



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

N
Here
1833 415

2



6000420601

33.

415.

THREE LETTERS

ON

THE PROPHECIES,

ON

THE TRUE PLACE OF THE SEVENTH SEAL,

THE

INFIDEL INDIVIDUAL ANTICHRIST;

AND

**ANTIOCHUS EPIPHANES AS A SUPPOSED SUBJECT
OF PROPHECY.**

BEING IN CONTINUATION OF EIGHT LETTERS,

PUBLISHED IN 1831.

By **JAMES HATLEY FRERE, Esq.**



“THOUGH THE VISION TARRY, WAIT FOR IT; BECAUSE IT WILL SURELY
COME, IT WILL NOT TARRY.” Habak. chap. ii. ver. 3.

LONDON:

HATCHARD AND SON, PICCADILLY;
SEELEY, FLEET STREET; AND NISBET, BERNERS STREET.

MDCCCXXXIII.

415.

LONDON:
PRINTED BY WILLIAM CLOWES,
14, CHARING CROSS.

CONTENTS.

LETTER IX.

	Page
<i>On the Apocalypse, and the true place of the Opening of the Seventh Seal</i>	1

LETTER X.

<i>On the Prophecies relating to the Infidel individual Antichrist of the last days</i>	10
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----

LETTER XI.

<i>On Antiochus Epiphanes as a supposed subject of Prophecy</i>	30
-----------------------------------------------------------------	----

POSTSCRIPT.

<i>On Dan. xi. 20, as describing Louis XVI.</i>	65
---------------------------------------------------------	----

LETTERS ON PROPHECY,

IN CONTINUATION, &c.

LETTER IX.*

On the Apocalypse, and the true place of the Opening of its Seventh Seal.

SIR—It may afford matter of just surprise, that commentators, in their examination of the Apocalypse, have paid so little attention to the description of it contained in the command of our Lord addressed to the Apostle (Rev. i. 19): “Write the things which thou hast seen, and the things which are, and the things which shall be hereafter;” subsequently explained to be the vision of Christ walking amidst the seven golden candlesticks of chap. i., the epistles to the seven Churches which “*are*” in Asia of chap. ii. & iii., and the things which must be “*hereafter*” commencing at chap. iv. But instead of attending to this clear chronological arrangement of the several successive parts of the book, into the past, the present, and the future or prophetic, it will be found that they generally consider the epistles to the seven Churches of chap. ii. & iii. as reaching far into, or perhaps to the end of time; and the seals, on the other hand, described in chap. vi., as commencing from the earliest period of Christianity; nor is there any one commentator who con-

* This Letter was inserted in “The Christian Herald,” for December 1832, a quarterly publication on Prophecy, edited by an Irish Clergyman of the established church.

siders the epistles as relating to the then present state of the seven Churches, and as written for their support and encouragement during the period of Pagan persecution; and who makes the first seal immediately succeed to them, and introduce the final judgments upon Paganism and Pagan Rome: the revelation of which was also designed to give them an assurance that these persecutions should be speedily avenged.

The universally received opinions relative to the more complex portion of the book which treats of "the things which must be hereafter," are also equally defective; for, as it must be admitted that prophecy is but history anticipated, an historical prophecy unchronologically arranged would be as great a solecism as any ancient or modern history that was so. Yet every commentator who has hitherto written on the Apocalypse, by erroneously understanding the mention of the seventh seal having been opened, which occurs at chap. viii. 1, to be an introduction to the events of that seal, has committed the greatest possible chronological error: embracing in the midst of the seals, and therefore amidst the events of time, the eternal state of the glorified Church, represented by the vision of the palm-bearing multitude before the throne, of the preceding chapter (vii. 9—17); so that no *chronological arrangement* of the Apocalypse has as yet even been proposed, seeing that eternity has thus been universally introduced between the sixth and seventh seals.

The Apocalypse, however, will be found really to consist of three chronological histories, viz.: The seven seals, contained in chap. vi. and vii., concluding with the vision of the eternal state; the seven trumpets, consisting of chap. viii. to x. 7, concluding (like the prophecy of Daniel, chap. xii. 7) with the vision of Christ assuring his Church, by the solemnity of an oath, that he regards their

sufferings and sets bounds to their duration ; and the little opened book (Rev. x. 8, to xiv.), concluding with the great judgment of the treading of the winepress of Armageddon. Again, chap. xvii. to the end of the volume, consists of three explanations, by the interpreting angel, of the three preceding histories, concluded respectively by the three following and other terminating texts, viz. : chap. xix. 9 : " Write—these are the true sayings of God ;" chap. xxi. 5 : " Write—for these words are true and faithful ;" and chap. xxii. 6 : " These sayings are faithful and true." And lastly, the intervening chapters (xv. and xvi.) are an appendix or supplement, containing the last judgments of the vials of wrath, which being common alike to the three main histories, of seals, trumpets, and little opened book, are referred to in each of them, at the place where the events are to be chronologically introduced.

This arrangement, which is strictly chronological, will also be found upon examination to explain all the difficulties and peculiarities of the text. The first which occurs, is, that after six seals have been described in chap. vi. as having been successively opened, each introducing a distinct vision, we find in chap. vii. a perfectly new vision introduced, without the mention of the opening of the only remaining seventh and last seal ; which circumstance is explained by the consideration that the events of this last seal, viz., the seven vials of the wrath of the Lamb poured out upon the Papal nations, being placed in the supplement, as being common to all three main histories, are therefore merely referred to in the series of seals, by the words " the great day of his wrath is come" (Rev. vi. 17). And the events being thus omitted, the opening of the seal is not mentioned, which would otherwise naturally have ushered them in. The vision of the sealing of the 144,000 of the symbolical

tribes of Israel, to preserve them from the judgments of these vials poured out upon the Papal nations, which is here inserted (Rev. vii. 1—8), like the corresponding vision of chap. xv. 1—4, where the same people are represented, is to be considered as a preface to the effusion of these vials; and the vision of the palm-bearing multitude before the throne (Rev. vii. 9—17), which describes the eternal state, follows the vials and concludes the history.

The next circumstance of the text of the Apocalypse calling for explanation, is, that the opening of the seventh seal is mentioned in chap. viii. 1; and that it appears therefore not only to be introduced subsequently to the vision of the eternal state, but also to be divided into eight or nine portions, viz., the silence, and the earthquake, together with the seven trumpets. This peculiarity is consequent upon the foregoing; for the announcement of the opening of the seventh seal having been, as already explained, omitted at chap. vi. 17, (its true chronological place in the series of seals, when the day of wrath, or seven vials of wrath were announced,) there would have been an apparent deficiency in the book if it had been nowhere said that the seventh seal had been opened; the deficiency is therefore supplied in the preface to the trumpet history of chap. viii. 1, which is to be understood as follows:—*And when the revelation of the seven seals had been terminated, by the opening of the seventh and last of them, which seal comprehended the great day of the wrath of the Lamb, or vials of wrath of Rev. xv. xvi., preceded by the vision of the sealing of the 144,000 of the tribes of Israel, and followed by the vision of the palm-bearing multitude, there was a short silence, or pause in the communications made to the Apostle, by the voices of the Cherubim "as the noise of thunder," in the same manner as a pause takes place between two distinct dra-*

matic exhibitions; and at the conclusion of this pause, seven angels are seen by the Apostle, preparing to communicate another revelation, with voices as the sound of a trumpet, the final event of which is set forth in this preface to be "an earthquake." The seventh seal therefore is not here mentioned as having been opened *after* the vision of the eternal state, but previously to it, at Rev. vi. 17, when the day of wrath is announced; and the silence, &c. the earthquake, and the seven trumpets, form no part of the contents of the seventh seal, which are all contained in the previous history, but constitute together a new history, with its proper preface.

The third peculiarity of the Apocalypse, which occurs in the sounding of the trumpets, is similar to that noticed relative to the opening of the seals. For after six trumpets have been successively sounded, in chap. viii. & ix., each introducing a distinct vision, at chap. x., without the announcement of the sounding of the seventh trumpet, another vision is introduced,—of Christ taking possession of the kingdoms of the world, setting his right foot upon the sea, and his left foot on the earth, when his wrath is indicated by a voice as of the roaring of a lion, and seven thunders are heard, which must chronologically be the subdivisions of the seventh and only remaining trumpet; and consequently the same as the seven vials of wrath, which are admitted to be the subdivisions of this trumpet. The reason of the omission of the announcement of the seventh trumpet in this place is, therefore, the same as has been before mentioned with respect to the omission of the announcement of the opening of the seventh seal, at Rev. vi. 17, viz.: because the events common to both are thrown into the supplement of Rev. xv. xvi.; and hence, in order that the events of these thunders or vials may not be twice repeated, the Apostle is also commanded not to write here that which they uttered, but to seal up their words.

The fourth peculiarity of the text, is, that chap. xi. 15, introduces the seventh trumpet into a history perfectly distinct from the trumpets; namely, into that of the little opened book. Which is to be explained in the same way as the circumstance of the introduction of the mention of the opening of the seventh seal into the preface of the trumpet history; for the sounding of the seventh trumpet having been omitted, for the reason stated, where it actually occurred in the trumpet history (at Rev. x. 3), it is here introduced, at its true chronological place, in the history of the little opened book, that this defect of its previous non-announcement may be supplied. Commentators have indeed been always aware that the seventh trumpet, including the seven vials of wrath as referred to by the announcement of Rev. xi. 18—"Thy wrath is come," was introduced "out of its place," or, in the distinct history of the little opened book; but they have never discovered the true cause of this peculiarity; nor that, from the same cause, the same thing is true of the seventh seal; which is also mentioned out of its place (viz. in the preface to the trumpet history); and that it in like manner contains the seven vials of wrath, referred to by that more emphatic announcement of Rev. vi. 17—"The great day of his wrath is come." And from this failure has arisen all the obscurity and uncertainty of interpretation, which has been so much objected against the Apocalypse.

The next peculiarity, unaccounted for by any existing system of interpretation, is the similarity of the texts, Rev. xvii. 1, "And there came 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 Babylon that sitteth upon many waters;" and Rev. xxi. 9—"And there came unto me one of the

seven angels, which had the seven vials full of the seven last plagues, and talked with me, saying, Come hither, I will shew thee the bride, the Lamb's wife." The reason of which repetition is, that the one text introduces the two explanations belonging to the sealed book, or civil history of the Roman Empire, and the other text introduces the explanation of the little opened book, or its ecclesiastical history.

Another obvious peculiarity of the book, also unaccounted for by any existing theory of interpretation, is, the repetition of certain other texts, which, from their character and the office they fulfil, may be called terminating texts. First, between Rev. xix. 8 and 11, where we find the two following: "Write :...These are the true sayings of God;—And I fell at his feet to worship him; and he said unto me, See thou do it not: I am thy fellow-servant." Secondly, between Rev. xxi. 2 and xxi. 9; where are the five following: "Behold, the tabernacle of God is with men, and he will dwell with them,...and God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes" *— "Write: for these words are true and faithful"—"It is done †"—"I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end"—"I will give unto him that is athirst of the fountain of the water of life freely." Thirdly, between Rev. xxii. 2, and the end of the volume; where are the five following: "The throne of God and of the Lamb shall be in it; and his servants shall serve him"—"These sayings are faithful and true"—"And when I had heard and seen, I fell down to worship before the feet of the angel which shewed me these things; then saith he unto me, See thou do it not: for I am thy fellow-servant"—"I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end"—"Whosoever will, let him

* The parallel passage to this occurs at the end of the main history of the western Roman empire, Rev. vii. 15—17.

† This corresponds with the close of the supplementary history, Rev. xvi. 17.

take the water of life freely." The explanation of which circumstance is, that the three distinct explanatory histories of which the latter part of the Apocalypse (chap. xvii. 1, to the end) consists, have their respective terminations marked, and shewn to be contemporary, by the repetition of these peculiar and characteristic texts occurring at the close of each of them.

The last peculiarity I will notice, is, that there are two distinct descriptive visions of the descent of the bride, the Lamb's wife; a brief one, at Rev. xxi. 2; and a more detailed one, commencing at verse 9 of the same chap. and ending at verse 6 of chap. xxii.; and these separated from each other by one set of the terminating texts already mentioned, and by the introductory invitation of the angel (Rev. xxi. 9) to behold a new vision. The reason of which circumstance is, that the first vision occurs in the explanatory history of the trumpets, and the second in the explanatory history of the little opened book.

Having thus shewn that the Apocalypse is strictly chronological; and that there are certain obvious peculiarities in its text, which this theory alone seems adequate to explain; I would observe that those commentators who, following the old system, suppose the place of the opening of the seventh seal to be at Rev. viii. 1, and not at Rev. vi. 17, are clearly bound to give, upon their theory also, some satisfactory explanation of them. But this has never been attempted; in fact, these peculiarities have for the most part remained unnoticed.

In conclusion: as you have done me the favour of inviting my correspondence, I will state that I see no impediment to my supplying you occasionally with such expositions of the various parts of the Apocalypse, as result from this chronological arrangement; provided you will allow me to aim at nothing further in my papers than to

make myself intelligible. In truth, I have a much higher motive to actuate me than could be supplied by desire of literary distinction, even were that within my reach ; for finding, after twenty years, that this my one talent, which, as I must believe, has been committed to me for the benefit of the Church, has been hitherto unproductive ; it becomes of vital importance that it should be made clear that this result has not been owing to any indifference on my part ; but to the apathy of others, to whom I have vainly laboured, during the long period above referred to, to make known the character and meaning of this portion of the sacred volume.

This long and painful trial, however, may perhaps, independently of other advantages, have better qualified me to expound the import of the roll of the prophet Ezekiel, and the little book of St. John, being sweet as honey in the mouth, but bitter in the belly. The revelations, when first made, through the influence of the Spirit of God, to the mind of man, of any truths contained in his holy word, are indeed sweet as honey ; but a long period of bitterness must be expected to succeed, when we attempt to communicate these truths to others.

I am, &c.

London, November, 1832.

LETTER X.

On the Prophecies relating to the Infidel individual Antichrist of the last days.

WHEN many years ago I attempted to shew that the cause of all the obscurity of the Apocalypse was an universal misarrangement, arising from a mistake as to the true place of the opening of the seventh seal; and that this error being corrected, it was really found to consist of three regular chronological prophecies; followed, as it was afterwards made to appear, by their three interpretations;* I had reason to believe that all uncertainty was removed from the subject of prophecy. In the interpretation however of "That which is noted in the Scripture of Truth," Daniel x. to xii., a difficulty has occurred, not arising, as in the case of the Apocalypse, from any defect in our knowledge of the arrangement of the several parts of which it consists; but from some hidden cause which the course of events alone can reveal. I allude to the circumstance of the death of Napoleon the Great, in the year 1821; after he had fulfilled all that is predicted of the Infidel Antichrist of the last days, from Dan. xi. 21 to 39; but before he had fulfilled the latter verses, 40 to 45, which appear to be ascribed to the same individual. Yet a consideration of the perfection of the prophecy, and of the clearness with which all that relates to the past time has been accomplished, will assure us that this obscurity is only temporary; and we have also reason to infer that the period of its removal is now near at hand.

* See pamphlet "On the General Structure of the Apocalypse," with a chart of its text prefixed, chronologically divided and arranged.

The correct general view of this prophecy is, that it has for its main object the history of the Infidel individual Antichrist of the last days; represented also in the Apocalypse, under the symbol of the eighth and last head of the Roman beast, who will be the leader of the nations to their final destruction at the battle of Armageddon: and therefore, its introductory portion, consisting, according to the invariable plan of all the regular prophecies, of the histories of the first great empires, commencing from the time when the prophet wrote, does not, like those of Dan. vii. and viii., (which have as their main objects the long continued apostacies of Popery and Mahometanism,) treat of these empires under the comprehensive symbols of a lion, a bear, a leopard, a ten-horned monster, a ram, or an he-goat, but in reference to its having for its final object an individual king, gives their histories under the form of the lives of those individual sovereigns who successively ruled in them. The history of the Persian empire is limited however to the actions of a single king, Xerxes, of whom it is said that "the fourth (from the time of the prophet) shall be far richer than they all," and that "by his strength, through his riches, he should stir up all against the realm of Grecia." The history of the Grecian empire, on the contrary, contains the actions of every king, beginning with Alexander the Great, its founder, who is represented as a mighty king who should "rule with great dominion, and do according to his will," and whose kingdom should "be divided towards the four winds of heaven, but not to his posterity;" and ending with Antiochus the Great, whose defeat by a Roman General is described, and under whom the divided Grecian empire terminated, then becoming tributary to the Romans. In the history of the Roman empire, as before in that of the Persian, the actions of a single king only are narrated,

Louis XVI., the immediate predecessor of the great object of the prophecy, and here strikingly designated as one who from his exaction of taxes, or financial embarrassments, should cause the glory of his kingdom to pass away; and should himself shortly be destroyed, but not fall as other kings, gloriously, at the head of his armies and in the fury of battle.

The remainder of this chapter, from verse 21 to the end, contains the history of the individual Antichrist; who is first described by the peculiar circumstances attending his rise, and as being one to whom as of inferior origin, and not of the Royal line, or entitled to reign by right of descent, they should not give the honour of the kingdom; but who should obtain it gradually and by artifice. Verses 22 to 28 are occupied by a minute detail of his campaign in Italy in the years 1796 and 1797, which led to the overthrow of the Papal government of Rome, in the year 1798; verses 29 and 30, by his expedition into Egypt; verse 31, by his authorized re-establishment of the Papal religion in France; and verse 32, by his confederacy with the Northern Powers, in the year 1801, against the maritime interests of Protestant Great Britain. The next verses, 33 to 35, are episodical, relating to the sufferings of the Church of Christ on the continent during these wars; and verses 36 to 39 describe him as having in 1804 attained regal authority, exercising such an arbitrary and uncontrolled military sway as to procure for him the surname of *the Great*; and as having, finally, in 1812, nearly the whole continent of Europe at his disposal, to be divided as a reward amongst his relatives and military followers.

The latter verses, 40 to 45, after intimating a certain lapse of time, by the reference there made to "the time of the end," continues the history of, nominally, the same

individual; and the narrative of his expedition through the Holy Land and Egypt to the borders of Libya is given rather with the clearness and minuteness of an historical record of past events, than like a prophecy of those yet future; closing with a description of his fall in the glorious holy mountain of Jerusalem.

The perfection of the construction of this prophecy therefore is, that by each of the histories of the Persian and the Roman empires being limited to the life of a single individual, while at the same time that of the intermediate Grecian empire contains the life of every king who successively reigned, in Macedon, Egypt, and Syria, during its period of about 141 years, there are no greater number of breaks or interruptions in the regular succession of individuals, than two, which must necessarily occur in passing from the history of the Persian to the Grecian, and again from the Grecian to the Roman empire; nevertheless, owing to the extensive omissions which are made on these occasions, passing from Xerxes to Alexander the Great, and from Antiochus the Great to Louis XVI., it is brought into nearly as narrow a compass as are the three preceding prophecies of Dan. ii. vii. and viii. where a single symbol describes an empire under its whole succession of kings.

That the foregoing, which assigns twenty-five verses (21 to 45) to the chief and ultimate subject of the prophecy, is, as far as respects its literal interpretation, a just view of it cannot be doubted, for it would be altogether inconsistent and unreasonable, when, in its introductory portion, no less than ten verses (viz. 10 to 19) are correctly, and by universal consent referred to the life and actions of a single king, Antiochus the Great, that only four (viz. 36 to 39) should, as is the case in the usual modern commentaries, be assigned to its supposed principal object.

Again, it is to be considered that the commencements

and terminations of the reigns of all the kings who are mentioned as preceding the "vile person" are so clearly defined, that no differences of opinion have ever existed concerning them; but let any one, bearing this in mind, read from verse 21 to the end of the chapter, attending to the text alone, and he will not be able to find any place where the history of the "vile person" terminates, until he falls between the seas, in the glorious holy mountain; for the only place where it might possibly be supposed that a new person is introduced is at verse 36, where, though no king has been previously mentioned, it is said "and *the king* shall do according to his will;" but this peculiarity binds it, so far, more closely to Napoleon the Great; for the preceding verses 21 to 32 having, as we have observed, been occupied by an account of his victories as a General in the armies of France, and by his acts as First Consul, he is here introduced into the prophecy, not as a new person, but as the "vile person" in the new regal character which he now assumed.

Perhaps to those who, through diffidence, or from not being conscious that ordinary and common sense is the best qualification for the perusal of prophecy, may hesitate to exercise an independent judgment on such a subject, it may be more satisfactory to know that this direct and simple view of verses 21 to 45, as describing the actions of one individual, was not only followed by the earliest Fathers and by St. Jerome, but was generally held by the Church down to the time of the Reformation; when the Protestants, having discovered that the Papacy was really an Antichristian power, the subject of Dan. vii. and Rev. xiii., misapplied to it, as might naturally be expected, many other prophecies also, with which it had no connexion; and with respect to Dan. xi. discarding altogether the ancient idea (still retained in the Papal

Church) that the Antichrist of the last days should be an individual, they applied verses 21 to 30 exclusively and ultimately to Antiochus Epiphanes, which had before been applied to him by St. Jerome only in a subordinate sense, as being in some measure a type of the individual *Antichrist* of the last days, as Solomon he says was a type of Christ; while they further distorted the remainder of the prophecy by interpreting it of the Pagan persecutions, the Papacy, the Saracens and the Turks. And though succeeding commentators have at length discovered that the Papal Antichrist is not treated of in verses 36 to 39, but the Infidel; they have so far continued to follow the errors of their more immediate predecessors of the Reformed Church as to separate from the general prophecy, and misapply to Antiochus Epiphanes, all that most essential part of it, commencing at verse 21, which contains a minute and chronological narrative of those actions, by which the Infidel individual Antichrist was established in power, or became a king; and which constitutes the principal evidence designed to identify the great object of the whole prophecy.

The death of Napoleon the Great, at a time when verses 40—45 remained as certainly unfulfilled, as verses 21 to 39 had been fulfilled by him, would seem to be fatal to the supposed unity of that part of the prophecy which consists of verses 21—45, were it not that Rev. xvii. 8—11, treating of the past short-lived seventh headship of the Roman empire which was held by Napoleon the Great, and of the future eighth headship to be held by the Antichrist, or the scarlet-coloured beast of the bottomless pit, who will lead the nations to their destruction at the battle of Armageddon, says, that the eighth “is of the seven;” which, taken in its most emphatic sense, would signify, that the seventh and eighth headships would both be held by the same individual, or that there would be such an union

between the two, as would account for their being thus decidedly identified together in this last prophecy of Daniel.

Again, another passage in the prophecy of Rev. xvii. 8—11, describing the Infidel Antichrist in his last manifestation (or ascent as it is termed from the bottomless pit) corresponding to the last of the two distinct divisions of his history as given by Daniel, is stated in the ostensible form of an enigma, or paradox; of which no similar example elsewhere occurs; for the eighth head of the Roman empire, who is also the subject of Dan. xi. 40 to 45, is there denominated "the beast that was, and *is not*, and *yet is*;" and the fact that this form of prophecy is without precedent, may justly lead us to the conclusion that there will be something peculiar and unprecedented in the circumstances of the rise, and in the character of the individual who is the subject of it. I may therefore on this ground also suppose, (at the least for the present, and until the event shall have cleared away all difficulties,) that he will be so united in character and situation with Napoleon the Great, who held the seventh headship of the Roman empire, as to be considered in the prophetic writings as the same individual, though he shall yet *not* be the same. All however that I have really to request is, that an acknowledged difficulty in a portion of the prophecy yet unfulfilled, and of so peculiar a character, may not prejudice the Church against the examination of those parts which have been already fulfilled, or of others where no difficulty exists.

I am the more entitled to claim this temporary indulgence, because, nearly twenty years ago I was enabled to point out, from the study of prophecy, the course of events which, in the political history of the Roman empire, should precede the manifestation of its eighth head; whose appearance will restore light to the subject; and all these previous events, which may be enumerated as follows, have now already occurred, viz. the fall of imperial France (to

be followed hereafter by the tyrannical reigns of imperial Austria, and imperial Rome); fulfilled in the abdication of Buonaparte in April, 1814.—The reverses of France, and the judgment upon it; fulfilled in the victory of Waterloo, and the consequent occupation of that kingdom by the allied armies from 1815 to 1818.—The preparation for the great popular revolution of the seventh apocalyptic vial, by the extensive prevalence of corrupt and disorganizing principles; fulfilled in the preparatory revolutions of Naples, Piedmont, Spain, and Portugal, between 1820 and 1823.—The suppression of these revolutions, that they might break out again under the seventh vial; fulfilled in the successes of the Austrian arms in Italy, in 1821; and by those of the French arms in Spain, in 1823.—The great exhaustion, or else the entire destruction of the Turkish empire; fulfilled, in part, by the revolt of Ali Pacha; by the separation of the Greek provinces; by the war with Russia; and still continuing in the course of fulfilment by the revolt of the Pacha of Egypt.—And lastly, the great Continental revolution of the seventh vial itself; for which preparation had been made, and which began to be fulfilled in France in July 1830: for whenever this last popular revolution shall have proceeded so far as to have divided, according to the prediction, “the great (papal) city into three parts,” or kingdoms, imperial Austria, as I have always said, will be one of these parts, and imperial Rome another; and whatever individual shall then attain the throne of Rome, will necessarily be the expected eighth and last head of the Roman empire; which has remained without a visible or acknowledged head ever since the fall of the short-lived seventh headship in April 1814, and will be the Antichrist of the last days, and the fulfiller of Dan. xi. 40—45.

The young Napoleon, as king of Rome, having himself

shared the brief seventh headship of the Roman empire, seemed qualified in an extraordinary manner, to answer the various conditions of the prophecy of Rev. xvii. 8—11, and thus also to be admitted as the representative of Napoleon the Great in the fulfilment of the concluding portion of the prophecy of Daniel. I never however sought for this, or any solution of my difficulty; conceiving that nothing but the event could possibly afford one; and having already given, I was satisfied, the correct literal interpretation of the prophecy, I waited in perfect confidence as to my future vindication. Often then as his claim to be the substitute for Napoleon the Great was suggested to me by others, on the ground of natural relationship; and obvious as his qualification to represent the combined seventh and eighth headships of the empire, as having been late nominal king of Rome, should have been to one who had formerly taken much pains to prove that headship was always dependant upon sovereignty, nominal or actual, in the metropolis of the empire, this possible mode of the fulfilment of future prophecy did not occur to me till after I had remained for some years subsequent to the event of 1821 in total darkness upon the subject; and then only by a mere accident; his late decease therefore has in no degree affected my original confidence in the final result; which ought never to rest upon apparent probabilities, or possibilities; but upon the certainty of the prophetic word. Neither have I any wish to cancel the observations which I made respecting him as late king of Rome in the new preface written in 1826, prefixed to my Combined View; because, in the uncertainty which must exist as to the mode in which this prophecy will be fulfilled, they may be of future use; and they are necessary besides to justify me for having at all alluded to him; but in my Eight Letters on Prophecy,

(pages 2, 77, and 78,) where I had named him as the future last head of the Roman empire, I have now corrected the passages by substituting the words "the last Antichrist." I should perhaps on the present occasion, as before, have thought it expedient to be entirely silent on the subject of prophecy in general, while so great an obscurity rested on any part of it, but a consideration of the maturity of the times, and our evident approach also to the period of the expected explanation, will prevent me from binding myself again to a similar abstinence.

I beg to observe in conclusion that the only alteration that has ever taken place in my views with respect to this last prophecy of Daniel is, that, in the year 1823, I was led by the course of events to discover, that instead of the eleventh and twelfth chapters forming one continued prophecy, as I and all others who had ever read or written on this portion of the Scriptures had supposed, they constitute a prophecy together with its interpretation, or explanatory portion, given by the attendant angel; which latter commences at chap. xii. 8, with the words "I heard but I understood not; then said I, O my Lord, what shall be the end?" &c. &c. Of which discovery it is not necessary here to explain the great importance; but I have never changed my opinion as to the literal interpretation of Dan. xi. 21 to 45, or considered it otherwise, than as professedly describing throughout the actions of a single individual; whatever anomaly I have latterly been compelled to admit there must be in the fulfilment of the concluding verses of it: and to alter my views now, though the difficulty still exists, would be to me more than a difficulty, it would be an impossibility.

It will then appear that the chronological arrangement of the text (which forms so important a feature in the investigation of the Apocalypse), has, with respect to this

prophecy of Daniel, been limited to the merely pointing out the division which takes place at chap. xii. 8, and is uniformly made, both in Daniel and St. John, between a prophecy itself, and the explanation given of it by an attendant angel.

The investigation of its language has been equally simple, for this is not symbolical, scarcely rising, indeed, above our ordinary figurative language. Thus if the prophecy, predicting the first victories of Buonaparte in the north of Italy, says, "With the arms of a *flood* shall they be overflowed from before him, and shall be broken;" Buonaparte himself, in recounting these victories to his army a few days after they had been achieved, using the very same figure, says, "Soldiers, you have precipitated yourselves like a *torrent* from the summit of the Apennines."

The comparing history with the prophecy so arranged and translated, as far as it has been fulfilled, has been equally satisfactory; for I remember well that when, twenty years ago, I was first engaged upon it, the details were so minute, and the coincidences of the history with the prophecy followed each other in so exact and striking a manner, that I was only led to say to myself, The prophecy runs off like a skein of thread, but what shall I do if it be exhausted before the history is? for it ran off so rapidly that there seemed to be danger of this. The dilemma I had apprehended I found provided for at the 36th verse, for there the prophecy changes from a minute chronological narrative of those acts by which Napoleon was established in power, to a more general description of his character and actions as a king; thus embracing, in that and the three following verses, a long period of time.

Nothing then could have been more simple than has been the investigation of this prophecy as far as it has

been fulfilled ; but the portion which is unfulfilled, and which is only separated from the former part by the intimation that it belongs to a distinct period of time, contained in the words "and *at the time of the end* shall the king of the south push at *him*," we have seen to be involved in mystery, it being impossible to refer the pronoun "him," as it occurs here, to any other antecedent than the king *who did according to his will*, mentioned in the preceding verse 36 ; Napoleon *the Great*, emperor of the French.

Do we seek an elucidation, by referring to contemporary unfulfilled prophecy ? we seek it in vain, for we find the very language in which that of Rev. xvii. is couched to be paradoxical and mysterious.

Again, if we proceed to that more dubious and uncertain attempt of the commentator, the connecting future prophecy with present political appearances, we find the mystery only deepened ; for amongst all the wonders of these extraordinary times ; when in the East we see that empire which has so long been the chief support of the Mahometan apostacy, at length crumbling into ruins ; and Jerusalem, hitherto trodden under foot of it, delivered from its grasp, and apparently about to be transferred to another power ; the prelude perhaps to her final emancipation : and when in the western Roman empire we see the spirit of revolution ready to dissolve all the bonds and connexions of society, and overthrowing every existing institution, bring on its predicted destruction ; and it is thus made evident that all things are so far matured, that Antichrist, in his last manifestation, must ere long be called to the head of the Roman empire ; that he may hereafter lead its nations to their total destruction at the battle of Armageddon ; we find that the individual who, as Antichrist, in his first manifestation, had been the prin-

cipal agent in preparing these changes is departed from the scene, and that there is now an entire deficiency in the Roman empire of any other individual qualified either by personal influence or descent to sustain the character as anticipated alike by the ancient and modern Church.

Here then again is written *mystery*, and while we adore the love and condescension of Christ in making any communication to his Church of his counsels respecting the future, it ought not to be unpleasant to the Christian to learn a lesson of patience and humility whenever, as in the present instance, an impenetrable barrier is placed against his farther inquiries; and I will therefore conclude my duties, as a commentator on this prophecy, by declaring, that, under present circumstances, I conceive the mystery in which the latter verses of it are involved to be so deep, that nothing but ignorance or enthusiasm can venture to offer any solution of it.

I would also vindicate the subject of prophecy by testifying, that painful and discouraging as have been my few attempts to communicate to the Church whatever knowledge of it I may possess, it has of itself ministered to me nothing but satisfaction and delight; and so certain do its results appear to me, that, not even at, or since the death of Buonaparte, (as I desire to record with thankfulness,) has one flitting cloud of doubt or unbelief ever for a moment passed across my mind; and to any, if such there be, who feel a due interest in these divine revelations, I would say, The vision is certain, and the interpretation thereof, as far as it has been fulfilled, is sure; and wait yet but for a little, and that of the future shall be equally so.

London, March 6, 1833.

NOTE I.

In the history of the Roman empire, the actions of a single king only are narrated, Louis XVI., the immediate predecessor of the great object of the prophecy—page 11, line 32.

The literal interpretation of Dan. xi. 20 is as follows:—"Then shall stand up in his own place" or station (*super basi suâ—luculenter constat exprimi sedem alicujus rei firmam cui ipsa innititur.—Geierus, in loc.*) "an exactor of money" (*incitator pecuniæ.—Venema, in loc.*) "causing the glory of the kingdom to pass away" (*transire faciens decus regni.—Venema, in loc.*), "but within few days he shall be destroyed, not in the fury of battle" (*morte peribit infaustâ, quam nulla tamen comitabitur gloria bellica, quomodo alias reges occumbere quandoque solent, fortiter, in irâ justa, dimicando adversus hostes.—Geierus, in loc.*)

NOTE II.

The Infidel Antichrist in his last manifestation, or ascent, as it is termed, from the bottomless pit—page 16, line 4.

In the same manner as, at the French revolution of the year 1792, a first rise of the infidel Beast of the bottomless pit took place, as described in Rev. xi. 7—12, who then made war against the truths of Christ, contained in the witnessings of the two testaments; which war ended in the defeat of the malice of the enemy, and in the exaltation of these two witnesses in the sight of all men,—and as the western Roman empire, soon after it had passed into this its first infidel state, then obtained a head or ruler in the person of Napoleon the Great, emperor of the French. So we are informed by prophecy (Rev. xvii. 8—14) that the result of the second great revolution of the Continent, now about commencing, will be a second ascent of "the beast of the bottomless pit," or a second manifestation and out-pouring of infidelity upon the face of the Roman earth, of a more virulent nature even than the former; for whereas infidelity was then represented as making war only against the revealed truths of the gospel; it is against Christ himself and his saints, on this second occasion, that the rage of the infidel nations is directed; for it is said, "These shall make war with the Lamb;" but their attempts on this occasion also will fail, and they will again "imagine a vain thing," for it is added, "the Lamb shall overcome them." The western Roman empire in this its second infidel state will also as formerly be brought under the rule of an individual, who will be the leader of the confederation against Christ and his saints;

and whom we know from Rev. xvii. 11, will be the last sovereign of Rome. Which prediction I referred to eighteen years ago when I said that Antichrist in his second manifestation, as emperor of Rome, would probably declare himself more decidedly than he had hitherto done as the head and patron of infidelity.

That which we are ignorant of respecting these manifestations is, (as has been before stated,) why Dan. xi. represents the acts of the two successive heads of the infidel western Roman empire as being those of the same individual,—and whether the declaration of Rev. xvii. 11, that the eighth “is of the seven” is to be considered in connection with this peculiarity in the prophecy of Daniel, and as implying also (if it were to be literally understood) a personal identity between the two headships,—and lastly, whether the declaration of Rev. xvii. 8, that the eighth “is not and yet is” should be taken in connection with both the foregoing as implying that this personal identity is not literal nor to be understood according to its obvious meaning, but is to be made out in some indirect and enigmatical manner. The perfection of the subject of prophecy would certainly lead us to connect all these declarations together, and make them all bear upon one point, that of a close connection between the individuals holding the two headships, short only of personal identity.

That the identity implied by the prophecy of Daniel may be satisfied by a mere similarity of character,—That the declaration that the eighth “is of the seven,” may refer to nothing more than the revival of one of the preceding seven titles of headship (viz. the sixth, or imperial) in the person of the future, and last emperor of Rome,—That the declaration that the beast of the bottomless pit, or its eighth head, “is not, and yet is,” may imply only a connection short of identity between the former manifestation of infidelity of the year 1792 and that which is yet future, (not to mention that this last interpretation is at direct variance with the statement that “the beast” here represents “the eighth” sovereign of the empire,) would certainly be altogether a conclusion so lame and impotent, drawn from prophetic terms apparently so connected and pregnant with meaning, although that meaning may be for the present wrapt up in mystery, as to be utterly unsatisfactory and inadmissible.

It is true that the symbol of “the beast of the bottomless pit” sometimes signifies, as in Rev. xi. 7, the infidel western Roman empire, i. e. infidelity manifested throughout the empire; sometimes the sovereign of that empire, as in Rev. xix. 19; and also in the passage before us, Rev. xvii. 11; thus representing sometimes the head of the empire, and sometimes

the empire itself; but this is entirely agreeable to that law by which in common language the head is often used as a synonyme for the whole body; and the correct sense of each passage in which it occurs must, in all such cases, as it easily may, in the instances above referred to, be determined by the context.

NOTE III.

Nearly twenty years ago I was enabled to point out, from the study of prophecy, the course of events which in the political history of the Roman empire should precede the manifestation of its eighth head—page 16, line 29.

The anticipations of events, in the Combined View of the Prophecies here referred to, were as follows:—

1st. *Respecting the fall of imperial France to make way for the tyrannical reigns of imperial Austria and imperial Rome.*

Extract from a Letter dated April 1813—See Combined View, &c. 1st Edit. Preface, page iv.

“ France would not recover from her present state.”—“ The French empire could not be of any very long duration.”

“ France, one of the kingdoms represented by the iron toes of the Great Image—her tyrannical reign under her present ruler*—the future tyrannical reigns of Rome and Austria.”—Do. 1st Edit. 1814, p. 135.

Note * “ The reader is requested to bear in mind that this interpretation of the vision of the Great Image was written while Buonaparte was emperor of France.”—Do. do. do.

2ndly. *Respecting the judgment of the fifth vial upon the kingdom of France.*

Extract from A Combined View, &c. 2nd Edit. published 8 May, 1815.—

See prefixed Chart.

“ Vial 5. Commences 1st March, 1815.”

“ The fifth vial foretells a dreadful retribution on the kingdom of France, which after having been a scourge to other nations, is herself to experience the greatest miseries—and I am disposed to believe that the judgments of this vial are now about to commence.....This note dated 8th April, 1815, printed 18th April, 1815.”—Do. 2nd Edit. 1815, page 111 & 112.

“ The fifth vial, the period of which I apprehend is yet future, is poured out upon ‘ the seat of the Beast’ of the bottomless pit, or of

“ the Infidel Power ; and predicts therefore a dreadful judgment upon the kingdom of France.”—Do. do. page 477.

“ You will drive Buonaparte before you ; you will drive him out of the country.”—*Verbal declaration made, as an interpreter of prophecy, to the Deputy Adjutant General of Artillery of the Duke of Wellington's army, previously to the battle of Waterloo.*—Do. 2nd Edit. 1826. Preface, page iii.

“ I conceive its only effect” (viz. of Buonaparte's return to France) “ will be to bring miseries on that country, answerable to those which she has so long been the means of inflicting upon other countries.”—*Paper on prophecy, put into the hands of the Editor of the Christian Observer, for publication, previously to the battle of Waterloo.*—Do. do. do.

3rdly. *Respecting the fall of the Turkish empire or else a marked judgment upon it.*

Extract from A Combined View, &c. 1st Edit. 1814, page 462.

“ The sixth (vial) is poured out upon the great river Euphrates, and relates to the overthrow and entire removal of the Ottoman empire.”

“ Should the Ottoman empire soon fall, as it is my firm opinion that it will.”—Do. do. do.

“ Or allowing for the exaggeration of prophetic or poetic language, suffer a marked judgment.”—2nd Edit. 1826, page 65.

4thly. *Respecting the extraordinary spread of revolutionary principles.*

Extract from A Combined View, &c. 2nd Edit. 1815, page 112.

“ The sixth vial foretells.....the increase of the influence of Buonaparte, or of his principles in the west, preparatory to his being head of the Roman empire.”

“ All manner of corrupt principles will prosper and thus prepare the way for that event which will once more place ‘the kings of the earth’ under his control ; for it is the beast out of the bottomless pit, who is the eighth, and last, head or ruler of the Roman empire, who leads the armies of the kings of the earth at the great battle of Armageddon.”—Do. 1st Edit. 1814, page 463.

5thly. *Respecting the temporary suppression of these revolutionary manifestations.*

Copy of a paper written, dated and signed by particular desire, and given into the hands of an inquirer on 1st Feb. 1823, when the French were preparing to enter Spain—See Combined View, 2nd Edit. 1826. Preface, page iv.

“ On the same principles on which I formerly thought that the Austrians would succeed against the Neapolitans, I am *bound* to say now (the opinion here given was against the current expectation of the time) that I think the French will succeed in putting down the Spaniards; namely, that the Continent may be so under pressure that there may be ground for the future great revolution of the seventh Apocalyptic vial.”

6thly. *Respecting the breaking forth of the revolution of the seventh vial, and the consequent rise of Antichrist to the throne of Rome.*

Extract from A Combined View, &c. 1st Edit. 1814, page 464.

“ On the pouring out of the seventh vial the second ‘Great Earthquake’ of the Apocalypse will take place—it will be apparently of wider extent than the earthquake of the year 1792.....the great papal continent will then become divided into three great coexistent states, —the eighth head of the Roman empire will now arise, that is Buonaparte will place himself upon the throne of Rome, which, after having been successively the seat of Paganism and Popery, will become the seat of Infidelity.”

“ The convulsions predicted on the first pouring out of the seventh vial will bring to him” (Buonaparte) “ a great accession of power.”—Do. 2nd Edit. 1815, p. 479.

“ The rise of Antichrist in his last form, as eighth head or sovereign of the empire, has always been expected to take place at the pouring out of the seventh vial, the ground of which expectation is that the Papal Roman empire, the Great City of Rev. xvi. 19, then assumes a tripartite division; but it appears, that Rome and Austria will form two of these states, (the third being uncertain,) and it is an unquestionable prophetic truth that whosoever shall become at that time emperor or sovereign of Rome, necessarily thus becomes eighth and last head of the empire, and therefore the Antichrist of the last days, under whom the Roman empire will go into perdition.”—Do. 2nd Edit. 1826, p. 483.

“ How long it may be before this revolution of the seventh vial takes place, which has thus been looked forward to, from the first, as the period of the reappearance, in power, of the infidel Antichrist of the last days, we have no means of deciding, and though all things appear to be nearly *politically* prepared for the last great crisis, yet the unprepared state, even of the spiritual Church of Christ, for the advent of her Lord, and the clear intimations of prophecy, (Rev. xiv. 8 and 9—11, xviii. 1—3 and 4—5,) that she hath yet two great prepa-

“ratory works to perform before the end come, would lead us to expect some delay.”—Do. do. pages 486 & 488.

N.B. The preparatory works of the Church here referred to (as to follow the work of the Bible Society the subject of the preceding verses 6 and 7 of Rev. chap. xiv.) were, first, The going forth of the prophetic word relative to the coming doom of Babylon; fulfilled in the publication of “Babylon foredoomed” and numerous treatises on the prophecies and the approaching coming of Christ in judgment, accompanied by the establishment of Prophetic Societies and the increased study of the subject which commenced in the years 1825 & 1826.—Secondly, The warning voice of the Church addressed to the members of the Roman Catholic communion; fulfilled in the establishment, in the year 1827, of “The Society for promoting the religious principles of the Reformation.”—Thus when all the previous *ecclesiastical* as well as political events foretold in prophecy had taken place, as anticipated, the great popular revolution itself commenced in July, 1830.

In reference to the present period I would observe, that, owing to the greater number of years assigned to the seventh vial of consummation above the other six vials, its events appear to be very gradually unfolded; and the revolution, commenced above two years ago, has not yet extended itself over the kingdoms of the Continent; preparations however for this great catastrophe, and for the complete destruction of the Papal power may still have been making silent progress. In the East the continued action of the sixth vial, the only one which affects that division of the prophetic earth, has been remarkably manifested in the farther dismemberment of the Ottoman empire. In the ecclesiastical history of the western Roman empire, no greater visible progress has been made than in its political history, though the commencement of “the harvest of the earth” appeared to be marked two years ago by the new and peculiar measures agitated in our religious societies, &c.; which first indications of the rise of a spirit of special prayer to Christ for deliverance, and of separation from his enemies, will no doubt in due time be followed by other more decided and unequivocal tokens of a similar character.

NOTE IV.

In the year 1823 I was led, by the course of events, to discover that instead of the eleventh and twelfth chapters of Daniel forming one continued prophecy—they constitute a prophecy together with its interpretation—page 19, line 13.

Having stated in the preceding note the various instances in which I

have correctly interpreted unfulfilled prophecy, I must now confess, that I originally expected all these events to be crowded into a much shorter space, and to take place before the year 1823. The cause of which was that the restoration of the Jews or the termination of the dispersed and scattered condition of that holy people, an event occurring at the close of the period of the seventh vial, is mentioned in Dan. xii. 7, and the announcement of the year 1823, or of the termination of a period of 1290 years from the authorized establishment of the Papacy, follows in verse 11; and from its not being then at all known by any one that the first epoch is stated in the prophecy itself, and the second in the explanation thereof given by the attendant angel, the close of the seventh vial, and the epoch of the year 1823, were considered as mentioned in connection with each other, and as standing in chronological order, and the former was hence necessarily considered as either preceding, or at the latest coinciding with the latter.

It was not, it may be farther observed, till the course of events had led to the adoption of a correct view of Dan. xi. and xii., as consisting of a prophecy followed by its explanation, and partly through the means of that discovery, that the character also of the latter portion of the Apocalypse, chap. xvii. to xxii. as consisting of *three explanations*, by the attendant angel, *of its three preceding distinct prophecies* was also discovered, and the scheme of the general structure of that wonderful book completed. I would now also be equally forward to discover and make known any farther error; entertaining a just confidence, founded alone upon the perfection of the subject which I have undertaken to discuss, that if ever events shall hereafter call upon me to do so, (though this in my estimation is rendered highly improbable by the scheme of prophetic interpretation being now so completed,) it will be upon *intelligible* grounds; and with a result which, as in the former instance, will rather entitle me to the thanks, than expose me to the censure of those who are interested with me in the rational, scientific, and reverential investigation of the Prophetic Scriptures.

LETTER XI.

On the opinions of the Church relative to Antiochus Epiphanes, as a supposed subject of prophecy.

It has been observed in the preceding letter, that the whole narrative of Dan. xi. 21 to 45, was justly understood by the earliest Fathers of the Church to refer alone to the individual Antichrist of the last days; and I propose here, in vindication of this most ancient interpretation, to inquire into the causes which have led to some of these verses, viz. 21 to 30, being now by every commentator considered to relate to Antiochus Epiphanes, king of Syria, an oppressor and persecutor of the Jewish nation: in the course of which inquiry it will appear, that he was at one time supposed to be treated of also in the succeeding verses, 31 to 45 of this chapter, and made the principal subject also of Dan. vii. and viii. until, through the gradual advance of prophetic knowledge, the passages which had been thus misapplied to him came to be correctly referred to the Papal, Mahometan, and Infidel Powers of the present Christian dispensation.

Josephus, who wrote in the first century, in his history of the Antiquities of the Jews, (book x. chap. 14, and book xii. chap. 7.) speaks of the actions of Antiochus Epiphanes, king of Syria, as having been predicted in Dan. chap. viii.; which interpretation appears also to have been adopted by the earliest ecclesiastical writers, while, as St. Jerome informs us, they considered the main subject of Dan. vii. and xi. to be *the individual Antichrist of the last days*, with whose character it should be observed they were more fully

acquainted, than with that of the Papacy or of the Mahometan Power, from the prophecy of Dan. xi. 21 to 45, consisting of a continued and detailed narrative, in which symbolical language is scarcely at all employed, and from their attention also being forcibly directed towards the individual Antichrist, whose manifestation was considered as the appointed signal for the approaching destruction of the world, which, in the early ages of the Church, it was expected would shortly happen.

We find that at a subsequent period a change occurred, and Antiochus Epiphanes was thenceforth considered not only as the subject of Dan. viii. but of Dan. vii. and xi. 21 to 45, also; the occasion of which was as follows:—Porphyry, a Platonic philosopher, and an enemy to Christianity, wrote, as St. Jerome informs us, “his twelfth book against the prophecies of Daniel, asserting that they were not composed by him whose name they bear, but by some one who was in Judea in the time of Antiochus Epiphanes, and that Daniel has not there spoken of future things, but that impostor has described things that were past;” and in support of this theory he advanced, to use the words of St. Jerome, “the calumny that those things which are really predicted, Dan. xi. 21 to 45, concerning Antichrist, and are to take place towards the end of the world, had been already accomplished in Antiochus Epiphanes.”—St. Jerome, however, refutes the assertion of Porphyry by shewing, that although with respect to Dan. xi. as far as to verse 20, there was no disagreement between him and the interpreters of the Christian Church, in order to maintain his application of it, from verse 21 to the end of the chapter, to Antiochus Epiphanes, he had notoriously falsified facts, “dreaming” and stating actions to have been performed by him, “for which he is unable to produce the evidence of any historian,” which charge is also repeated by

other commentators*. St. Jerome therefore himself agrees with the ecclesiastical writers, his predecessors, in considering the whole of this prophecy as relating to the individual Antichrist of the last days, but was yet induced erroneously to admit, to a certain extent, the application of it to Antiochus Epiphanes; observing that, “as Solomon and the rest of the saints were types and forerunners of Christ, so that most wicked king who persecuted the saints and defiled the sanctuary was, it is to be believed, a type of Antichrist;” and hence he applied some passages in a subordinate and typical sense to Antiochus, although he observes generally, and also with respect to particular passages, that it refers ultimately and as to its real object to *the individual Antichrist of the last days*. Thus, after giving the interpretation of verses 22 to 24, as applied by Porphyry to Antiochus Epiphanes, he adds, “But our ecclesiastical writers more correctly and better interpret that *Antichrist* will do these things”—again on verses 25 and 26 he says, “Porphyry interprets this of Antiochus; our ecclesiastical writers, however, according to its higher signification, interpret all as concerning Antichrist”—on verse 27, as applied to Antiochus, he says, “This thing can not be proved by history; wherefore our Church understands all as relating to Antichrist”—on verse 30, “Which will be more completely fulfilled in the time of Antichrist”—again on verse 31, “All which things our Church maintain to have been done as typical of Antichrist”—on verse 32, “Which thing I judge will happen in the times of Antichrist”—on verse 33, “Which no one doubts will come to pass under Antichrist”—on verses 34 and 35, “Our

* “In hoc loco Porphyrius somniat”—“quem ubi legerit nullam potest proferre historiam.”—Hieronymus in Dan. xi. 41 to 45.

“Verum facile est Porphyrium mendacii arguere”—“figmenta sunt hæc Porphyrii.”—Pererius in Daniele, page 872 and 875.

“ writers understand the little help to be under Antichrist” —on verse 36, “ Which indeed we understand concerning “ Antichrist; but Porphyry, and those who follow him, “ consider it to be spoken concerning Antiochus Epiphanes” —on verses 37 to 39, “ The interpretation is more easy as “ applied to Antichrist”—on verses 40 and 41, “ These “ things Porphyry refers to Antiochus, but we to Anti- “ christ”—on verses 44 and 45, “ But our writers thus ex- “ plain the last part of this vision concerning Antichrist.” Geierus also, on Dan. xi. 21—45, observes, that “ as Por- “ phry understood this prophecy as concerning Antiochus “ Epiphanes alone ; so all the ecclesiastical writers previous “ to St. Jerome understood it concerning Antichrist alone ; “ but it was the common opinion of the Fathers, subse- “ quent to St. Jerome, that these things related partly to “ Epiphanes, partly to Antichrist; or that Antichrist was “ shadowed forth in this Epiphanes.” Again, in Pole’s Synopsis, we find it thus stated, “ St. Jerome witnesses that “ all his predecessors thought the prophecy to concern “ Antichrist alone ; but St. Jerome, Theodoret, and others, “ understand it partly concerning Antiochus, as a type, and “ partly concerning Antichrist.”

This method of interpreting the prophecy introduced by St. Jerome, continued unquestioned till the approach of the period of the Reformation, when all those features of cruelty, impiety, and arrogance which are so accurately described in the prophecies of Dan. vii. and Rev. xiii., really relating to the Papal Antichrist, having been exhibited by the Church of Rome, the Reformers (unaware that there were three Antichristian Powers equally the subject of prophecy) applied that term exclusively to the Papacy, affirming that the Antichrist of the last days was not, as had hitherto been supposed, an individual, but a community. Thus Brightman observes, that “ Antichrist should not be any particular

“man*.” So also another Protestant controversialist says, that it appears from 2 Thes. ii. 3, and Dan. vii. 8, &c. “that Antichrist is not simply an individual man, but an order, succession, and establishment of men †.” The Papists, in repelling the charge of Antichristianism thus brought against them, quoted the universal opinion and earliest tradition of the Church, that Antichrist was to be an individual; and this point was in consequence warmly contested between the parties; Cardinal Bellarmin being one of the principal writers on the side of the Papacy, who thus observes, “We differ concerning Antichrist, properly so called, whether he be an individual man; for all Catholics think Antichrist to be some single man; but all the heretics, above quoted, teach that Antichrist, properly so called, is not a single person, but a single throne or tyrannical government, or the apostolical seat of those who preside over the Church ‡.” To the same effect, Aquipontanus, another Catholic writer, says, “Therefore from this and similar passages of sacred scripture, the ancient Fathers gather and conclude the Antichrist concerning whom we now treat, to be one particular and determinate man, as Irenæus, Tertullianus, Hippolytus Martyr, Ambrosius, Chrysostomus, Hieronymus, Augustinus, Hilarius, Theodoretus, Cyrillus Hierosolymitanus, Cyrillus Alexandrinus, Gregorius Magnus, Damascenus, Ephrem Syrus, Prosper, Beda, Haymo, and the rest who have written upon Daniel or the Apocalypse §.” The writers of the Reformed Church now con-

* Refutatio Antichristi quem describit Bellarminus.—Apocalyp. p. 492.

† Disputatio Theologica quod Papa Romanus sit Antichristus ille de quo propheta et Apostoli prædixerunt, autore Georgio Sohn, p. 2.

‡ Bellarminus de Romano Pontifice, lib. iii. cap. 21, p. 345.

§ Confutatio virulentæ disputationis theologicæ, in quâ G. Sohn conatus est docere Pontificem Romanum esse Antichristum a prophetis et Apostolis prædictum, p. 4.—See also “Malvenda de Antichristo,” lib. i. cap. 4.—“Hager de singularitate Antichristi,” &c. &c.

ceived that they recognized the Papacy not only in the prophecies of Dan. vii. and Rev. xiii. where it is really spoken of, but also in Dan. xi. 36 to 39, and Rev. xvii. 8 to 14, which treat of other subjects. But notwithstanding these errors in the interpretation of prophecy, some of the effects of which yet remain, there was this important improvement now introduced, that neither Antiochus Epiphanes, nor the individual Antichrist of the last days, were any longer considered as the subject of Dan. vii. but that chapter was at length correctly referred to its true object, the Antichristian power of the Papacy.

Sir Isaac Newton, some time after this, pointed out that Antiochus Epiphanes, who had for above sixteen hundred years, that is, from the time of Josephus, been considered as the subject of Dan. viii. could not be really described in it. He therefore referred it himself to the Roman Power as established in the East; in which he was followed by Bishop Newton and other commentators. Mr. King, however, in 1788*, and Mr. Whitaker, in 1795, were the first who gave the true interpretation of this chapter, by showing that it accurately describes the character and actions of Mahomet and his successors, and thus completed another important step in the progress of prophetic interpretation.

As the evident manifestation of the Papal Power enabled commentators, at the period of the Reformation, to refer the seventh chapter of Daniel to its right object; so also we find that the revelation of the Infidel power at the period of the French Revolution introduced another important era of prophetic discovery: for Mr. Kett, in his work on the prophecies, published in the year 1799, first brought forward a new interpretation of Dan. xi. 36 to 39, in which he considers Infidelity to be described under the character of the wilful king. There is this fault however in his interpretation, that though he states that there are three Antichrists, (or, as he

* Morsels of Criticism, p. 463 to 502.

was referred by Bishop Newton to so early a period in history as that of the destruction of Jerusalem by the Roman army under Titus, I was discouraged from farther prosecuting the idea, as the chronology of the prophecy did not appear to admit of it; and from the same cause, the dissent of commentators, I was then also led to abandon an opinion I justly entertained, derived from the history of the fall of Jericho, that the plan of the Apccalypse must be that of a double septenary. It was not therefore till many years had elapsed, that is till the year 1813, that having given my attention more decidedly to the subject, and discovered that my original idea respecting the form of the Apocalypse was correct, and having interpreted also the preceding prophecies of Daniel, I again adverted to the 11th chapter, and beginning with my old exposition of the 20th and 21st verses, found, without meeting with a single difficulty, that all from verse 21 to 39, had been regularly fulfilled by Napoleon Buonaparte; and that the text, verse 31, "and arms shall stand on his part," does not, as Bishop Newton and other commentators of the Reformed Church have supposed, first introduce the Roman empire into the prophecy, together with a change in its character from biography to general history, but continues the narrative of the actions of the individual mentioned in the preceding verses, referring to the successes of the "arms" of Buonaparte in the year 1800, commencing with the battle of Marengo, by which, on his return from his Egyptian expedition, he re-established the fallen fortunes of the French nation; and that the next clause, "they shall pollute the sanctuary of strength, and place the abomination that maketh desolate," does not allude, as they have also supposed, to the ensigns of the Roman army under Titus, as being the objects of idolatrous worship, but (as a technical prophetic term for the establishment of idolatry) relates to the formal re-establishment by Buonaparte

after it had been nationally abolished, of the idolatrous Papal religion in France, by the Concordat concluded between him and the Pope, in the year 1800: the same figure of placing the desolating abomination within the sanctuary, occurring again at the close of this prophecy (Dan. xii. 11.) and being there used in connexion with the "time, times, and dividing of a time," and prolonged period of "1260 days" of the same Papal power.

Thus Antiochus Epiphanes having been dismissed by the early writers of the Reformation, of his formerly supposed interest in Dan. vii., and by Sir Isaac Newton followed by King and Whitaker of his supposed interest in Dan. viii., and the earliest commentators of the Reformed Church, as succeeded by Keil and Faber, having in like manner transferred Dan. xi. 31. to 45. to different objects, I was at length led to discover that he was not the real subject of the preceding verses 21. to 30. Nor should their having been so misapplied, create any serious obstacle to the establishment of a more correct interpretation, when the similar opinions which we have seen were once entertained respecting him as the supposed object of these prophecies of Daniel, which describe the other two Antichristian Powers, have already been so entirely done away, as scarcely to have left any vestige of their having ever existed.

An objection has been offered to my interpretation on account of the transition made from Antiochus the Great to the last ages of the world: but this I have already shown constitutes the great beauty and perfection of the prophecy*, exhibiting, to use the words of Whiston, in a similar occasion, the highest possible evidence of "divine art and concurrence:" and I have only further to add, that I was perfectly unaware at the time I gave my own view of verses 21. to 30. that such had been the interpretation of the ancient Church: or when I justified the omission of so many

* See page 25.

kings where the prophecy passes from Antiochus the Great to the present times, by referring to the similar previous omission where it passes from Xerxes to Alexander the Great, that I was only repeating the argument which had been used above 1500 years before by St. Jerome for a similar end. His words are, "Our interpreters consider all these things to be predicted concerning the Antichrist who is to come in the last days; and when this appears to be objected to them, why the prophetic narrative has omitted so many persons from Seleucus (verse 20) to the end of the world, they reply that in the former part of the history where the kings of Persia were treated of, only four kings were introduced after Cyrus, king of the Persians, and many intervening being passed over, it brought us immediately to Alexander the Great, king of Macedon; and that this is the manner of holy writ, not to narrate every thing, but to set forth those things which appear to be of most importance." There is also a striking coincidence between my interpretation and the most ancient one, where, commenting upon those words (verse 39) "he shall divide the land for gain," or for a reward, I have explained it of Buonaparte's having conferred territorial rights, together with corresponding titles of nobility and dotations of land in the countries subdued by him, upon the marshals, generals, and soldiers of his army. St. Jerome having, ages before, anticipated, from the plain language of the prophecy, that "the Antichrist of the last days, shall divide the land amongst his army*."

The error of commentators in universally misapplying Dan. xi. 21—30 to Antiochus Epiphanes has of course arisen from their having been led to continue the prophetic history of the sovereigns of the Grecian empire beyond the 19th verse, where it terminates with the death of Antio-

* "Antichristus terram suo exercitui dividet"—Hieronymus in loc.

thus the Great. But also it is to be ascribed, in some measure, to the deficiency of authentic records concerning his times, which has occasioned the comment of Porphyry, corrupt as it is, to be referred to as a valuable historical document; so that it is observed by Scaliger, that "all we have upon Daniel we owe to St. Jerome, and he "to Porphyry." Others also complain of this deficiency*, which Bishop Newton confirms, when he remarks that "no one historian hath related so many circumstances, "and in such exact order of time, as the prophet hath "foretold them;" and that we are "particularly obliged "to Porphyry and Jerome, who enjoyed the advantage "of having those histories entire, which have since either "in whole or in part been destroyed." Hence it arises that the application of any part of this prophecy by modern commentators to Antiochus, rests chiefly on the authority of a Platonic philosopher, who notoriously falsified historical facts to further his own calumny against Christianity, together with that of one of the Fathers of the Church, who being acknowledged to possess superior means of forming a judgment to any subsequent commentator, does not testify in favour of it, but rather to the contrary, allowing it only in a very inferior and subordinate sense. That it in no way refers to him I shall now endeavour to show on the authority of the few fragments of genuine history which yet remain, though I am aware that I shall attempt at great disadvantage to impugn an interpretation which all have been accustomed to admit on supposed good authority, and with which we have been so long familiar; and that the many objections to it are

* "Insigni laboremus historiæ defectu."—Venema, p. 695.

"Præter illas causas obscuritatis quas communes habet cum cæteris prophetis, etiam "nonnullas habet proprias; siquidem vaticinia ejus multis variarum gentium his-
"toris convoluta sunt quarum perexigua nunc extat notitia, oblitteratis eorum scriptis,
"qui eas historias olim diligenter exposuerant."—Daniel secundum septuaginta.

not likely to be adequately appreciated even when pointed out.

In entering upon this inquiry it should be borne in mind that we are not to be satisfied with merely insulated passages corresponding with insulated events in the life of Antiochus, even if many such could be made out, but that we must attend most especially to the chronological succession of the events, and to the relation which one part of the prophecy bears to another. I have already stated my full conviction that it describes the actions of Napoleon the Great, and I cannot better illustrate the character of the factitious application of it to Antiochus Epiphanes, than by contrasting, in the few remarks which I propose to make, the history of these two individuals.

In verse 21, the preceding king having been described in the context as taken off by a violent and ignominious death, the chief subject of the whole of this prophecy is introduced in the following words: "In his estate shall stand up a vile person, to whom they shall not give the honour of the kingdom, but he shall come in peaceably, and obtain the kingdom by flatteries." By the epithet vile, by which the individual here brought before us is distinguished, his moral character is not intended to be described, but the different clauses of the sentence being taken in connexion with each other, we are directed to look to a person notable for the peculiar manner of his elevation to the throne, as being one who shall not *immediately* obtain it, because from his inferior birth he shall have no natural right or title to it; but who being contented "peaceably" and by degrees to approach the concealed object of his ambition, shall at length succeed through an artful policy, or "by insidious, treacherous dealings*:" consequently it is not till we have arrived at an advanced period in his prophetic history, that is at the 36th verse of this chapter,

* Winkle on Daniel, in. loc.

that he is honoured with the title of king. The true import of this epithet "vile," as denoting inferiority of birth, and not of character, has been especially noticed by Venema, in his work dated A. D. 1752; who, though he upholds the antiquated idea that Antiochus Epiphanes is equally the subject of all the prophecies of Dan. vii., viii., and xi., has written, I should conceive, by far the most laborious, learned, and valuable disquisition extant, respecting him as a subject of prophecy; in which however he does not attempt to maintain the usual interpretation of this first introductory passage as relating to him, but refers it to Heliodorus, a private individual, who endeavoured to obtain the kingdom of Syria, after having destroyed by poison his sovereign Seleucus, the brother and predecessor of Antiochus; and, in support of his opinion that it is by no means personally applicable to Antiochus, adduces the subjoined passage from Appianus, describing the manner of his ascending the throne of Syria. He had been formerly sent by his father, Antiochus the Great, as a hostage to the Romans, by all classes of whom he had been treated, as appears from Livy, more like a king than a hostage; and being reclaimed from them by his elder brother Seleucus, then reigning king of Syria, who had sent his own son Demetrius to be a hostage in his room, "he was on his way home come as far as Athens, when Seleucus was slain by Heliodorus. But Eumenes (king of Pergamus) and Attalus, that they might bind Antiochus to them, being now a little offended at, and jealous of the Romans, drove out Heliodorus, who affected the kingdom, and placed him in possession of it. *He was called by the Syrians Epiphanes, or Illustrious, because strangers usurping the kingdom, he appeared the vindicator of the dominion of his ancestors* *." So that instead of re-

* Appiani liber Syrius, and Howel's History of the World, vol. i. p. 609, or Usher's Annals.

sembling the individual described in the prophecy, as being one to whom they should not give the honour of the kingdom, because he was of inferior birth, Antiochus Epiphanes, the son of Antiochus the Great, and the brother of the late king, was one to whom they did give the kingdom, and with it the surname of "the Illustrious," which afterwards united with the title of divinity was stamped upon his coin; on this account, that being the only one who could lawfully ascend the throne, whilst his nephew Demetrius was forcibly detained as a hostage at Rome, he had been manifested, or shone forth, in his native splendour, as it were a *divine* vindicator of the rights of his royal house, when a stranger had usurped the kingdom*. And had commentators liberty of choice to find out a sovereign, the circumstances attending the commencement of whose reign, as authenticated by history, should present *the most striking contrast* to the description given in the prophecy, a more decided one could not easily have been met with.—On the other hand, in applying it to Napoleon, we find those peculiarities in his situation and character which have distinguished his rise to the throne from that of all his predecessors, to be here most accurately described; who, in his conversations during his captivity, is reported to have made the following observation. "What is most extraordinary, and I believe unparalleled in history is, that I rose from being a *private*

* "Quando Antiochus pronis animis a populo receptus est, successorque declaratus, simul *ἐπιφανής* Epiphanes, illustris seu Deus præsens cognominatus, quod peregrinis regnum usurpantibus, quæ Appiani verba sunt, βασιλεὺς οικίῳ ἀφ᾽ ἑᾶ, ἀντὶ δitionis adsertor exortus suis adluzerit.—Venema, p. 516.

Imo tantum abest, ut ignominioso, ut honorificentissimo titulo fuerit in principio regni condecoratus *ἐπιφανής* Epiphanes a populo dictus, *illustris* non simpliciter, sed quasi *Deus præsens*, qui decus regni a peregrino raptum, reddidit domui regiæ.—Hunc enim esse tituli sensum, intellecto nomine *Διῶν*, dudum docuerunt, et ex nummis illustrarunt, Eruditissimi Viri, Vaillant. Ez. Spanhemius et H. Valesius.—Venema, p. 519.

“*person* to the astonishing height of power I possessed, “without having committed a single crime to obtain it.” Again he says, “*From nothing* I raised myself to be the “most powerful monarch in the world. Europe was at “my feet*.” Or, in other words, he came in peaceably, and obtained the kingdom by an artful policy, exercised for a period of about eight years, during four of which he was only a General in the service of the French Republic; was then elected its First Consul for a limited period of ten years, and then for life; and, finally, was created Emperor; which dignity was made hereditary in his family.

The next verse, 22, “with the arms of a flood shall they “be overflowed from before him and shall be broken; yea “also the Prince of the Covenant,” describes evidently the sudden and overwhelming invasion of some neighbouring country, by this person of inferior birth, where it appears from the use of the term “*they*,” that he will be opposed by allied forces, one of them holding a sacred office, and being therefore called the Prince of the Covenant. This part of the prophecy is referred by Bishop Newton and others to Antiochus’ defeating the forces of Heliodorus, but any such event is a fiction of the imagination, not only unsupported by any historical records, but irreconcilable with such as do exist; for the conspiracy of Heliodorus, it appears, was disconcerted previously to the arrival of Antiochus in Syria, by the voluntary act of Eumenes and Attalus, who thus endeavoured to obtain his favour and alliance against the advancing power of the Romans†; whence Venema, who as a consistent interpreter, considers the whole to the end of the chapter as biographical, ap-

* A Voice from St. Helena, vol. i. p. 250 and 405.

† “Magno deinde Antiocho exempto rebus humanis, Seleucus ejus filius hæres institutus est, qui fratrem Antiochum obsidem apud Romanos, tradito ejus loco Demetrio filio, liberavit. Is cum in patriam reverteretur, et jam Athenis propinquus

plying every passage, as far as to the end of the 39th verse inclusive, to the history of Antiochus Epiphanes, and verse 40 to 45 to his son and successor Antiochus Eupator, unable to find out any event corresponding with this part of the prophecy, meets the difficulty by adopting the novel hypothesis, that his expeditions into Egypt and war with Ptolemy are *twice* related, viz. here in a supposed summary view of his whole reign, extending to the end of verse 24, and again in a supposed more detailed history of it, extending from verse 25 to 39 inclusive; whereas in applying it to Napoleon Buonaparte it predicts, and (as already observed) in the very language in which he has himself spoken of the event, the overwhelming violence with which precipitating himself "like a *torrent* from the summit of the "Apennines," he broke and dissipated the opposing armies of the Emperor of Austria and the King of Sardinia, and *inundated* the plains of Lombardy*, at the commencement of that campaign in Italy in the year 1796, which drew upon him the admiration of the world, and laid the foundation of all his future power.

The Prince of the Covenant, spoken of at the conclusion of this verse, as being involved in the general overthrow, is considered by Bishop Newton and others to be Onias, the high-priest of the Jews, who was deprived of his office by the tyrannical act of Antiochus, and the treachery of his

"*esset, Seleucus ex insidiis Heliodori cujusdam ex suis incaute interficitur. Heliodorum porro regnum suspicere conantem Eumenes et Attalus vi pepulere, Antiocho in regem substituto, cui viro blandiebantur maxime. Ex nonnullis quippe offensionibus jam Romanos suspectos habere ceperant. In hunc modum Antiochus, Antiochi magni filius, Syriæ principatum adeptus est, quod nomen apud Syrios jam pridem insigne fuerat, quod arrepto ab exterris regno, ipse indigena rex habitus est.*"—Appiani Alexandrini Liber Syrius.

* "The new system of military operations practised by Napoleon disconcerted every one. The campaign was scarcely opened, when Lombardy was inundated with troops in every direction, and the French approached Mantua *pêle mèle* with the enemy."—Journal of Count De Las Cases, vol. i. p. 3.

brother Jason, who by a bribe of 360 talents of silver, procured a transfer of the high-priesthood to himself, as related in 2 Mac. iv. 10. Or by some Jason himself is considered to be described, who three years later was, in his turn, deposed by Antiochus, in favour of Menelaus, and, as in the former case, through the influence of a bribe,—see 2 Mac. iv. 23—27; so that he who in the prophecy is represented, in the most direct terms, as a party in a war, and as broken and overwhelmed by the arms of the person of inferior birth, is according to the usual interpretations considered to be one wholly unconcerned in any war, but dispossessed in a time of peace of his *civil* office, through a corrupt influence; and “the league” consequently, mentioned at the beginning of the next verse, is not interpreted of a cessation of hostilities, but of a private negotiation, relative to this mercenary and nefarious transaction, altogether unconnected with military events*; than which certainly nothing can be more arbitrary and unsatisfactory. Other commentators have proposed Demetrius, Antiochus, the Romans, Ptolemy Philopator, Trypho, Judeus Maccabeus, Matthias, or Hyrcanus; so that Venema observes they appear to have adopted “anything that first came to hand, and leave the reader far more uncertain than he was before.” But in reference to the application of this passage to the life of Napoleon Buonaparte, it is to be observed that the Pope, who bore the sacred character of the nominal spiritual head of the Christian Church, and was at the same time a temporal Prince, was most deeply interested in the invasion of Italy during the years 1796 and 1797†, it being one

* “Though Antiochus had *made a league* with Jason the new high-priest.”—Bishop Newton.

† Buonaparte to the Directory—Head Quarters, Tolentino, 10 Ventose (19th Feb. 1797.)—“I shall send you immediately the ten standards which we have taken from the Pope in the different actions we have had with his troops.”—Debrett’s State Papers, vol. vi. p. 49.

of the main objects of the French Directory in undertaking it "to intimidate or annihilate and dethrone the Pope*," whose troops coming into hostile collision with those of Buonaparte, after the armies of the Emperor of Austria and the King of Sardinia had been broken and dispersed, was obliged to purchase by great sacrifices an armistice, (or, as it is termed in the prophecy; a "league,") concluded between the parties on 23d June, 1796.

In verse 24, it is said, "And he shall do that which his fathers have not done, nor his fathers' fathers: he shall scatter among them the prey, and spoil, and riches." Of which prediction Venema is unable in this period of the history of Antiochus to find any satisfactory fulfilment, and therefore with Bishop Newton and others, and by the aid of the hypothesis before alluded to, refers it chiefly to those acts of extravagance which were exhibited by him towards the latter end of his reign. But, referring now to a more correct interpretation of this prophecy, we may observe that the prospect of recruiting their impaired finances from the resources of Italy, is stated to have been one of the chief incentives with the French Directory to its invasion; and it was also the particular boast of Buonaparte, that finding his army destitute of every thing at the beginning of this war, he not only amply provided for its maintenance for two years by the spoils of the conquered country, but moreover sent 30 millions of livres to Paris, for the use of the government; and thus by combining the lust of plunder which influenced the barbarians of the north, in their ancient invasion of the Roman empire, with a degree of skill and science in war which could only have been found in a society in its most advanced state; as well as by the recklessness with which he seized and transferred

* Scott's Life of Napoleon, vol. iii. p. 95.

to the metropolis of France those wonders of art which the triumph of the Roman arms had in still earlier ages brought from Greece, he satisfied the strong language of the prophecy, which says that he shall do in these respects "as his fathers have not done, nor his fathers' fathers."

It is next said of this person of inferior birth, that "he shall forecast his devices against the strong-holds even for a time." Of which marked prophetic event no satisfactory explanation is given in Bishop Newton's commentary, for his looking even to his own strong-holds, to which it is by him principally referred, not only stands on the extremely slender historical evidence of 2 Mac. iv. 21 & 22, but as far as such an act is there implied it was a defensive one, presenting Antiochus to us, not like the subject of the prophecy, as the aggressor; but merely as preparing to resist the claims made upon him by the young king Ptolemy for the restitution of the province of Cœlosyria*; and as to his attempts upon the strong-holds of an enemy which is

* "Eulæus, the eunuch, foster-father of Philometor, and Lomus, governing Egypt, re demanded Cœlosyria from Antiochus Epiphanes, as fraudulently seized upon; which afforded the ground of a war between the uncle and the youth. For the right of Philometor in re-demanding Cœlosyria it was alleged, that Antiochus the Great, father of Epiphanes, against justice and right, first took away Cœlosyria from Ptolemy Epiphanes, father of Philometor, when he was in his nonage; and afterwards restored the same unto him with his daughter Cleopatra, upon the account of her portion. Antiochus Epiphanes on the contrary asserting, that from the time when his father overcame the father of Philometor, at Parium, Cœlosyria was ever subject to the Kings of Syria; and stiffly denying that it was given by his father unto Cleopatra, the mother of Philometor, for her dowry."—Polyb. Legat. 72 & 82. See Usher's Annals.

"Antiochus seeing now clearly the Alexandrians preparing themselves to a war for Cœlosyria, sent Meleager ambassador to Rome, who by his command might declare it to the Senate, and, alleging their confederacy, might say, that against all right he was invaded by Ptolemy."—Ibid. Legat. 71. See do.

"All affirmed that the war was commenced through the default of Eulæus, the eunuch; after that, alleging the kindred and age of Ptolemy, they deprecated the rage of the King Antiochus."—Ibid. Legat. 82. See do.

the event the prophecy describes, they are entirely suppositious and imaginary. And here I may be allowed to remark, as demonstrating at once the little agreement there is between the prophecy and the life of Antiochus, that though the wars of the vile person have been hitherto described in three verses (22 to 24), in all their varieties of circumstances, as first those of overwhelming success—then a temporary truce—next his establishing himself in the conquered country—then his distribution of the spoil—and lastly, his laying siege to the fortified places, the wars of Antiochus were not yet begun; for his invasion of Egypt, which was *the first he was engaged in*, is not supposed by those who apply the prophecy to him, to be spoken of till the 25th verse: and it is this which has given occasion for the theory of Venema, who, meeting the difficulty by supposing the three first verses to contain a summary of the whole actions of his life, considers that its detailed history does really commence with verse 25. His forecasting his devices against the strong holds, mentioned in verse 24, he accordingly refers to his plundering the temples for the sake of their riches during his whole life; but especially to that last act, which immediately preceded his death—his attempt to spoil the temple of Diana at Elymais. But on referring it to the life of Napoleon, and to his campaign in Italy, no such difficulties of interpretation occur, for the reduction of the castle of Milan, and the blockade of Mantua, the latter of which fortresses, from its strength and position, is denominated the key of Italy, the capture or relief of which were the great objects held in view during the remainder of the campaign by the contending armies, and whose eventual surrender was the reward of Buonaparte's various successful battles, occupies here its true chronological place.

Venema observes upon the following verses, 25 and 26,

“ He (viz. the King of the South) “ shall not stand, for
 “ they shall forecast devices against him; yea, they that
 “ feed of the portion of his meat shall destroy him *;
 and his army (viz. that of the vile person †) shall over-
 “ flow, and many (on both sides) shall fall down slain,”
 that commentators, in referring this to Ptolemy, King of
 Egypt, as being defeated by Antiochus, *through the*
treachery of his own counsellors, or of “ those who fed
 “ of the portion of his meat, have not been able to extri-
 “ cate themselves from their difficulties, except by having
 “ recourse to conjectures resting on no foundation, and in
 “ themselves improbable. ‡” But as referred to Buona-
 parte, and the Emperor of Austria, we have, as I have
 stated on a former occasion, the direct evidence of the
 author of the Campaign in Italy, that the “ precious in-
 “ telligence” communicated to the former, by which he
 was enabled to overcome the superior forces of the latter,
 “ was not procured through the means of a common spy,
 “ but from some one whose situation afforded him oppor-
 “ tunities of being well acquainted with the plans formed
 “ by the Austrians §.”

In verse 27, where it is said, “ and both these kings’
 “ hearts shall be to do mischief, and they shall speak lies
 “ at one table, but it shall not prosper, for the end
 “ shall be at the time appointed,” there is in the un-
 sophisticated prophecy a connection between all its parts;
 the two kings will naturally be considered as the allied
 parties, the King of the South and the Prince of the
 Covenant, who are here represented as united in the per-
 nicious and mischievous device to uphold what God had de-

* “ *Authores hujus perfidiæ futuros non ex vulgo homines, sed præcipuos ex*
 “ *Consiliariis.*”—Calvinus in Dan. xi. 26. A.D. 1591.

† *Relativum* ad remotius subjectum referre, nihil habet insoliti.—Venema, p. 573.

‡ *Ibid.* p. 569.

§ History of the Campaign in Italy of the year 1796, p. 331.

creed should, at a time foreordained and appointed, be overthrown through the instrumentality of the vile person ; by which overthrow they should be proved, with respect to their consultations in opposition to the divine purpose, to have spoken but lies, or to have imagined vain things. These two kings are however usually interpreted as being the adverse parties, the vile person and the King of the South, or Antiochus and Ptolemy Philometor king of Egypt, and the circumstance supposed to be described in the prophecy is, that Ptolemy, in consequence of his defeat, having surrendered himself into the hands of Antiochus, the latter pretended to espouse his cause against that of his younger brother, that he might thus profit by their mutual dissensions ; but it may justly be said, that though Antiochus did not eventually prosper, it was otherwise with Ptolemy Philometor ; whose interests were essentially opposed to his ; for he was reconciled to his brother, and reigned afterwards in Egypt in conjunction with him, being himself protected from the designs of Antiochus by the seasonable interposition of the Romans. Neither can any thing be named which, in consequence of this failure in the supposed mutual counsels of Antiochus and Ptolemy, came now to *an appointed end*. But on the other hand, considering the prophecy to relate to these latter days, the parties to these counsels will, according to its more natural construction, be understood to be “ the King of the South,” and the “ Prince of the Covenant ;” or the Emperor of Austria and the Pope ; before spoken of as the allied adversaries of “ the vile person ;” between whom we find accordingly, on referring to history, that, as the last act of this war, a new treaty was formed, to oppose the progress of the arms of Buonaparte, and that the Austrian General Colli was sent to take the command of the Papal forces ; the failure of whose efforts, (and the words of the historian

are "never was mission less successful,") was calculated to bring about the fulfilment of the divine counsels, that the end of the Gentile dispensation, and of the supremacy of Rome, should be at the time appointed: for the forces of the Pope, thus commanded, being defeated and dispersed, he was reduced to entire submission; and subsequently, as the final result of this war, in February, 1798, his temporal power was abolished; a republican form of government, under the protection of France, established at Rome; the Cardinals, deprived of their dignities, were banished; and himself also driven into exile, from which he never lived to return: which first fall of Papal Babylon was altogether an event of so much importance as to be made the subject of the third apocalyptic vial of wrath. Nor was the Papal See re-established in Italy till, on the renewal of the war, and during the absence of Buonaparte in Egypt, the Austrians, by the aid of the Russians, recovered their ascendancy in that country. In the expression, "that the end may be *at the time appointed,*" we may well believe that reference is also made to the sacred period of 7 times 7 times 7 times 7, or 2401 years, commencing B. C. 603*, when, on the first captivity of Judah, the vision relating to the times of the Gentiles, or to the four Gentile monarchies, was shewn to King Nebuchadnezzar, and ending at this very date, A.D. 1798; as well as to the other shorter Gentile period, of 12 times 12 times 12, or 1728 years, commencing A.D. 70, when the Jewish dispensation was entirely abolished by the destruction of Jerusalem, and ending with the commencing abolition of the Gentile dispensation, by the first fall of Papal Rome or Babylon, in this year 1798; which city is now the antagonist of Jerusalem, like the ancient one, from whence it derives its prophetic name. And a still further period of 7 times 7 years

* See marginal date to Dan. ii. 1.

is appointed for the final overthrow of Rome, and the complete termination of the Gentile dispensation, A.D. 1847; when Jerusalem will again become, as previously to her first captivity, the metropolis of the whole world. And it may add weight to this exposition of the phrase to observe, that the time is manifestly appointed for the restoration of the Jews, and the termination of their dispersion and captivity amongst the Gentiles (described under the term of the accomplishing, or finishing, to scatter the power of the holy people), by the oath of our Lord, with which this vision closes, Dan xii. 7; though the precise epoch is not, like the ecclesiastical period of the "time, times, and dividing of a time," there specified; the length of the civil periods being sufficiently defined by their own internal evidence*. It should also be observed that the final restoration of the Jews is intimated to be the chief object of the prophecy by the angel who communicates it to Daniel, when he says, in the introductory vision (chap. x. 14), "Now I am come to make thee understand what shall befall *thy people* in the latter days." Here then we may also say, with respect to the whole passage, and especially to the phrase "*the end shall be at the time appointed,*" that the interesting and satisfactory fulfilment in the person of Napoleon Buonaparte makes more conspicuous the failure in the person of Antiochus.

The next event described in the 29th and 30th verses, is a new expedition towards the south, undertaken by the person of inferior birth, in which he is baffled by the "ships

* See "Theory of Sacred or Perfect Numbers," Combined View, edit. 1826, pages 256 to 270; also Letters No. III. IV. and V. upon the "Civil and Ecclesiastical Prophetic Periods."—The numbers 2401 and 1728 are, the one a square, the other a cube, having respectively as their roots 49 and 12, which are also themselves sacred numbers. We see the *square* combined with the number *twelve* in the 144,000 of Rev. vii. and xiv.—The Holy of Holies in the tabernacle, and in Solomon's temple, and the New Jerusalem of the Apocalypse are, all three, *cubes* of different dimensions, as indicative of the heavenly or most perfect state.

of Chittim." This is referred to ambassadors from Rome peremptorily demanding that Antiochus should give up a second expedition he had undertaken into Egypt, and retire from that country; upon which Venema observes that it is difficult to understand why the *ships* are here mentioned, as Antiochus "was not repulsed by ships, or by "a navy," but by Roman ambassadors; and therefore, though he adopts the interpretation, as being unable to find any other, he is led to suspect some error in the text. But Buonaparte *was* repulsed on his second expedition towards the south, or into Egypt, by "a navy," that of Great Britain, first by the loss of the battle of the Nile, and secondly by his forced retreat from before the walls of St. Jean d' Acre.

The prophecy then goes on to say, "therefore he shall be "grieved, and return, and have indignation against the "Holy Covenant." In the reference of which to Antiochus we may perceive the usual defect of a want of connexion between the several parts of the interpretation; for there is no reason to be given why, being repulsed from Egypt by the Romans, his anger was "*therefore*" excited against the Jewish Nation, the "Holy Covenant" of the ancient dispensation, they being in no way a party to the affront thus offered to him; whereas, when the British nation is understood to be spoken of, called *the Holy Covenant* of the present dispensation, as alone in the period of the divided Roman empire amongst all its ten kingdoms professing nationally the Protestant faith, and hence also in the Apocalypse represented by the analogous symbol of *the twelve sealed tribes of Israel*, there is a plain reason why his anger should be excited against it, on account of his repulse by "the ships of Chittim;" for these will then be seen to be two different designations of the same people, as being at once the most favoured people of any with respect to their

religious privileges, and also the most celebrated maritime nation of the latter days*. It is farther said, that on his return “he shall have intelligence with them that forsake “the Holy Covenant,” which is interpreted of Antiochus’s having intelligence with those *Jews* who forsook the interests of their own nation, some of whom came and invited him to invade Judea †. But which, as referred to these latter days, and to Napoleon Buonaparte, would imply that on his return from his Egyptian expedition, indignant at the repulse he had there met with, he had intelligence and communication with traitors to the *British nation*; upon which I formerly remarked as follows, in my work published in 1814:—“What *intelligence*, communication, or “correspondence Buonaparte had at this time with those “British subjects, who were traitors to their government, “or had forsaken the *Holy Covenant*, (from whom, as we “may suppose, he endeavoured to learn how he might best “work the destruction of England,) is not I believe mentioned in any history; for as the treachery which caused “the overthrow of the armies of the Emperor of Austria “in the year 1796, was chiefly known by its success, and “from Buonaparte’s having availed himself of it; so the “traitorous correspondence here referred to, not having “been attended with any visible result, is perhaps still “undiscovered. We may however well imagine, that as

* The blind infatuation with which, despising our birthright, we are at the present time endeavouring to divest ourselves nationally of our Protestant and Christian character, which has so long been our security, distinguishing us from the rest of the nations of the old Roman empire; and the recent event of the deliverance of Jerusalem from Turkish bondage, constitute two of the most decided tokens of the rapidly advancing maturity of the times; or of the near approach of the awful close of the Gentile dispensation, by the destruction of the whole Roman empire, and restoration of the ancient Israel to their former supremacy.

† “Illi vero ad Antiochum se receperunt, eique supplicarunt ut ipsis ducibus in “Judeam irrumperet.”—Josephus, quoted by Bishop Newton.

“ hatred to England was his principal motive for his undertaking the invasion of Egypt, this passion was not decreased by the result of the expedition, and that, having indignation against the Holy Covenant, he would leave no means untried to effect its destruction. We know that there were English and Irish traitors resident at this time in Paris, as there had been ever since the Revolution, and that delegates had before been expressly sent from Ireland, with whom the Directory had concerted the invasion of that country, which was attempted in the year 1796; and it is therefore possible that it was with some of these characters that Buonaparte now held intercourse, though the transaction, having been secret, is only revealed in scripture*.” This deficiency of historical evidence, relative to a fact of the truth of which I have myself always been as fully convinced from the evidence of this prophecy alone, as I could have been on any ground whatever, is however now supplied; and the circumstance is the more interesting, because it was always my custom, when first engaged in interpreting the prophecies, in order to avoid the influence of preconceived notions, to make out every fact as far as possible from the mere consideration of the text: and thus, examining fulfilled and unfulfilled prophecy precisely on the same principle, it has come to pass that I have by prophecy alone been made acquainted with many events equally in past and future history, of which the foregoing is only one example; but the singularity of this interpretation is, that, relating to a secret transaction, though the event was past, it has hitherto, as if it had related to one future, waited for its confirmation. I am, however, at length happily able to refer to the following passage in a publication which records many of

* Combined View, &c. 1st edit. 1814, p. 391; 2d edit. 1815, p. 408.

Buonaparte's conversations at St. Helena, and which fully establishes the fact of the "intelligence" and communication held by him at this time with the traitors to the British government. "Napoleon (O'Meara states in his narrative) afterwards spoke about Hoche. 'If Hoche had arrived Ireland was lost to you.' 'If Ireland,' added he, 'had sent over honest men to me I would have certainly made an attempt upon it; but I had no confidence in either the integrity or the talents of the Irish leaders that were in France, they could offer no plan, were divided in opinion, and continually quarrelling with each other*.'"

At verse 31, where it is said, "And arms shall stand on his part, and they shall pollute the sanctuary of strength, and place the abomination that maketh desolate;" all modern commentators abandon the history of Antiochus, and the biographical exposition of the prophecy, for a *general history* of the Roman empire; thus opening to themselves a range of near two thousand years, out of which they may select at their pleasure the few events still required to complete their interpretations. I shall not therefore think it necessary to pursue the investigation any farther; but, having already exceeded my proposed limits, and brought my subject to a fair conclusion, and I conceive also sufficiently treated of Antiochus, as a supposed subject of prophecy, I will only in addition quote the valuable observations of Venema, upon the question of this transition, which are applicable alike to the interpretations of Mede, Newton, and all others of the present day. First, he remarks that the word "*arms*," placed here so absolutely, and without any epithet, can never be considered as meaning *the Romans*, except by a most arbitrary and

* A Voice from St. Helena, vol. i. p. 483.

capricious mode of interpretation. Again, that we must necessarily understand the word *his*, where it is said "arms" shall stand on *his* part, to refer to the vile person, who is the subject of the preceding verses, and that the original will not admit of the altered version, "After him arms shall stand up," by which Mede has attempted to favour the transition to the Romans; also that the Romans not only polluted the sanctuary, and placed the abomination that maketh desolate, but laid Jerusalem and the temple level with the ground, and abolished the whole Jewish polity, nothing like which is to be found in these words. And further, that it is evident that, when our Lord warned his disciples, saying, "When therefore ye shall see the abomination of desolation spoken of by Daniel the prophet, stand in the holy place, (whoso readeth let him understand,) then let them which be in Judæa flee into the mountains," he referred not to the abomination of desolation mentioned in Dan. xi. 31, but to that of Dan ix. 27, where that great act of divine judgment, the destruction of Jerusalem, is unquestionably predicted. This will more clearly appear if, for the reading of our text, and "for the overspreading of abominations he shall make it desolate," we substitute the marginal reading, "and upon the battlements shall be the idols of the desolator," which agrees, far better than the other, with the words of our Lord, and with their supposed fulfilment in the planting of the idolatrous ensigns of the Roman army in the neighbourhood of the temple of Jerusalem.

Venema lastly remarks, in opposition to this transition, that there is no ground for quitting at this point the history of Antiochus, which affords the most satisfactory interpretation that can be desired of this portion of the prophecy; and, in truth, it must be confessed that his taking away the daily sacrifice in the temple of Jerusalem, which he dedi-

cated to Jupiter Olympius, placing within it a literal idol, or abomination of desolation—accompanied as this act was by the most cruel persecutions of the Jewish believers, as related in the books of the Maccabees—if the context only would have borne out the interpretation, is an event than which nothing can appear to agree better with the words of the prediction, or to be more worthy to be brought forward as a subject of prophecy. But it is evident that modern commentators, having omitted to pass from the Grecian to the Roman empire, where the history of the former terminates, at verse 19, with the death of Antiochus the Great, are at length led, with great violence, to force a passage where every thing on both sides is the most opposed to it; as Mr. Faber, in his “Dissertation on the “1260 years,” observes, “If the transition be not made “in verse 31, by the introduction of a new appellation, “‘the arms,’ *I see not where it can be made;*” and again, “If therefore the Romans be not brought upon the “stage (at verse 31), *it is not easy to say in what succeeding part of this chronological prediction they are “brought upon it, and in what part Antiochus quits it*.”*

* “Dissertations on the Prophecies relative to the period of the 1260 years,” vol. i. p. 244, 5th edition.

Mr. Faber, in his Sacred Calendar of Prophecy, vol. ii. page 183, justly observes, that this prophecy remarkably “differs from all the preceding visions in the circumstance of its being a plain historical narrative altogether undisguised by symbols or ‘hieroglyphics;” thus correcting his former work, where, leaving with verse 30 the biographical exposition of the text, he introduced the Roman empire under the symbol of “two nervous and mighty human arms,” as referring either to “its two Consuls” or to its two branches, viz. those “of the east and the west.” It has already been explained that this prophecy, having for its great and final object an individual, and being therefore throughout biographical, is necessarily unsymbolical, inasmuch as the lives of the many individuals who are here introduced, and the many circumstances which are detailed respecting each, could not have been readily narrated in the language of symbols; and it may be hoped therefore, that Mr. Faber, now recognizing this peculiarity, will also acknowledge its cause, and hereafter interpret it biographically throughout.

I must take this opportunity of protesting against the manner in which Mr. Faber,

Venema further observes with respect to the latter part of this prophecy, commencing from verse 31, that “commentators not only differ about the subject of it, and the hypothesis upon which it is to be explained, but even those who agree with one another in these points, run into the most opposite opinions as to particular passages.” And it will be found especially that nothing like a satisfactory or established interpretation has, till of late, been given of those important verses 36 to 39, which describe the character usually called the “wilful king,” or the king that shall “do according to his will;” the real meaning of which phrase I have already shown is (as in the preceding verses, 3 and 16, where Alexander, King of Macedon, and the third Antiochus, King of Syria, are spoken of) that he shall be a king distinguished in history by bearing, in reference to his great power, the surname of *the Great*. Mede applies it to the Papacy, and understands his *dividing the land for gain*, as of his appropriating certain kingdoms to certain tutelary saints, viz. “England to St. George, Scotland to St. Andrew, France to St. Denis, Spain to St. James,” &c. Bishop Newton refers it to the same Papal Power bestowing endowments

in his last work, has corrected his former expositions, merely observing thus in his preface to the Sacred Calendar:—“My wish is, that it should be considered as superseding my Dissertations on the Prophecies relative to the period of 1260 years. The individual who possesses not sufficient fortitude to rectify mistakes into which he may once peradventure have been betrayed, ought never to lay his hand upon the volume of prophecy.” These observations, liberal as they appear to be, and falling in exactly as they do with all the prejudices already too much entertained against the subject, on account of its supposed uncertainty, cannot, I am persuaded, but have a tendency greatly to strengthen them; whereas I believe that there are no difficulties in it which can ever call upon a commentator to make alterations on so extensive a scale, unless he has himself produced them by adopting a system fundamentally erroneous; and that, on the contrary, the perfection of the subject demands, and easily admits, that no alteration should ever be made unaccompanied by an explanation of the grounds upon which the former interpretation was given, compared with those upon which the present opinion rests.

of land upon bishops, priests, monks, and ecclesiastical establishments; but these different applications of the passage may be considered to have been superseded in 1806 by that of Mr. Faber, who referred it to "*France*" in its infidel state at the commencement of the revolution of the year 1789, and to the sale by the atheistical republic "of the lands both of the crown, the church, and the nobility, to the partisans of anarchy and atheism*," which interpretation, in its turn, may be considered to have been superseded in 1814 by that given in my "Combined View of the Prophecies," where the division of the land is referred to the act of Napoleon the Great, who divided the subjugated Continent of Europe amongst his relatives, his marshals, generals, and other military followers; for this view of the passage has also been since adopted by Mr. Faber in his Sacred Calendar †. He indeed now defines the Wilful King as "the Roman empire‡," and considers Napoleon in this transaction only as the agent of the empire, or of that Wilful King, whom he first defined as being In-fidel France §," then as being "the infidel *Roman* government of France," or "the revolutionary imperial government, as contradistinguished from the Bourbon regal government which preceded it ||," (or perhaps I ought rather to say that he still combines all these definitions together,) denying however, as he must do, unless he adopt my interpretation

* Dissertation on the Prophecies relating to the 1260 years, vol. i. p. 418.

† "The Roman kingdom now acting under its seventh head (Napoleon Buonaparte) honoured a large, and powerful, and favoured, and privileged army with the spoils of Continental Europe—some became kings, some dukes, and some princes.—Jerome's view of this clause is substantially correct. *Antichristus terram suo exercitui dividet.*"—Antichrist shall divide the land (the Roman earth) amongst his army.—Sacred Calendar of Prophecy, vol. ii. p. 260—262.

‡ "That king," (i. e. the wilful king of Dan. xi. 36 to 39,) "is most undoubtedly the Roman empire."—Ibid. vol. ii. p. 211.

§ Dissertation, &c. vol. i. p. 404.

|| Remarks on the Effusion of the Fifth Apocalyptic Vial, pages 5, 15, and 16.

from the beginning, that Napoleon is personally the Wilful King, i. e. that the prophecy is biographical. Nevertheless, as he now admits that the last act of this Wilful King, described in verse 39, is that of Napoleon the Great, when he divided the kingdoms and lands of Continental Europe amongst the nobles of his court; which must be acknowledged to have been a most notable personal act of his own, and therefore is stated most truly in the prophecy as being the result of "*his own (individual) will;*" and as I have also given, I conceive, sufficient proof that the character first introduced at verse 21 belonged to no other sovereign but Napoleon; and that the acts narrated in that and the subsequent verses were those which he, and none other, has ever performed; and as the prophecy up to that disputed point is universally allowed to be *biographical*, speaking of various sovereigns with respect to their wives, their sons, their daughters, their followers and attendants, their counsellors, their armies, their warlike enterprises, their treaties of peace, their friendships, their enmities, their births, marriages, and deaths,—the intelligent reader who looks for consistency and simplicity of interpretation will, I trust, find no difficulty in dismissing altogether these embarrassing and complicated, or else ever varying definitions; which are all equally opposed to the character of this particular prophecy*; and in recognizing its original and divine simplicity by referring the whole of it, from verse 21 to 39, which immediately succeeds to the histories of Antiochus the Great and Louis XVI., to the individual Napoleon the Great.

Desiring however to limit my observations chiefly to that

* It is in itself a sufficient argument against Mr. Faber's definition of the wilful king, that the divider of the land, and the land which is divided, are both made to be the same, viz. "the Roman empire."—We must call to mind the acknowledged principle that this prophecy is "*a plain historical narrative, altogether undisguised by symbols and hieroglyphics;*" and therefore equally as much as "the land" which is divided is literally *land*, so is "the (wilful) king," who divides it, literally *a king*.

first portion of the prophecy, in which, by treating it as a continued biographical narrative, relating to Antiochus Epiphanes, some degree of consistency is maintained by modern commentators; and to say nothing more at the present time of that complete break-up and failure in their interpretations, which takes place at verse 31; it must be allowed, with respect to this former part, that on comparing it in its genuine import as illustrated by its context, with the actions of Antiochus as authenticated by history, and chronologically considered, no real correspondence whatever has been found between them; and that even where the failure may be less palpable, the degree of plausibility obtained has only been by giving an insulated interpretation of a single passage as entirely detached from its context; a practice never to be acquiesced in. We must also take into consideration the great variety of interpretations which have been given of its several passages by those different commentators who have applied it to Antiochus, as may be more fully ascertained by referring to Venema; whereas, on the other hand, considered as applied to Napoleon the Great, the prophetic narrative is perfectly clear and closely connected throughout; and the fulfilment every where so striking, that the interpretation of each passage can be but one; thus establishing him, beyond the possibility of a doubt, as the true object of the prophecy, by a strength of evidence not to be in the least degree affected even by the deep mystery in which for the present the concluding verses of this chapter are involved.

The subject of this letter were highly important and interesting, even did no difficulty exist in any portion of the chapter to make it particularly desirable that I should prove, in every possible way, the strength of the foundation upon which my interpretation of it rests*. For independently of

* Though I acknowledge that the change of persons which the event has proved must take place at Dan. xi. 40, forms a great difficulty in the exposition of this pro-

this motive, an universal misapplication, during so many centuries, of verses 21 to 45, and latterly of verses 21 to 30, to Antiochus, would demand an investigation, in order to vindicate it from the charge of uncertainty so commonly, and yet so unjustly, brought against all prophecy; whereas I trust that it has been shown, as the result of this examination, that there is no ambiguity or want of precision in it; but that commentators, either living before its fulfilment, have erred from not being furnished with the materials for a more correct exposition, or, if living at a later period, have been led astray by the example of their predecessors. The plausibility also of its factitious exposition, as now generally to be read in those commentaries, where it is supposed to have been fulfilled in the life of Antiochus, is such as to call for inquiry, as being calculated at least to give some countenance to the ancient idea that, although not the principal object of the prophecy, he was yet to be considered as a type of the individual antichrist of the last days who is so; and it was chiefly with a view to satisfy myself respecting this circumstance, that I formerly instituted an inquiry, the result of which I now bring forward with the fullest conviction that there is no legitimate ground or evidence whatever for considering him to be at all treated of in it, neither directly, as is now maintained, nor partially and merely typically, as was held by the earlier commentators.

phesy; or rather, to speak more correctly, though I desire to set it forth as an extraordinary peculiarity in it, which waits for further explanation at the time of its fulfilment, and therefore draw largely, but confidently, upon futurity for the full vindication of my interpretation; yet it is but fair that I should observe, that Venema, though far more particular than his predecessors, who in their changes and transitions violate all the rules and proprieties of interpretation without remorse, makes a change of persons at the very same place, interpreting all from Dan. xi. 21 to 39, of Antiochus Epiphanes, and from verse 40 to 45 of his successor on the throne of Syria, Antiochus Eupator.

June 24th, 1833.

POSTSCRIPT.

I WILL here take the opportunity of noticing an objection offered by Mr. Faber, to my interpretation of Dan. xi. 20, in a pamphlet published by him in 1815, criticising my general views of prophecy, and to which I have not hitherto made any reply. The only way in which a fully satisfactory one could be given was obviously to refer to every objection, without taking upon myself the responsibility of selection. This accordingly was the method I pursued, considering it page by page, and paragraph by paragraph; but I was induced to abandon the intended publication, after I had even put the two first sheets into type, on the ground of the little attention the subject of prophecy then excited, as also of the disproportionate length to which a reply so conducted had necessarily extended itself. The following extract from my unpublished manuscript may however be usefully inserted here, and affords, I believe, a fair specimen of the strength of Mr. Faber's attack, and of the ease with which every part of it may be answered.

In page 57 Mr. Faber denies my right to interpret the 20th verse of Dan. xi. 'Then shall stand up in his estate,' &c., as referring to Louis XVI., because I must necessarily understand *his estate* to mean *his own estate*; the person immediately preceding him in the prophecy being Antiochus the Great. After making some observations to this effect in his text, he subjoins the following note.

“ If I mistake not, Mr. Frere has availed himself of the
“ ambiguity of our English pronoun *his*, which we use both

“ reflectively and demonstratively. At least it is necessary
 “ for his scheme of interpretation, that the phrase *his*
 “ *estate*, in ver. 20, should denote reflectively *his own*
 “ *estate*, but that the very same phrase, in ver. 21, should
 “ mean demonstratively *his* (i. e. the tax-raiser’s) *estate*.
 “ The difference appears more palpably in the Latin. In
 “ order to preserve his system, Mr. Frere must inevitably
 “ translate כִּנּוּ עַל in ver. 20, by ‘*In suo imperio;*’ while
 “ yet he renders the same כִּנּוּ עַל, as it occurs in ver. 21, by
 “ ‘*In ejus imperio.*’ If we may take such liberties as
 “ these, it will not be difficult to make a prophecy speak
 “ what suits us best.”

The objections of Mr. Faber, I conceive, then, resolve themselves into these—First, That I have availed myself of an ambiguity in the English pronoun “*his,*” which does not exist in the original: for if it does exist there, the objection of itself falls to the ground.—Secondly, With respect to the complete phrase, “shall stand up in his estate;” that I have availed myself of a similar ambiguity of our authorized version, which does not exist in the original; interpreting it in ver. 20, of a person standing up in *his own* place or estate, and in ver. 21, of one standing up *in the place of his predecessor.*—Thirdly, That, this ambiguity being unauthorized, but yet essential to my interpretation, I cannot apply ver. 20 to Louis XVI. And then Mr. Faber rightly observes, “If the tax-gatherer cannot be Louis, neither can the vile person be Buonaparte; and if the vile person cannot be Buonaparte, then neither can Lord Nelson be Admiral of the ships of Chittim. In short, all the prophecy which has been so strangely misapplied to Louis; and the early campaigns of Buonaparte must be restored to those” (viz. Jason, &c.) “to whom it has been so rightly applied by Bishop Newton.”

With respect to the first objection, as there is but a

single word in the Hebrew for *his*, and *his own*, the pronominal affix ך, the ambiguity is the same in the original as in the English; and I have clearly on this occasion taken no other "liberty" than all the Fathers of the Church, the venerable Reformers, have necessarily done, who, translating the single Hebrew affix ך "his," understand it reflectively or demonstratively, as the context may require. Not to go far for an instance, where it is used reflectively for "*his own*," the sense required for my interpretation of Dan. xi. 20, we refer to ver. 36 of this chapter, where it is said, "The king shall do according to *his* will;" in which passage it is obviously "*his own* will" that is spoken of.

Whether the complete phrase, translated "Then shall stand up in his estate," can ever be properly considered as describing, in the original, the succession of one individual to the estate or place of another, may admit of a question, which our version leaves undecided. That it may properly describe a person appearing in *his own* estate, or appointed place, is undoubted. The literal translation is, "Then shall stand up upon his base," which Wintle, in his work upon Daniel, translates in the same manner as I have respectively understood the passages in my Combined View, viz. Dan. xi. 20, he renders "*Then shall stand up upon his base, or bottom;*" and the next verse, 21, he translates, "*Then shall succeed him* a contemptible person, on whom they shall not confer the royal dignity, but he shall come in privily and secure the kingdom by flatteries;" adding the following observation: "I have varied the expression, lest the repetition should sound harsh or offensive, though I wished to retain it *in the first instance, as expressive of the literal sense of the Hebrew* *."

Geierus, admitting *only* the literal sense of the Hebrew,

* Wintle on Daniel, pp. 43, 44, & 180.

invariably translates the phrase thus "super basi *sua*," i. e. on *his own* base. He observes that the original word בַּסֵּבֶל , where it occurs in the book of Exodus, chap. xxx. 18, 28, xxxi. 9; xxxv. 16, &c., describes *the foot* of the brazen laver which was placed at the entrance of the tabernacle for the priests to wash in; and as the brazen laver must stand on *his own foot or base*, the example would authorize us to translate the passage in dispute "Then shall stand up upon *his own foot, or base*, a Raiser of Taxes," &c. The other passages he points out are, Gen. xl. 13, xli. 13, where the word is used as relating to the "place" or "office" of the chief butler of Pharaoh: "Yet within three days shall Pharaoh lift up thine head, and restore thee unto *thy place*;" again, "Me he restored unto *mine office*." Where, in like manner, the example would authorize us to translate the passage under consideration, "Then shall stand up in *his own place, or office*, a Raiser of Taxes," &c. The word occurs also four times in the prophecy of Dan. xi., viz. in verses 7, 20, 21, & 38; in the first instance it describes Ptolemy Euergetes ascending the throne of Egypt, where Geierus interprets the passage, "constitutus super basi *sua*:" that is, that Ptolemy was "established upon *his own* base," or stood up in *his own* estate; and he observes that the *precise* meaning of the word, which is here, as in other places in our version, "accurately enough translated 'estate,' is *the firm seat of any thing upon which it rests*." In verse 20, the passage now immediately under discussion, he again gives the translation "in loco *suo*," in *his own* place, and refers to his former observations on verse 7, where he had already stated that everywhere throughout this chapter the phrase means *his own base or estate*. At verse 38, "In his estate shall he honour the God of Forces," he again translates it "super *sede sua*," "upon *his own* seat;" and observes on this

occasion, that in verses 7, 20, & 21, this phrase designates “ the royal station in which any king fixes his seat ;” and that these texts, where the Hebrew phrase occurs, “ sufficiently refute the opinion of Cardinal Bellarmin, who, “ strengthening himself by the authority of the Latin “ version of Theodoretus, would have it to be equivalent “ to the Latin phrase ‘ in loco,’—‘ in the place of ;’ which “ no one in the least skilled in the Hebrew language can “ fail to see is quite irregular, for it does not appear in “ any instance that the phrase על כנו ‘ in his estate,’ ever “ means, in the place or turn of another, as Maldona- “ tus contends [with sufficient audacity.” Venema also confirms the statement of Geierus, so far as to affirm that “ it never denotes a successor, or one who stands up in the “ place of another *.”

Mr. Faber, therefore, instead of calling upon me to give up my interpretation of the last prophecy of Daniel, from ver. 20 downward, because I cannot of course interpret “ then shall stand up in his estate,” as implying that Louis XVI. was the successor to the estate, or stood up in the place of Antiochus the Great, but must understand it that Louis XVI. stood up in *his own* estate, would, if deference is to be paid to the opinion of those commentators who appear to have given the most attention to the critical examination of the phrase, perhaps do well to *reject every other* meaning of it than that which my interpretation of the prophecy here requires.

Lastly, Mr. Faber's representation that the liberty of interpreting the phrase in two different ways, in verses 20 and 21, is “ necessary” for my application of the prophecy to Louis XVI. and Napoleon Buonaparte, is obviously erroneous ; as the reader is perfectly free, as far as this is concerned, either with Wintle, to read ver. 20, (as I have also

* “ Non successorem designat.”—Venema, p. 506.

done in my Combined View,) “ *Then shall stand up upon his base,*” or arise, a Raiser of Taxes, (Louis XVI.), and next to read ver. 21, “ *Then shall succeed him a vile person,*” (Napoleon Buonaparte). Or otherwise, submitting to the authority of Geierus and Venema, (who, with Wintle, are the only commentators I have met with who at all discuss the point,) to render the phrase alike in both places, viz. (verse “ 20,) *Then shall arise a Raiser of Taxes, causing the glory of the kingdom to pass away; but he shall suddenly be destroyed, not in the heat of battle;*” And (verse 21,) “ *Then shall arise a person of ignoble birth, to whom they shall not give the honour of the kingdom, but he shall come in quietly and obtain the kingdom by insidious dealings.*”

I will conclude by subjoining some historical extracts relative to the causes which produced the French Revolution of the year 1792, calculated to illustrate the propriety with which Louis XVI. is designated as a sovereign who, in the character of a “ *Raiser (or Exactor) of taxes, should cause the glory of his kingdom to pass away.*”

“ The event which immediately led to the French Revolution, was the discovery in the year 1787, that the annual produce of the French finances fell short of the annual expenditure by forty French millions, or three millions two hundred thousand pounds of our money*.”

“ The *tax on salt*, one of the great pretexts for the Revolution †.”

“ *The finances are so intimately connected with the destiny of empires, and so many interests depend upon them, that their situation is the first object to which statesmen*

* Butler's *Revolutions of the Germanic Empire*, p. 196.

† The Times, 20th April, 1816.

and individuals turn their attention. *The origin of our troubles proceeded from financial derangements*.*"

"But it was owing to a secondary cause that the American War became instrumental to the Revolution. It involved the Crown in such difficulties and distresses, as compelled it at length, of necessity, to throw itself for support upon the people; thereby affording them such an opportunity for speaking, thinking, and acting freely, as (excepting the licentiousness of the civil wars) three centuries had not before shown to France. †"

"Mr. Necker was displaced in May, 1781; and by the ill management of the finances afterwards, during the extravagant administration of M. Calonne, the revenue of France, which was nearly twenty-four millions sterling per year, was become unequal to the expenditure, not because the revenue had decreased, but because the expenses had increased; and this was the circumstance the nation laid hold of to bring forward a revolution."

"It will be necessary here to show how taxes were formerly raised in France: the king, or rather the court or ministry, acting under the use of that name, framed the edicts for taxes at their own discretion, and sent them to the parliament to be registered, for till they were registered by parliament they were not operative. Disputes had long existed between the court and the parliament with respect to the extent of the parliament's authority on this head. The court insisted that the authority of parliament went no farther than to remonstrate, or show reasons against the tax, reserving to itself the right of determining whether

* Speech of Count Corvetto, on presenting a plan for the budget to the French Chamber of Deputies, on the 14th Nov. 1816.

† Dodsley's Annual Register, 1787, p. 176.

the reasons were well or ill founded, and in consequence either to withdraw the edict as a matter of choice, or to order it to be enregistered as a matter of authority. The parliaments, on their part, insisted that they had not only a right to remonstrate, but to reject; and on this ground they were always supported by the nation."

"M. Calonne, who wanted money, as he knew the sturdy disposition of the parliament with respect to new taxes, ingeniously sought either to approach them by a more gentle means than that of direct authority, or to get over their heads by a manœuvre, and for this purpose he revived the project of assembling a body of men from the several provinces under the title of an "assembly of the Notables," or men of note, who met in 1787, and who were either to recommend taxes to the parliaments, or to act as a parliament themselves. *We are to view this as the first practical step towards the Revolution.*"

"The plan of those who had a constitution in view was to contend with the Court on the ground of taxes. In a debate on this subject, M. de la Fayette said, that raising money by taxes could only be done by a national assembly freely elected by the people, and acting as their representative."

"As one of the plans had failed, that of getting the assembly (of Notables) to act as a parliament, the other came in view, viz. that of recommending. On this subject the assembly agreed to recommend two new taxes to be enregistered by the parliament, the one a stamp tax, and the other a territorial tax, or sort of land-tax: the two have been estimated at about five millions sterling per annum."

"The assembly of Notables having broken up, the new minister* sent the edicts for the two new taxes recommended by the assembly to the parliaments to be enregistered. They

* Brienne, Archbishop of Toulouse, afterwards, in 1788, promoted to the archbishopric of Sens.

of course came first before the parliament of Paris, who returned for answer, That with such a revenue as the nation then supported, the name of taxes ought not to be mentioned but for the purpose of reducing them, and threw both the edicts out."

"On this refusal the parliament was ordered to Versailles; where, in the usual form, *the king held what under the old government was called a Bed of Justice*, and the two edicts were enregistered in presence of the parliament by an order of state. On this the parliament immediately returned to Paris, renewed their session in form, and ordered the enregistering to be struck out, declaring that everything done at Versailles was illegal. All the members of parliament were then served with lettres de Cachet, and exiled to Troyes; but as they continued as inflexible in exile as before, and as vengeance did not supply the place of taxes, they were after a short time recalled to Paris*."

"An extraordinary full meeting of the parliament was held on Nov. 19, 1787, attended by all the princes of the blood, great officers of state, and peers of France. The king arrived at nine o'clock in the morning at the *Palais* in Paris, where that body were assembled. He brought with him two edicts to be registered by the parliament, the one being for a new loan to the amount of 450 million of livres, or near nineteen millions of pounds in English money. The monarch opened the way for his edicts by a speech of unusual length, &c.—he then proceeded to explain the nature of the loan he demanded, and to point out the advantages it possessed above others, and show its necessity; and then, returning to the tone of authority in which he set out, declared that his parliament ought to reckon upon his confidence and affection, but they ought likewise to merit them, &c. &c. Permission

* A Comparative Display of the different opinions of the most distinguished British writers on the subject of the French Revolution, vol. i., pages 4, 85, 87, 88, and 91.

being then announced for every member of the assembly to deliver his sentiments without restraint, a very warm debate commenced on the subject of the loan, which was supported with equal perseverance by the party on the side of the crown, and by that which opposed its being registered, until about six o'clock; when the king, who had sat nine hours without refreshment, being wearied with the length of the arguments, perhaps chagrined at the freedom used in them, and pressed by hunger, suddenly rose, and commanded the edict to be registered without farther delay. This compendious method of passing a law, most unexpectedly was opposed by the Duke of Orleans, who considering it as a direct infringement of the rights of parliament, immediately protested against the whole proceedings of the day, as being thereby rendered null and void. The king astonished, however, repeated his orders, and then quitting the assembly, returned to Versailles."

"M. de Catalan, the president of the parliament of Toulouse, having, in conjunction with that body, refused to register the late edict for levying a tax of two-twentieths on the nation, the king immediately ordered a *lettre de cachet* to be issued against the president. M. de Catalan was accordingly arrested and sent prisoner to an old castle at the foot of the Pyrenean mountains."

"The parliament (in their remonstrance) tell the king bluntly, that he could not suppose himself able to destroy the constitution at a single blow, by concentrating parliament in his own person*."

The origin and nature of the custom of the sovereigns of France holding what was termed a Bed of Justice, upon which occasion Louis XVI. appeared conspicuously as "*an Exactor*," is thus explained in the same volume from which the foregoing extract is taken.

* Dodsley's Annual Register for 1787, page 197; and for 1789, pages 7 and 9.

“ The practice of calling upon the parliament, or courts of justice, to enregister the king’s edicts, did not originate in an idea of their communicating any authority or force to those laws, nor even with a view of receiving their approbation, but merely as notaries to record and authenticate their existence. The parliaments, however, as their popularity and power increased, assumed a right of judging whether these edicts were injurious to the public; and if it was determined in the affirmative, they, under colour of a sort of legal fiction, refused to register them, for they pretended that being injurious to the people, and contrary to the king’s wisdom, justice, or clemency, they did not believe them to be the king’s real acts, but considered them as an imposition practised by his ministers. In troublesome times, or under weak administrations, this opposition was frequently successful; but if the governing power was firm and determined, the king had recourse to what was called a Bed of Justice; that is, he went in person, attended by several of the great officers of state, to authenticate and confirm his own deed, in the presence of the parliament, all the members of which had previous notice to attend; and as all debate was precluded by his presence, he had nothing farther to do, than to order the edict to be registered, a command which he saw executed on the spot*.”

Sir Walter Scott, in the introductory chapters to his *Life of Napoleon*, gives a similar statement relative to the cause and origin of the French revolution, beautifully illustrative of the text under consideration.

“ The monarchical government of France,” he observes, “ might have been entire at this moment, had the state of the finances of the kingdom permitted the monarch to temporize

* Dodsley’s Annual Register, 1789, page 8.

with the existing discontents, and the progress of new opinions, without increasing the taxes of a people already greatly overburdened."

"As if determined to bring matters to an issue betwixt the king and the parliament, the minister of finance (the Archbishop of Toulouse) laid before the latter two new edicts for taxes, similar in most respects to those which had been recommended by his predecessor Calonne to the Notables." The parliament refused to register these edicts. "He then resolved upon a display of the royal prerogative in its most arbitrary and obnoxious form. A Bed of Justice, as it was termed, was held, where the king, presiding in person over the Court of Parliament, commanded the edicts, imposing certain new taxes, to be registered in his own presence. Thus, by an act of authority emanating directly from the sovereign, beating down the only species of opposition which the subjects, through any organ whatsoever, could offer to the increase of taxation."

"The parliament yielded the semblance of a momentary obedience, but protested solemnly, that the edict having been registered solely by the royal command, and against their unanimous opinion, should not have the force of a law; and expressed, for the first time, in direct terms, the proposition, *fraught with the fate of France*, that neither the edicts of the king, nor the registration of those edicts by the parliament, were sufficient to impose permanent burdens on the people; but that such taxation was competent to the States-general only." In punishment of their undaunted defence of the popular cause, the parliament was banished to Troyes. The provincial parliaments supported the principles adopted by their brethren of Paris. The Chambers of Accounts, &c. also remonstrated against the taxes, and refused to enforce them. "This was the first direct and immediate movement of that mighty revolution, which after-

wards rushed to its crisis like a rock rolling down a mountain. This was the first torch which was actually applied to the various combustibles which lay scattered through France. The flame soon spread into the provinces."

The king, indeed, recalled the parliament from their exile, coming at the same time under an express engagement to convoke the States-general; but was induced to hold what was called a Royal Sitting of the parliament, which resembled in all its forms a Bed of Justice. "The king, arrayed in all the forms of his royalty, once more, and for the last time, convoked his parliament in person; and again with his own voice commanded the Court to register a royal edict for a loan of four hundred and twenty millions of francs. This demand gave occasion to a debate which lasted nine hours, and was only closed by the king rising up, and issuing at length his positive and imperative orders that the loan should be registered. To the astonishment of the meeting, the first prince of the blood, the Duke of Orleans, arose, as if in reply, and demanded to know if they were assembled in a Bed of Justice, or in a Royal Sitting; and receiving for answer that the latter was the quality of the meeting, he entered a solemn protest against the proceedings. Two members of the parliament of Paris were imprisoned in remote fortresses, and the Duke of Orleans was sent in exile to his estate."

"As if God and man had alike determined the fall of this ancient monarchy," a hurricane of most portentous and unusual character bursting upon the kingdom, augmented the sufferings and the discontents of the people. "The Estates-general of France met at Versailles on 5th May, 1789; and that was indisputably the first day of the Revolution*." "They consisted of the noblesse, the clergy, and

* Life of Napoleon by Sir Walter Scott, vol. i., pages 81, 104, 106, 109, 111,

deputies chosen by the people. Then it was that the nobility were with the clergy, by the dangers which surrounded them, compelled to merge with the commons in one house. The Revolution, which had long before that time been gathering, burst upon their devoted heads, and swept away king, nobles, and clergy. The result was written in blood throughout France and Europe.*

The National or Constituent Assembly, thus formed, was succeeded, in October, 1791, by the National Legislative Assembly; and that by the National Convention: at whose first sitting, on 21st September, 1792, "Manuel arose and demanded that the first proposal submitted to the Convention should be the abolition of royalty!—Collot d'Herbois, a sorry comedian, who had been hissed from the stage, desired the motion to be instantly put to the vote.—The Abbe Gregoire declared that the dynasties of kings were a race of devouring animals who lived only on human flesh; and that kings were, in the moral order of things, what monsters are in the physical; that courts were the arsenals of crimes and the centre of corruption; and that the history of princes was the martyrology of the people."—"Ducos exclaimed that the crimes of Louis alone formed a sufficient reason for *the abolition of monarchy*. The motion was resolved, and passed unanimously. And each side of the Hall, anxious to manifest their share in this great measure, echoed back to the other the new cry of 'vive la republique;' *thus fell*, at the voice of a wretched player and cut-throat, *the most ancient and distinguished monarchy of Europe* †." Thus, according to the prophecy of Daniel, *did the glory of the kingdom of France pass away*. Or, referring to the description given of the same event, in the powerful imagery of the Apocalypse, (chap. vi. 12,) upon the occurrence of the

* The Times, 10th April, 1832.

† Life of Napoleon by Sir Walter Scott, vol. i., p. 84—86.

political commotion, or "great earthquake," (the commencement of those final judgments by which the present constitution of the world will be destroyed,) the regal "sun" suffered total eclipse, and "became black as sackcloth of hair;"—the symbolical "moon" also "became as blood," when the queen perished on the scaffold;—and the "stars" fell from heaven when all the orders of nobility were abrogated.—Thus the whole political "heaven," or system of the French government, passed away, as it were a scroll rolling itself together, to make way alone for that "new heaven and new earth" wherein dwelleth righteousness: and those things that are shaken, as things that are made, were removed, "that those things which cannot be shaken" may be established and remain.

FINIS.

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

A Combined View of the Prophecies, with a minute Interpretation of Daniel.	<i>s. d.</i> 12 0
The General Structure of the Apocalypse, with Chart of its Text chronologically divided and arranged	2 0
Eight Letters on the Prophecies, viz. on the Seventh Vial; the Civil and Ecclesiastical Prophetic Periods, and the Type of Jericho	2 6
Three Letters, viz. On the the true place of the Seventh Seal; the Infidel Individual Antichrist; and Antiochus Epiphanes	2 0
Or the whole handsomely bound	<hr/> 18 6 <hr/>



