Gnostics* and the other to *the Mohammedans*. There is a greater difference between *the actions of the Gnostics* and *the actions of the Mohammedans*, than the obvious similarity of the two predictions will warrant; and at the same time there is a less striking resemblance between *their principles*, than the predictions seem to require. *The*

actions of the Gnostics and the actions of the Mohammedans were totally unlike ; and I can see no reason why the principles of the Gnostics should be thought to resemble those of the Mohammedans more than the principles of many other Christian heretics. But, in the case of the Saracens and the Turks, we exactly find at once the required similarity and the required dissimilarity : and, while homogeneity is thus preserved inviolate, the chronology of the Apocalypse (supposing it to be, as I have attempted to prove it to be, *one continued vision*) remains perfectly unbroken. With so much in favour of Mede's interpretation, I cannot feel my faith in it shaken by the Archdeacon's objections. I fully agree with him, that the fallen star of the fifth trumpet cannot mean Mohammed ; but this objection is removed by the interpretation which I have given of it. His three next objections do not seem to me insurmountable. The symbolical darkness of the fifth trumpet I do not conceive to mean the darkness of preceding heresies : it began to issue out of the bottomless pit or hell, when the false prophet retired to the cave of Hera to vent his imposture. I cannot see, why we are bound to conclude that the darkness must extend to the whole christian world, merely because it is said that the sun and the air were darkened ; any more than we ought to suppose the whole natural world darkened, because a great smoke darkened the sun and the air to the inhabitants of a particular country. The regions, in which the Waldenses most flourished, certainly did escape in a remarkable manner the incursions of the Saracens ; and I think, with Bp. Newton, that this escape is a sufficient fulfilment of the prophecy. The fifth objection is invalid, supposing the prediction to relate to the Saracens in particular, and not to the Mohammedans in general. The Saracens indeed subsisted as a nation more than 150 years, just as the Gnostics continued as a sect more than 150 years ; but they subsisted as an unsettled nation, answering to the character of a *woe inflicted by locusts*, exactly 150 years. In the sixth objection there is some weight, but I cannot allow it to counterbalance the arguments in favour of Mede's interpretation. In prophecies avowedly descriptive we not unfrequently meet with a mixture of the literal with the symbolical. Thus, in the final battle of Armageddon, if we compare the description of it with other parallel prophecies, Christ is probably a literal character, the kings of the earth and their armies are certainly literal characters, and the beast is just as certainly a symbolical character. Apply this remark to the Archdeacon's objection, that commentators, in order to refer the fifth trumpet to the Saracens, sometimes expound it literally and sometimes symbolically ; and perhaps it may not be thought wholly unanswerable.\* So again : whatever might have been the state of the Turkish nation before it is mentioned by St. John, it was certainly, immediately before the period of its supposed introduction into the Apocalypse, divided into four sultanies ; and those four sultanies were seated upon the Euphrates : whereas the rise of Mohammedism from the cave of Hera in Arabia can by no ingenuity be transferred to the Euphrates. It is not sufficient to say, that the Saracens were at a subsequent period seated upon the Euphrates : a prophecy relating to the rise of Mohammedism, must commence from Arabia.†

\* P. 249, 250, 251.

† P. 271.



With regard to the propriety of considering *the Saracens and the Turks as woes*, the Archdeacon cannot object to it even according to his own definition of a *woe* :|| for surely *the rapid propagation of Mohammedism by the Saracens, and its establishment by the Turks*, may well be considered as *two heavy woes to the Christian Church* ; especially if we take into the account *the contemporary rise and establishment of the western apostacy*. On the same ground, neither can he object to the interpretation which I have given of *the third woe*, as ushering in *the open developement of French atheism and anarchy*. But I much doubt whether his idea of *the three Apocalyptic woes* be perfectly accurate. They are *woes to "the inhabitants of the earth."*\* But *the inhabitants of the earth* are not *the pure church*, but *the idolatrous inhabitants of the Roman empire*. Accordingly, *all the woes*, supposing *the seven vials* to constitute jointly *the third woe*, are represented as *punishments inflicted both upon the eastern and western Romans*.† The sense, which the Archdeacon affixes to *the Apocalyptic earth*, or (as he sometimes translates the original word) *land*, is irreconcilable with many passages wherein that symbol is introduced :‡ therefore I consider it as untenable. And I think his definition of *the Apocalyptic sea* to be equally untenable, and for the same reason.§

3. The Archdeacon supposes *the woman* described in *the 12th chapter* to denote *the Church*, not merely while christian, but from the very earliest ages ; and he conceives *the man-child* to be *the literal Messiah*, with whom the Church had been travailing in earnest expectation through a long series of years. *The war in heaven* he likewise understands *literally*, and believes it to relate to *the expulsion of Satan and his apostate angels*. Not indeed that he supposes *a battle* to have been actually fought ; but he refers this part of the Apocalypse to the same conflict as that alluded to in Jude 6. and 2 Pet. ii. 4.

It is obvious, that this scheme is liable to much the same objections as those which I have already adduced against the schemes of Mede and Bp. Newton. The whole of the little book, as itself repeatedly testifies, treats of *the 1260 years*. This is so manifest, that all commentators, who depart from such an opinion, are obliged to have recourse to the most arbitrary glosses upon the text. Bp. Newton accordingly asserts, that *the flight of the woman into the wilderness* mentioned in *the 6th verse* is introduced *proleptically*, because it was posterior in point of time to the events which he supposes to be intended by *the war in heaven*. The Archdeacon, in a somewhat similar manner, would throw *the whole of that war* into a *parenthesis*, in order that he may be at liberty to apply it to *the expulsion of the devil and his angels from heaven*. After carefully reading however all that the bishop and the Archdeacon have said in favour of their respective schemes, and after attentively considering the structure of the little book, I cannot think that either *the prolepsis* or *the parenthesis* are at all warranted by the general tenor of the prophecy ; and to myself it certainly appears a complete breach of chronological

|| Pref. p. xvii.

\* Rev. viii. 13. + Rev. ix. 4, 20, 21. vi. 15, 18. xvi. 2, 5, 6, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 17, 19.

‡ Compare the Archdeacon, p. 210, 211. with Rev. xiii. 8, 12, 14. § P. 211.

precision to suppose, that in the very midst of an insulated prediction (severed by the Apostle himself from his larger prediction,) which professes to treat of *the 1260 years*, we should be suddenly carried back either to the age of primitive christianity, the age of Constantine, or a period preceding the very creation of the world. Nor is this the only objection to the Archdeacon's exposition: it contains likewise a violation of *homogeneity*. *The woman* is said to be in *the same heaven as the dragon*. But by *that heaven* the Archdeacon understands *the literal heaven*, out of which the apostate angels were cast. *The woman* therefore must have been in *he literal heaven*. But when was "the Church from the time of Adam"\* down to the present time, whether patriarchal, Levitical, or christian, in *the literal heaven* from which the devil was expelled?

4. I have already mentioned the agreement between the Archdeacon and myself, that *the first apocalyptic beast* is *the Roman empire*, and the same as *Daniel's fourth beast*; not, as some have supposed, *the Papacy*, and the same as *the little horn of Daniel's beast*. The Archdeacon indeed may perhaps be thought by some needlessly to refine on the subject:† yet his opinion of *this beast* is substantially the same as my own. To his remarks however on *the seventh and eighth forms* of Roman government I can by no means subscribe. He conceives *the seventh* to be *the Exarchate of Ravenna*, and *the eighth* (unless I altogether mistake his meaning) to be *a compound of all the Popish sovereigns*, a college (if I may so speak) of all the ten horns.‡ As I have in the body of my work given my reasons very abundantly why I cannot allow *the Exarchate of Ravenna* to be *the seventh head*, I shall confine myself to some observations on the Archdeacon's opinion of *the eighth*. The first objection to it is obviously, that it *confounds* the members of *the beast*, making his *ten horns* the same as his *last head*. The next is, that *this apparently distinct eighth head* is to be one of the *preceding seven*; so that *the beast* has *really* only seven, though he may *seem* upon a superficial view of his history to have eight. With which of his seven predecessors can *this supposed collegiate regal head* be identified? The last is, that *the eighth head of the beast* is represented as something perfectly distinct from the kings seated within his empire, although it manifestly influences their actions. We read, that *the beast* is to go into perdition while subsisting under *his eighth form of government*. Now, if we turn to the passage where his perdition is described, we find him *heading* a confederacy of those very kings whom the Archdeacon conceives jointly to constitute his *last head*.§

5. Though I quite agree with the Archdeacon, that *the little horn of Daniel's fourth beast*, when generally considered, is the same as *the second apocalyptic beast* or *the false prophet*; yet, if we descend to *particulars*, I am unable to assent to his exposition of these kindred symbols. He thinks, that *the second apocalyptic beast* represents *the whole of the great apostacy*; and that his *two horns* denote, one *the Papacy*, and the other *Mohammedism*.|| It is somewhat remarkable, that I had once in the course of my study of the Revelation fallen upon the very same opinion; but it is liable to what appears to

\* P. 315. † See p. 39—335, 421,—425, 436. ‡ P. 431, 432.

§ Rev. xvi. 13, 14, xix. 19.

|| P. 356—374.

myself insuperable objections.—Of *the second apocalyptic beast* strict unity of action is predicated: but it is natural to suppose, that, if his *two horns* had been designed to represent *two such distinct powers* as *Pofery* and *Mohammedism*, a separate set of actions would have been ascribed to each; as there are, for instance, to *the two little horns* described by Daniel, and (what is perhaps more strictly analogical) to *the several horns* and *the little horn* of Daniel's *fourth beast*.—The *second apocalyptic beast* makes his appearance in the little book, which (according to the Archdeacon himself\*) peculiarly relates to “another Antichristian usurpation” as contradistinguished from the *already predicted Mohammedan usurpation*, and of which “the western nations of the Gentiles are to be the object:” surely then, if we would be consistent in our expositions, we cannot expect to find in the little book any mention of *Mohammedism*.—The *second apocalyptic beast* is represented as being *one false prophet*, or (what amounts to the same thing) *one body of personal false prophets*: now, when we consider the nature of what Mede properly terms *the counter elements*† of the Apocalypse, and when we find that the true prophets of God are said to be *two* in number, we can scarcely conceive that the counter-element to the *two* true prophets would have been *one* false prophet, when so fair an opportunity was presented of producing a *perfect counter-element* by exhibiting *two* false prophets, namely *Pofery* and *Mohammedism*: *one* false prophet however is alone mentioned; whence it seems most natural to conclude that *one* power is alone intended.—The power, which *the second beast* exercises under the protection of *the first*, is among other particulars (as the Archdeacon himself allows‡) *idolatrous*; and, if the exposition which Dr. Zouch and myself give of *the image* set up by him be just, it is *idolatrously persecuting*: the disciples of Mohammed have ever warmly protested against idolatry, and have repeatedly charged the Papists with being guilty of it.—The *second beast* is represented as very closely connected with *the first*, and as exercising his authority under his immediate sanction: this perfectly accords with *Pofery*, but by no means so with *Mohammedism*, which has ever been in direct opposition to the *papal Roman empire*, and against which repeated crusades have been undertaken.—The *second beast* is allowed by the Archdeacon to be the same as *the little horn of Daniel's fourth beast*; therefore *the little horn* must, according to his scheme, typify at once both *Pofery* and *Mohammedism*:§ but what is there in the character of this *little horn*, which can reasonably induce us to suppose that it denotes *two entirely distinct religious powers*? All the *other horns* of all the *other beasts* represent each a *single power*: *homogeneity* therefore forbids us to suppose that it alone represents *two*. Its actions equally forbid such a supposition. Like those of the *second apocalyptic beast*, they are strictly the actions of one. The *little horn*, for instance, subverts *three of the other horns*. *Pofery* and *Mohammedism* cannot both subvert the *scif-sam* *three horns*: and, if they had each subverted *three*, then their common symbol *the little horn* would have subverted *six*. But *Mohammedism* never subverted *any three*, and *the little horn* does subvert *three*; therefore *Mohammedism* can have no connection with *the little horn*. The

\* P. 277, 278, 279. † Αντιστοιχα βασιλεια. ‡ P. 350, 351. § P. 350—357.

truth of these observations will yet further appear, if we consider the character of *the mystic apocalyptic harlot*. This character is so strongly drawn, that the Archdeacon cannot but confine it to the *partial apostacy*. Hence, in order to preserve consistency, he is obliged to say, that *the harlot* is not *absolutely* the same as the *second beast* or *the false prophet*, but only as *one of his two horns*.\* Yet, to any unprejudiced reader *the harlot* must appear to perform exactly the same part to *the ten-horned beast* described in the 17th chapter, that *the second beast* does to *the ten-horned beast* in the 13th chapter, and *the little horn* to *the ten-horned beast* in the 7th chapter of *Daniel*. The Archdeacon indeed himself both draws out in three columns the parallelism of *the little horn*, *the second apocalyptic beast*, and *the man of sin*; and elsewhere parallelizes in two columns *the false prophet* or *the second apocalyptic beast* and *the harlot*.† What then can we conclude, but that all three denote *one and the same power*, whatever that may be; and consequently, since *the harlot* and *the man of sin* are exclusively *the papal power*, that *both the others* must be exclusively *the papal power* likewise?‡ Before this subject is altogether dismissed, I must remark, that the Archdeacon has adduced some very forcible arguments to prove that *the second apocalyptic beast* cannot denote, as it hath recently been conjectured, *the infidel democratic power of France*.§ He seems to me likewise to describe most justly *the motives* of the kings in stripping *the harlot*. “This hostility between the kings and the harlot,” says he, “does not seem to proceed from any virtue in them, but from worldly avarice and ambition. They covet her power and her riches; and this change in their conduct seems to take place from the time when they awake from their intoxication. They, who had been the means of exalting the harlot, become the instruments of her fall.”||

The Archdeacon, I am persuaded, will not be offended at the freedom of these remarks. If we be rapidly approaching to *the time of the end*, as there is abundant reason to believe that we are, we certainly ought to redouble our caution in admitting any exposition of prophecy which will not stand the test of the strictest examination. It is by *the running to and fro of many* that *knowledge is increased*: and every person, that attempts to unfold the sacred oracles of God, ought not only to *expect* but to *desire*, that his writings should be even severely scrutinized. He may indeed fairly demand, that he should be treated with *civility*: but, while he deprecates the offensive illiberality of sarcasm and the disgusting coarseness of vulgar scurrility, by some esteemed the very acmé of wit and perfection of criticism, he ought never to shrink from the manly sincerity of calm and dispassionate investigation. I cannot conclude with greater propriety than in the words of the Archdeacon himself. “Truth, in this important research, is, I hope, as it ought to be, my principal concern: and I shall rejoice to see these sacred prophecies truly interpreted, though the correction of my mistakes should lay the foundation of so desirable a superstructure.”¶

\* P. 456, 477.  
self, p. 350, 334.

† P. 354, 473.  
§ P. 363.

‡ See indeed the Archdeacon him-  
|| P. 433.

¶ Pref. p. xx.



## DATE DUE



BS1556 F12 1811

A Dissertation on the prophecies that

relate to the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints



1 1012 00077 6684