















HORÆ APOCALYPTICÆ.



# HORÆ APOCALYPTICÆ;

OR,

## A COMMENTARY ON THE APOCALYPSE,

CRITICAL AND HISTORICAL;

INCLUDING ALSO AN EXAMINATION OF THE  
CHIEF PROPHECIES OF DANIEL.

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

WITH APPENDICES;

CONTAINING, BESIDES OTHER MATTER,

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

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

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

FIFTH EDITION,

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

VOL. IV.

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

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

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



B3  
2825  
E46 h  
1852  
v. 4

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

### TO VOL. IV.

---

### PART VI.

CHAP.	PAGE
I. ERA OF THE SEVENTH VIAL .. .. .	1
§ 1. THE THIRD FLYING ANGEL, AND HARVEST AND VINTAGE OF THE EARTH .. .. .	2
§ 2. THE SEVENTH VIAL, AND EXPOSURE AND JUDGMENT OF PAPAL ROME AND THE PAPAL ANTI-CHRIST .. .. .	19
II. § 1. DANIEL'S LAST PROPHECY:—THE FIRST HALF	55
§ 2. — — — THE SECOND HALF	79
§ 3. OTHER OLD TESTAMENT PROPHECIES OF THE CONSUMMATION .. .. .	113
III. THE MILLENNIUM .. .. .	130
§ 1. THE CHIEF MILLENNARY THEORIES .. .. .	134
§ 2. APOCALYPTIC PREMILLENNIAL EVIDENCE .. .. .	146
§ 3. GENERAL SCRIPTURAL PREMILLENNIAL EVIDENCE	157
IV. INTRODUCTION TO THE MILLENNIUM; AND THE NEW JERUSALEM .. .. .	196
V. § 1. OUR PRESENT PLACE IN THE PROPHETIC CALENDAR .. .. .	224
§ 2. APOCALYPTIC PHILOSOPHY OF THE HISTORY OF CHRISTENDOM, AND CONCLUDING APPLICATION	243

### APPENDIX.

PERIOD	
PART I. HISTORY OF APOCALYPTIC INTERPRETATION.	
I. FROM ST. JOHN TO CONSTANTINE .. .. .	275
II. FROM CONSTANTINE TO FALL OF ROMAN EMPIRE .. .. .	310
III. FROM FALL OF ROMAN EMPIRE A.D. 500 TO A.D. 1100	336
IV. FROM A.D. 1100 TO THE REFORMATION .. .. .	381

PERIOD	PAGE
V. ÆRA AND CENTURY OF THE REFORMATION ..	436
VI. FROM END OF CENTURY OF THE REFORMATION TO THE FRENCH REVOLUTION .. .. .	485
VII. FROM FRENCH REVOLUTION TO PRESENT TIME ..	529
§ 1. FROM 1789 TO 1820 .. .. .	530
§ 2. FROM 1820 TO 1862 ; AND CONCLUSION ..	551

## PART II. CRITICAL EXAMINATION OF CHIEF COUNT-

CHAP. ER-SCHEMES OF APOCALYPTIC INTERPRETATION	564
I. § 1. GERMAN NERONIC PRÆTERIST COUNTER-SCHEME	565
§ 2. BOSSUET'S DOMITIANIC PRÆTERIST COUNTER- SCHEME .. .. .	585
II. § 1. FUTURIST ORIGINAL APOCALYPTIC COUNTER- SCHEME .. .. .	598
§ 2. MODIFIED FUTURIST COUNTER-SCHEMES OF BARKER AND W. KELLY .. .. .	630
§ 3. PATRISTIC VIEWS OF PROPHECY AND ANTI- CHRIST MAINLY NON-FUTURIST .. .. .	653
III. DR. ARNOLD'S PROPHETIC EXPOSITORY PRINCIPLE	664
IV. EXAMINATION AND REFUTATION OF THE RECENT COUNTER-MILLENNARY THEORIES .. .. .	680

PART III. CHAP. I. ADAMIC WORLD'S NEAR AP-  
PROACH TO ITS SEVENTH MILLENNARY ACCORD-  
ING TO HEBREW SCRIPTURE CHRONOLOGY ..

701

II. PREMONITORY INDICATIONS COMPARED OF NEARNESS OF CHRIST'S FIRST AND SECOND PERSONAL ADVENTS .. .. .	710
--	-----

## PLATES TO VOL. IV.

PLATE XXXVII. IMPERIAL ROME SEATED ON THE SEVEN HILLS, HOLDING A SWORD ; AND PAPAL ROME SEATED, HOLDING OUT THE CUP OF HER APOSTASY ..	34
XXXVIII. DIAGRAM SHOWING THE CONVERGENCY TO THE PRESENT ÆRA OF THE CHIEF PROPHETIC PE- RIODS .. .. .	240

CORRIGENDA TO VOL. IV.

- Page 65, Note ¶; read *הַמְּתָּרֵם*  
 — 82, line 12 from bottom; read *aliene* from  
 — 83, last line but one of text; for *broke* read *spoke*  
 — 99, Note<sup>1</sup>, line 1; read on the verb *פָּבַד* (*Piel פָּבַד*),  
 — 143, Note<sup>3</sup>; read *Dan. vii. 9, 10, 22.*  
 — 252, line 12; for ) read (  
 — 258, last line; for 75 read 275  
 — 332, line 12; for *inexplicable* read *explicable*  
 — 395, Note<sup>7</sup>; read *confota*; and for 357 read 359  
 — 395, Note<sup>11</sup>; read 272, 399  
 — 398, Note<sup>4</sup>; read *dæmonas*  
 — 403, line 12, read *Babylon* (or *Roman power*)  
 — 421; *The Tabular Scheme should have faced inwards.*  
 — 492, lines 4, 5; transpose of *so* as to precede *new*  
 — 563, line 8; read also by  
 — 578, Note<sup>3</sup>; for this read *his*  
 — 636, Note<sup>1</sup>; read 622; and Note\*, 609—611  
 — 657, Note<sup>1</sup>; read 624, 625; and Note\*, 628  
 — 678, line 15; *dele the first that*  
 — 679, line 14; for these Lectures read *this Book*; and  
     Note<sup>1</sup>, for 679 read 678  
 — 700, 4 lines from bottom; read about *Premillennarians*  
     like myself  
 — 703, last line but one; read Note<sup>2</sup>  
 — 714, last line but one; read *Percrebuerat*



## PART VI.

---

FROM APOC. XIV. 9 TO APOC. XIV. 20, AND FROM APOC. XVI. 15  
TO THE END OF THE APOCALYPSE.

### THE PRESENT AND THE FUTURE.

FROM A. D. 1849 TO THE MILLENNIUM AND FINAL  
JUDGMENT.

---

### CHAPTER I.

#### THE ÆRA OF THE SEVENTH VIAL.

WE have been brought by our comparison of prophecy and history down to the eve of the seventh Vial in the one, and to near about the middle of the 19th Century in the other. I hope hereafter to take a brief review of the evidence on which we have advanced thus far in the parallelism. But even *à priori* to this, and on simply glancing back in the memory over the ground step by step trodden by us, we must, I think, see reason to rest upon the evidence, as what may well warrant us in our conclusions. And, supposing such to be the case, and that we have indeed satisfactorily made out our course thus far, then the question is further forced upon us by the extraordinary events of the year 1848, whether we may not have advanced yet a step further onward in the prophetic calendar of history; and these events

have been the commencement of what was indicated by the figures of the seventh and last Apocalyptic Vial:—a Vial described as outpoured into the air; with an earthquake following which resulted in the tripartition of the great City: all preparatorily to the final destruction of that great City, and of its master the Beast, by fire and by the sword;—the judgment of burning, and judgment of blood, in the winepress-treading in Armageddon.

I purpose soon to revert to this Vial-figuration, and the historic question above-stated connected with it. Let me however first, and in a preliminary Section, set before my readers what (upon the strength mainly of there being but one winepress-treading in the Apocalyptic prophecy)<sup>1</sup> I have been led to suppose a succincter sketch of the same judgment in the supplemental predictive series of the Part *without-written* of the Apocalypse. We shall then have finished our review of that one grand division of the prophecy; and have nothing left behind unconsidered, to interrupt our progress in the fuller series *within-written* of Apocalyptic prefiguration, onward to the end.<sup>2</sup>

§ 1.—THE PRESUMED PRIMARY AND BRIEFER SERIES OF PREFIGURATIONS OF THE ÆRA OF THE SEVENTH VIAL IN THE PART WITHOUT-WRITTEN OF THE APOCALYPSE, DOWN TO THE WINEPRESS-TREADING BEFORE THE MILLENNIUM.

“And a third Angel followed them, saying with a loud voice; ‘If any man worship the Beast and his image, and receive his mark on his forehead, or on his hand, even he shall drink<sup>3</sup> of the wine of the wrath of God, which is poured out without mixture<sup>4</sup> into the cup of his anger;<sup>5</sup> and he shall be tormented with fire and brimstone, in the presence of the holy angels, and in the presence of the Lamb. And the smoke of their torment ascendeth up for ever and ever:

<sup>1</sup> See my Vol. iii. pp. 330—332.

<sup>2</sup> Except that there will need an examination into the prophecy in Dan. xi. xii. and one or two other Old Testament prophecies, in order to a comparison of the particulars intimated in those predictions respecting the events of the time of the end, with the prefigurations in the Apocalypse.

<sup>3</sup> και αυτος πινεται.

<sup>4</sup> του κεκρασμενου ακρατου.

<sup>5</sup> εν τη ποτηριω της οργης αυτου.

and they have no rest day nor night, who worship the Beast and his image, and whosoever receiveth the mark of his name.'

"Here is the patience of the saints: here are they that keep the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus.

"And I heard a voice from heaven saying, Write, Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord from henceforth! <sup>1</sup> Yea, saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labours; for their works <sup>2</sup> do follow them.

"And I looked, and behold a white cloud: and upon the cloud One sitting like unto a son of man; <sup>3</sup> having on his head a golden crown, <sup>4</sup> and in his hand a sharp sickle. And another Angel came out of the temple, crying with a loud voice to him that sate on the cloud, Thrust in <sup>5</sup> thy sickle and reap: for the time is come for thee to reap: for the harvest of the earth is ripe. <sup>6</sup> And he that sate on the cloud thrust in <sup>7</sup> his sickle on the earth: and the earth was reaped.

"And another Angel came out of the temple which is in heaven, he also having a sharp sickle. <sup>8</sup> And another Angel came out from the altar, which had power over the fire; and cried with a loud voice to him that had the sickle, saying; Thrust in thy sharp sickle, and gather the clusters of the vine of the earth, for her grapes are fully ripe. And the Angel thrust in his sickle into the earth, and gathered the vine of the earth, and cast it into the great wine-press of the wrath of God. And the wine-press was trodden without the city; and blood came out of the wine-press, even unto the horses' bridles, by the space of a thousand and six hundred furlongs." <sup>9</sup>—Apoc. xiv. 9—20.

In this *primary* and *brief* sketch of the progress of events towards the consummation,—the same that I suppose to have been inscribed on the *Part without-written* of

<sup>1</sup> Heinrichs and Tregelles stop thus; οἱ ἐν Κυρίῳ ἀποθνήσκοντες ἀπαρτί· Ναι, κ. τ. λ. Wordsworth; . . ἀποθνήσκοντες· Ἀπαρτί ναι, λέγει τὸ Πνεῦμα.

<sup>2</sup> τὰ γὰρ ἔργα αὐτῶν ἀκοληθεῖ μετ' αὐτῶν· with γὰρ, not καί.

<sup>3</sup> ὅμοιον ὡς ἀνθρώπου· without the article, in all the manuscripts.

<sup>4</sup> στέφανον χρυσοῦν. <sup>5</sup> πῆψον· literally send. <sup>6</sup> ἐξηρανόθη, lit. dried.

<sup>7</sup> Or, threw his sickle; ἐβαλεν. <sup>8</sup> ἔρειπανον, as before.

<sup>9</sup> ἀπο σταδίων χιλίων ἑξακοσίων· to be observed on afterwards.



the Apocalyptic scroll,—there occur the four several symbolic figurations and notices following.

1st then,—and next after that *second* flying Angel, whose voice, as noted shortly since, we seem already to have heard begun in the Church, triumphing over Papal Rome as fallen by reason of its corruptions,—St. John beheld in vision a *third Angel* flying abroad in mid-heaven, in the wake of the former two; with not only a warning voice against worshipping the Beast and his image, but a declaration also of the impending end of such worshippers, as doomed to drink of the bitter wine<sup>1</sup> of the wrath of God, and to be tormented with fire and sulphur before the holy angels and the Lamb; the smoke of which torment would ascend up for ever.—A prefiguration which seems to me to require, in order to its fulfilment, 1st, a sufficiently general agreement among Christ's faithful Protestant servants, as to what is meant both by the *Beast* and the *Beast's Image*, to give weight to the judgment hence denounced against their worshippers: 2ndly, a general and strong impression among them, as to the punishment of such as might worship or obey the one, and the other, being a punishment by *fire*, and that as imminent as terrible: 3rdly, a public and notorious outcry of warning to this effect throughout European Christendom, with its vast colonial dependencies.—And thus we are forced to regard the symbol as hitherto unfulfilled.<sup>2</sup> While there has been for some three centuries a very general agreement among Protestants on the sense of the Apocalyptic Babylon as signifying Papal Rome, and of the Beast as *in some way or other* signifying the Popedom,<sup>3</sup> (for the differences of opinion are here for the most part on lesser details,)<sup>4</sup>—on the meaning of

<sup>1</sup> *κεκρασμενον ακρατον* literally *mixt, unmixt*:—*unmixt* in the sense (so Isa. i. 22) of *undiluted*;—*mixed*, as the wine sometimes given to criminals before execution, with sundry bitter ingredients. So Daubuz, p. 639: who compares (as does also Mede) Psalm lxxv. 8; “In the Lord's hand is a cup, and the wine is red: it is full of mixture, (Sept. *οινα ακρατα πληρης κρασματος*,) and He poureth out of the same: as to the dregs thereof all the wicked of the earth shall wring them out, and drink them.” Compare too Isa. xxix. 9, “They are drunken, but not with wine:” also Isa. li. 21, and Jer. xxv. 15; cited already in my Vol. iii. p. 353, in illustration of the similar symbol in the Apocalyptic Vials. <sup>2</sup> Written in 1844.

<sup>3</sup> From the time of the Reformation. Indeed the Waldenses so explained it before, as we saw, in their Treatise on Antichrist. See my Vol. ii. pp. 394—397.

<sup>4</sup> Even they who interpret the Beast to mean the *secular Roman empire*, as Faber, Cuninghame, and Bickersteth, do yet so view that empire as animated and directed



the *Beast's Image* opinions have not only greatly varied, but its popularly known solutions been one and all thus far most unsatisfactory.<sup>1</sup> The reader will long ere this have become acquainted with my own view of it, as signifying the *General Councils of Papal Christendom*, very chiefly the *Council of Trent*, and formed his judgment respecting it. Should this impress itself on the mind of the Christian public as clearly true, and together therewith, a sense of the imminent danger of deferring to Pope or Councils, as authorities co-ordinate with God's own written word, such as to force a loud and general outcry of warning against it, then we may consider an important step of advance made towards the incipient fulfilment of the vision.<sup>2</sup>—It is easy to see the consistency of this clause in the present vision with what was indicated by that of *the three spirits like frogs* in the other series of visions. It is in "*the Church*," and so in *Church-Councils*, that the living antitype to the Apocalyptic *False Prophet* (the *third* of those three unclean spirits) very specially seeks its countervail to the authority of the word of God. After then that such a deceiving spirit shall have come in like a flood, it might well be that a voice of opposing truth should be expressly raised against it.

2. After this *a voice from heaven* was heard by St. John to follow, saying, "Write, Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord from henceforth; &c." In which voice the words *from henceforth blessed*, or, as they may be rendered,

by the Papacy, that their interpretation virtually, and to all practical purposes, tends to the same point as that of those who with myself explain it, or its ruling head, of the line of Popes.

<sup>1</sup> So, as before noted, I wrote in my 1st Edition, published in 1844.

<sup>2</sup> The solution offered in the *Horæ* has, I have reason to know, approved itself to many minds, as it has become gradually known since its first publication. But, as I am revising my work for its 5th Edition in 1861, a conviction more general on this point seems to me to be still needed in order to help to the fulfilment.

It has gratified me, let me add, to learn, some long time after the first publication of my own solution, that the same substantially would seem to have been the view of the symbol taken by Sir I. Newton. In his chapter on Prophetic Language, p. 23, he says; "A *council* of a kingdom is signified by its *image*." And, in his brief Treatise on Apocalyptic Interpretation, he speaks of the Beast out of the earth persuading men "to make an image to the Beast, that is, to assemble a body of men like him in point of religion." What he adds about "its giving life to the Beast, so that it should both speak, and, by dictating, cause that all religious bodies of men who would not worship the authority of the image should be mystically killed," throws, however, some obscurity over his meaning.—No objection to the solution worth mentioning has been suggested, so far as I know, by opponents.

from time near at hand,<sup>1</sup> referred to, I incline to think, and indicated, the *near approach* of the grand epoch of blessedness predicated in Scripture of departed saints: I mean the blessedness of their reward and joy at Christ's coming. For it is the imminent nearness of a *judgment according to works*, in this case of *reward*,<sup>2</sup> that Apocalyptic analogy suggests as the intent of the accompanying phrase, "Their works follow them:"<sup>3</sup> even though the "rest from their labours," spoken of, be construed to mean that of the grave, or the separate state; and not (which it might perhaps rather be) that which even yet *remains* for the people of God,<sup>4</sup> and which they are not to enter on until Christ's "revelation in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that know not God."<sup>5</sup> On the which cheering truth the injunction, "*Write this*," implies apparently<sup>6</sup> that there will be some deep impression on the matter in the true Church of Christ, and urgent inculcation of it, at the time answering to the vision. Such I incline to think with Mede is the sense of the vision; an impression grounded on its own evidence, and confirmed by that of the context respecting the harvest and the vintage immediately following. Besides which it seems in this sense well to agree with the tenor of the voice heard synchronically from heaven just before the seventh vial's judgment by fire on Babylon, in the other series of visions; "*Behold I come quickly; blessed is he that watcheth and keepeth his garments.*"—It cannot surely figure a revelation of the peaceful rest of

<sup>1</sup> So Mede: comparing Matt. xxiii. 39; "*From henceforth (απ' αρτι) ye shall not see me,*" &c.: i. e. *not* from the precise moment of his speaking, but from a time near it. There is, however, a certain difference in the senses of *απαρτι*, as indicative of time nearer or more distant. Compare Matt. xxvi. 29, 64, John i. 52, xiii. 19, xiv. 7. The statement Matt. xxvi. 64, *Απ' αρτι οψεσθε τον Υιον τε ανθρωπω καθημενον εκ δεξιων της δυναμειωσ*, is express in Luke xxii. 69 by, *Απο τε νυν εσαι ο Υιος τε ανθρωπω καθημενος*.

<sup>2</sup> Compare, in the general anticipative description of the results of the 7th Trumpet given in Apoc. xi. 15—19, the clause, "*and the time of the dead is come, that they should be judged, and that thou shouldst give reward to thy servants the prophets.*"

<sup>3</sup> So in the case of Babylon, xviii. 5, it is said, "*Her sins (ηκολουθησαν) have followed up to heaven,*" at an epoch when her destruction was imminent. Compare too Acts x. 4, "*Thy prayers and alms have come up for a memorial before God;*" said of Cornelius at the time when the answer of blessing was immediately about to be given.

<sup>4</sup> Heb. iv. 9, &c.: where the word *σαββατισμος* is used, as one parallel to *καταπανσις*, used ib. 1, 3, &c.

<sup>5</sup> 2 Thess. i. 7; "*To you that are troubled rest (ανειν) with us, when,*" &c.

<sup>6</sup> See Apoc. x. 4, and my comment.

Christ's saints *from immediately after death*, in intended opposition to the Romish *purgatorial* doctrine, so as some have explained it.<sup>1</sup> In that case the phrase used would rather have been, "Blessed are they that die in the Lord, *from after death*," in assertion of the blessedness of *all* dead and dying saints from the time of their dying: not "*from henceforth*," so as to make it date from a time subsequent to the date of the voice in vision. Nor, again, can it well mean, so as certain other expositors have imagined, simply that persecution would be at the time figured so severe, or coming judgments so fearful, as to make death a happy refuge from them.<sup>2</sup> Where then the distinctive appropriateness of the voice at this point in the prophecy? For, although doubtless another notice, just previously given, did intimate that the æra prefigured is to be eminently one of trial both to the faith and the patience of Christ's true saints, and one to show very notably whether they will keep, as their one rule of *action*, "the commands of God," and of *doctrine* "the faith of Jesus," yet many such times of trial had been prefigured as coming before.—It may be added that, on the view here advocated of the heavenly intimation, it would seem almost to imply a general settlement of the minds of the faithful at the time figured on the great *premillennial question*. For how could the saints' blessedness and reward be viewed as imminent, if a millennium of the spiritual evangelization of the world were expected to precede it?

3. Next appeared a symbolization of what is called *the harvest of the earth*; a harvest followed immediately by what is designated as its *vintage*. So the type of things natural is here used, as often elsewhere also, in the figuration of things spiritual:—the same succession and order characterizing these providential ingatherings of the mystical earth's fruits, which characterized the natural ingatherings in the land of Israel.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Newton, Scott, &c.

<sup>2</sup> So Hammond, comparing Is. lvii. 1, 2, "taken from the evil to come, he shall enter into peace, &c." Compare too Jer. xxii. 10; "Weep not for the dead, neither bemoan him; but weep sore for him that goeth away; for he shall return no more, nor see his native country."

<sup>3</sup> The *barley* harvest was finished at the Passover, when the sanctifying wave-sheaf was presented; the *wheat* harvest at Pentecost, when the first-fruits were offered;

But what the nature of the harvest figured? Was it one of *mercy*, or of *judgment*? of the *good*, or of the *bad*? On this point commentators differ: the majority of the modern English expositors taking it, I believe, in the *former* view;<sup>1</sup> the majority of the earlier Protestant interpreters, and of those too of the more modern German school, taking it in the *latter*.<sup>2</sup> The symbol, we must observe, is *of itself* indeterminate. In our Lord's notable parable,—the same which ends with the explanatory statement, “The harvest is the end of the world, (or *age*, *αιωνος*), the reapers are the angels,”<sup>3</sup>—there is described a two-fold produce, of *wheat* and of *tares*, as alike grown up in the harvest-field; and a two-fold reaping correspondent, of judgment and of reward, the former, it would seem, to precede the latter: “Gather ye together *first* the tares, and bind them in bundles to burn them; but gather the wheat into my barn.” Similarly St. Paul speaks of men reaping at the last what they sow, in two different kinds of harvest: “He that soweth to the flesh shall of the flesh reap destruction (*φθοραν*); but he that soweth to the Spirit shall of the Spirit reap life everlasting.”<sup>4</sup> Thus the circumstance of our Lord's having on one occasion spoken, in altogether a *good* sense, of “the fields being white unto harvest,”<sup>5</sup>—with reference however, not to men's preparedness for gathering into his kingdom in its heavenly perfected state, but only for gathering into his kingdom in its preparatory earthly state,—and again that of his having said in St. Mark respecting the *good* seed of the kingdom, “When the fruit is brought forth, immedi-

the *vintage* not until the Feast of Tabernacles, at the end of the ecclesiastical year, and of the crops. See Lev. xxiii. 10, 20, 39; Deut. xvi. 13.

<sup>1</sup> E. g. Mr. Cuninghame and Mr. Bickersteth. The *former* considers it as the gathering of such of his saints to Christ, on his coming in the air, as answer to the palm-bearers of chap. vii.: for, if I rightly understand him, he has adopted the singular theory of two distinct translations of the saints alive at his advent. See his Work, pp. 261, 323. The *latter* (on Prophecy, p. 273) calls it “the harvest for *glory*,” in contradistinction to “the vintage of *wrath*.”—Mr. Cuninghame refers to Sir I. Newton and Bishop Horsley as agreeing in this view. Bishop Jebb too adopts it. On verses 15 to 18, he says: “Put in thy sickle to the *corn of the just*, and the *vine of the unjust*.” And so again Mr. Brooks, p. 236. Mr. Faber is an exception.

<sup>2</sup> E. g. of the *former* Mede, Vitringa, Bishop Newton: of the *latter*, Heinrichs, M. Stuart, &c. And so, long before them, Victorinus; who construes it, as well as the vintage, “de gentibus perituris in adventu Domini.” Daubuz, p. 646, advances the singular theory of the symbol signifying the separation of the good (i. e. good in profession) from the bad, at the Reformation.

<sup>3</sup> Matt. xiii. 39.

<sup>4</sup> Gal. vi. 8.

<sup>5</sup> John iv. 35.



ately he putteth in the sickle, because the harvest is come,"<sup>1</sup> cannot decide the present question. In these two passages it is *the context* which determines the nature of the seed, and of the harvest. And it is similarly from the context of the present passage that we must decide the nature of the harvest *here* intended.

And, after considering this, I find myself forced to view the harvest as one of *judgment*. 1st, the circumstance of its being called *the harvest of the earth*<sup>2</sup> strikingly points to this conclusion: the term *earth* being always, as Jerome observes, used in the Apocalypse in a *bad* sense;<sup>3</sup> and the saints noted in it as not of an earthly citizenship, but heavenly.<sup>4</sup>—2. To the same effect is the designation of the reaping sickle as a *sharp* one. For the Apocalypse is a book peculiarly select in its epithets: and surely this would be a strange epithet to designate a gathering painless and most blessed, such as Enoch's and Elijah's, of the then living saints to their heavenly home.<sup>5</sup>—3. The *dried* state of the produce at the time when the sickle is put in to cut it, "Thrust in thy sickle and reap; for the time is come for thee to reap, for the harvest of the earth is *dried up*," (so it is in the original.)<sup>6</sup>—forbids the idea of its being a harvest of *wheat*, or other good produce. Does the agriculturist wait his *corn* being *dried up* before reaping it? Alike sacred and profane writers, the ancient and the modern husbandry, rule the thing otherwise.<sup>7</sup> Thus the lexi-

<sup>1</sup> Mark iv. 29. See Note 7 below.

<sup>2</sup> ὁ θερισμος τῆς γῆς.

<sup>3</sup> See my Note 1 at p. 416 of Vol. i.

<sup>4</sup> So Apoc. xiii. 6, &c.—Compare Phil. iii. 20.

<sup>5</sup> Thus the epithet *sharp* is applied to the instrument spoken of presently after as used in the *vintage*, for a sickle of *judgment*. Daubuz (p. 646) allows that this its designation implies something *violent* and *painful* in the act done by it; and so explains it of the *Wars* of the Reformation.

<sup>6</sup> ἐξηρανθη.

<sup>7</sup> The *Scriptural* view of the time for cutting the corn, is given in two passages a little while since referred to:—the one, John iv. 35, where the fields are said to have been "*white* unto the harvest;" the other, Mark iv. 29, where the harvest-time is said to have come, and the sickle to be immediately put in ὅταν παραδῶ ὁ καρπός, i. e. when the fruit hath put itself forth, as come to maturity. See Schleusner on παραδίδωμι.—Compare the application of the term *dried* to a plant in the sense of its being *withered* and *dead*, Matt. xiii. 6, where the Greek verb, rendered *withered away* in our authorized version, is as here ἐξηρανθη, *dried up*; and so too in James i. 11, 1 Peter i. 24.

Of ancient *classic* writers I shall quote with Daubuz from *Virgil* and *Columella*. The *former* (Elog. iv. 28) notes the time to be when "Molli paulatim flavescent campus arista:" where mark the *molli*, as well as the *flavescent*. The *latter* writes; "Æqualiter flavescentibus jam satis, antequam ex toto grana indurescant, cum rubi-

grapher infers from the simple word *εξηρανωθη*, especially considering its use in that sense in the Septuagint, that a harvest of judgment is here intended.<sup>1</sup>—4. Nor is such a use of the harvest-emblem unknown in other prophecies.<sup>2</sup> Especially in the only parallel one where the symbols of *harvest* and *vintage* are *conjointly* used, in symbolization of the events of the great consummation, viz. in Joel iii. 13, there cannot be a doubt, I conceive, as to the *one*, as well as the *other*, being symbols of *judgment*. “Let the heathen be wakened, and come up to the valley of Jehoshaphat: for there will I sit to judge all the heathen round about. *Put ye in the sickle, for the harvest is ripe: come, get you down, for the press is full, the fats overflow; for their wickedness is great.*” In fact it is scarcely possible to read this passage without an impression of its being the actual *original* of the Apocalyptic imagery of the harvest and the vintage; relating to the same events, and marking their character.

Thus, on the whole, we may, I think, confidently conclude on the *harvest of the earth* here figured depicting the first grand act of the judgments of the consummation on Antichristendom; as the *vintage* was meant to signify the second. And, judging from what we find stated in the other series of Apocalyptic prophecy, and its two-fold distinction of the judgments of the consummation into one *by fire on Babylon*, and a second by fire and the sword *on the Beast and his followers*, I can scarcely hesitate at identifying this *harvest of the earth* with the first-mentioned *judgment of burning*.<sup>3</sup> I am confirmed in this by the *εξηρανωθη*, the *dried up* state of the figured harvest. For the

cundum colorem traxerint, messis facienda est.”—And *Pliny*; “Oraculum biduo celerius messem facere, potius quam biduo serius.” *Nat. Hist.* xviii. 30.

And so too the *modern* Agriculturists’ precept; “Do not let the corn become *too ripe* before you cut it.” I cite from *Thorley’s Farmers’ Almanac*. The stalk, it is said, should be white at top; but through the sap, still not wholly descended, retain still a measure of greenness below.

<sup>1</sup> “Ex multorum interpretum sententiâ per metaphoram innuitur *ad pœnam maturuisse* adversarios religionis Christianæ, mensurâ peccatorum impletâ: quod eo magis verisimile est, quo magis constat *ξηρανωσθαι* in versione Alex. de pernicie, interitu, et pœnis divinis haud raro usurpari. *Zach.* x. 2, *Is.* xli. 17, xlii. 14, *Amos* ii. 9.” *Schleusner on Ξηρανω.*

<sup>2</sup> E. g. *Isa.* xvii. 5, 11, (cited by *Mede*), spoken of a harvest of judgment: and *Jer.* li. 33, with special reference to *Babylon*, “Yet a little while, and the time of her harvest is come.”

<sup>3</sup> Such is very much the view of *Mede* and *Vitringa*.

dry and noxious weed is fit only for *burning*.<sup>1</sup> So Tichonius, "Aruit messis terræ, id est *ad combustionem parata est*." <sup>2</sup> Let me add a very unintended comment from the cyclical Letter of a *Roman Pope* in the middle age; where he speaks of the harvest-field of Christendom appearing like a field grown over with weeds, "rather *dried up* in preparation for *burning*, than *white* in preparation for harvest." <sup>3</sup>—If the earth itself have to suffer, as in the time of Noah, with its evil produce, what wonder? "The earth which drinketh in the rain that cometh oft upon it, and bringeth forth herbs meet for them by whom it is dressed, receiveth blessing from God: but that which beareth thorns and briars is rejected, and is nigh unto cursing; whose end is to be burned." <sup>4</sup>

This main point of the vision settled, we need not to be long detained by its details.—It was one *like a son of man*, *sitting on a white cloud*, that appeared holding the sharp sickle of execution, and to whom the charge was transmitted from the inner temple, "Thrust in thy sickle, for the harvest of the earth is ripe." And both his likeness to a son of man,<sup>5</sup> and the white lightning-cloud<sup>6</sup> his chariot,<sup>7</sup> concurred to point out the *God-man*, Christ Jesus, as the person intended.—Yet not so as to indicate this being the occasion of his great predicted second advent with the clouds of heaven, when every eye shall see him. We must remember that the visibility of Christ to the Evangelist, here in vision, no more shows that he would be personally visible at the time and in the events so foreshown, than his

<sup>1</sup> Compare the Jewish proverb, "If they do these things in a green tree, what shall be done in the dry?" Luke xxiii. 31: also John xv. 6, "It is cast forth as a branch, and is withered (*εξηρανωθη*); and men gather them, and cast them into the fire, and they are burned." Compare too the burning of "all that grew on the ground," in the case of Sodom; Gen. xix. 25. <sup>2</sup> Hom. xii. ad fin.

<sup>3</sup> "Agerque potius ardescere videatur ad ignem, quam albescere inveniatur ad messem." Pope Gregory X's Letter of convocation to the 2nd Lyons General Council. Hard. vii. 670.

So too, I see, Bernard, in his Letter to Pope Eugenius, ii. 6, De Consideratione; "Leva oculos, . . . et vide regiones, si non sunt magis *siccæ ad ignem*, quam *albæ ad messem*."—And somewhat similarly also *Hermas*, of old, in his 3rd and 4th Similitudes. <sup>4</sup> Heb. vi. 7, 8.

<sup>5</sup> Compare John v. 27, Apoc. i. 13, where the *artiele* before *son* is also wanting.

<sup>6</sup> *λευκη νεφελη*. Compare the *λευκος εξαστραπτων* of Luke ix. 29.

<sup>7</sup> "He maketh the clouds his chariot;" Psalm civ. 3. Vitringa, p. 894, compares Isa. xix. 1, where the Lord is spoken of as riding on a swift cloud to execute judgment on Egypt.—See too my Vol. ii. p. 42, Note <sup>2</sup>.

appearance in an earlier part of the Apocalyptic visions robed in a cloud, and with his face shining as the sun; <sup>1</sup> which, we saw reason to believe, symbolized the spiritual discovery of his gospel-grace and salvation at the Reformation. I conceive it was intended to designate Christ as the great *initiator* of the final judgments, just as the subsequent notice of his treading the wine-press <sup>2</sup> marked him out as their *completor*: agreeably with his own declaration, "The Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son."<sup>3</sup>—The *golden crown* that he wore, implied his having come forth in the character of a conquering warrior over his enemies: <sup>4</sup>—so is each symbol of power, at first attached to the world's potentates, now transferred in the figuration to their rightful owner.<sup>5</sup>—As to the Angel's cry to him from out the sanctuary of the divine presence, declaring the time of the harvest-judgment to have fully come,<sup>6</sup> it well illustrates another of Christ's sayings, in his prophecy of the judgments attendant on the second advent. "Of that day and hour knoweth no one; no, not the Angels that are in heaven, *nor the Son*: [i. e. not in his human character, as a *son of man*:] but the Father only." (Mark xiii. 32.)

So He that sat on the cloud cast down his sharp sickle upon the earth; and the earth was reaped.

4thly,—and as the ending of the *outside* of the Apocalyptic scroll, (if my view of the *writing-without* be correct,)—there followed a figuration of the earth's *vintage* and *winepress-treading*,<sup>7</sup> in indication of judgment unto blood,

<sup>1</sup> Apoc. x. 1.

<sup>2</sup> Apoc. xix. 15.

<sup>3</sup> John v. 22 and 27. It is possible that this vision may also have allusion to Christ's statement, in his memorable prophecy of the end of the world, Matt. xxiv. 30; "And then shall appear the *sign* of the Son of man in heaven; and then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn:"—i. e. if, as some think, the sign of his coming be something distinct from, and the immediate precursor of, his coming itself.

<sup>4</sup> Compare Isa. ix. 5; "For every battle of the warrior is with confused noise, and garments rolled in blood; but this shall be with *burning* and *fuel of fire*. For unto us a child is born, &c. And the government shall be on his shoulder:" &c.

<sup>5</sup> See Vol. i. p. 106. So too Apoc. xix. 12, in the other prophetic series, to be considered in the next Section of this Chapter.

<sup>6</sup> The circumstance of the harvest of wickedness having grown more than ripe, as the word *εξηρανθη* seems to indicate, marked the prolonged forbearance of God.

<sup>7</sup> With these two great judgments of the consummation,—that of the harvest and that of the vintage,—against apostate *Christendom*, we may compare the two consummatory acts of judgment against the *Jews*, whereby their total subversion as a



as all allow, very dreadful: this being the last judgment visible upon the earthly scene (as the vintage was the last natural gathering) against apostate Christendom.

The *vine* to be gathered was called "*the vine of the earth:*" and designated, I imagine, first and chiefly, the ecclesiastical body and church of Antichristendom; inclusive, however, of its chief secular supporters also.<sup>1</sup>—Like as of ancient Judah, so of Christendom it might have been said, "I planted thee a noble vine, wholly a right seed; how then art thou turned into the degenerate plant of a strange vine unto me?"<sup>2</sup> For too soon, notwithstanding all its privileges, the Christian church and people apostatized; "their vine degenerating into the vine of Sodom, their grapes becoming grapes of gall, their clusters bitter, and their wine the poison of dragons."<sup>3</sup> For a greatly-protracted period the long-suffering of God was foreshown as bearing with it. But now that period was over; its clusters were more than ripe; and its fated time of punishment, like that of the Jewish vine long before it,<sup>4</sup> fully come.—The *agent* in the preliminary act of gathering the vine's clusters appeared in the vision to be an Angel with a sharp sickle or pruninghook in hand, issuing forth from the inner temple in heaven. By his egress thence the divine origin of the coming judgment was intimated, just as in the previous cases of the judgments under the Trumpets and the Vials;<sup>5</sup> by the sharpness of the sickle, the severity of the judgment intended.<sup>6</sup>—As to the *Angel* that had to announce to the one

nation was effected: viz. 1st, the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus; 2nd, the tremendous slaughter of their armies and people, fifty years after, by Hadrian. In which latter, after the battle of Bittera, the Rabbin in the *Codex Taanith* of the *Jerusalem Talmud*, adopting, very remarkably, the Apocalyptic language here used, say that "blood flowed up to the horses' noses for 1600 stadia." Vitringa, p. 902, quotes this from Lightfoot.

<sup>1</sup> So the Jewish vine signified, I conceive, the Jewish nation as a *church*, and with church privileges. See the figure in Isa. v.

<sup>2</sup> Jer. ii. 21.—Just before, Judah had been represented by the prophet as an *unfaithful wife*. So that there is a similar variety of images to figure Judah's apostasy there, with what we find to figure Christendom's apostasy here;—in one place as a *harlot*, in another as a *corrupt vine*.

<sup>3</sup> Deut. xxxii. 32. Compare one of the Apocalyptic designations of Anti-christendom as "the great city which is spiritually called *Sodom*;" Apoc. xi. 8. Another represented its popular constituency as the nominal but *apostate Israel*; Apoc. vii. Dr. A. Clarke, in his remarks on the wild grapes in Isa. v. 2, observes, that in Palestine there were some fruits of the grape kind that were poisonous.

<sup>4</sup> Isa. v. 6.—In Matt. xxi. 33, &c., the figure is varied.

<sup>5</sup> Apoc. viii. 2, xv. 6.

<sup>6</sup> See what I have said on the *reaper's* sharp sickle just before.—The word  $\delta\rho\epsilon\pi\alpha$ -

just mentioned the precise moment for his putting in the sickle of execution, (such is the division of offices among the angelic host in God's providential government,) his description is remarkable both as being the one "that had authority over the fire,"<sup>1</sup> (that is, the altar-fire,) and as appearing to come forth "from out of the altar."<sup>2</sup> He answered evidently in the Apocalyptic temple of vision to those Levitical priests of the Jewish earthly temple, whose office it was to keep the sacred fire ever burning on the altar, in order to the consumption of the daily holocausts and of the voluntary burnt-offerings and peace-offerings; as also to look to the ashes left from the burning,<sup>3</sup> and which had dropt into the grate beneath the altar.<sup>4</sup> Thus his bearing part in the prefigured judgment might seem to indicate two things respecting it. 1st, it indicated that it was as a *sacrifice to the divine justice* that the vine was to be gathered, and its clusters trod in the wine-press; very much as in a famous, and probably not uncorrespondent, prophecy of Ezekiel,<sup>5</sup> as well as in that of Apoc. xix. 17, and others also:<sup>6</sup>—the heaven-derived altar-fire being the perpetual visible symbol among the Jews of God's justice;<sup>7</sup> and of

*νον* is used in ancient authors as well for the instrument of pruning or cutting shrubs as for reaping. See Daubuz ad loc. p. 652; who quotes Aristides Quintilianus saying, *ὡς κλημα δρεπανῷ τειμεν*. Also Virgil Bucol. iv. "Non rastros patietur humus, non vinea falcem:" and Horace, Od. i. 31, "Premant Calenâ falce quibus dedit Fortuna vitem:" &c.

<sup>1</sup> *εχων εξουσιαν επι του πυρος*.

<sup>2</sup> *εξηλθεν εκ του θυσιαστηριου*. Observe *εκ*, not *απο*.

<sup>3</sup> Lev. vi. 9—13.—With regard to the *altar-fire*, (that which had originally fallen from heaven,) he had to supply it with wood every morning, that it might never go out. As regarded the *ashes of wood*, consumed with the burnt-offering, it was his direction first, and while in his linen garments, to put them beside the altar; then in other garments to carry them away to a clean place without the camp.—This was quite a different office from that alluded to in Apoc. viii. 3, (I beg attention to this point,) of receiving and offering incense.

<sup>4</sup> See Exod. xxvii. 3—5. Also my notice on the subject in the Appendix to Vol. ii. pp. 513, 514.

<sup>5</sup> Ezek. xxxix. 17.

<sup>6</sup> E. g. Isa. xxxiv. 6. In Apoc. xix. 17, the image is that of a *supper*. But the *banquet* and the *sacrifice* were, as is well known, continually united; both in the Jewish religious rites, and in those too of the heathen.—Daubuz observes on the frequent application of *sacrificial* words, such as *θυω*, *mactō*, &c., to the slaughter of enemies: e. g. by Virgil, "Pallas te hoc vulnerē, Pallas, *immolat*:" also how in some cases, as in that of the slaughter of the Midianite by Phinehas (Numb. xxv. 13), it was accepted as a propitiatory offering.

Let me add in illustration Jer. xxv. 30; where, after notice of the wine-cup of God's fury being given to the nations, it is said, "The Lord shall roar from his holy habitation; . . . he shall give a shout, as they that tread the grapes, against all the inhabitants of the earth."

<sup>7</sup> See the observations, including Note<sup>2</sup>, at p. 215 of my 3rd Volume.

its preparedness to consume all except those that might have made a covenant with Him in his own appointed way by sacrifice,<sup>1</sup> and, through faith in the substituted offering of the Lamb of God, saved themselves. 2ndly, it pointed to one special cause of God's wrath against the earth's inhabitants,—namely, *their slaughter of the martyrs*; whose ashes, as of acceptable self-devoted holocausts, mixed with those of the great propitiatory burnt-offering, had long been accumulating (under this Angel's charge, it is to be supposed) beneath the Apocalyptic altar. Already early in the drama a voice had been heard by St. John from the souls of witnesses slain for Christ beneath the altar, “Lord, how long dost thou not avenge our blood on those that dwell on the earth:” and it was then said that they were to wait for this avenging, till a second and additional band of martyrs had been completed in number, besides themselves.<sup>2</sup> As late as the third Vial a cry from the same point indicated, that not the full predicted vengeance, but only a preliminary judgment, had then begun.<sup>3</sup> Now, however, (and perhaps with some last notable act of martyrdom marking the epoch,) the cry of this Angel issuing forth from the interior of, or hollow beneath, the altar, proclaimed that their number was completed,—their moment of full avenging come;—the asserted power of the two witnesses to bring down fire from heaven against their injurers, to consume them,<sup>4</sup> about to be fearfully illustrated before the world;—and the earth to disclose her blood, and no more cover her slain.<sup>5</sup>

As to the remaining particulars of the figuration we may observe, in passing, that the *gathering* of the vine's clusters by the Angel's sharp pruning-hook, and the *casting* them into the wine-press of the wrath of God, seemed to indicate acts preparatory to the *winepress-treading*:<sup>6</sup> the former perhaps meaning some signal separation, by sharp judgments, of Antichrist's members from those of Christ;

<sup>1</sup> Psalm l. 5.

<sup>2</sup> Apoc. vi. 11. See Vol. i. p. 227, &c.

<sup>3</sup> Apoc. xvi. 7: where, as before remarked, the text of the best critical editions reads, *ηκουσα του θυσιαστηριου λεγοντος*, implying a voice from within or underneath the altar; especially as compared with the phraseology here used of the Angel, *εξηλθεν εκ του θυσιαστηριου*. See my Vol. iii. p. 388.

<sup>4</sup> Apoc. xi. 5. See Vol. ii. pp. 212—214.

<sup>5</sup> Isa. xxvi. 21.

<sup>6</sup> So Daubuz, p. 659, and others.

the latter, the over-ruling of their own wicked wills,<sup>1</sup> and of the plans of the evil spirits animating them,<sup>2</sup> to accomplish the gathering of the antichristian body to the fated field of vengeance.—What *the locality* of that field we may perhaps better conjecture after comparing some other prophecies; so as will be done at the end of the Chapter on Daniel next following. Two things seem clear about it:—1st, that the *locale* of the *winepress-treading* can scarce be different from the *Armageddon* of the other series of Apocalyptic prophecy:—2nd, that its description here as “*without the city*,” (a figure in itself very appropriate, let me observe, as both the king’s and other wine-presses of old were actually situated outside the walls of Jerusalem,<sup>3</sup>) is a characteristic that agrees well with what is said in Apoc. xix. of the Beast and his adherents being slain by Christ *after* the destruction of Babylon, the great city, and consequently *away from it*.—As to the inference drawn by many commentators from the circumstance of blood being said to flow out from this wine-press for 1600 furlongs up to the horses’ bridles, and the fact that 1600 furlongs is also about the length of the Holy Land, from Dan to Beersheba,<sup>4</sup>—I say as to their inference from these premises to the effect of the whole length of that Holy Land being the destined field of slaughter,<sup>5</sup> it seems to me hardly warranted by the prophetic language. For the number 1600 is, as sundry patristic as well as other expositors have observed, *a square number*.<sup>6</sup> And both the circumstance of *winevats*,—square

<sup>1</sup> Compare Acts ii. 23; “Him, being delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, ye have taken;” &c.

<sup>2</sup> I mean the three spirits like frogs, that gathered the kings of the earth to Armageddon. Apoc. xvi. 14, 16.

<sup>3</sup> So Daubuz, p. 662. In Zechariah’s prophetic description of the re-habitation of Jerusalem in its *fullest* ancient extent, it is said, “The land shall be inhabited from the tower of Hananeel to the *king’s winepresses*.” Zech. xiv. 10. Which phrase is explained by Kimchi (M’Caul’s Translation, p. 185) as if including *the threshing-floor* as well as *the winepress*.

<sup>4</sup> Noted by Jerome ad Dardan. Pliny makes the length of Palestine to be 189 miles. Nat. Hist. v. 13. So Daubuz, p. 664.

<sup>5</sup> So Fuller in his Pisgah; also Faber and others, after him.—Daubuz adopts their view as to its being the measure of Palestine; but applies it *figuratively*, as signifying the length of the *mystical* apostate Israel; i. e. the whole territorial extent of Papal Christendom.—Mede suggests the fact of 1600 stadia being also the length of the *States of the Church* in Italy, from Rome to Verona.

<sup>6</sup> “Quadratum satis amplum.” So Vitringa, p. 902, after the old interpreters Victorinus, Tichonius, Primasius.



it might be, or of other shape,—dug in the earth or rock, being a usual appendage of the agricultural *winepress*,<sup>1</sup> and that of their being expressly mentioned in the parallel figurative prophecy of Joel, (“Come, get you down, for the *press*<sup>2</sup> is full, the *fats*<sup>3</sup> overflow, for their wickedness is great,”) concur to make it probable that in the Apocalyptic picture this appendage of the *winevat* was not wanting, and that the 1600 furlongs expressed its *square*.<sup>4</sup> Supposing which to be the case, the depth of blood mentioned might be that in the winevat;—a uniform depth, and one gauged easily, and as usual: whereas, on the hypothesis of a *stream* of 1600 furlongs in length, it is hard to conceive how the depth should not vary, but be still up to the horses’ bridles throughout the length of the 1600 furlongs. Indeed I doubt the words admitting that sense.<sup>5</sup>—What the *square* intended, if such it be, is a little dubious. If we take the number 1600 as the square of 40, then the area will be one of 5 miles to a side, equal to 25 square miles.<sup>6</sup> If, on the other hand, the 1600 furlongs be ex-

<sup>1</sup> On Isa. v. 2, “He made a *winepress* in it,” or rather *winevat*, Hebr. בַּיַּד, it is observed by Dr. A. Clarke that the Septuagint rendering of the word is here *προληνιον*, but in four other places more properly *ὑποληνιον*; viz. Isa. xvi. 10, Joel iii. 13, Hag. ii. 16, and Zech. xiv. 10. The *winepress* itself, he says, (in Latin the *torcular* or *calcatorium*) is in Hebr. called רֶזֶק, or רֶזֶקָה. Near it was the *lacus*: (Columella xii. 18. 3, Ovid. *Fast.* iv. 888:) a large open place, or vessel, which by a conduit received the *sweet, mustum*, or *blood of the grape*, from the winepress; and which in hot countries was often dug under ground, or out of the rock, for coolness, that the heat might not cause too great a fermentation in it.

So too Burmann De Vectigal. 16, in reference to Ovid’s line, “Præmia de lacubus proxima musta tuis.” And let me refer also to the Scripture Expositors, Patrick, on Lev. xxiii. 39, with regard to the vintage and winepress at the Feast of Tabernacles, and Bishop Lowth on Isa. v. 2.

<sup>2</sup> רֶזֶק

<sup>3</sup> הַרְקָה

<sup>4</sup> The Greek word *ληνος*, which is used here, alike in verses 19 and 20, is a word applied in either sense; that is, both to signify the *winepress* and the *winevat*. See Schleusner on the words *ληνος* and *ὑποληνιον*.

<sup>5</sup> The expression in the original is *ἐξηλθεν αίμα εκ της ληνου αχρι των χαλιων των ιπιων απο σταδιων χιλων εξακοσιων*. And the parallel passage adduced to justify this use of the *απο*, is John xi. 18; “Bethany was nigh Jerusalem, *ως απο σταδιων δεκαπεντε*, about *fifteen furlongs off*.” To which we may add John xxi. 8; and also Arrian; *Ἐπερκειται δε αυτης απο τριων ημερων πολις Σαυη, και μετ’ αλλας εννεα ημερας Αφαρ*: &c. But this is the distance of an extreme point. And, were the analogy of these passages followed, the rendering here would be, “At the distance of 1600 stadia from the winepress the blood was up to the horses’ bridles:”—in which case how much deeper must it have been at the winepress itself!

<sup>6</sup> This idea of the square I have not seen elsewhere. And I ought to offer some parallel passage to justify it;—some one where a numeral of measure, without the word *square* added, does yet mean square measure: which however I cannot recollect.

plained to give the circuit of the square, 400 to each side,<sup>1</sup>—then the square area will be vastly greater, being one, not of 5 miles to each side, but 50. Even on the smaller scale the figure would indicate tremendous slaughter.<sup>2</sup>—Its *executor* we are told in another Apocalyptic prophecy is to be the WORD OF GOD, the LORD JESUS. For He it is that is there described as treading the winepress of the wrath of God ;<sup>3</sup> being the Omega, as well as Alpha, of the judgments of the consummation. With which other description of the great winepress-treading the present is connected not otherwise only, and by general resemblance of the main subject, but also by that singular standard of measure, “*up to the horses’ bridles.*” For it seems to indicate the presence of *horses* and *horsemen*, as visible in the prefiguration, on the scene of slaughter ; the same fact that appears prominently also in the figurative picture of the winepress-treading described in Apoc. xix. : this latter being executed upon “*them that sate on horses,*” among others, in the Beast’s army ;<sup>4</sup> and by One who himself *sat on a white horse*, with saints attendant, *on white horses* likewise.<sup>5</sup>

---

So ends the *brief* sketch (as I presume it to be) of the æra and events of the seventh Vial, given to St. John in the rapid concluding evolution of the *writing without* on the Apocalyptic scroll : that same of which the chief object was a full supplementary figurative description of the BEAST FROM THE ABYSS ; and so its notice of other subjects naturally more succinct. In resuming however the original *within-written* series of prefigurations a much fuller revelation was made of the same deeply interesting subjects ; to the which fuller revelation we have now to turn.

<sup>1</sup> So the old expositors mentioned, as before observed, by Vitringa. “*Quater enim quadringenta,*” it is said, “*efficiunt 1600.*” Hengstenberg supposes the winevat to have been *round*, and 1600 stadia the length of the circumference. But that was not, I believe, so usual a form as the *square*.

<sup>2</sup> It would be a *winefat* of the size of ancient Rome or modern London.

<sup>3</sup> Apoc. xix. 15.

<sup>4</sup> Ib. 18 ; “*that ye may eat the flesh of kings, and the flesh of captains, . . . and of horses, and of them that sit on them.*”

<sup>5</sup> Ib. 11, 14.

§ 2. THE FULLER APOCALYPTIC FIGURATION, AS WITHIN-WRITTEN, OF THE EVENTS IMMEDIATELY PREPARATORY TO, AND THOSE INCLUDED IN, THE SEVENTH VIAL; DOWN TO THE WINEPRESS-TREADING, AND DESTRUCTION OF THE BEAST AND FALSE PROPHET, IMMEDIATELY BEFORE THE MILLENNIUM.

It is the Part *within-written* of the Apocalyptic scroll, with its fuller and more particular series of prefigurations of the events of the seventh Vial, that now calls for attention.

“Behold I come as a thief: blessed is he that watcheth and keepeth his garments, lest he walk naked, and they see his shame!—And they gathered them together<sup>1</sup> to the place<sup>2</sup> which is called in the Hebrew tongue Armageddon.<sup>3</sup>

And the seventh [Angel]<sup>4</sup> poured out his Vial on the air:<sup>5</sup> and there came a great voice from the temple of heaven,<sup>6</sup> from the throne, saying, It is done. And there were lightnings, and voices, and thunders: and there was a great earthquake, such as was not since men<sup>7</sup> were upon the earth,—such an earthquake,<sup>8</sup> so great. And the city the great one<sup>9</sup> was divided into three parts: and the cities of the nations<sup>10</sup> fell. And great Babylon was remembered before God, to give unto her the cup<sup>11</sup> of the wine of the fierceness of his anger. And every island fled away; and the mountains were not found. And there

<sup>1</sup> και συνηγαγεν αυτους. It seems to me very obvious that this συνηγαγεν in the singular has for its nominative the neuter plural of πνευματα δαιμονιων, agreeably with a well-known rule of Greek grammar; the pronoun accusative αυτους, meaning the kings, being governed by it. Compare verse 14: εσι γαρ πνευματα δαιμονιων ποιουντα σημεια, α εκπορευεται επι τους βασιλεας της οικουμηνης ολης, συναγαγειν αυτους εις τον πολεμον της ημερας εκεινης της μεγαλης. I am surprised that not only certain other expositors, following our authorized version, but even Mr. Tregelles, should have construed συνηγαγεν, “he gathered them together.”

<sup>2</sup> A has the curious reading ποταμον, instead of τοπον.

<sup>3</sup> Αρμαγεδων Α; Μαγεδδων Β.

<sup>4</sup> Αγγελος is omitted in Α and Β.

<sup>5</sup> επι τον αερα, not εις. So Α, Β, and the critical editions generally.

<sup>6</sup> του ουρανου, omitted by Α.

<sup>7</sup> ανθρωποι. So the MS. Β, and Wordsworth. Α and Tregelles read ανθρωπος εγενετο, in the singular.

<sup>8</sup> τηλικουτος.

<sup>9</sup> η πολις η μεγαλη.

<sup>10</sup> των εθνων, a word used vii. 9, x. 11, xiv. 6, &c., where it may probably have a meaning extending beyond the Roman world: as well as in xi. 2, 9, and xvii. 15, where it seems used restrictedly of the Latinized Christians of the Popedom.

<sup>11</sup> το ποτηριον.

fell upon the men<sup>1</sup> great hail out of heaven; [every stone] about a talent's weight. And the men blasphemed God because of the plague<sup>2</sup> of the hail; for the plague thereof was exceeding great." Apoc. xvi. 15—21.

I. And here then, *introductorily* to the outpouring of that Vial, and next after the vision of the three spirits like frogs issuing forth "to gather the kings of the whole earth to the war of the great day of God Almighty," there came first that solemn warning-voice by Christ from heaven, "Behold I come as a thief: blessed is he that watcheth and keepeth his garments, that he may not walk naked, and his shame be seen!" A warning this suited to every age of the Church; but doubly so, of course, when the spirits of delusion were to be thus abroad, the night thus far spent, and the cry already raised, as it would seem, of the day of Christ's coming being at hand.<sup>3</sup> For then surely, if ever, He might expect his servants, and especially the ministers and watchmen of his temple,<sup>4</sup> to be awake and looking out for his appearing:<sup>5</sup> then, if ever, that they should be watchful against putting off, like indecorous slumberers,<sup>6</sup> or men drugged into sleep by the poison-draught of some spirit of delusion, those garments of righteousness<sup>7</sup> and sal-

<sup>1</sup> Literally, "there falls;" *καταβαίνει ἐπὶ τῶς ἀνθρώπους.*

<sup>2</sup> *ἐκ τῆς πληγῆς.*

<sup>3</sup> Rom. xiii. 12—14.

<sup>4</sup> I thus particularize, because many expositors, with Vitringa, (p. 985,) think there is an allusion in the text to the Jewish custom of the *Prefect of the Temple* going his rounds at night, to see that the watchmen there were awake at their posts. Which watchmen seem alluded to in Psalm cxxx. 6, and elsewhere.

<sup>5</sup> Compare Luke xii. 35; "Let your loins be girded, and your lights burning; and ye yourselves like men waiting for their lord:" 2 Peter iii. 12; "looking for, and hasting unto, the coming of the day of God:" &c.

<sup>6</sup> Though the Eastern habits are in many respects different from our own, yet they have very much the European custom of putting off *day-clothes* on lying down to sleep at night, and putting on a loose and open night-dress. This is alluded to figuratively in Rom. xiii. 12; "It is high time to awake out of sleep. . . The night is far spent, the day is at hand; let us therefore cast off the works of darkness, and put on the armour of light:"—or, as he says verse 14, "Put ye on the Lord Jesus Christ." Again 1 Thess. v. 8: "Let us who are of the day be sober; (and *watch*, verse 6;) putting on the breastplate of faith and hope, and for a helmet the hope of salvation."

The need of attention to the avoidance of *spiritual* self-exposure, was strikingly symbolized to the Israelites in the charges given about *outward* decency. So in Deut. xxiii. 14; "The Lord thy God walketh in the midst of thy camp: . . . therefore shall thy camp be holy; that He see no unclean thing (or nakedness, so the Hebrew) in thee." Also Exod. xxviii. 42, 43; a passage referred to by Daubuz.

<sup>7</sup> Isa. lxi. 10.



vation of which He himself was the giver:<sup>1</sup> lest, seeing them naked, He should shut them out from his heavenly temple and kingdom;<sup>2</sup> and their spiritual nakedness and shame be exposed before the world!<sup>3</sup>—Next after which follows a passing notice of the three unclean spirits of delusion advancing successfully in their object of gathering the kings of the earth (inclusive of course of the people of their kingdoms) towards the scene of the great conflict, called in the Hebrew tongue *Armageddon*:<sup>4</sup>—an appellative this etymologically explicable either as *the mountain of gathering*, or *the mountain of destruction*;<sup>5</sup> and on which, and whether designative of some actual locality, or wholly figurative, I deem it best, as the conflict falls

<sup>1</sup> Apoc. iii. 17, 18; "Because thou knowest not that thou art poor and naked, I counsel thee to buy of me . . . white raiment that thou mayest be clothed, and that the shame of thy nakedness do not appear."

<sup>2</sup> As the slumbering watchman of the temple would be excluded; or as the man that wanted the wedding-garment.

<sup>3</sup> So in the case of the watchman of the temple thrust out in his night-clothes.

I might add that, in case of detected unfaithfulness in the *wife*, exposure was one of the punishments sometimes inflicted. So Hosea ii. 2, 3: "Let her put away her whoredoms; . . . lest I strip her naked, and set her as in the day that she was born:" &c. But the idea of the marriage relation does not seem to me referred to in the verse before us.

<sup>4</sup> It is agreed, I believe, on all hands that the war of *Armageddon* must be considered as taking place under the seventh Vial, and constituting the conflict immediately prior to the judgment of the consummation. Hence the notice here made must either be anticipative, or the εἰς construed in the sense of *towards*, so as in Apoc. xii. 6. See my Vol. iii. p. 46, Note<sup>3</sup>.

<sup>5</sup> Both *Grotius* and *Vitringa* derive it from מִגְדוֹ a mountain, and מְדַד which signifies alike to *destroy* and to *collect*; the former as in Dan. iv. 14, 23, in the Chaldee; the latter, as in Micah v. 1. Of which meanings *Grotius* adopts the latter for his etymology of *Armageddon*, *Vitringa* the former. *Mede*, p. 522, prefers to derive it from מְדַד מְדַד *excidium*, and מְדַד *turma*; in a sense of the word very much the same as *Vitringa's*.

It was probably from one of these words that *Megiddo* derived its name: a town of Manasseh famous as the scene of the battle in which the good king Josiah was killed by Pharaoh Necho, 2 Kings xxiii. 29; and also near to that of the battle in which Sisera was overthrown by Barak, Judges v. 19. And some expositors have supposed this precise place *Megiddo* to be intended as the actual *Armageddon* of the prophecy; or, if not so, a reference to be meant to one or other of these battles fought near it.—I should think however that there is hardly reason for this opinion. Of the two battles that of Barak and Sisera was scarcely of sufficient importance to be singled out as a precedent; and that of Josiah and Pharaoh Necho was of an issue and character the direct reverse to that of *Armageddon*.

On the other hand *M. Stuart* supposes a reference to the occasion told of in Zech. xii. 11; when, after the final gathering of the nations against Jerusalem, and their destruction, there is to be a great mourning in Jerusalem, "like the mourning of Haddrimmon in the valley of Megiddo." The locality of the Apocalyptic warring, on this supposition, would be not *Megiddo* itself, but Jerusalem and its neighbourhood. And *Vitringa* and others identify the conflict of the *Valley of Jehoshaphat*, mentioned by Joel, with that of *Armageddon*.—I purpose to notice these points on occasion of noticing the war itself, at the conclusion of my next chapter on Daniel xi. ciii.

Probably the name should be considered simply *mystical*; so as those other appellatives mentioned in the Apocalypse,—*Sodom*, *Egypt*, *Babylon*, *Abaddon*.

later, under the seventh Vial, to reserve my remarks for a later Chapter.

And then at length, and without further delay, the outpouring is described by the Evangelist as taking place of the *seventh and last Vial* of judgment; an outpouring, it is said, on the *air*, or *atmosphere*, of the Apocalyptic world:—the immediate sequel of which outpouring was voices, thunderings, and lightnings, and a great earthquake such as had not been since the men were upon the earth, affecting the sea, or maritime parts, as well as the mainland, and causing the disruption of the Great City into three parts. Immediately following on which was the further plague of a tremendous hail; which, however, though so severe, was ineffectual to induce repentance among the people: and then a yet more terrible judgment on “Great Babylon;” (so “the city the great one” is here first called;) which now at length came up in remembrance before God, “to give to her the cup of the wine of the wrath of his anger.”

Of the primary part of which prefiguration the sense, translated from symbols into realities, (let me here, A.D. 1861, reprint my explanation just as originally given in 1844,)—realities yet future, but apparently quickly coming, seems to be this:—that, after a certain progress of the three unclean spirits now abroad, viz. (as I conceive,) those of *infidel* and perhaps *revolutionary irreligion*, of *popery*, and of *antichristian priestcraft*, such as to marshal their strength in Western Christendom and its colonial dependencies in hostility against Christ’s cause and Church, and after a cry too of Christ’s coming as near at hand, such as seems now surely begun,<sup>1</sup> there is to arise, all suddenly

<sup>1</sup> I here wish to take the Scriptural expression of *Christ’s coming* with a certain latitude of meaning; so as to include the voice of many who may yet not be distinctly expecting his *personal* manifestation, or the great judgment of quick and dead. So, e. g. *Dr. Arnold*. Christ, he says, is to come again after his resurrection in *three* different senses:—1st, and in the highest sense, when this world shall end, and we shall rise to judgment; 2ndly, when individually we each receive Christ’s call at death; 3rdly, when He comes to bring on the whole earth, or on some one or more nations, (as on Jerusalem at the time of its destruction by the Romans,) a great season of suffering and judgment. Then he adds, that to all of us now living it may be said that in the 1st sense Christ *may* come “*in this generation*,” since we know not the times and seasons which the Father hath in his own power; and also that in the 3rd too He *may* come to us “*in this generation* ;” “*there not being wanting signs which make it probable that He will so come.*”—In his Lectures on Modern History, p. 38,

and fearfully, some extraordinary *convulsion, darkening, and vitiation* of its *political atmosphere*: the permitted effect perhaps, in God's righteous judgment, of the working to a crisis of those evil principles.—I thus explain the *air* in the Apocalyptic vision to mean the European *political and moral atmosphere*, after the analogy of the Apocalyptic *firmament*; which has been construed, on I think undoubted evidence, to symbolize the *political firmament*. And I speak of the effect of the disturbance caused in this figurative atmosphere by the Vial's outpouring as of that three-fold character; because, as the *natural atmosphere* (whence the symbol is derived) is alike the region of storms, the medium through which the heavenly luminaries shine on us, and the element we breathe, a great physical disturbance wrought therein must needs affect it in respect of each of those functions:<sup>1</sup> which being so in the *symbol*, it seems but reasonable to suppose the same in the *thing symbolized*. Besides that in the only other instance in the Apocalypse wherein the *air* is spoken of as affected,—viz. on occasion of the issuing from the pit of the abyss of the smoke and miasma of Mahometanism, “whereby the sun and the *air* were darkened,”<sup>2</sup>—we know from history that there resulted an agitation and tainting of the moral and political atmosphere of Greek Christendom, through the spread of that false religion; as well as an obscuration of the lights, or ruling authorities, in its political heaven.—Nor does it seem to me improbable that some ominous derangement of the *natural atmosphere* may furnish a *literal* groundwork for the figure, nearly contemporarily.<sup>3</sup>—Doubtless under the judgment of the seventh Vial (if I have rightly explained it) we must expect this convulsion, vitiation, and darkening of the political and moral atmosphere in Western Europe to be unprecedentedly awful: the very elements of thought

there is a remarkable passage yet more to my point, which I reserve for citation to my 5th and concluding Chapter.

<sup>1</sup> Somewhat as in that remarkable case alluded to by Cowper;

And Nature seems with dim and sickly eye  
To wait the close of all.

I have quoted this already in my Vol. iii. p. 345; and stated that it alludes to a very remarkable fog, which covered both Europe and Asia the whole summer of 1783, and in one country of Europe prevented the sun being seen for three years.

<sup>2</sup> Apoc. ix. 2. See Vol. i. pp. 441, 442.

<sup>3</sup> See Vol. iii. pp. 347, 348.



and feeling, of social affection and moral principle, whereby society and its national politics are in God's wonderful wisdom constituted and preserved, being so affected as very much to intercept all genial influences of the ruling authorities in its system,—to minister disease instead of health to each body politic,—and perhaps, with terrible convulsions, to resolve society for a while into its primary elements.<sup>1</sup>

So as to the Vial's outpouring on the *air*: the only new symbol in the figurations before us. And then as regards the *thunders, lightnings, and voices* of the vision, they indicate of course wars and tumults following, so as always elsewhere in the Apocalyptic prophecy: while the notice of the fearful *hailstorm* attendant may perhaps further indicate that *France*, the most northerly of the Papal kingdoms, is again to enact the part of a chief instrumental operator of the plague,<sup>2</sup> very much as in the earlier judgments of the

<sup>1</sup> As the symbol of the *air* is a new one in the Apocalyptic visions, it may be satisfactory to the reader to have the explanations of it given by two other commentators,—one of an earlier age, one (in 1844) a contemporary,—who have paid most attention to the figure; viz. *Vitringa* and *Mr. Cuninghame*.

*Vitringa*, p. 988, after noting that the word *air* is here to be taken in its largest signification, goes on thus to describe the effects (as he supposed them) of the Vial's outpouring on it. "Ad Phialam hanc effusam tenebræ obductæ sunt cælo mystico illius terræ ejus imperium sibi vindicaverat Bestia. Rectores utriusque ordinis, qui in hoc cælo fulserant, de sedibus suis visi sunt deturbari: . . . omnia autem in regimine politico et ecclesiastico illius magni imperii eum in modum conturbari, ut *aer* deesset populo illius civitatis quem biberet, et à quo refocillaretur; (sunt enim Principes et rectores populorum, quatenus populos sibi subjectos fovent, et in illos curâ et institutione suâ influunt, [qu. *inflant* ?] veluti spiritus oris populi, hoc est veluti aer quem bibunt et hauriunt, ut vocantur apud Jeremiam; (Lam. iv. 20;) et aer ille conturbatus locum faceret, et occasione Deo præberet gravissimis illis judiciis, quæ Imperio Bestiæ ad totalem statûs ejus subversionem decreverat."

*Mr. Cuninghame*. "It is through the medium of the natural air, or atmosphere, that the natural sun, moon, and stars communicate to us their light, heat, and influences: it is the same air which is in us the principle of vitality. Now, through what air or atmosphere do the symbolic sun, moon, and stars communicate to us their influences, light, and heat? I answer, through the medium of the *political and ecclesiastical constitutions of the states*. These constitutions are also the principle of vitality to the body politic." And thence he argues that the outpouring of the seventh Vial is to be upon the political and ecclesiastical constitution of the Roman Empire; causing a tremendous agitation throughout the government and politico-ecclesiastical system of the bestial empire, destroying the general balance of power, and superinducing the horrors of a political storm, pp. 305, 306.—There is no very great difference, it will be seen, in our explanations.

Besides which expositors let me also cite the explanation of *M. Stuart*, as representative of quite a different system of Apocalyptic interpretation. "We are probably," says he, "to regard *the air* in this case as the element by which is to be engendered the dreadful storm that follows, which is to overthrow the principal cities of the Beast and his confederates."

<sup>2</sup> The precedent of the first Trumpet seems at any rate to indicate, *if its analogy*

seventh Trumpet.<sup>1</sup>—For the result a most remarkable *revolution* is foreshown as destined to befall the European Commonwealth; viz. the final breaking up of that decemregal form of the Papal empire, which has now characterized it for near thirteen centuries, into a new and *tripartite* form: the tripartition meant being probably, like the earlier separation of the tenth of the Great City, conjointly *religious* and *political*.<sup>2</sup> In which form the *Great City*, or ROME,—including, I presume, both its subject Ecclesiastical State, and the *third* of the tripartition connected with it,—is to receive its own peculiar final and appalling fate: as it is said, “And great Babylon was remembered before God, to give her the cup of the wine of the fierceness of his wrath.”—So that whensoever, after fearful wars and convulsions, a tripartition like this shall take place in the European commonwealth, it must be regarded as the proximate sign, and very alarm bell to Christendom, of the

*be followed*, a judgment from the *North*. Many expositors prefer to explain it of the *Russian* power. And on revising my Work, and comparing this prophecy with one in Ezekiel xxxviii., xxxix., which seems to point to Russia’s taking part in the great pre-millennial conflict, as will be noticed at the end of my next Chapter, I must admit that this view of the symbol is also not improbable.

It is to be observed that the mention of the great hail falling comes *after*, not *before*, that of the great city’s tripartition.

<sup>1</sup> See Vol. iii. pp. 337—339.—Vitringa, p. 994, explains the *hail-storm* simply to indicate a judgment immediately from heaven. He compares the hail which fell in the seventh Egyptian plague, and that which fell on the Canaanites after Joshua’s victory over them at Gibeon, Joshua x. 11; the latter especially a very notable case for comparison. He might not unfitly have added the case of Barak’s victory near Megiddo, where “the stars in their courses” fought against Sisera: for Josephus (as Horsley observes on the song of Deborah) explains this of a *hail-storm* directed against him.—Compare too the as yet unfulfilled prophecy of Isa. xxx. 30; “The Lord shall cause his glorious voice to be heard; and shall show the lighting down of his arm, with the indignation of his anger, and with the flame of a devouring fire, with scattering, and tempest, and *hail-stones*.”

It seems to me very possible that there may be here too that which shall *literally* answer to the prediction. See the Note, Vol. iii. p. 346. But the analogy of all the Apocalyptic prefigurations requires primarily a *symbolic* explanation.

<sup>2</sup> Vitringa conjectures that one-third will be *adherents to the Papacy*, or *Beast*; another third *favourers of superstition*, but not the *Papacy*; and the last third on the *side of the true Protestant Church*: “totam illam civitatem scindendam esse in partes sive factiones tres; quarum *una* superstitioni et idololatriæ Romanensi adhuc adhærebit; altera auctoritati Pontificiæ renunciare parata sit, sed superstitionem tamen veterem non facile deseret; *tertia* in partes transibit ecclesiæ, cujus causæ Deum viderant notabili Providentiâ favisse.” p. 991.

Mr. Cuninghame’s general view is to the effect that the division will have relation to the work of the three unclean spirits, as understood by him: one division ranging under the standard of *atheism and anarchy*, another of *despotism*, another of *popery*. In his last Edition he still advocates, though with a certain variation from his former opinion, a tripartition of *political principles*, not *territorial division*. Which latter however seems to myself certainly included; just as in Apoc. xi. 13.

judgment, the great judgment being then at length close at hand.

[Such was the explanation of this Apocalyptic symbolization given in my three former Editions, published successively in 1844, 1846, 1847. And can it be right for me to republish the Work again, now in 1850, (so I added in my 4th Edition, and yet again, on the 5th reprinting of my Work ten years later, in 1861, I see no reason to alter the opinion there and then expressed,) without asking whether what occurred at the revolutionary outbreaks of 1848 did not singularly coincide with the expectations so stated as to the probable characteristics of the commencing effusion of the seventh Vial? For, first, there was then a vitiation of the *natural* atmosphere over all Europe, such as to awaken the general attention and awe,—a vitiation affecting with its poison alike the vegetable world, and the health and life of man;<sup>1</sup> and then, almost coincidently therewith, convulsions altogether unprecedented in character, outbreaking primarily in France without any adequate apparent cause,<sup>2</sup> and thence propagated lightning-like throughout Europe, which disordered and imperilled the whole *social*<sup>3</sup> as well as *political* relations of men, alike in France, Sicily, North and South Italy, Rome, Germany, Austria, Hungary. Truly the current language of the day seemed almost like an adoption of the Apocalyptic figure,

<sup>1</sup> In his speech on the Public Health Bill, as reported in the Times of Aug. 8, 1848, Lord Morpeth cited a then recent Number of the British and Foreign Medico-Chirurgical Review, "which proved," he said, "by induction from a mass of facts, that certain atmospheric conditions and electrical states concurred in the production of the cholera."—Again, in the 18th meeting of the British Association for advancement of science, the Athenæum of Aug. 26, 1848 notices a very elaborate paper by Col. Sykes on "the Atmospheric Disturbances throughout the world:"—"a paper, it says, which "characterizes the *atmospheric* disturbances and anomalies that presented themselves in various places in Europe, Asia, Africa, and America, for some months past, as not less remarkable than the *political* agitations and storms which swept lately over Europe."

The manner in which the *potato blight* was a sign and consequence of the atmospheric vitiation over a large part of Europe, as well as the *cholera morbus*, is notorious; and to how alarming an extent in some countries, above all in Ireland.

<sup>2</sup> In France the revolution of 1848 was but a fresh shock of the great original revolution of 1789. So M. Montalembert justly observed, as cited in my Vol. iii. p. 476.

<sup>3</sup> So in Count Mole's Address to the Electors of the Gironde on his election, at the beginning of October, 1848. "It is *society* itself which is in danger. The contest has commenced between civilization and barbarism. On the one side is placed *family* and *property*: on the other the abolition of those eternal laws of which the roots are implanted in the heart of man, and which emanate directly from his divine Creator." ap. Evening Mail, Oct. 4, 1848.



and confession to the effusion of a vial on the air.<sup>1</sup>—And, as results, who even now sees the end? Does not all seem as

<sup>1</sup> It may be curious and instructive to mark the applications of the *figure* to the *fact*, by persons of different character and view, in that extraordinary crisis.

1. The *democratic revolutionists*.—*M. Lamartine*, May 9, 1848, thus made his Report to the National Assembly. “Before the Revolution no European thought was permitted us. We were 36 millions isolated on the continent. . . The system was one of repression and force: our *horizon* was exceedingly limited: *air* was wanting to our dignity, as to our policy. At present our system is the system of a democratic truth, which shall swell to the proportions of a social universal faith: our *horizon* is the futurity of civilized nations: our *vital air* is the breath of liberty in the free breasts of the whole universe.” From the *Galignani* of that date.

And so, near about the same time, the *Giornale Costituzionale* of Naples, (where I was then residing,) of May 20, 1848. After mention of the Frankfort Assembly, gathered with the view of forming a new Germanic Constitution, it thus wrote: “*Hannovi dei tempi in cui l'opinione pubblica, come l'aria atmosferica, riempie tutti gli sparsi vuoti, in cui questa viene respirata da taluno, e da lui nuovamente infusa negli altri.*” And then the writer adds, that the aristocratic element, which for 1000 years had been so prominent in Italy, “*svanì dinanzi al soffio del volere popolare.*”

2. The *philosophic observer*, as in the Paper of the British Association cited above, called attention to the remarkable analogy between the *physical atmospheric disturbances*, and the *political agitations* and *storms* which had been sweeping over Europe. And so too, more than once, the *Times*, the *Illustrated London News*, and other newspapers.

Let me abstract from the leading article of the *Illustrated News* of Oct. 25, 1851. “Long before the great Revolution of 1789 skilful mariners . . . were aware of the signs and portents of the approaching tempest. In like manner the revolutions of 1830 and 1848 betrayed their coming by a premonitory *darkening of the atmosphere*, by a *sudden fall in the social barometer*, unintelligible to the many, but full of meaning to the few. The *air was surcharged with electricity*; and the weather-wise were enabled to calculate when the clouds would meet, the *thunders* roar, and the *lightnings flash upon society.*” “Similar warnings,” it is added, “are heard at the present time. There are clouds on the verge of the horizon laden with lightning, and which are certain to break somewhere. The cry of danger comes loudest from *France*. It is still the focus of revolution.” Besides which, the writer then particularizes *Germany, Hungary, Italy*. In 1861 may we not repeat this?

3. As a specimen of the *practical Christian's* feelings, let me select the following from the Bible Society's Report of May 1848. “The storms of political agitation have gathered round the close of the year.” [i. e. of the Bible Society's year, ending May 1.] . . . “The present state of the Continent of Europe makes the work of the highest importance. The fashion of the world passeth away. Thrones are being overturned, nations shaken. Is it not on a dark stormy night, and in the *tempest*, that the compass is most useful, the skilful pilot, and a correct chart? So the heavenly chart, &c. . . The *political atmosphere* however of this country [Belgium] is less troubled than that of either of the neighbouring nations.” Again, at the conclusion of the Report: “Recent extraordinary events have brought the continent of Europe before us under a most unexpected aspect. . . The *hurricane* of political revolution has already swept away barriers which have for ages impeded the free circulation of truth. . . Your Committee watch the events with anxious emotion. . . But they do not think it necessary to wait till the sea of agitation is calmed, till the broken framework of society is reconstructed, and the world once more at rest. Why should we not now go forth; and, taking our stand amidst the nations rocked to and fro by the storm, fearlessly hold up before them the volume of inspired truth? . . . God hath come out of his place. He arises to shake terribly the earth. It is as though the oracle had again broken silence, I will overturn, overturn, overturn. Yet let not our hearts be troubled, . . . for it may be after these things, that there shall be heard as it were the voice of a great multitude, and as the voice of great waters, and many thunders, saying the Lord God Omnipotent reigneth.”

4. Of *prophetic students* many, as might be expected, recognised the correspondence

if the European Commonwealth was on the eve of some new construction: France leading the van in the revolution, and Germany and Italy following? Does there exist a statesman who can look upon the coming future without awe; or one who can have any confidence in predicting its issues?—After all that has happened, how can it be but that with increased solemnity of feeling we now bethink us of those awful words, “And he said, *It is done.*” or repeat, that if, after fearful wars and convulsions, there result in Papal Christendom a *tripartition* like that predicted in the Apocalypse, it must be regarded as the actual proximate sign, and *alarum bell* to Christendom, of the judgment, the great judgment, being then beyond a doubt close at hand?]

II. But proceed we to mark the description of the judgments next following, as detailed in the two or three next Chapters: first subjoining Chapter xvii., for the convenience of the reader; though given indeed before, already, with a view to its comparison with Apoc. xiii.<sup>1</sup>

“xvii. 1. And there came one of the seven Angels which had the seven vials, and talked with me, saying, Come hither; I will show unto thee the judgment of the great harlot, that sitteth upon many waters:<sup>2</sup> 2. with whom the kings of the earth have committed fornication; and the inhabitants of the earth have been made drunk with the wine of her fornication.

“3. So he carried me away in the spirit into a wilderness:<sup>3</sup> and I saw a woman sitting upon a scarlet-coloured beast, full of names of blasphemy, having seven heads and ten horns. 4. And the woman was arrayed in purple and scarlet, and decked with gold and precious stones and pearls; having a golden cup in her hand, full of abominations and

of fact and prophecy; and loudly express their conviction of the seventh vial's effusion into the air having begun.

<sup>1</sup> Viz. in Vol. iii. p. 71 et seq.

<sup>2</sup> For critical notices I beg to refer generally to Vol. iii. pp. 71—74. The chief variations in A and B from the received text are there given. The Codex Ephraemi, or C, it should be understood, is wanting in all this Chapter. I here only add, or repeat, just a few critical notices on the text.

<sup>3</sup> εις ερημον. No MS. or edition prefixes the article here.



filthiness<sup>1</sup> of her fornication. 5. And upon her forehead was a name written, *Mystery, Babylon the Great, the Mother of harlots and abominations of the earth.* 6. And I saw the woman drunken with the blood of the saints, and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus: and when I saw her, I wondered with great wonder.

“7. And the Angel said unto me, Wherefore didst thou wonder? I will tell thee the mystery of the woman, and of the beast that carrieth her, which hath the seven heads and ten horns.

“8. The beast which thou sawest was, and is not; and is to ascend<sup>2</sup> out of the bottomless pit, and to go into perdition: and they that dwell on the earth shall wonder, (whose names were not written in the book of life from the foundation of the world,) when they behold the beast that was, and is not, and shall come.<sup>3</sup> 9. Here is the mind which hath wisdom. The seven heads are seven mountains, where (or, on which) the woman sitteth. 10. And there are seven kings: the five have fallen; the one is; the other hath not yet come; and, when he shall have come, he must continue a short space. 11. And the beast that was, and is not, even he is the eighth, and is of the seven, and goeth into perdition. 12. And the ten horns which thou sawest are ten kings, which have not yet received a kingdom; but receive power as kings at one time<sup>4</sup> with the beast. 13. These have one mind, and give<sup>5</sup> their power and strength unto the beast. 14. These shall make war with the Lamb: and the Lamb shall overcome them, (for he is the Lord of lords and King of kings,) and they that are with him, the called, and chosen, and faithful.<sup>6</sup> 15. And he saith unto me, The waters which thou sawest, where the harlot sitteth, are

<sup>1</sup> The received text has *ακαθαρτητος*. A, B, and the critical Editions read *τα ακαθαρτητα*.

<sup>2</sup> *μελλει αναβαινιν*. I give Mr. Tregelles' version, which I conceive expresses the real force of *μελλει*. See my remarks on Apoc. x. 7, Vol. ii. p. 127.

<sup>3</sup> Our translators render, “and yet is,” after the reading *καιπερ εστι*. *Και παρισται* is the reading of A, B, and the critical Editions.

<sup>4</sup> *μιαν ωραν λαμβανουσι μετα του θηριου*. The translation above given is, I feel persuaded, the true one. The authorized version is, “one hour.” See my Vol. iii. pp. 81, 82, Note 1.

<sup>5</sup> *ειδοασιν*. So A and B; for the received *ειξειδωσουσι*.  
<sup>6</sup> So Vitranga; understanding *vincent*, or *νικησουσι*, after the *κλητοι*. This is also, I conceive, beyond a doubt the true rendering: not that of our English authorized version; which translates, “They that are with him *are* the called,” &c.

peoples, and multitudes, and nations, and tongues. 16. And the ten horns which thou sawest upon<sup>1</sup> the beast, these shall hate the harlot, and shall make her desolate and naked, and shall eat her flesh, and burn her with fire. 17. For God hath put into their hearts to fulfil his will, and to agree, and to give their kingdom unto the beast, until the words of God shall be fulfilled. 18. And the woman which thou sawest is the city the great one, which ruleth over the kings of the earth."

The vision of this Chapter xvii. is one introductory to the judgments of Babylon, and explanatory to St. John (to St. John as the *symbolic man*<sup>2</sup>) of its causes and reasonableness. Such is God's usual method, when about to execute any very notable act of vengeance. He shows his Church its justice beforehand: thereby at once vindicating his own honour; and giving warning to such of his people as may thus far have been deceived by the offending party, to separate from it, and so escape its imminent doom.<sup>3</sup>

Turning to the particulars of the symbolization here shown to St. John, the prominent figure in the vision appeared to be *a gaudily-dressed drunken Harlot*, seated on a *Beast* of monstrous form, with *seven heads*, and on the seventh (itself growing out of the cicatrice of a former excised seventh<sup>4</sup>) *ten horns*. A symbol this last which has been pretty fully explained for the most part in a preceding chapter of this Work: <sup>5</sup> for I have there discussed quite at

<sup>1</sup> So our version, reading  $\epsilon\pi\iota$ . A, B, and the critical Editions generally have the reading  $\kappa\alpha\iota$ : as if the Beast itself would at last turn with the ten kings against the woman. And Bellarmine urges the reading  $\kappa\alpha\iota$ , in defence of the Papacy against Protestants. "For how can Bishops of Rome be Antichrist," he argues, "when Antichrist is to join with the ten kings, and destroy Rome?" But see my Note <sup>3</sup> on p. 74 of Vol. iii. in support of the reading  $\epsilon\pi\iota$ . I there cite Tertullian and Hippolytus, two Fathers of earlier date than any extant Greek MS. of the Apocalypse, in support of  $\epsilon\pi\iota$ . It is the reading too of most copies of the Vulgate; "Decem cornu quæ vidisti in Bestiâ:" and adopted by the Romanists Ribera, à Lapide, Malvenda, &c., as well as by our Protestant interpreters Vitringa, Daubuz, &c.

It should be observed that the apostate Church's *False Prophet* continues with the Beast to the end. So Apoc. xix. 19. Comparing with this what is said of *the wine-press being trodden without the city*, p. 15 *suprà*, it is supposable that the *city* Rome might be destroyed, while the Pope and Papal Priesthood and Church remained.

<sup>2</sup> See Vol. ii. p. 115.

<sup>3</sup> So in the angel's declaration to Lot, Gen. xix. 12, 13, 22, before the destruction of Sodom; in Jeremiah's prophetic denunciation of the Chaldean Babylon's coming overthrow, and warning to escape from it, Jer. li. 6, &c.; and in those by Christ, and afterwards by his apostle St. James against the guilty Jerusalem, just before its destruction by Titus.

<sup>4</sup> Inferred from Apoc. xiii. 3; "And I saw one of his heads as it were wounded unto death, and the deadly wound was healed." <sup>5</sup> Part iv. chap. iv.

large the mystery of the Beast's seven, or rather eight heads; its eighth head's ten horns; and also its general history and character. So that it is only *the Woman*, its rider, i. e. *Babylon*, or *Rome personified*, (of whom but little comparatively has been said before,) and her connexion with the Beast, that now seems to call for explanation or illustration.

And here, first, let me call attention to one point in the Angel's description, (a point some time since very passingly noticed by me,<sup>1</sup>) which, both as regards the ten horns of the Beast, and as regards the Woman, refer to them, I doubt not, in a state of existence previous to that pictured in the vision of Apoc. xvii.;—I mean his statement about “the ten horns hating the Harlot, and making her desolate, and eating her flesh, and burning her with fire.” Now in our present vision the pictured relationship of the Beast and its ten horns to the Woman is that evidently of closest friendship: and this seems meant to figure the *normal* kindly relationship between them, during the 1260 years of the Beast's life under its last head. Moreover, as regards the Woman's final sudden destruction by fire, described in Apoc. xviii, there is plainly figured a judgment from God, like that on Sodom; not a burning by the ten kings: indeed the kings of the earth, whatever their number, are depicted as then lamenting over her destruction. How then are we to explain the verse in question, and what it says of the ten horns hating, and desolating, and burning the harlot with fire? Just in this way. It is evident that the Angel, in his explanatory remarks, includes the whole history of both Beast and Woman, from the beginning of their existence; not that alone depicted in the vision before us:—of Rome, as the city reigning over the kings of the earth in St. John's time, (verse 18,) that is, *imperial Rome* with its sword of conquest; as well as of *Rome Papal*, with the drugged cup of her superstition, as pictured in the vision: <sup>2</sup> of the seven successive earlier ruling *heads*

<sup>1</sup> See my Vol. iii. p. 396, Note 4.

<sup>2</sup> Compare the very illustrative medals of Rome *imperial*, and Rome *Papal*, in my Plate.

Peter Olivi, a Franciscan monk of the xiiiith century, (noticed hereafter in my History of Apocalyptic Interpretation,) thus similarly in his Postils on the Apocalypse, speaks of the two Romes as alike included in the description. “Hæc mulier stat pro Romanâ gente et imperio, tam prout fuit quondam *in statu paganismi*, quàm

of the *Beast*, five of which had fallen in St. John's time; as well as of the second seventh, i.e. the eighth, under which the revived *Beast* or Roman empire was again to prosper, bearing on it the ten horns as its constituent kings, and together with them supporting, and fornicating with, *the cup-bearing Rome*, or *Rome Papal*. Just so, I conceive, there was indicated by the Angel the *prior* history of the *ten horns*, as well as their later history;—their history as hinted at in Apoc. xii., before they got their diadems, and when Rome was still *imperial*: and that *then* they would desolate the Harlot, (a title equally applicable to Rome *imperial*, as to Rome *Papal*,<sup>1</sup>) and eat her flesh, and burn her with fire. Now all this, we know, was most strikingly fulfilled by the ten Gothic powers spoiling and desolating and burning imperial Rome in the 5th and 6th centuries; indeed so desolating her *campagna* as in fact to originate that *ἐρημία* out of which she rose up again as *Papal Rome*; and which attached to her ever after, even when the self-same Gothic powers, in their diademed and second stage of existence, had become unitedly subjected, so as is depicted in our illustrative vision, to her harlotry.<sup>2</sup>

This premised, and that the Harlot-Woman, as figured in vision, or Papal Rome, must, as Mother and Mistress of all Churches of the Papacy, be considered to include as part and parcel of herself, not only the ecclesiastical State, or Peter's Patrimony, in Italy; but also the vast domains, convents, churches, and other property appertaining to the Papal Church elsewhere, both in Europe, and over the world,<sup>3</sup> there seems nothing more needed, in order to the

prout fuit in *fide Christi*, multis tamen criminibus cum hoc mundo fornicata. Vocatur ergo *Meretrix magna*."

<sup>1</sup> In either case and character the title of *harlot* would suit Rome. It is applied to heathen cities, e. g. to Tyre, Is. xxiii. 16; to those in covenant with God, under the old dispensation, both Judah and Israel, Is. i. 21, Jer. iii. 1, 8, Ezek. xvi., xxiii., &c; and, under the gospel, to an unfaithful wife, Matt. v. 32, xix. 9.

<sup>2</sup> See p. 36 *infra*.

<sup>3</sup> Vitringa understands the *Great City* in its largest sense, and as comprehending its decem-regal empire, both in xi. 13, where a tenth part of the city is said to have fallen, and in xvi. 19, where it is said to have been divided into three parts; but in this xviii chapter he seems to understand it in a stricter sense of the *City of Rome* exclusively. And so too Daubuz, p. 800. I think it more reasonable however to understand it, as elsewhere, with a larger latitude.

It is observable that both in Jeremiah's Lamentations, *Jerusalem personified* is spoken of sometimes as *Judah*; (compare Lam. i. 1, 3, 7, &c. ;) and that in the medals struck after the Romans' capture of Jerusalem, the personified *City* has the legend *Judæa Capta*.



complete exposition of this part of the vision, than the observations following.—1st, as in the emblem the Beast's body both upheld, and was subject to, the Woman that sate on it, so the Western Papal Empire, as a whole, with the power of its ten secular kingdoms and many peoples, upheld, and was also at the same time ruled by, Papal Rome, as the recognized Mother and Mistress Church of Christendom: the Pope too for the time being, or Beast's ruling head, fully concurring and taking part in the same act; *sustaining* his Church upon the seven hills, even as one married to her,<sup>1</sup> to use the phraseology of the Roman Law;<sup>2</sup> and gloryingly up-bearing and exhibiting her, somewhat as the heathen Jove might be represented as carrying, or ridden by, his concubine.<sup>3</sup>—2ndly, as the Woman was here depicted before St. John under a double character, viz. as a harlot to the ten kings, and a vintner or tavern-hostess vending wines to the common people,<sup>4</sup> (just according to the custom of earlier times, in which the harlot and the

<sup>1</sup> See Vol. iii. p. 179, Notes<sup>1</sup> and <sup>2</sup>.—"The proud Church of Rome," says Bale in fitter phrase, "the *paramour* of Antichrist."—Somewhat similarly in the medals of ancient Rome there was often an association of Rome and Rome's emperor: e. g. *Roma Dea* was sometimes depicted as crowning the Emperor, sometimes as crowned by the Emperor. See Rasehe in verb. *Roma*, col. 1132, 1144.

<sup>2</sup> "Necessitas imponit marito *mulieris sustentationem* sufferre." Ulpian Digest. 1, 2, tit. 3, leg. 22.—In Martene De Rit. ii. 90 I read, in the prayer on a Pope's consecration, that, as "*ei universæ Christianitatis molem superimposuisti*," so God will strengthen him that "*eclesiasticæ universitatis onus dignè ferat*." The *universa Christianitas* and the *eclesiastica universitas* are precisely that which *Rome Papal*, as borne up by the Beast in the vision of Apoc. xvii., figured. In a medal of Julius II, he was in a symbol of yet larger pretensions, but not so correct, figured as Atlas bearing up the whole globe on his shoulders; with the legend, "*Immane Pondus, Vires infraetæ*."

<sup>3</sup> Daubuz, p. 750, illustrates from a picture of the rape of Europa, as described by Achilles Tattius, the manner in which we may consider the woman to have sate on the Beast; viz. sideways, as women generally ride in our country. He says; *Ἡ παρθένος μεσοῖς ἐπεκαθῆτο τοῖς νωτοῖς τοῦ βόου, οὐ περιβαδῆν, ἀλλὰ κατὰ πλευρᾶν, ἐπὶ δεξιᾷ συμβασα τῷ ποδεῖ*. Erot. Lib. i. So on coins of Sidon. Rasehe iv. 939, &c.

In medals of the middle age I have observed Rome depicted as sitting on a couch, of which the end on either side are heads of Beasts.

Under a different kind of figure the great city of the seven hills is represented elsewhere as the ruling Pope's throne, or seat. So Apoc. xiii. 2; "The Dragon gave him up his power, and his *throne*:" that is, his seat on the seven hills; spoken of also xvi. 10.—Similarly Zion is at one time represented in holy Scripture as the *Lord's throne*, at another as his *spouse*: e. g. Jer. iii. 17, Isa. lxii. 5.

<sup>4</sup> Compare Apoc. xvii. 4, "Having a golden cup in her hand, full of abominations and the filthiness of her fornication;" xiv. 8, "Babylon hath fallen because she hath made all nations to drink of the wine of her fornication;" and xviii. 3, "All the nations have drunk of the wine of her fornication, and the kings of the earth have committed fornication with her."

hostess of a tavern were characters frequently united,<sup>1</sup>) so, the Church of Rome answered to the symbol in either point of view ; interchanging mutual favours, such as might suit their respective circumstances and characters, with the kings of Anti-Christendom ; and to the common people dealing out for sale the wine of the poison<sup>2</sup> of her fornication, her indulgences, relics, transubstantiation-cup, as if the cup of salvation, &c., (see again the late Pope's most illustrative medal, here given, pointing the application,)<sup>3</sup> therewith drugging, and making them besotted and drunk.—3. With regard to the portraiture of the Woman, as “robed in purple and scarlet, and adorned with gold and precious stones and pearls,”<sup>4</sup> it is, as applied to the Romish Church, a picture characteristic and from the life ; the dress colouring specified being distinctively that of the Romish ecclesiastical dignitaries,<sup>5</sup> and the ornaments those with which it has been bedecked beyond any church called Christian ;<sup>6</sup> nay, beyond any religious body and religion probably that has ever existed in the world :—not to add that even the very name on the harlot's forehead, *Mystery*, (a name allusive evidently to St. Paul's predicted *mystery of iniquity*,<sup>7</sup>) was once, if we may repose credit on no vul-

<sup>1</sup> So Daubuz 754.—For example, the reader may remember disquisitions in vindication of the character of Rahab, founded on the frequent identity of the *παρδοχευς* and the *πορνη*.

<sup>2</sup> See Note || p. 42 *infra*. *Mede* too had construed the word *θυμω* to the same effect, before *Daubuz*.

<sup>3</sup> It was first struck just after the commencement of the 6th Vial's outpouring ; and exhibited now in a Protestant country just before the 7th Vial's effusion :—the precise time, if I mistake not, that this vision is to be referred to.—Compare this example of *allusive contrast* with that given Vol. ii. p. 61.

<sup>4</sup> The comment of Tichonius is ; “ornatu vario et lapidibus pretiosis ; id est omnibus illecebris simulate veritatis.” (Qu. *virtutis* ?)

<sup>5</sup> For these colours appertain to the dress of the ecclesiastical dignitaries of no other church, I believe ;—e. g. neither of the Greek, Armenian, or Coptic : of course not to that of the English.

<sup>6</sup> Bishop Newton exemplifies from the riches of the chapel of “our Lady” at Loretto : “The riches of whose holy image, and house, and treasury,—the golden angels, the gold and silver lamps, the vast number, variety, and richness of the jewels, of the vestments for the holy image and for the priests, with the prodigious treasures of all sorts, are far beyond the reach of description : and, as Mr. Addison says, ‘as much surpassed my expectation as other sights have generally fallen short of it. Silver can scarce find an admission ; and gold itself looks but poorly amongst such an incredible number of precious stones.’”—This is but a sample.

<sup>7</sup> “The *mystery of iniquity* doth already work : only he who now letteth will let until he be taken away : and then shall that Wicked One be revealed,” &c. 2 Thess. ii. 7, 8. See my Vol. iii. p. 96, &c.—There is a contrast in this to the *mystery of godliness*, 1 Tim. iii. 16. On which contrast see my Vol. iii. p. 186.


Bishop Newton and others observe that there is an allusion here also to the custom

IMPERIAL ROME SITTING ON THE SEVEN HILLS.  
HOLDING HER MILITARY SWORD OF EMPIRE.



From a coin in the British Museum.

PAPAL ROME, MOTHER AND MISTRESS  
HOLDING OUT HER INTOXICATING CUP OF ANTI-CHRISTIAN APOSTACY.



A Papal Medal struck at Rome on occasion of the last Jubilee





gar authority,<sup>1</sup> written on the Pope's tiara; and the Apocalyptic title, "Mother of harlots and of the abominations of the earth," the very parody, if I may so say, of the title Rome arrogates to herself, "Rome, Mother and Mistress."<sup>2</sup>—4. As to the Harlot's depicted drunkenness with the blood of the saints, the fact of its applicability to the Romish Church, throughout the latter half at least of its patron the Beast's 1260 predicted years of prospering,<sup>3</sup> is written in deep-dyed characters on the page of history; and superabundant evidence thereof given by me in other parts of this book.

In these several points I have embraced, I believe, all the main characteristics of the depicted seven-hilled Harlot's protraiture and history.<sup>4</sup> It would seem from the picture of her here given that whatever injury might have been sustained by the Woman during the time of the preceding Vials, whether from the outpouring of the 5th Vial upon the throne of the Beast, so as we saw it fulfilled in the anti-Romish acts and fury of the French Revolutionists,<sup>5</sup> or again from the progress of the Angel with the everlasting Gospel, would have been *at the time of the vision*, just a little before her final destruction, in appearance repaired.

of certain notorious prostitutes having their names written on a label on their foreheads:—as Seneca says; "Nomen tuum pependit in fronte; pretium stupri accepisti:" and Juvenal Sat. vi. 122;

Nuda pupillis  
Constitit auratis, titulum mentita Lysiscæ.

Vitringa supposes the name to have been thus written;

ΜΥΣΤΗΡΙΟΝ  
ΒΑΒΥΛΩΝ Ἡ ΜΕΓΑΛΗ  
Ἡ ΜΗΤΗΡ ΤΩΝ ΠΟΡΝΩΝ ΚΑΙ ΤΩΝ ΒΔΕΛΥΜΑΤΩΝ  
ΤΗΣ ΓΗΣ.

<sup>1</sup> *Scaliger*, on the authority of an informant of the Duke of Montmorency whilst at Rome. And so again Francis Le Moine and Brocardus, an ocular evidence, they assure us; saying that Julius III removed it. See Daubuz, Vitringa, and Bishop Newton ad loc.

<sup>2</sup> So the Tridentine Council; "Romana Ecclesia, quæ omnium Ecclesiarum *Mater est et Magistra.*" Hard. x. 53. Whence the common phrase *our Holy Mother the Church.*

<sup>3</sup> See my Vol. ii. pp. 20, 28, 423—429, &c.

<sup>4</sup> The prophecy was one much noted by the early Fathers. "Legè Apocalypsin Joannis; et quid de muliere purpuratâ, et scriptâ in ejus fronte blasphemiâ, septem montibus, aquis multis, et Babylonis cantetur exitu, contuere. *Exite*, inquit Dominus, *de illâ populus meus*, &c." So in the Epistle of Paula and Eustochium to Marcella, apud Hieronymi Op. iv. ii. 551. The object of the letter was to urge Marcella to leave Rome for Bethlehem: it being allowed that there was a holy church there; but the ambition and greatness of the city deprecated, as aliene from the spirit of monastic devotion.

<sup>5</sup> See Part v. Chap. v. in my Vol. iii. p. 395, &c.

And so in truth we see it *now*.<sup>1</sup> For Rome's Harlot-Church appears at this present time putting on all her former bravery, and boastings, and charms.<sup>2</sup> Still, as of old, she holds out to the world her cup of abominations; <sup>3</sup> still, as of old, breathes out, and acts out, her spirit of bloodthirstiness against the saints of Christ.<sup>4</sup> As to the ultimate promised victory of the saints persecuted by her,—“Christ's called, and chosen, and faithful ones,”—its fulfilment is yet future; but surely, judging from the signs of the times, not so very far off.

Thus much as to the *figure* in the foreground of the picture now exhibited to St. John. We have next to consider the *local scene* associated in the picture with it.

“He carried me away in the Spirit to a *desert place* (or *plain*); and I saw a woman sitting on a scarlet-coloured Beast; &c.” “*A desert* :”—such is the graphic description primarily given of the *local habitation* of the figured Harlot. And, with a view to its right understanding, it will be important first to notice the absence of the article prefix; <sup>5</sup> for thereby this desert scene is pointedly and at once distinguished from that into which the Woman, *the true Church* of Apoc. xii., was previously said to have fled and hidden, for her destined 1260 days of obscurity, solitude, and trial: <sup>6</sup> the latter being called ἡ ἐρημος, *the desert*,

<sup>1</sup> So first written in 1844. Yet more did she so appear after the storm of 1848—1851, on L. Napoleon's inauguration as President, and then Emperor, and courting and patronage of the Romish Church, so long as his policy seemed to require it.

<sup>2</sup> Daubuz notably observes, p. 784, that St. John's here wondering (he being a *symbolic man*) shows that even to the end Babylon will be powerful, and the true worshippers affrighted:—that, having recovered from former judgments and losses, Rome will again appear invested with very great power; and having no apprehension of her future destruction, which is to be very sudden and unexpected, will revive all her former pretensions: whereupon Protestants, who judge according to human wisdom only, may think that what she has done before (in the way of persecution) she may do still; until ministers of God, like the Angel, are made use of as instruments to show their fellow Protestants that the Romish Harlot is just about to be suddenly destroyed.

<sup>3</sup> See again the late Papal Jubilean medal.—Earlier examples of nearly the same medal may be seen in Bonanni, ii. 497, 737, &c.

<sup>4</sup> So, for example, at Lisbon and Madeira, as Hewitson notices in 1844, *Life*, pp. 126, 269, &c.; so at Florence, as in the case of the *Madiari*, &c.

<sup>5</sup> εἰς ἐρημον. The absence of the definite article is the rather observable; as it is the only instance, I believe, in the New Testament in which the word occurs as a substantive without it.

<sup>6</sup> See my Vol. iii. pp 65—68.—*Mr. Brooks* has fallen into the mistake of identi-

distinctively; <sup>1</sup> or that which answered on the Apocalyptic earth to the great and desolate wilderness in which, under the older dispensation, the nation and church of Israel, and afterwards Elijah too, and then Christ, were for a longer or shorter period of time hidden from the world.<sup>2</sup>—But what then *this* desert scene, pictorially associated with the Apocalyptic Harlot; and what its significancy in the prefiguration? There is predicted elsewhere a state of *ερημια* *total* and *final*, that is destined to befall the Woman at last through the judgment by fire from Almighty God.<sup>3</sup> And some have supposed this latter to be anticipatively signified by the desert in question.<sup>4</sup> But the whole character of the Harlot's symbolization seems to me to negative the idea of this being the desert scene here depicted: for she is here pictured, not as suffering under judgments either of human or divine origin, but in all the wantonness, pride, and gaudiness of a prospering harlotry.—Putting this then aside, it may be worth observing that, in the course of the Angel's explanatory statement, a certain further characteristic was noted of the desert scene's appearance to St. John; viz. that it appeared to a considerable extent *flooded with water*, round where the woman was seated on her subject Beast:—"The waters," it is said, "that thou sawest, where the harlot sitteth."<sup>5</sup> And hence in fact Vitranga draws his explanation,<sup>6</sup> to the effect that the local scene exhibited was *imaginatively* designed to answer to the chorography of the *Euphratean Babylon*; which, being finally surrounded by marshes, from the circumstance of the waters of the river overflowing and stagnating round it, was designated by the Prophet Isaiah as

fyng the two *ερημοι*;—the stepping-stone to his identification of the two women. An error fatal, as it seems to me, to all true interpretation of the Woman of chap. xii.

<sup>1</sup> See Horne's Introduction, Vol. iii. p. 53.

<sup>2</sup> 1 Kings xix. 4, 8; Matt. iv. 1. See, to this effect, Michaelis' Note on "the desert" of Christ's temptation, as cited and approved by Middleton on the Greek Article, when commenting on Matt. iv. 1.

<sup>3</sup> Apoc. xviii. 19; "For in one hour she hath been desolated;" *μια ώρα ηρημωθη.*

<sup>4</sup> Such, for example, is Daubuz's explanation of the scenic figuration; as "depicting the state of the whore on her accusation and conviction; . . . just upon the brink of destruction, and ready to become desolate." pp. 748, 749. He however just alludes afterwards to the actual desert state of the Campagna.

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

<sup>6</sup> p. 1015.

‘*the desert of the sea.*’<sup>1</sup> But Vitringa should have observed that the Angel’s discourse intimated yet a third and still more notable feature in the chorography of the scene associated with the Woman, viz. that of *seven hills* as her seat :<sup>2</sup> so that the conclusion we finally come to, and that by almost necessary inference, is, that the desert-scene pictured in the vision was not the Campagna of Babylonia, but the *Campagna of Rome*.

No doubt to St. John there might here arise a question of difficulty. How could this be the Roman Campagna, —considering that that Campagna was in his time, and had been for many centuries, a scene among the most cultivated and populous in the world; and every way one presenting the greatest contrast in appearance to a marshy desert?<sup>3</sup> The explanation, as it seems to me, is at our point of time very simply and easily to be drawn from the fact of the present actual desolate state of the Campagna; and knowledge that this began at the time when first, the ten-horned Beast of Western Anti-Christendom having emerged into existence, the Harlot-church of Rome rose on its back to supremacy, and has so continued ever since. For the initiatory epoch let me refer to Gibbon; who, when about to describe Rome’s revival and restoration to dominion, in the new character of *Rome Papal*, under Gregory the First’s Pontificate, near about the close of the 6th century, gives a descriptive sketch of the then Campagna which one might almost suppose drawn, like so many other of his pictures, for the very purpose of illustrating this passage of the Apocalyptic prophecy.<sup>4</sup> He states that at that time,

<sup>1</sup> Isa. xxi. 1. So too Jer. li. 13; “Thou that dwellest on many waters.”—This its predicted desert state was very much the actual state of the Euphratean Babylon in St. John’s time. His contemporary Pliny, N. H. vi. 30, speaks of it as then a great desert wilderness.

<sup>2</sup> Apoc. xvii. 9.

<sup>3</sup> Strabo speaks of “the whole of Latium as a flourishing and very productive country, with the exception of a few spots near the coast which were marshy and unhealthy:” also, as to the Campagna between the Alban hills and Rome, that, “excepting the parts towards the sea, the rest is a good country to live in, and well cultivated.” So Dr. Arnold, in his interesting Chapter on the Physical History of Rome and its Campagna; Vol. i. p. 505: in which Chapter he inquires whence, and why, the difference between its present and its ancient state.

So too the Christian Sibyl of the 2nd century, B. viii. p. 372, of whom I shall have to speak again in my History of Apocalyptic Interpretation; *ἔσκει νικησεὶς τὸ πῆδον Ρωμῆς εὐριθῆς*.

<sup>4</sup> Gibb. viii. pp. 153—161: a passage referred to before in my Vol. iii. p. 129:



(chiefly from the long-continued and perpetual harass of barbarian incursions,) “the Campagna was reduced to the state of a dreary wilderness; the land barren, the waters impure, the air infectious.” He further notices the super-added desolation from the effect of *inundations* of the Tiber, which (especially at the time of Gregory’s elevation) had “rushed with irresistible violence into the *valleys of the seven hills*,” and there bred pestilence from “the *stagnation of the deluge*.”<sup>1</sup> And, after remarking on the awful “depopulation, vacancy, and solitude of the city,” he observes that, “*like Babylon*, the name of Rome might have been erased from the earth, if the city had not been animated by a vital principle, [viz. that of being St. Peter’s See, and the depository too of his sacred relics, as well as of those of his brother-martyr *Paul*,] which again restored her<sup>2</sup> to honour and dominion:” —restored her to it in the new character of “Rome, Mother and Mistress,” the Harlot-Church of the seven hills. Nor, though the *city* rose again by degrees, in its new and ecclesiastical character, did the *Campagna* change from being a scene of desolation. In Robertson’s sketch of the state of Western Europe after the subsidence of the barbarian invasions, in the earlier part of the middle age, he observes that, in consequence of the existing depopulation, districts once the most cultivated, above all in *Italy*, were in some parts converted into forests, in others into marshes, by the overflow of rivers and stagnating of the floods:<sup>3</sup> inasmuch, that in some of the earliest charters extant, lands granted to monasteries and individuals were distinguished into such as were cultivated, and such as were *eremi*, or *desert*; the reason of the grant being frequently this, that the grantee had reclaimed them *ab eremo*, from the *desert*.<sup>4</sup> Now, in every

where see also other illustrations of the fact cited. Pope Gregory’s own account may be seen in the Appendix to P. Paolo’s Council of Trent, p. 774. Engl. Ed.

<sup>1</sup> Gibbon alludes, in a Note, to an account of this inundation brought by one of his Deacons to *Gregory of Tours* (x. 1.): with the further report of a *dragon* having appeared in the flood; which, while passing down the Tiber into the sea, was stranded. Considering the emblematic sense attached to this flood by the Angel, and its probable identification with the one mentioned as cast out of the Dragon’s mouth in Apoc. xii. 15, it is curious to compare the report of the Deacon on this point with the Apocalyptic description of the Dragon’s standing on the shore of the flood, and resigning his empire to the new rising Beast, Apoc. xii. 18, xiii. 2.

<sup>2</sup> So Gibbon impersonates Rome as a *Woman*.

<sup>3</sup> Charles the Fifth; Proof 5. Also Hallam iii. 365.

<sup>4</sup> Ducange on *Eremus*.



other of the countries referred to, the recovery of the lands from this state of barrenness, and desert, was by degrees successfully accomplished, together with the advancing progress of civilization and population. But not so in the vast plain round Rome. There, age after age, from the time of the Goths and Gregory, down even to the present time, where is the traveller to Rome that has not been struck by the waste and dreary Campagna that surrounds the "Eternal City;" whether approaching it by those desolate fifty miles from Civita Vecchia, or viewing it from the hills of Alba or Tivoli? Besides that the Tiber still from time to time fearfully overflows his banks, as of old;<sup>1</sup> and Rome is thus still often to be seen from those distant hills sitting upon many waters.

Thus we see that the *desert scene* associated with the Woman, in the Apocalyptic scene pictured to St. John, was a *landscape admirably perfect, as from the life*:<sup>2</sup>—a true and faithful picture of the *Campagna of Rome* itself, such as it appeared at the time when under Gregory the Harlot first established her supremacy thereupon; and such as she has appeared ever since.—Nor was the pictured scene admirable in this point of view only; but also for its having an *emblematic*, as well as *literal*, significancy and truth. For, as *the seven hills* in the landscape were not merely a natural feature of the scene, but also symbolized the seven several forms of government that Rome would previously have experienced,<sup>3</sup> so the floods that inundated the base of those hills where the Harlot had her seat were not only *literally* true, as a feature of the Campagna after Papal Rome rose to dominion, but also furnished the Angel with an apt *symbol* of the barbarian floods which, after pouring into and desolating the empire, would at length constitute nations, tribes, and languages subject to Papal Rome's dominion.<sup>4</sup> Again, such as was the physical *ερημια* and barrenness all round it,

<sup>1</sup> Visitors in the winter of 1847, 1848 saw this strikingly exhibited before them.

<sup>2</sup> See the Section in my 1st Vol. on the local appropriateness of Scripture Symbols, beginning p. 420.

<sup>3</sup> Apoc. xvii. 10. See my solution, Part iv. Chap. iv.; Vol. iii. pp. 114, &c.

<sup>4</sup> Apoc. xvii. 15.—To Bossuet's objection that, were this Woman an apostatized *Christian Church*, or *City*, she would be called an *adulteress*, not *harlot*, or *πορνη*, I may again refer to Matt. v. 32, xix. 9, and also Isa. i. 21, &c. in the Septuagint; passages already before noted, p. 32.

such has ever been the spiritual *εσθημια* characteristic of her dominion.<sup>1</sup> This seems to me the perfection of symbolic figures; a perfection frequently observable in those of the Apocalypse.—Besides which it must be observed that the presence of the *flood* in this picture, whence we may suppose the Beast to have emerged on which the Woman sate, made it, if I might so say, the precise pair and counterpart to a notable one shown in an earlier vision to St. John:<sup>2</sup> I mean to that which represented a flood cast from the Dragon's mouth, in order to drown the *faithful* woman, or Church; out of which, after *her* escape and disappearance, and when the earth had so drained off the waters as to leave but the remnant of a lake remaining, (so I infer from the description,<sup>3</sup>) a seven-headed ten-horned Beast, like this very one, appeared to emerge.—It is a new *tache* of connexion between figurations in this and the other Apocalyptic series.

It only remains that I add a remark on the *Vial-Angel* who showed this vision to St. John, and the reason of John's being spoken of as carried away *in the spirit* to see it.<sup>4</sup> The *latter* point is explainable, perhaps, from the circumstance of the vision being thus far out of the usual routine and order, as exhibiting a phænomenon of 1260 years' duration; and consequently that which Christ's people, living at the time of the Vials, would only be able to see *mentally*, not by the bodily eye.<sup>5</sup>—As to the *Angel*, I think that particular Vial-Angel must be supposed the revealer, in the time of whose vial-outpouring a full understanding might prove to be given of the mystery of the Woman and the Beast:—that is, doubtless, the *seventh* and *last*.<sup>6</sup>

So was the mystery of the Woman and her subject Beast

<sup>1</sup> Now that I am reprinting the 5th Edition of this Work in 1861, has not this fact, politically, socially, and morally considered, forced itself on men's minds, very generally?

<sup>2</sup> Apoc. xii. 15, xiii. 1. See my Vol. iii. pp. 71, 83.

<sup>3</sup> See Vol. iii. p. 71, Note 2.

<sup>4</sup> "And he carried me away *in the spirit* to a desert place; and I saw," &c.

<sup>5</sup> Compare the retrospective view of the two Witnesses' history given in Apoc. xi. The Angel gives it all in the form of *retrospective narrative*, until he has brought down their history to the time corresponding with that of his descent. Whereupon (but not before) the witnesses are brought on the scene in actual vision. See Vol. ii. pp. 462—464.

<sup>6</sup> So the Angel, xxi. 9, that showed St. John the *New Jerusalem*, was evidently the seventh of the vial-Angels.

made manifest to St. John, in all its details, just before the figuration of their total and final destruction.—And, let me ask, has there not of late been some advance to a fulfilment of the vision?

III. Next came the vision of another Angel, and of the destruction of Babylon following on his appearance; which began as follows:—

“And, after these things,<sup>1</sup> I saw another Angel coming

<sup>1</sup> The whole chapter xviii. is as follows.

1. “And after these things I saw another Angel coming down \* from heaven, having great power; † and the earth was lightened with his glory. 2. And he cried with a strong voice, ‡ saying; Fallen, fallen, is the great Babylon, and is become the habitation of demons, and the prison-house of every unclean spirit, and the prison § of every unclean and hateful bird: 3. for all the nations have drunk of the wine of the poison || of her fornication; and the kings of the earth have committed fornication with her; and the merchants of the earth are waxed rich through the abundance of her luxury. ¶

4. And I heard another voice from heaven, saying, Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partaker of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues! 5. For her sins have reached unto heaven, and God hath remembered her iniquities. 6. Reward her even as she rewarded [you]; \*\* and double unto her double, according to her works: in the cup which she hath filled, fill to her double! 7. How much she hath glorified herself, and lived luxuriously, †† so much torment and sorrow give her! As to that ‡‡ she saith in her heart, I sit a queen, and am not a widow, and shall see no mourning, 8. therefore shall her plagues come in one day, death, §§ and mourning, and famine; and she shall be utterly burnt with fire: for strong is the Lord God who judgeth her.

9. And the kings of the earth who have committed fornication, and lived luxuriously with her, shall bewail her, and lament for her, when they see the smoke of her burning; 10. standing afar off for the fear of her torment: saying, Alas, alas, that great city Babylon, that mighty city; for in one hour is thy judgment come.

11. And the merchants of the earth weep and mourn over her; for no man buyeth their merchandise any more:—12. the merchandise of gold and silver, and precious stones, and pearls, and fine linen, and purple, and silk, and scarlet, and all thiyne wood, and every kind of vessel of ivory, and all manner of vessels of most precious wood, and of brass, and iron, and marble; 13. and cinnamon, and amomus, |||

\* καταβαινοντα.

† or authority; εξουσιαν.

‡ εν ισχυρα φωνη. So A, B, and the critical Editions; instead of εν ισχυι φωνη μεγαλη, as the received text.

§ φυλακη is the Greek word used in either clause; though our translation gives two renderings, “the hold of every foul spirit, and cage of every unclean bird.”

|| θυμον. Daubuz, p. 637, on Apoc. xiv. 8, conceives the word θυμον to mean poison, accordantly with the Septuagint, which renders the Hebrew חַרְחַרִּי by words signifying poison as well as wrath: e. g. in Deut. xxxii. 24, Job vi. 4, xx. 16, Psalm lviii. 4. For an animal's anger and poison were both supposed to be in the gall; and when he is angry the poison is discharged.

¶ σπρηγιον: in our authorized translation, and also in Tregelles', delicacies.

\*\* ὑμιν is omitted in A, B, C, and the critical Editions. †† εσθηριασει.

‡‡ ὅτι λεγει, κ. τ. λ. I prefer to construe the ὅτι disjointly, As to that, with reference to the therefore in the clause following, as its consequent; and not to make it the consequent of what precedes.

§§ θανατος: perhaps pestilence, as in Apoc. vi. 8. So Vitringa, p. 1065, after Grotius and Launæus.

||| The best MSS. here insert και αμωμον, “and the amomum:” a tree from

down from heaven having great power, [probably as the appointed executor of the coming judgment that he announced,<sup>1</sup>] and the earth was lightened with his glory.

and odours, and ointments, and frankincense, and wine, and oil, and fine flour, and wheat, and cattle, and sheep, and horses, and chariots, and slaves,\* and souls of men. 14. And the fruits † that thy soul lusted after are departed from thee, and all things that were dainty and goodly are departed from thee: and they shall find ‡ them no more at all.

15. The merchants of these things which were made rich by her, shall stand afar off, for the fear of her torment, weeping and wailing: 16. and saying, Alas, alas, that great city, that was clothed in fine linen, and purple, and scarlet, and decked with gold, and precious stones, and pearls! For in one hour so great riches is come to nought.

17. And every shipmaster, and every passenger sailing to the place,§ and sailors, and as many as trade by sea, stood afar off; 18. and cried, when they saw the smoke of her burning, saying, What city is like unto this great city? 19. And they cast dust on their heads, and cried, weeping and wailing; saying, Alas, alas, that great city, wherein were made rich all that had ships in the sea, by reason of her costliness; for in one hour is she made desolate.

20. Rejoice over her, thou heaven, and ye saints, and apostles,|| and prophets; for God hath avenged you on her.

21. And a mighty angel took up a stone like a great mill-stone, and cast it into the sea; saying, Thus, with violence, shall that great city Babylon be thrown down, and shall be found no more at all. 22. And the voice of harpers and musicians, and of pipers and trumpeters, shall be heard no more at all in thee: and no craftsman, of whatsoever craft he be, shall be found any more in thee: and the sound of a mill-stone shall be heard no more at all in thee: 23. and the light of a candle shall shine no more at all in thee: and the voice of the bridegroom and of the bride shall be heard no more at all in thee. For thy merchants were the great men of the earth: for by thy sorceries were all nations deceived.

24. And in her was found the blood ¶ of prophets, and of saints, and of all that had been slain upon the earth." \*\*

xix. 1. "And after these things I heard as it were a great voice of much people in heaven, saying, Alleluia! Salvation, and glory, and honour, and power unto the Lord our God! †† 2. For true and just are his judgments; ‡‡ for he hath judged the great harlot, which did corrupt the earth with her fornication, §§ and hath avenged the blood of his servants at her hands. 3. And a second time they said Alleluia! And her smoke riseth up for ever and ever. |||| 4. And the four-and-twenty elders and the four living creatures fell down, and worshipped God that sat on the throne, saying, Amen; Alleluia!"

<sup>1</sup> So the Lord, who announced to Abraham that he was come down to inquire into

which one of the most esteemed ointments of the ancients was made. See Schleusner on the word.

\* σωματων.

† σωρα. Compare the emblems of the *harvest* and *vintage*, Apoc. xiv., discussed in the preceding section of this Chapter.

‡ ερησουσιν. So A, C; instead of the *ερησος* of the received text.

§ πας ὁ ἐπι τοπον πλεων. So A and C. In B we read *τον τοπον*. Compare Acts xxvii. 2; *μελλοντες πλειν τες κατα την Ασian τοπες*.

|| και οι ἄγιοι και οι αποστολοι. So A, B. The received text omits the second *και οι*.

¶ The MS. B and Scholz read *αιματα*, in the plural:—a form of the word of which no other example occurs, I believe, in the New Testament, except in John i. 13. In the Septuagint it is not very infrequent.

\*\* Daubuz, p. 853, has justly animadverted on the improper division of chapters here: as the four first verses of Apoc. xix. evidently belong to Apoc. xviii.

†† Or, "is our God's;" according to the reading of the critical editions; *ἡ σωτηρια και ἡ δοξα, και ἡ δυναμις του Θεου ἡμων*.

‡‡ κρισεις.

§§ Compare Apoc. xi. 18.

|||| *εις τους αιωνας των αιωνων*.



And he cried mightily with a strong voice, saying, Babylon the Great hath fallen, hath fallen; for all the nations have drunk of the wine of the poison of her fornication: &c." It seemed a repetition, and in almost precisely the same terms, of the cry of the second flying Angel of Apoc. xiv.,<sup>1</sup> though with the notable added circumstance that "she was become the habitation of demons, and prison-house of every unclean spirit;"<sup>2</sup> and, moreover, like that former voice, (notwithstanding the use of the *past* tense in the sentence,) seemed to be still *anticipative*:<sup>3</sup> but anticipative at the very smallest interval before the catastrophe: and not without an effulgence of light, as well as strength of cry, correspondent with the urgency of the time; even as its *last*, as well as loudest echo, upon the ear of nations.—And then followed a warning voice from heaven, heard loud and distinct by St. John, in his symbolic character, as I presume; that is, as the representative of *Christ's true saints and servants* then living: "Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues: for her sins have reached unto heaven."<sup>4</sup> A warning like that of the Covenant-Angel to Lot, on the eve of the destruction of Sodom;<sup>5</sup> or that from God, through Moses, to the surrounding Israelites, the moment before the earthquake that swallowed up the tents of Dathan and Abiram:<sup>6</sup> and which indicated two things respecting them; 1st, that there would be even then some of the holy seed in

the wickedness of Sodom, preparatorily to judgment on it, was himself that judgment's executor. Compare Gen. xviii. 20, xix. 22.

On the propriety and force of epithets attached to Apocalyptic agents, as having reference to what they had to perform, compare what is said of the ζων of Apoc. vii. 2, and the σχυρος of Apoc. x. 1, in my Vol. i. p. 274, and Vol. ii. pp. 41, 42. So again Apoc. xviii. 21.

<sup>1</sup> See my Vol. iii. p. 491, on xiv. 8.

<sup>2</sup> Compare Apoc. xx. 10; where we read that, after the millennium, "the Devil is to be cast into the lake of fire where the Beast and the False Prophet are."

<sup>3</sup> For the cry, "Come out of her, my people," follows.

<sup>4</sup> So when Sodom's cry was said to have come up to heaven, Gen. xviii. 21, its judgment was close at hand.—In proof that the voice from heaven to St. John indicated a conviction strongly to be made on the minds of God's saints at the time prefigured, I refer the reader to the notable precedents of Apoc. vii., x., &c. See in my Vol. i. Part i. Chap. vii. § 4; and, in my Vol. ii., the whole historical comment on Apoc. x. 1—xi. 3.

<sup>5</sup> Gen. xix. 16—22.

<sup>6</sup> Numb. xvi. 23—33.—I might add that of Christ to the disciples, with reference to the time of the siege of Jerusalem, commencing, "Then let them that be in Judea flee to the mountains," &c.; Matt. xxiv. 16:—a warning doubtless impressed on their minds by the Holy Spirit at the intended crisis, though uttered long before.—Compare too Jer. li. 6, "Flee out of the midst of Babylon, &c."



the mystic Babylon ; 2ndly, that their danger of participation in its coming destruction, whether through mistakes of judgment, or sluggish lingering, would be extreme and imminent.<sup>1</sup>—After which that same voice apparently, addressed still and all through to the saints,<sup>2</sup> described in vivid detail the catastrophe, even as if enacted before the Evangelist's eyes on the scene of vision ; though with that mixture of the future and past with the present, which is so common in the descriptions of prophecy:<sup>3</sup>—in the first place depicting the *nature of the catastrophe* ;—its suddenness when least expected,<sup>4</sup>—its instantaneousness, as all completed in an hour,<sup>5</sup>—its totality, such that all life was quenched in it,<sup>6</sup>—its manner, with violence like as of the shock of a mill-stone hurled into the waters,<sup>7</sup>—and the instrumentality employed, viz. that of fire, eternal fire, of which the smoke goeth up for ever:<sup>8</sup>—then detailing the *lamentations* over its fall ; first of the kings of earth that ere while committed fornication with it ;<sup>9</sup> next successively of the merchants and shipmasters and sailors that were enriched by,

<sup>1</sup> See Vol. iii. pp. 295, 296.

<sup>2</sup> Vitringa supposes the verses 4 and 5, only, to be the voice to St. John from heaven, and that the *διπλασσαι αυτη*, "Double to her," &c., is addressed to the kings mentioned xvii. 16. A strange hypothesis surely!—For the *saints*, not the *kings*, are the injured ones ; and the *saints* the avengers of those wrongs, in God's retributive justice.

<sup>3</sup> The *future* is in fact the characteristic tense of the description, until verse 17, when it is changed for the *past* ; the past tenses *previously* used being those of speakers that are themselves introduced in the *future*. For example it is said in verses 10, 11, "The kings of the earth *shall bewail* her, standing afar off, Alas, that great city ; in one hour *has thy judgment come.*" But in the 17th it is said, "And every shipmaster *stood* afar off." Yet even after this, in verse 21, the Angel that took up the mill-stone uses the *future*, "Thus *shall* great Babylon be cast down ;" *οὕτως βληθησεται*. In verse 24 the *past* is used again.

In prophecies where the *future* may be used with reference to the actual time of the prophet's seeing the vision, as well as with reference to the thing represented in the prophetic vision, the tenses used must be reasoned from with great caution. I have spoken of this before. Compare the interchange of tenses in the Angel's narrative of the two witnesses, Apoc. xi. : also in xvii. ; and again in xx. 4, 6 : where "*reigned*" (*εβασιλευσαν*) and "*shall reign*" (*βασιλευσουσι*) are used interchangeably. For notable examples elsewhere see the prophecies in Deut. xxxii., Isa. liii., &c.

<sup>4</sup> So verse 7 ; "She saith, I sit as a queen, and shall see no sorrow."

<sup>5</sup> So verses 10, 16, 19 ; *μια ὥρα ηρημωθη*.—In verse 8 it is said, "In *one day* shall thy plagues come,—pestilence, and mourning, and famine ;" as if for some short time before the final catastrophe by fire, there were to be some terrible visitation of Rome with pestilence and famine.

<sup>6</sup> So verses 22, 23, "And the voice of harpers, &c. &c., shall be heard no more in thee : " &c.

<sup>7</sup> Verse 21.

<sup>8</sup> So verses 8, 9, 18 of chap. xviii., and xix. 3 : in which last a very strong expression is used to depict the eternity of the fire ; "Her smoke riseth up *εις τους αιωνας των αιωνων*, for *ages of ages.*"

<sup>9</sup> Verse 9.

or took part in, its various branches of traffic ;<sup>1</sup> all standing afar off (the expression is most graphic) for fear of the smoke of her burning :—and, finally, stating two *reasons* for the judgment ; one, that all nations had been deceived by her sorceries,<sup>2</sup> the other and chief reason, because of her having been the persecutor of the saints, and of the blood of their successive generations being found in her.<sup>3</sup>—After which, and the completion of her destruction,<sup>4</sup> a burst of songs of praise was heard to resound from a great multitude in heaven, saying, “ Alleluia ! The salvation, and the glory, and the power is our God’s : for true and just are his judgments ; for he hath judged the great Harlot ; ” &c. Twice was that song of praise uttered : and then the twenty-four elders and four living creatures took it up, and repeated it : (*it is the last act related of them :*) worshipping in prostrate adoration the Divine One that sat upon the throne ; and saying, Amen, Alleluia !

From which passage I draw the following conclusions, as to the probable progress of events in the fast coming future. 1st, (and *this* with strong conviction in my own mind of its truth,) that the destruction of ROME, the mystic Babylon,—comprehending not the mere *city* of Rome, but, at the least, the *Papal Ecclesiastical State* in Italy, or *Papal Metropolitan Bishopric*, and probably, together with it, that *third*, or *more*, out of the political tripartition of Christendom, a little before described as occurring,<sup>5</sup> which might

<sup>1</sup> Verses 11, 17.—The wares traded in may be thus classified :—1. Gold, silver, precious stones, pearls, ivory, brass, iron, marble, wood ;—2. Linen, purple, silk, scarlet :—3. Cinnamon, odours, ointments, frankincense ;—4. Wine and oil, wheat and fine flour, sheep and cattle ;—5. Horses and chariots ;—6. Bodies and souls of men.—The last *ψυχας ανθρωπων* appears at first sight, as applied to the mystic Babylon or Rome, very remarkably applicable in a spiritual sense. But it is an expression used elsewhere simply to mean *persons*, especially *slaves* ; e. g. in Numb. xxxi. 40, *ψυχαι ανθρωπων εκ και δεκα χιλιαδες* : and ib. 35, *ψυχαι ανθρωπων απο των γυναικων*, for *women-slaves* : and so Hesychius explains *ψυχαγωγοι* as *ανδραποδισται*. Consequently it must not be insisted on as implying Rome’s traffic in souls ; though I can scarcely myself believe this to be unintended.

<sup>2</sup> Verse 23. Compare Apoc. ix. 21 ; where the same word *φαρμακεια* is used : and my comment on it Vol. ii. p. 16.

<sup>3</sup> Verses 6, 20, 24.—Compare Apoc. vi. 10, “ How long, O Lord holy and true, dost thou not judge, and avenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth : ” i. e. the *Roman* earth : also Apoc. ix. 21, and my comment, Vol. ii. pp. 20, 28, &c. : and what our Lord says of the blood of all the prophets slain in Jerusalem coming on the then living generation, in Matt. xxiii. 35, 36.

<sup>4</sup> For this is mentioned as the subject of their song of adoration. Moreover it is added as a notice connected with it, Apoc. xix. 3, “ And her smoke ascendeth up for ever and ever.”

<sup>5</sup> Apoc. xvi. 19. See p. 25 *suprà*.

then adhere to it,<sup>1</sup>—is very soon after that tri-partition to be effected, all unexpectedly to those remaining in it,<sup>2</sup> by the sudden and tremendous agency of an *earthquake* and *volcanic fire*:<sup>3</sup>—a mode of destruction not obscurely intimated by certain very striking allusive expressions in other prophecies both of the Old and New Testament; <sup>4</sup> and

<sup>1</sup> So Sodom's destruction involved that of "the cities and *all the plain*" adjacent and connected, "and all the inhabitants of the cities, and that which grew upon the ground." Gen. xix. 25.—On this understanding of the extent of the country desolated, the amaze and consternation of the kings, merchants, and shipmasters, that are represented as lamenting over the catastrophe of the great city, will be well accounted for.—The Pope's most ancient Metropolitan jurisdiction extended over the ten provinces of the *Vicarius Urbicus*; viz. Campania, Tuscia, Umbria, Picenum, Valeria, Samnium, Apulia and Calabria, Lucania and the Bruttii, Sicily, Sardinia, Corsica. Bingham, ix. 1. 9.

<sup>2</sup> "I sit a queen, and am no widow, &c."

It was stated in the Tablet Roman Catholic Paper, that about a month after Pio IX's accession the Abbess of Minsk spent a whole night at Rome in prayer for the Catholic Church: and that, while so occupied, a voice (none other than that of the Saviour) address her thus: "Fear not, my daughter! I have not left my Church a widow: I have chosen for her a Pontiff after my own heart." So Mr. Bateman (of Biddulph Grange) stated at the anniversary of the Protestant Association in May 1849.—Compare what I have observed elsewhere, Vol. ii. pp. 79—81, and Vol. iii. p. 179, about the Pope's relation of husband to the Universal Church.

<sup>3</sup> It is scarcely needful to say that the hypothesis of *unquenched volcanic fire*, with the shocks of an earthquake accompanying, (a natural and usual concomitant of volcanic eruption,) best suits the descriptive notices of the city falling as with the shock of a millstone hurled into the sea, and of its smoke rising up (like that of Sodom, Jude 7) *for ever and ever*. The only other offered explanation,—viz. that of Vitringa and Daubuz, which refers the catastrophe to the fire with which the ten kings are represented in Apoc. xvii. 16 as consuming the harlot,—might answer sufficiently well were it merely said that the Great City was burnt, and the smoke ascended up (like that of Ai and Gibeah, Josh. viii. 20, Judg. xx. 40) to heaven. But surely this cannot answer to the strength of the expression, Apoc. xix. 3, "her smoke goeth up *for ever and ever*." Besides, how could the kings well have been her burners now, when in fact her mourners? And again, were the mere burning of Rome by *human* agency the thing intended, whence all the terror and standing afar off, of the kings, merchants, and shipmasters? The theory seems to me palpably untenable; and will appear yet more so from what is said, as I shall afterwards observe, in xix. 20, and xx. 10, about the Beast's and the Devil's sentence of judgment, as in some way connected with that of the eternal sulphur-fire of the mystic Babylon.

How different this final fate of Rome and the Popedom from what Mr. Townshend said he expected. "When Rome changes,—and it will be changed, by the blessing of the Almighty imbuing in his own good time the nations of the earth with the same conviction with which he has so long imbued the mind of England,—then there may be peace with Rome." Pref. to Foxe, p. 27.

<sup>4</sup> I shall only cite from the *Old Testament*, 1. Isa. xxxiv. 9, 10; "And the streams thereof [i. e. of the mystic Edom] shall be turned into pitch, and the dust thereof into brimstone, and the land thereof shall become burning pitch; it shall not be quenched night nor day: the smoke thereof shall go up for ever;"—this mystic Edom being but the figurative name, it has been very generally supposed, of *Rome*:—2. Jer. li. 25; "I am against thee, O destroying mountain, which destroyest all the earth, [Sept. *το ορος το διεφθαμενον το διαφθειρον πασαν την γην*]"\* saith the

\* See my remarks on the double entendre of this word *διαφθειρω* in this, and other parallel passages, Vol. iii. p. 335, Note 4.



thus expected, as we find, alike by ancient Jewish Rabbies<sup>1</sup> and Christian Fathers of the Church:<sup>2</sup> not to add that the very nature of the Italian soil has forced on many a mind, in different ages, the thought of its physical preparedness almost for such a catastrophe.<sup>3</sup>—2ndly, I infer that imme-

Lord; and I will stretch out mine hand upon thee, and roll thee down from the rocks, and will make thee a burnt mountain:”—a prophecy respecting the New Testament Babylon, or *Rome*, as it is generally allowed, yet more than its type the ancient Babylon. (Vid. Lowth ad loc., and Vitringa, pp. 1061, 1065.)—From the *New Testament* I shall only cite here Luke xvii. 28—32; “As it was in the days of Lot, they ate, they drank; . . . but the same day that Lot went out from Sodom, it rained fire and brimstone from heaven, and destroyed them all, even thus shall it be in the day when the Son of man is revealed. . . Remember Lot’s wife.”—Other passages will occur for comparison when we come to a later passage of the prophecy; as, for example, Isa. xxx. 33, “For Tophet is ordained of old,” &c.

<sup>1</sup> Vitringa cites some authorities of this kind at p. 1065 of his *Apocalypse*; the Jewish opinion being founded, he says, on that passage from Isaiah xxxiv. 9, which I have given in the Note preceding; as Edom was supposed by them to mean Rome. So, 1st, the Chaldean paraphrase, thus translated by Vitringa: “Et convertentur flumina *Romæ* in picem, et terra ejus in sulphur, eritque terra in picem ardentem:” \* 2. Rabbi Bechai in *Cad. Hakkemach*, who says, “Illud est [sacrificium holocausti] quod ascendit in fœum, (Lev. vi. 12,) illud est regnum Romanum impium, quod se ipsum superbè extollit et effert; cujus finis est ut judicetur igne, quemadmodum dicitur, ‘Hoc holocaustum nunquam extinguetur;’” &c.—Vitringa observes elsewhere, p. 1061, that it was the belief of the Jews that the destruction of the *ancient Babylon* was the effect not of man’s agency only, but of an *earthquake*.

<sup>2</sup> See Gibbon’s summary of the early patristic views, Vol. ii. p. 305. “Intestine discord, the invasion of the fiercest barbarians from the unknown regions of the North, pestilence and famine, comets and eclipses, earthquakes and inundations, were only so many preparatory and alarming signs of the *great catastrophe of Rome*: when the country of the Scipios and Cæsars should be consumed by a flame from heaven; and the city of the seven hills, with her palaces, her temples, and her triumphal arches, should be buried in a vast lake of fire and brimstone.” We might cite Tertullian, the Pseudo-Sibyl, Lactantius, &c. I have elsewhere quoted even Gregory the Great, acknowledging and expressing his belief in the tradition. “Roma à Gentilibus non exterminabitur; sed tempestatibus, *coruscis turbinibus, ac terræ motu*, in se marcescet.” Dial. ii. 15.

<sup>3</sup> It is not *Ætna*, the Lipari volcanic islands, Vesuvius, and the Phlegrean fields, that alone offer visible indication of the physical aptness and preparedness of Italy for such a catastrophe. The great Apennine mountain-chain, and its branches, are said to be very mainly volcanic in character, from Reggio to Verona; and the country round Rome, more especially, is almost as strikingly so as that of Sodom itself. Let me quote an extract or two, from among multitudes to the same effect, in the mineralogist *Ferber’s Tour in Italy*. (Raspe’s English Translation.) So p. 189; “The road from Rome to Ostia is all volcanic ashes, till within two miles of Ostia.” p. 191; “From Rome to Tivoli I went on fields and hills of volcanic ashes or tufa:—the water of the *Lago de Tartari*, on the left of the road, has a strong smell of the hepar sulphuris.” p. 200: “A volcanic hill in an amphitheatrical form incloses a part of the plain over Albano, &c., and a flat country of volcanic ashes and hills, to Rome. The ground about Rome is generally of that nature.” At p. 234, describing the route from Rome to Sienna, “one of the most remarkable in Italy to a naturalist,” he says that after the Ponte Molle volcanic tufa hills succeeded as far as Monte Rosi; behind which was a lava torrent; and, somewhat further, a small lake, *Lago di Monte Rosi*, which seemed to have been an old volcano. Then followed a large lake, *Lago di Vico*, the sunk crater of an old volcano: and so on all the way to near Sienna.

\* So too Kimchi: “This chapter points out the future destruction of Rome, here called Bozra; for Bozra was a great city of the Edomites.” A. Clarke in loc.

diately before this event (perhaps for some little time before it) there will be a diffusion of great religious light, and a sounding forth of strong appeals on the character and the fated and imminent doom of Rome and the Popedom, alike in the Church and in the world;<sup>1</sup> so that all will see and take warning, but they that wilfully, and from worldliness, pride, or indifference to the truth, shut their eyes and ears to the evidence.<sup>2</sup>—3rdly, I infer that the *Jews* will probably just at, or after this catastrophe, be converted, (conjunctively with a vast number of the Gentiles,) the completed outpouring of the seven Vials having marked the time for it;<sup>3</sup> and join, and perhaps take the lead in, the earthly Church's song of praise on the occasion: the language used to designate this song in the Apocalyptic prefigurations being now for the first time *Hebrew*, "*Hallelujah*;"<sup>4</sup> a cir-

He elsewhere (p. 135) speaks of a subterranean connexion probably existing between Vesuvius, Solfatara, Ætna, Stromboli, and the Ocean.

We find in history that Rome, in the reigns of both Titus and Commodus, felt the shock of earthquakes, and the accompanying outbursts of volcanic flame. See Dion. Cass. lxxvi. 24, and Herodian, i. 14. In the latter case, (one referred to Vol. i. p. 160, in illustration of my 2nd Seal,) when the Temple of Peace was burnt down, Herodian suggests the alternative explanation of lightning or volcanic fire; *ειτε σκηπτου νυκτωρ κατενεχθεντος, ειτε και πυρος ποθεν εκ του σεισμου διαρροεντος.*

This physical aptitude of Italy for such an end is noted, though with his usual sneer, by Gibbon. "The country which for religious motives had been chosen for the origin and principal scene of the conflagration, was the best adapted for that purpose by natural and physical causes: by its deep caverns, beds of sulphur, and numerous volcanoes; of which those of Ætna, of Vesuvius, and of Lipari, exhibit a very imperfect representation." *Ibid.*

<sup>1</sup> So *Vitringa* (p. 1062) says that the Angel's strong cry, and accompanying refulgence of light, show, first, that the report of Babylon's fall would be published through the world; secondly, that there would be in it a most illustrious manifestation of God's majesty. And *Daubuz* (p. 802) observes similarly, that no Angel is said in Scripture to have appeared with such a light, without its being implied thereby that God would enlighten by a further knowledge of Himself those to whom the Angel was sent: whence he infers that both the *idolaters* of the *corrupt Church* would be enlightened and converted by the fall of Babylon, and this event followed by a conversion more general. For the former of which expectations, however, I see no scriptural reason.

Both *Vitringa* and *Daubuz* compare Ezek. xliii. 2; "The glory of the God of Israel came from the way of the East, and his voice was like a noise of many waters; and the earth shined with his glory." Let me add Ezek. xxxix. 21; "I will set my glory among the heathen; and all the heathen shall see my judgment that I have executed:" that is on Gog's destruction.

<sup>2</sup> Compare St. Paul's words 2 Thess. ii. 11, 12, "God shall send them strong delusion that they should believe a lie, that they all might be damned who believed not the truth," &c., with the Apocalyptic Babylon's confident boast, "I shall not be a widow," &c.—The subsequent prefiguration of the Beast and his army shows that the number of them that would resist all evidence, from hatred to the truth, will even at the last be very large.

<sup>3</sup> Apoc. xv. 8. See my Vol. iii. pp. 336, 337.

<sup>4</sup> Ἀλληλουια, answering to the Hebrew הַלְלוּ־יְהוָה, *Praise Jehovah!* Lightfoot observes that the *Hallel* is first used in Scripture at the end of Psalm civ.: and that



cumstance certainly very remarkable, and noted by many previous commentators as having the meaning I suggest:<sup>1</sup>—not to add that its probability is enhanced, as I think, by the fact that the Jews themselves, or at least some of the most learned of their Rabbies, have supposed that the restoration of their people is to follow on the fall of Rome.<sup>2</sup>—4thly, I infer that down to the time figured by this chorus of song, no translation of the living saints, or resurrection of the saints departed this life, will have taken place; the scenery of the inmost temple, with its throne, and seated Divinity, and the elders and living creatures attendant near it, *the mystical representatives of the expectant Church in Paradise*,<sup>3</sup> remaining still figured in vision, as before.—Whether the scene continued so afterwards, and the same inference might be made with regard to time at all later, is another question. But it is one which will more properly come under consideration in the Chapter next but one following.<sup>4</sup>

4. Next after this the Evangelist tells of a command issuing “from the throne,” which called to all God’s servants, and all that feared him, “Praise ye our God;”<sup>5</sup> and how thereupon a far louder voice than that heard before, even as of many waters and of mighty thunderings, (including in it probably that of very many princes and people,)<sup>6</sup> was heard to burst forth in a new anthem of

the Jews note respecting it, that this Hallel comes not till there be tidings of the destruction of ungodly men; “Let the sinners be consumed out of the earth, and let the wicked be no more. Bless the Lord, O my soul! *Praise ye the Lord!*” So Daubuz.—I observe that Tobit, xiii. 18, speaking of the rebuilding of Jerusalem, says; “And all her streets shall say *Alleluia*; and they shall praise Him, saying, Blessed be God who hath extolled it for ever.”

<sup>1</sup> So Brightman, Vitringa, Daubuz, &c., more or less: and, among contemporaries, Mr. Biekersteth.\*

<sup>2</sup> Kimchi says in his Comment on Obadiah; “This is the hope of the nation,—when Rome shall be desolated, then there shall be the redemption of Israel.” Vitringa, p. 1066, refers for comparison to other testimonies given in Buxtorf on the word *רִיבֵי*.

<sup>3</sup> See Vol. i. pp. 86—93.

<sup>4</sup> Viz. that on the Millennium.

<sup>5</sup> We should mark the expression “our God.” There is no various reading.

<sup>6</sup> Compare Apoc. xiv. 2, and Vol. iii. p. 315. In that case the voice was as that

\* Compare Augustine’s observation on St. Paul’s use of the Hebrew and Greek words, Abba, *ὁ πατήρ*, in Gal. iv. 6; “Intelligitur non frustra duarum linguarum verba posuisse idem significantia, propter universum populum qui de Judæis et de Gentibus in unitatem fidei vocatus est; ut *Hebræum* verbum ad *Judæos*, *Græcum* ad *gentes*, . . . pertineat.”

praise; <sup>1</sup> its two themes being the now closely instant establishment of Christ's kingdom, and his marriage: the bride,

of "a great thunder," βροντης μεγαλης, in the *singular*: in this, with a stronger adjective, and the noun in the *plural*, "as the voice of mighty thunderings," βροντων ισχυρων.

<sup>1</sup> I subjoin the chapter, as before.

xix. 5. "And a voice came out from the throne, saying, Praise our God, all ye his servants, and ye that fear him, both small and great. 6. And I heard as it were the voice of a great multitude, and as the voice of many waters, and as the voice of mighty thunderings, saying, Alleluia, for the \* Lord God omnipotent reigneth. † 7. Let us be glad and rejoice, and give honour to him: for the marriage of the Lamb is come, and his wife hath made herself ready. 8. And to her it was granted ‡ that she should be arrayed in fine linen, bright and clean: § for the fine linen is the righteousness of the saints. 9. And he saith unto me, Write, blessed are they who have been called ¶ unto the marriage supper of the Lamb. And he saith unto me, These are the true sayings of God. 10. And I fell before his feet to worship him: and he saith unto me, See thou do it not: I am thy fellow-servant, and (the fellow-servant) ¶ of thy brethren, that keep up \*\* the testimony of Jesus: worship God: for the testimony of Jesus is the spirit of the prophecy. ††

11. And I saw heaven opened, and behold a white horse; and he that sat upon it was called Faithful and True; and in righteousness he doth judge and make war. 12. His eyes were as a flame of fire, and on his head were many diadems; and he had a name written, that no man knew but he himself. 13. And he was clothed with a vesture dipped in blood, and his name is called, The Word of God. 14. And the armies which were in heaven followed him upon white horses, clothed in fine linen, white and clean. †† 15. And out of his mouth goeth a sharp §§ sword, that with it he should smite the nations: and he shall rule over them with a rod of iron: and he treadeth the winepress of the fierceness of the wrath of Almighty God. 16. And he hath on his vesture and on his thigh a ||| name written, King of kings and Lord of lords. ¶¶

17. And I saw an Angel \*† standing in the sun: and he cried with a loud voice, saying to all the fowls that fly in the midst of heaven, Come and gather yourselves together unto the great supper of God; \*‡ 18. that ye may eat the flesh of kings, and the flesh of captains, and the flesh of mighty men, and the flesh of horses and of them that sit on them, and the flesh of all men, both free and bond, both small and great.

19. And I saw the beast, and the kings of the earth, and their armies, gathered together to make war \*§ against him that sat on the horse, and against his army.

\* B and Scholz add ἡμων, "our God." Other critical editions omit it.

† βασιλευσε. So xi. 17.

‡ Και εδοθη αυτη. Perhaps, "And it hath been granted to her;" as one of the joyful subjects of song to the hymnists.

§ βυσσινον λαμπρον και καθαρον.

|| οί κεκλημενοι.

¶ συνδουλος σου ειμι και των αδελφων σου.

\*\* εχοντων την μαρτυριαν. So Apoc. xii. 17: also vi. 9; Δια την μαρτυριαν ην ειχον.

†† Of the prophecy, της προφητειας. So i. 3, xxii. 7, 10, 18, 19, distinctively of the Apocalyptic prophecy. Of prophecy generally St. Peter says προφητεια, without the article; 2 Pet. i. 20, 21.—Alike the Angel in this revelation, and the Apostle, and all his successors of the true Apostolic line, in their life and doctrine, witnessed for Jesus.

‡‡ βυσσινον λευκον καθαρον.

§§ B, Scholz, and Wordsworth insert διστομος, two-edged. So too the Vulgate.

||| Scholz reads το ονομα, the name, with the article.

¶¶ Eckhel, viii. 298, speaking of some pseudo-moneta in which is a horse with a mark on his thigh, thus remarks; "Notæ femori impressæ veterum morem indicant." A omits the words επι το ιματιον και.

\*† Scholz and other critical editions write ένα αγγελον, one angel.

\*‡ εις το δειπνον το μεγα του θεου. So A, B, and the critical editions.

\*§ τον πολεμον. So Scholz and other critical editions read it, both here and in xx.

it appeared, having had it granted her to be arrayed in the finest white linen,<sup>1</sup> (which linen, it was said, was the righteousness<sup>2</sup> of *saints*, so marking *the saints* as *the bride*,) and the song retaining still the form *Hallelujah*.—But an enemy yet remains to be overcome, ere the completion of the anticipated blessedness. As the *harlot* must be exposed and branded and destroyed ere the manifestation of the *bride*, so the usurper *Antichrist*, (the self-vaunting King of kings and Lord of lords,)<sup>3</sup> ere *Christ's* establishment of his kingdom. And,—after a passing mention of the Angel's declaring the blessedness of those who were called to the Lamb's marriage-supper, (whether a class *the same as*, or a class *distinct from, the Bride herself*,<sup>4</sup>) and another of St. John's falling down and worshipping the revealing Angel, (still I suppose in his symbolic representative character,<sup>5</sup>) and being rebuked for it,—there follows a most striking and remarkable vision of Christ issuing forth to the destruction of this long usurping Antichrist. The heaven appeared opened to make way for

20. And the beast was taken, and with him the false prophet that wrought miracles before him,\* with which he deceived them that had received the mark of the beast, and them that worship his image. These both were cast alive into the lake of fire burning with brimstone. 21. And the remnant were slain with the sword of him that sat upon the horse, which sword proceedeth out of his mouth: and all the fowls were filled with their flesh."

xx. "And I saw an angel come down from heaven, having the key of the bottomless pit, and a great chain in his hand. And he laid hold on the dragon, that old serpent, which is the devil and Satan, and bound him a thousand years," &c.

<sup>1</sup> *Βυσσινιον*. This was linen of the finest kind; such as kings and priests and nobles wore: for example *Joseph*, Gen. xli. 42; *David*, 1 Chron. xv. 27; *the priests*, Exod. xxviii. 39; and *the rich man* in the parable, Luke xvi. 19.—On the possibly intended meaning of the word here, as suggested by Daubuz in a very interesting critique, I reserve my observations till the chapter iv. following.

<sup>2</sup> *δικαιωματα* used in the same sense, I conceive, of *justification*, as *δικαιωμα* in the singular in St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans, v. 16, and, in the plural, Heb. ix. 1, 10. The *plural* is here perhaps adopted, rather than the *singular*, in order to signify the *badges* of that justification on the many justified.

<sup>3</sup> So Gerson (ap. Gieseler, Text Book iii. 256,) speaks of this as applied to the Pope by the Papists of the day; "Papa, cujus in femore scripsit Christus, Rex regum, Dominus dominantium."—He too had the sharp sword of *anathema* going out of his mouth. "*Anathematis gladio feriantur*;" or "*Anathematis mucrone percussus*." So Innocent III, against the Waldenses and Albigenses.

See generally my sketch of Antichrist in his full-grown greatness, Part iv. Chap. v. § 2.

<sup>4</sup> I may have again to advert to this in chapter iv. following.

<sup>5</sup> So Daubuz.

8. Usually, as in xii. 17 and xiii. 7, the article is not added. It seems to be *the* war of *Armageddon*, before resolved on.

\* B, Scholz, and Wordsworth, ὁ μετ' αὐτου ψευδοπροφητης.

† *την λιμνην του πυρος την καιομενην εν θειω*. Our translators have rendered it "*a lake*;" not marking the definite article: a mistake of no inconsiderable importance, as will appear afterwards in my comment.

his descending. His appearance had in it all that was most august of superhuman majesty. His emblems were those of royalty and triumph,—the white horse, the sharp sword, the many diadems, the red or purple robe;—red, however, with blood, as that of one that had already begun to tread the wine-press of God's wrath. (Was it not the wine-press long before prophesied of as trodden in Bozrah?<sup>1</sup>) His *names* enunciated were, The Faithful and True, the Word of God, the King of kings and Lord of lords, besides that secret as well as incommunicable name JEHOVAH.<sup>2</sup> And *hosts*, already “*in heaven*,”<sup>3</sup> (were they not his saints, “the called, and chosen, and faithful?”<sup>4</sup>) appeared following him; themselves also on white horses: the partakers (so did the end contrast with the beginning of this great drama<sup>5</sup>) of their Lord's triumph.—Meanwhile the Beast and his False Prophet, and the kings and armies that still supported him, are represented as having gathered to the scene of conflict. And,—after a proclamation from an Angel that seemed “*standing in the sun*,” (whether to denote his universal visibility,<sup>6</sup> or the supreme royalty that dictated his words,<sup>7</sup>) inviting all the birds of prey that might fly in the mid-heaven, to assemble and partake of the great supper about to be prepared in the judgments of God Almighty,<sup>8</sup>—after this, I say, the conflict was joined; the Beast, or Antichrist, and his False Prophet taken, and cast alive into “the lake of fire,” (mark the definite article,) that same “which was burning with brimstone;”<sup>9</sup> the kings and other earthly adherents of Antichrist slain by the sword of Him that sat on the white horse, a portion for the birds of

<sup>1</sup> Isa. lxiii. 1. I shall have to make the comparison in my next chapter.

<sup>2</sup> Such I conceive to be the name meant. Compare Judg. xiii. 18; “Why askest thou after my name, seeing it is secret?”

<sup>3</sup> τα στρατευματα τα εν τω ουρανω.

<sup>4</sup> Compare xvii. 14;—“These shall war with the Lamb: and the Lamb shall overcome them, (for He is King of kings and Lord of lords,) and they that are with Him, the called, and chosen, and faithful.”

<sup>5</sup> See Vol. i. p. 106.

<sup>6</sup> So the late Rev. Robert Hall, in his noble Sermon on the Discouragements and Supports of the Christian minister.

<sup>7</sup> Such I conceive to be at least *part* of the meaning of the symbol; so as, for example, in the notable case of the *woman clothed with the sun* in Apoc. xii. 1.

<sup>8</sup> Ezekiel's prophecy of God's great sacrifice and supper, and the birds invited to it, in Ezek. xxxix. 17, &c., can scarce fail of occurring as a probable parallel to the reader. But I reserve to my next Chapter a notice of this, and a few other such prophecies.

<sup>9</sup> See Note † on the page preceding.



prey; <sup>1</sup> and the Dragon taken, and imprisoned in the abyss for a thousand years.—And so the MILLENNIUM appeared to begin.

From this prefigurative vision thus much may I think be inferred respecting the coming future;—viz. that some signal, total, and most tremendous destruction of the Papal Antichrist, (that false usurping king of kings and lord of lords,) with the Papal Priesthood and Kings (perhaps kingdoms too) adhering to him, is to follow very soon after the catastrophe of Rome and its Italian dependency:—a destruction to be accompanied with some striking manifestation of Christ, and of his glory and power, who is then to be made publicly manifest as the true King of kings and Lord of lords: and to be wrought by the agency of earthquake and fire, (probably volcanic fire,) so as to involve the reprobates, thus destroyed, in the same fiery lake as Rome itself and its subject territory just before.<sup>2</sup>—The fact of their destruction following after, and so being in point of time distinct from, that of Rome, as would seem to be the case,<sup>3</sup> is perhaps to be accounted for by the supposition of Antichrist and his army being, at the time, gathered to some country or place *without* the territories of the Popedom:—a supposition already suggested by the intimation in the parallel prophecy of chap. xiv. that the wine-press of God's wrath was to be trodden "*without the city*;"<sup>4</sup> and partially confirmed, I think, by other and earlier prophecies of the last crisis. As to the nature of the manifestation then to be made of Christ's glory,—whether *personal* or simply *providential*,—again, whether the hosts attending to participate in his triumph are *angels* or *saints*, and, if saints,

<sup>1</sup> Compare Christ's proverbial saying, "Where the carcase is, there shall the eagles (or vultures) be gathered together."  
<sup>2</sup> Compare Dan. vii. 10, 11.

<sup>3</sup> At the same time it is to be remembered, as *possible*, that the second description may be only added in *particular*, of what was described previously in *the general*, respecting parties suffering from the same catastrophe; the one picturing being *territorial*, the other *personal*.

<sup>4</sup> Apoc. xiv. 20. See p. 16 *suprà*.—The Beast's separation from his proper seat, at the time of his destruction, may be compared with Pharaoh's and Korah's from theirs. I shall have again to advert to this point at the end of the next chapter.—Moreover the distinctive notice of the False Prophet's destruction may be compared with that of Elijah's slaughter of Baal's prophets, distinctively from the other worshippers of Baal, at Mount Carmel.



whether in the *earthly* or the *resurrection* state, (a point involving that other, already mooted,<sup>1</sup> whether the *bride* and the *parties called to the bridal supper* are identical, or distinct,)—finally, what the nature of the *lake of fire* mentioned, and whether identical or connected with that eternal and penal fire of which we read such awful notices in other Scriptures,—on all these points of solemn and surpassing interest, it is evident that the answer to be given must involve a consideration of the great question of the Millennium and Second Advent; and can therefore only fitly be given in the Chapter next but one following, in which the whole millennial subject has to be discussed.—Before which, however, it may be well to look carefully to those apparently parallel prophecies respecting the final crisis, whether in Daniel or other of the Old Testament prophets, that have been just referred to.

## CHAPTER II.

### CHIEF OLD TESTAMENT PROPHECIES RESPECTING THE CRISIS OF THE CONSUMMATION.

#### § 1.—THE FIRST HALF OF DANIEL'S LAST PROPHECY, FROM DAN. X. 1 TO XI. 31.

THE date of the vision that I am now about to notice,—I mean Daniel's last vision, given in chapters x., xi., and xii. of his prophetic Book,—is stated by the Prophet to have been the third year of the reign of Cyrus; <sup>2</sup> its local scene by the banks of the Hiddekel or Tigris.<sup>3</sup> Now it appears from Ezra that it was in the first year of his reign that Cyrus issued his memorable edict for the Jews' emancipation from Babylon, and that Zerubbabel and other Jews, acting on it, returned to Jerusalem: <sup>4</sup> also that it was in the seventh Jewish month (or October) that they set up an altar there,<sup>5</sup> and in the second month of the second year of

<sup>1</sup> p. 52.

<sup>4</sup> Ezra i. 1, 5; ii. 2.

<sup>2</sup> Dan. x. 1.

<sup>3</sup> Dan. x. 4.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid. iii. 1—6.

their coming that they laid the foundation of the new Temple:<sup>1</sup>—after which there began from the people of the land a system of harassing and interruption,—in part by personal opposition, in part through the agency of accusers sent to vilify them at the Persian Court,—which at once put a stop to the work; and suspended it through what remained of the reign of Cyrus, and for some years after, till the accession of Darius son of Hystaspes.<sup>2</sup> Such then had already begun to be the state of things at Jerusalem in the April<sup>3</sup> of that 3rd year of Cyrus, in which Daniel (now, like St. John in Patmos, an old man of eighty or ninety)<sup>4</sup> saw the vision we are about to consider. It seems important to bear this in mind in examining the prophecy before us.—We can scarce but suppose that his fasting and prayer, which preceded and was answered by the present vision, had reference, like that which preceded a former revelation,<sup>5</sup> to the then state of trial and disappointment attending the returned remnant of his people. The Angel's words, on occasion of a former vision, about *the street being built in troublous times*,<sup>6</sup> seemed already beginning to have fulfilment. When were better times to come,—the times of the Messiah promised? His heart was set to understand the things predicted.<sup>7</sup> Of the quadruple series of Gentile dominant empires which, it had been 70 years before foreshown to him, were to precede the full and final establishment of Messiah's kingdom,<sup>8</sup> the *second*, of *Persia*, had already come, a guarantee for all the rest. But the *third*,—that of *Greece*, as expressly foreshown to him,<sup>9</sup>—had as yet not come forward. When was that next step in the great chain of events to take place? When the *fourth* empire to appear, under which apparently Messiah was to

<sup>1</sup> Ezra iii. 8, &c.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. iv. 1, 11, 24.

<sup>3</sup> The vision was seen on the 24th day of the Jewish *first* month, or month *Abib*: which was part March, part April. Dan. x. 4.

<sup>4</sup> Daniel was carried away from Jerusalem, on the first deportation of captive Jews, in the third year of Jehoiakim and first of Nebuchadnezzar. At this time he must have been nearly grown up; as we find him in Nebuchadnezzar's second year expounding to him his dream of the great quadripartite image: after which there had now elapsed the seventy years and more of the captivity. Dan. i. 1, 6; ii. 1.

<sup>5</sup> Dan. ix. 3, &c.

<sup>6</sup> Dan. ix. 25. Compare Hagg. i. 9.

<sup>7</sup> Dan. x. 12; "From the first day that thou didst set thy heart to understand," &c.

<sup>8</sup> Both in the symbol of the *quadripartite image*, and that of the *four wild beasts*, Dan. ii. vii.

<sup>9</sup> Dan. viii. 5, 6, 21.

be manifested in humiliation, and cut off; <sup>1</sup> and which was to introduce into the Temple, that had now been just founded anew, *the abomination that would make desolate?* <sup>2</sup> When again the consummation of judgment to be poured out on *the desolator*; <sup>3</sup> and so and then, apparently, that glorious restoration of Israel and of the Temple to take place, under the King Messiah, that had been prefigured to another holy prophet, the associate of Daniel's youth and captivity, I mean Ezekiel? <sup>4</sup>

The vision accorded to Daniel at the expiration of these three weeks of fasting and humiliation, and which was avowedly intended to enlighten him on the subjects of his anxious searching, <sup>5</sup> opened with the view of some glorious Being of surpassing splendour, standing on the waters of the Tigris. <sup>6</sup> Was it an Angel, or the Lord of Angels? Doubtless the latter: forasmuch as not in respect of his glory only, but of the priestly garb that he wore, <sup>7</sup> the position he stood in, and the solemn oath that he uttered, the parallel was most close between what is here said of him, and what is in the Apocalypse said of the Covenant-Angel that long afterwards appeared to St. John in the visions of Patmos. <sup>8</sup> Moreover the attendant Angels, who were also seen by Daniel in the vision, referred to him their questions as to a superior. <sup>9</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Dan. ix. 25, 26.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. verse 27.

<sup>3</sup> So the Margin.—This is allowed to be a perfectly admissible translation; as much so as that of the English Version, "on the desolate." So Professor Lee in his Introduction to Eusebius' Theophania, p. cxiv.

<sup>4</sup> Ezek. xl., &c. Whether the temple figuratively, or in the sense of a literal building, is not here a question.

<sup>5</sup> Dan. x. 12, 14; "From the first day that thou didst set thy heart to understand, and to chasten thyself before God, thy words were heard, and I am come for thy words."—"I am come to make thee understand what shall befall thy people in the latter days."

<sup>6</sup> "Then I lifted up my eyes, and looked; and behold a certain man clothed in linen, whose loins were girded with fine gold of Uphaz. His body also was like the beryl; and his face as the appearance of lightning; and his eyes as lamps of fire; and his arms and his feet like in colour to polished brass; and the voice of his words like the voice of a multitude." Dan. x. 5, &c.

<sup>7</sup> Compare on the high priest's dress, Exod. xxxix. 5, 22.

<sup>8</sup> See Apoc. i. 13—15, and x. 1, 6.

<sup>9</sup> Dan. xii. 5—7.—I have drawn out this evidence because neither his appearance in splendour, nor his likeness to man, would of itself distinguish him from a created angel; created angels having sometimes so appeared to men: but only other more peculiar characteristics; whether as regarded the acts, words, or functions ascribed to him. See, for example, in Matt. xxviii. 3, 4, the description of the created angels that attended Christ's resurrection.—Similarly in Apoc. xiv. 14 he that appeared on the white cloud, *like to a son of man*, could only be judged from *the adjuncts* of the vision to be Christ. See pp. 11, 12, *suprà*. And so too in Apoc. i. 13.

Thus it seemed, I say, to be the LORD, the MESSIAH, Himself. His *priestly garb* marked him out in that character of the *priest*, the offering priest of the great propitiatory sacrifice, which it needed that he should fulfil ere he took the kingdom.<sup>1</sup> His *silence*, all the while that an attendant Angel detailed to the prophet the prediction we are about considering, might seem to have been the silence of one meditating on the mighty work before him. Again his *position*, with his feet planted on the waters of the Hiddekel, now the great characteristic river of the dominant Persian Empire, symbolized apparently his claim to that domination and empire as his own:<sup>2</sup>—on the realization of which claim those times of Eden that the river Hiddekel might suggest to the prophet's mind<sup>3</sup> would return; and its waters flow again through a Paradise restored.

It is generally supposed by commentators that the Angel who touched and strengthened the prophet, when struck down by the glory of the vision, and then in a predictive narrative informed him respecting the coming future, was the Angel *Gabriel*. And, as Gabriel is specifically mentioned twice before as the appointed communicator with the prophet,<sup>4</sup> this seems very probable. He tells him that on the first day that he chastened himself before God his prayer was heard: and, after a mysterious intimation or two on what for awhile hindered him from coming,<sup>5</sup> and what he was afterwards about to do, in regard both of the Prince of Persia and then the Prince of Greece,<sup>6</sup>—intimations indicating the fact of angelic ministration in influencing men's minds, and so bringing about the appointed issues and changes in human affairs,<sup>7</sup>—he proceeds, in the notable prophecy of chap. xi. and xii., to unfold the then coming fu-

<sup>1</sup> Compare Dan. ix. 26: a prophecy of Messiah given Daniel about four or five years before; it being dated in the first year of Darius the Mede, or two years before the first of Cyrus.

<sup>2</sup> Compare Apoc. x. 1, and my remarks on it Vol. ii. pp. 42, 43, 61, 87.

<sup>3</sup> Gen. ii. 14.—Wintle places the scene near its confluence with the Euphrates.

<sup>4</sup> Dan. viii. 16, ix. 21.—It is observable that in the former of these two passages, it was "a man's voice from between the banks of the Ulai" that directed Gabriel to make Daniel understand the vision then given: just as here the Covenant-Angel stood on the waters of the Hiddekel; while the Angelic attendants were on its banks.

<sup>5</sup> Dan. x. 13; "But the prince of the kingdom of Persia withstood me 21 days; &c."

<sup>6</sup> Dan. x. 20; "And now will I return to fight with the Prince of Persia: and when I am gone forth, lo, the Prince of Grecia shall come."

<sup>7</sup> The Jews supposed angels to have their distinctive appointments over nations.



ture, first under *Persian*, and then under *Greek* supremacy, —the *second* and *third* in the great *tetrarchical succession* of prophecy: with the addition of a sketch of the *sequel* of events, specially with reference to the future fortunes of Daniel's own people,<sup>1</sup> (whether that meant the *literal Israel*, and *Jews* only, or in part too the later-formed *Christian Israel* and *Church*,) even until the consummation. For "the time appointed was long."<sup>2</sup>

The prophecy thus naturally divides itself into two parts: 1st that *from xi. 1 to xi. 31*, sketching the times of the Persians and Greeks; 2ndly that *from xi. 31 to the end of chap. xii.*, sketching the sequel. Now it is not my intention to enter *fully* into the details of the earlier half of the prophecy. For these I refer to Jerome, or Bishop Newton.<sup>3</sup> My object is only to give such a general view of this part, in respect of its literal meaning, and its historic fulfilment, as may serve fitly to introduce that second and more difficult part which has a direct bearing on the time and events of the final crisis; questions which we have hitherto been considering simply by the light of the *Apocalyptic* prophecy. It may be well to consider the two divisions of the prophecy each in a separate Section: and I now proceed accordingly, without further delay, to the discussion of that which belongs to the present Section; viz.

#### THE EARLIER HALF OF THE PROPHECY.

The Angel's prophetic narrative begins from the time then present.<sup>4</sup> Three Persian kings, he says, were to rise after Cyrus, (these were *Cambyses*, *Smerdis*, and *Darius Hystaspes*,) before any mutation needing notice in the

See Dr. M'Caul's *Kimchi* on Zechar. ii. 3.—So too Jerome on Isaiah xv.: "Angeli qui singulis præsunt gentibus."

<sup>1</sup> "I am come to make thee understand what shall befall *thy people* in the latter days." Dan. x. 14.

<sup>2</sup> Dan. x. 1.

<sup>3</sup> In this Chapter of my Book I have referred continually to *Wintle* on Daniel for the Hebrew, as well as to *Bishop Newton* and *Prideaux* for the history. They both give copious authorities.—In revising for my 4th Edition I have also compared my explanations throughout with *Venema's*; who, down to verse 31, takes the same general historic view of the prophecy as Newton, Wintle, and myself.

<sup>4</sup> I purpose to subjoin the prophetic text in detached passages; and, beneath, the comment that illustrates them; making such critical remarks on each as may seem to me useful for readers unskilled like myself in Hebrew. I must trust to the courtesy of Hebrew scholars to excuse it, if of these Notes some appear to them to be needlessly particular, or relative to points clear in themselves.



world's affairs :<sup>1</sup> then a fourth, (*Xerxes*), pre-eminent for his riches and power ; who, by stirring up the whole empire against *Greece*, was to bring Greece directly into contact with Persia ; an aspirant thenceforward for the supremacy. And then “*a mighty king*” was to *stand up*,<sup>2</sup> evidently the famous *Greek* king *Alexander the Great* : (here is the first grand transition in the prophecy ; and one to be well marked as a precedent for comparison, in regard alike of what is unexpressed in it and of what is expressed, and as being a passage, *per saltum*, to another and later age, as well as to another *country* :)<sup>3</sup>—I say this king was evidently the famous *Greek* ruler *Alexander the Great* : no other king having risen up in the 150 years between him and Xerxes, of whom it could be predicated that “he ruled with a great dominion, and did according to his will ;” besides that what is said of the *quadri-partition* of his kingdom after his death “to others, and not to his own posterity,” agrees very exactly, and so as it can be shown to do in the case probably of no other conqueror of antiquity, both with what is historically recorded of the division of Alexander's kingdom, and also with what was clearly foreshown about it in

<sup>1</sup> The prophecy, Dan. xi. 2, begins thus.

xi. 2. “And now will I show thee the truth. Behold there shall stand up yet three kings in Persia ; and the fourth shall be far richer than they all : and by his strength, through his riches,\* he shall stir up all † against ‡ the realm of Grecia.” §

<sup>2</sup> 3. “And a mighty king shall stand up, || that shall rule with great dominion, and do according to his will. 4. And when he shall stand up ¶ his kingdom shall be broken, and shall be divided towards the four winds of heaven : and not to his posterity, nor according to his dominion which he ruled : for his kingdom shall be plucked up, even for others beside \*\* those.”

<sup>3</sup> Viz. to that of *Javan*, or *Greece* ; mentioned in the preceding clause.

\* Wintle ; “When he is grown strong through his wealth.”

† On the peculiar suitableness of this phrase to depict the preparations for Xerxes' expedition into Greece, see my Vol. iii. p. 445, Note <sup>2</sup>.

‡ אֶרֶץ. The sense of *against*, here given, attaches to the word in 1 Chron. xx. 5 ; “There was war *with* (אֶרֶץ) the Philistines.”

§ יָוָן, *Javan* ; the usual word for Greece. So in Dan. x. 20, just before : also in Dan. viii. 21, observed on in my Vol. iii. p. 426.

|| עָמַד. The same Hebrew verb occurs in the verses 2, 4, 6, 7, 8, 14, 15, 16, (twice,) 17, 20, 21, 25, 31 ; also xii. 1, 13. In verse 8 it is rendered *continue*, in verse 15 *withstand* ; in the other cases *stand up*, as here, or simply *stand*. Gesenius says it is a word used particularly of a new prince ; instancing Dan. viii. 23, as well as xi. 2, 3, 20.—Besides which cases it occurs in verses 11, 13, 14 in the Hiphil form ; in verse 14 in the sense of *to make to stand, establish, confirm* ; in verses 11, 13 in that of *to stir up, to excite*. ¶ Or, *when he shall have stood up*.

\*\* כִּי־בִדָּךְ *exclusively, or to the exclusion of* ; very much as in Exod. xii. 37, or Ezra ii. 65 :—the word “*those*” meaning *his posterity* ; the Hebrew אֲחֵרֵיךָ, rendered *posterity*, being used as a concrete.

another and earlier of Daniel's prophecies.<sup>1</sup>—It is the subsequent history of *two* distinctively, out of these *four* divisions of the Greek conqueror's empire, that the revealing Angel proceeded to sketch; viz. of what he called "*the King of the South*," and "*the King of the North*." Now, from this simple designation alone, we might à priori pretty confidently have conjectured that the *Ægypto-Macedonian* and *Syro-Macedonian dynasties* were intended, of the *Ptolemies* and the *Seleucidæ*; the seats of government of these princes being respectively South and North of Judea. But, in effect, conjecture is not needed on the point; the country of the *King of the South* being expressly in an early passage of the prophecy called *Ægypt*.<sup>2</sup>—And the considerate reader can scarce fail of seeing good reason for their selection, as special subjects of prophetic description to Daniel: not merely from the circumstance of their continuing longer, and making a much greater figure in history, than the other two post-Alexandrine Macedonian kingdoms;<sup>3</sup> but yet more on account of the *Holy Land of Judea* being involved more or less in their quarrels and wars;<sup>4</sup> and the Jewish government being a dependency for the most part of one or other of them, until its occupation and subjugation by the Romans.<sup>5</sup>

And in regard to the earlier part of the prophecy concerning them,—i. e. from verse 6 to verse 31, where the question arises whether there may not then be made a transition to the *Roman* subjugation of Judea,—there has been

<sup>1</sup> Dan. viii. 8; "When he (the Grecian he-goat) was strong the great horn was broken; and for it came up four notable ones," &c. See my Vol. iii. p. 428.—I observe that Dr. Arnold heads the chapter 36 of his *Roman History*, a chapter relative to the kingdoms of Alexander's successors, with this verse of Dan. viii. 8.

<sup>2</sup> So verse 8; "He [viz. the *King of the South*] shall carry captive their gods into *Ægypt*;" compared with the notice of the same event in the verse following, "The King of the South shall come into *his own kingdom*, and return to *his own land*."

<sup>3</sup> The *Thracico-Macedonian* kingdom of Lysimachus was early overthrown by the first Seleucus, B.C. 281, about twenty years after the battle of Ipsus: and again the *Greco-Macedonian* kingdom of Cassander was finally overthrown by the Romans, as the result of the battle of Pydna, B.C. 168: whereas *Syria* was not made a Roman province till B.C. 65; *Ægypt* not till B.C. 30.

<sup>4</sup> So Jerome, ap. Venema, p. 2.

<sup>5</sup> The following comprehensive tabular view may be useful of the dates of the successive kings of the Ptolemaic and Seleucidæan dynasties, through the century and a half comprehended (as I suppose) in this prophetic sketch. I premise that the date of Alexander the Great's death is B.C. 323; of that of his half-brother Philip Aridæus, 316; of that of his son Alexander Ægus, by Roxana, 309; a short time after which (the date is generally given 306) the chief Macedonian governors and princes assumed the royal title;—Ptolemy, however, a little before the rest.

exhibited, I think, such satisfactory evidence of a continuous parallelism between the predictive description of the

<i>The Ptolemies.</i>		B.C.	B.C.	<i>The Seleucidæ.</i>	
1. Ptolemy Soter, (son of Ptolemy Lagus) Governor of Egypt. . . . .	323	323	312	1. Seleucus Nicator, Governor of Babylon.	
. . . . . takes the title of King of Egypt. . . . .	306			. . . . . recovers Babylon: and the <i>Æra of the Seleucidæ</i> begins.	
2. Ptolemy Philadelphus associated with his father. . . . .	285				
Sole king on his father's death (Under him the Septuagint Greek version of the Old Testament was made; or, at least, begun.)*	283	280	261	2. Antiochus Soter.	
				3. Antiochus Theus.	
3. Ptolemy Energetes. . . . .	246	246	226	4. Seleucus Callinicus.	
		226	223	5. Seleucus Ceraunus.	
				6. Antiochus Magnus.	
4. Ptolemy Philopater . . . . .	222				
5. Ptolemy Epiphanes . . . . .	204		187	7. Seleucus Philopator.	
6. Ptolemy Philometor . . . . .	181	175	164	8. Antiochus Epiphanes.	
		164		9. Antiochus Eupator; of whom Rome takes the guardianship.	
7. Ptolemy Physcon . . . . .	146				

After this fourteen more *Syrian* kings reigned, in reigns of short and uncertain power, till Syria was occupied and made a Roman province, B.C. 65, by Pompey (at which time the *Æra of the Seleucidæ* properly ends, though sometimes used much later; see my Vol. i. p. 31:) also six more *Egyptian* princes, to the death of Ptolemy Auletes: who dying, B.C. 51, left his kingdom and children to Roman guardianship; one of them the *Cleopatra* famous in the histories of Cæsar and Antony.

\* For it was not completed at once, but made at intervals: the Pentateuch first, under Philadelphus; the prophets, it has been thought by learned men, not till perhaps 100 years, or more, after. Hence we can only partially argue from it against the objection first made by Porphyry, and which has been revived of late years by sundry rationalistic writers; as if this prophecy of Daniel was written after the times of the Antiochi and Ptolemies to whose history we refer it.

Nor indeed is it needed. As regards Daniel's earlier nine Chapters, there is, 1st, the internal evidence of the language used; in part *Chaldee*, as by one in Babylonia, and during Babylon's supremacy; viz. from ch. ii. 4 to the end of ch. vii.; in part *Hebrew*, of a character most like to that of Daniel's contemporaries, Ezekiel and Ezra: 2ndly, the evidence of prophecies, the fulfilment of which is demonstrable, reaching far beyond the times of Antiochus Epiphanes and the Maccabees; alike those in Dan. ii., vii., which prefigure the history of the Roman empire down to its resolution into ten kingdoms, and subsequent final supersession by the empire of Messiah; and that in Dan. ix. respecting Messiah's manifestation in humiliation and death, after the 70 hebdomads, or 490 years, from some Persian king's decree for the rebuilding of Jerusalem.

Then, as regards chaps. x., xi., xii., now specially our subject, we have the evidence, 1st, of the Hebrew language used, still of the same character as before; not that of Greek, as in the post-Malachine Apocryphal books:—2ndly, that of the all but impossibility of these three chapters being fraudulently inserted into Daniel's canonical books in the Maccabean, or post-Maccabean times:—3rdly, that of the absurdity of the idea of a Jew's forging them, with a view to its appearing a prophecy of Maccabean times; and yet, by its mention of the 1335 days' period (as well as the 1260 days'), and of Daniel's standing at the end of them in his lot, and, together with the other just, shining as the sun and stars for ever and ever, furnishing its own refutation, if so applied. All this besides Christ's own testimony to the genuineness of the whole book of Daniel, as then in the Jewish Old Testament Canon.

two kings here given, and the international history of the Ptolemies and Seleucidæ, as to leave no reasonable doubt as to the meaning *so far* of the prophecy; and thus to offer us the immense advantage of a sufficiently clear introduction, at the outset, to that which is more obscure.

1. Whereas the King of the South was to be strong,<sup>1</sup> and the King of the North, (another of the great Greek King's princes or governors,) though later apparently in assuming the royal title, to become stronger than the King of the South, then contentions (as it is implied) to arise and continue between them, until composed by the expedient of a family alliance through the marriage of a daughter of the King of the South to the King of the North,—so

<sup>1</sup> 5. "And the king of the south shall be strong, and one of his princes: \* and he shall be strong above him, † and have dominion: his dominion shall be a great dominion. 6. And in the end of the years ‡ they shall join themselves together: § for the king's daughter of the south shall come || to the king of the north to make an agreement." ¶

\* Wintle translates; "The King of the South, *that is*, one of his (Alexander's) princes, shall be strong;" observing that two manuscripts omit the *and*, before *one of*; and that, if retained, it must be taken as only *explanatory*. Then in the next clause he translates, "Yet shall *another* exceed him in strength:" instead of "*he* shall."—On the other hand the Septuagint translates, "And one of his princes shall be strong above him;" omitting the *second* connecting *and*. And Newton thinks that there is manifestly either this redundancy, by error of transcription, in the Hebrew text; or an omission of "the king of the north," after this second *and*.

But no alteration of the received text seems to me necessary. It only needs that we understand "shall be strong," from the clause preceding, after "one of his (Alexander's) princes." And so indeed, I now observe, Venema, p. 3, explains it. It is to be remembered that *Ptolemy* became *King of the South* ere Seleucus assumed the royal title; and consequently while he was yet professedly only a governor, governor of Babylon.—We have in this clause an early example of Daniel's use of *pronouns*, in reference not to the next immediately preceding noun, but the one before.

† Mark the *he* and *him*, in the sense of, "the *latter* above the *former*."

‡ Sept. *μετα τα ετη αυτου* reading יָצְאוּ;—i. e. after Seleucus' death.

§ The Hebrew word (the Hithpael form of יָצָא *to join*) is used 2 Chron. xx. 35, 37; "Jehoshaphat did *join himself* with Ahaziah:" i. e. in the partnership and alliance of a joint undertaking.

¶ "Proprie intrasse in domum ejus et thalamum, tanquam sponsa ad sponsum. Verbum enim בָּא sæpe introcundi potestatem exserit, oppositè ad foras seu יָצָא *exire*; et de intimo sumitur ac familiarissimo commercio (e. g. Judg. xii. 9, Cant. i. 4) quale est inter conjuges." Venema, p. 14.

¶ Hebr. לַעֲשׂוֹת יְשׁוּבִים. Literally, "To do or make *rectitudes*:" so Venema: Lee, *to make things straight*; Gesenius, *to make peace*. The latter compares verse 17, where the root יָצָא occurs, and where the Septuagint renders it (more correctly probably than our English translation) *εἰθεία πάντα μετ' αυτου ποιησει*: very much as Prof. Lee here. The Greek rendering here is, *του ποιησαι συνθηκας μετ' αυτου*.

Let me suggest the passage 2 Kings x. 15, "Is thy heart *right*, as my heart is with thy heart," where the same Hebrew word יָצָא occurs; in proof that it is used to express *friendliness*, as well as *moral rectitude*. So *Aben Ezra* explains the present passage, "to make peace between them;" as also the Rabbi *Saadiah*.



*Ptolemy the First* became strong as King of Egypt, and *Seleucus*, the Macedonian governor of Babylon, on subsequently assuming the title of King, much greater and stronger:<sup>1</sup> and, a quarrel having soon arisen between the immediate successors of these two kings, war ensued;<sup>2</sup> and continued until composed by the second Ptolemy giving his daughter Berenice in marriage to the third of the Seleucidæan dynasty.—2. Whereas this scheme of family alliance was prophesied of as to fail,<sup>3</sup> and both the South King's married daughter, and the King her husband, and

<sup>1</sup> So Appian, apud Bishop Newton. In fact Seleucus' empire extended from the Indus to the Ægean.—At this time lived Megasthenes and Berosus.

<sup>2</sup> So Newton, and also Venema, pp. 10, 11, from Jerome and Pausanias.

<sup>3</sup> 6. "But she shall not retain \* the power of the arm; † neither shall he stand, nor his arm:" ‡ but she shall be given up; and they that brought her, and he that begat her: § and he that strengthened her || in these ¶ times.\*\*

\* The same Hebrew word occurs in Dan. x. 8; "I retained no strength."

† עֲזָרָה, *βραχίων*, is a word frequent in the Old Testament, both in the singular and plural, to signify *strength, power*, whether of an *individual*, or sometimes of a *military host*. So עֲזָרָה שָׂרָא, Job xxii. 8, "a man of *arm*, or *strength*;" and Gen. xlix. 24, "The *arms* (i. e. power) of his hands were made strong by the God of Jacob."—In Isa. li. 9, and lxii. 8, the double phrase "*strength of the arm*" (ισχυς βραχιονος, Sept.) is used conjointly, as here.—In subsequent verses of this chapter it is used *with verbs* thus; (I quote from the Septuagint to avoid the ambiguity of the word *arm* in English:—) xi. 15; Και οἱ βραχίονες του βασιλεως του νοτου ου στησονται (so the *Alexandrine* Sept., the Vatican copy omits the *ου*;) xi. 22, βραχίονες του κατακλυζοντος κατακλυσθησονται.—Compare Ezek. xxx. 25; Και ενισχυσω τους βραχίονας βασιλεως Βαβυλωνος, οἱ δε βραχίονες Φαραω πεσουνται.—Wintle makes this word the nominative; "The arm shall not retain strength."

‡ The Septuagint translates, Και ου στησεται το σπερμα αυτου; reading, with the omission of σ, and a different punctuation from that of the text of our translators, הַרְבֵּי his seed, or children: which I conceive to be the better reading; since otherwise in the phrase "Neither shall he stand, nor his arm," or power, the last clause is tautologous. So too Wintle.—Boothroyd translates, "Neither shall she stand, nor her seed." But does the gender admit of this?—Venema reads and translates as our English version.

§ Bishop Newton and Wintle translate, "he whom she brought forth;" therein, as Wintle says, "following the marginal reading and the versions:" and so Venema (p. 20) q. v. "Her son."—The Sept. omits the Mappik; translating ἡ νεανις, the young woman. Aben Ezra follows a still somewhat different reading; which signifies her mother.

|| Venema, 22, translates this, "munimentum ejus, firmiter eam tenens, in temporibus:" explaining it of a strong fortress at Daphne where Berenice took refuge, and which she was by treachery induced to surrender. ¶ Wintle, "at the times."

\*\* Aben Ezra explains this to mean *astrologers*; an explanation curious and worth observing; if the phrase may bear that sense, in the absence of a word denoting knowledge. In Esther i. 13, and 1 Chron. xii. 32, they who understand times, מְדַבְּרֵי הַיָּמִים, is a periphrasis for *astrologers*: (compare Deut. xviii. 10, 14, "one that useth divination, or an observer of times, or an enchanter:") "times" meaning in some places men's destinies. So Psalm xxxi. 15, "My times are in thy hand:" also 1 Chron. xxix. 30, Job xxiv. 1.—Else he that strengthened her must be taken (one for many) to mean the party that supported Berenice against Laodice, at the time of her being in Syria, including especially her husband. So Wintle.



her son too by the marriage,<sup>1</sup> and her attendants to fall,—so both *Berenice*, and her husband *Antiochus*, and her son too by him, and her attendants, were actually murdered by the arts of Antiochus' original but repudiated wife, *Laodice*;<sup>2</sup> and the originally devised means of alliance and amity between the two kingdoms turned into an occasion of the wars that followed.<sup>3</sup>—For, 3rdly, whereas “out of a branch of her roots,”<sup>4</sup> one was to stand up to avenge

<sup>1</sup> Taking the Septuagint reading  $\sigma\tau\epsilon\delta$ , *seed*.

<sup>2</sup> See the authorities in Newton, Venema, or the Univ. Hist. ix. 197 et seq.

<sup>3</sup> Venema, p. 16, insists on this point:—whence the obvious propriety of its being noticed in the forefront of the prophecy.

<sup>4</sup> “7. But out of a branch of her roots\* shall one stand up in his estate,† which shall come with an army‡ and shall enter into the fortress§ of the king of the north, and shall deal against them, and shall prevail; 8. and shall also carry captives into Egypt their gods, with their princes,|| and with their precious vessels¶ of silver and

\* Historically applied this seems a remarkable and distinctive phrase. Compare Isa. xi. 1; “There shall come forth a rod out of the stem of Jesse, and a branch shall grow out of his roots.” Her *roots* mean her *parentage* or *ancestry*: so a person is indicated who should be of a common stock with her; i. e. a brother, if taken most strictly. Thus Saadiah makes the person meant to be the *brother* of the king's daughter before spoken of.—Venema renders the clause; “Stabit ex sureculo radicum ejus stirps ejus obumbrans:” the Vulgate; “Stabit de germine radicum ejus plantatio:” the Cod. Chis. mentioned by Wintle,  $\phi\upsilon\tau\omicron\nu\ \epsilon\kappa\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \rho\acute{\iota}\zeta\eta\varsigma\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\nu\ \sigma\upsilon\lambda\lambda\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$  as if reading  $\text{נבצר משטירו}$ , with a slight change in the Hebrew.

†  $\text{בניו}$  without the preposition, for  $\text{בניו}$  *in his place*, or *stead*. So Gesenius. With  $\text{בניו}$  the phrase is used in this sense in verses 20, 21, 38. The word  $\text{בניו}$ , a *place*, is used Gen. xl. 13, “In three days Pharaoh shall restore thee to thy *place*;” and again Gen. xli. 13, “to my *office*.”—Wintle renders it “on its base.”

‡  $\text{בצבא}$ , usually *to*. So the Sept.  $\eta\acute{\iota}\xi\epsilon\ \pi\rho\omicron\varsigma\ \tau\eta\nu\ \delta\upsilon\nu\alpha\mu\iota\nu$ . The sense of *with* is however adopted by Wintle.—If this be not warranted, then the meaning may be, “shall come to the *power*,” i. e. to the *power of the kingdom*; for  $\text{בצבא}$  means *power*, as well as a *host* or *army*.—And so, I now see, Venema takes it; “Veniet ad potentiam;” or “imperium.” pp. 33—36.

§  $\text{בצבא}$ : a word which occurs also in verse 10, “stirred up' to *his fortress*;” and is the same that by its use in verse 38 in the plural has given rise to Mede's famous criticism on the *Mahuzzim*.—Venema, p. 37, thinks that it may be here taken *collectively* of all the *defences* of the Northern kingdom, including the *tutelar gods*.”

||  $\text{בצבא}$  The Septuagint has it,  $\mu\epsilon\tau\alpha\ \tau\omega\nu\ \chi\omega\mu\epsilon\nu\tau\omega\nu\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omega\nu$ , *with their molten images*: a meaning very different from our English rendering, *princes*, but which attaches also to the Hebrew word  $\text{בצבא}$ . For the root of the word is  $\text{בצב}$ , to *pour out*: and it thus applies alike to *images melted* in fusion, (as the cognate word in Isa. xli. 29,) and to *princes poured upon* with the anointing oil, as in Josh. xiii. 21, Psalm lxxxiii. 12, &c.

Probably the Septuagint rendering, *molten images*, is the more correct: as it so well carries on the idea of *their gods* in the clause preceding; and was also so striking a point in the historical fulfilment. And so, I see, Gesenius ad verb. explains it, as well as Wintle. Venema thinks either rendering good, and suitable to the history. pp. 47, 48.

¶  $\text{בכסף}$ , *vessels of their desire*:—a phrase used also of the sacred Jewish vessels carried off to Babylon by Nebuchadnezzar, 2 Chron. xxxvi. 10. Compare my remarks on somewhat similar phrases in verses 16, 37 *infra*.

the ill-treatment of the daughter of the King of the South, then this Southern King to invade the Northern King's territories, take his fortresses, capture his treasures and princes, and (as it is singularly added) *their gods*, and return triumphantly with them into his own country and kingdom, Egypt,—so the *third Ptolemy*, forthwith on coming to the kingdom, invaded Syria, (then under the rule of the fourth Seleucid king, *Seleucus Callinicus*, son to Laodice,) overran the whole kingdom to the Euphrates, and indeed beyond almost to the Indus, plundered it of 40,000 talents of silver and of 2500 *images of gods*; and with these, and numerous captives, returned triumphantly back into Egypt.<sup>1</sup>—4. Whereas the sons of the King of the North (*sons* in the *plural*) were to be stirred up,<sup>2</sup> and assemble great forces, as if with a view to the recovery of

gold; and he shall continue more years than the king of the north. 9. So the king of the south shall come into *his* kingdom, and shall return into his own land.\*

<sup>1</sup> So Wintle from Jerome. An inscription on an ancient marble, which he notes from Calmet, thus records this exploit of Euergetes;

“Sacris quæ ab Egypto Persæ abstulerant receptis, ac cum reliquâ congestâ gazâ in Egyptum relatis.”

The inscription was published by Allatius at Rome in 1631. Hence it would seem that Euergetes brought back among these idol-gods those that Cambyses the Persian king had carried away two centuries and a half before out of Egypt. But, as Venema observes, they could not be meant specifically here; the gods spoken of being said to be made captive.

<sup>2</sup> “10. But his sons † shall be stirred up, ‡ and shall assemble a multitude of

---

\* This verse seems recapitulatory.—It is to be observed that there is no *his* prefixed to kingdom in the Hebrew. So that the natural translation would be; “And he (viz. the King of the *North*) shall enter into the kingdom of the King of the South, and return to his own land;” i. e. without effecting anything. Compare Is. xxxvii. 34. And so, I see, Venema translates and expounds it, pp. 51—55; with an extract from Justin in illustration:—“Lætus malis suis. . . Seleucus, veluti par viribus, bellum Ptolemæo inferit: sed quasi ad ludibrium tantum fortunæ natus esset, nec propter aliud regni opes recepisset quàm ut amitteret, victus prælio. . . trepidus Antiochiam confugit.”

† That is the sons of the *King of the North*, the last mentioned, according to the explanation above given of the verse preceding. The King of the North, spoken of in the next verse as the southern King's antagonist, was apparently one of these two sons. So Aben Ezra and Saadiah.

We should observe that wherever, as here, there is the pronominal suffix, there is no distinction in Hebrew between the plural and the dual. So that we cannot argue for a duality of sons as here expressly defined.

‡ The Hebrew is מִלְחָמָה, the same verb that occurs again, and in the same *Hithpahal* form, near the end of this verse, and also in verse 25; and quite a different one from that in verse 2. Its root is מִלְחָמָה: a verb not used in *Kal*; but which in *Piel* signifies to stir up contention, as Prov. xv. 18, “A wrathful man stirreth up strife:” and in its *Hithpahal* form (as here) is used, 1st, says Gesenius, in the sense to be excited, as to anger, 2nd, to contend, to engage in war. So Deut. ii. 5, 19, “Meddle not with them in war;” also Jer. l. 24.

their losses and to revenge, and *one* out of them (*one* only) to overflow, (whether over his own recaptured territory, or over that of his enemy the King of the South,) and the King of the South to meet him in battle, and utterly overthrow him,—so did *Seleucus Ceraunus*, and, on his speedy death a year or two after, his brother and successor *Antiochus*, called *the Great*,<sup>1</sup> assemble great forces to recover their father's dominions, and the latter achieve the object, recover *Seleucia* and *Syria*, and proceed to invade *Egypt* with a mighty army; <sup>2</sup> whereupon ensued the (to him) disastrous battle of *Raphia*, on the *Egyptian* frontier, in which he suffered a total defeat from *Philopator*, the then reigning *Ptolemy*.—5. Whereas <sup>3</sup> the King of the South was

great forces; and one shall certainly come,\* and overflow, and pass through, then shall he return,† and be stirred up,‡ even to his fortress.§ 11. And the king of the south shall be moved with choler, and shall come forth, and fight with him, even with the king of the north; and he shall set forth || a great multitude; but the multitude shall be given into his ¶ hand.”

<sup>1</sup> So *Justin* xxx. 1; “*Antiochus rex Syriæ, veteri inter se regnorum odio stimulante, repentino bello multas urbes ejus (Ptolemæi) oppressit, ipsamque Ægyptum aggressus.*”

The following dates will be useful towards the illustration of this prophetic sketch of *Antiochus the Great's* history.

B.C.	
223	<i>Antiochus</i> succeeds to the <i>Syrian</i> throne.
217	Is defeated in the battle of <i>Raphia</i> .
198	Defeats <i>Scopas</i> in the battle of <i>Panias</i> , on returning from his <i>Eastern</i> conquests; and recovers <i>Judea</i> and <i>Jerusalem</i> .
192	War with the <i>Romans</i> begins, and lasts three years.
190	Battle and defeat of <i>Magnesia</i> .
187	<i>Antiochus</i> killed.

<sup>2</sup> *Polybius* describes the army and its amount; 62,000 foot, 6000 horse, and 102 elephants. *Newton* and *Wintle*.

<sup>3</sup> 12. “And when he hath taken away\*\* the multitude, his heart shall be lifted up:

\* The change from plural to singular is as marked in the *Hebrew* as the *English*.—The clause is literally, “And he shall come, coming.”

† The *Hebrew* verb  $\text{זָּוַר}$  is the same that is used in verses 18 and 19 subsequently with  $\text{בָּ}$ , in the sense of *to turn one's face towards a place*. It often means, when joined with another verb, *to do a thing again*. So *Venema*, p. 58, “*Phrasis iterationem continet.*” So here it may perhaps mean, that after his *first* acting out of his anger, and overflowing, he should be again excited to urge the war.

‡ *Gesenius* supplies “and *march*” even to his fortress; i. e. the fortress of the *Southern King*.

§ “*Usque ad munitissimum locum.*” So *Venema*, p. 66; explaining the effect of the paragogic  $\text{מְּ}$  at the end of the word *mahoz*, as giving it the force of a superlative; and the actual place alluded to to be the famous fortress of *Gaza*, in defence of which the battle of *Raphia* was fought near it.

|| Or, *make to stand*. So verse 13. See p. 60, Note ||.

¶ The *he* and *his* in the two successive clauses refer evidently to different persons.

\*\*  $\text{סָרַף}$ ; a word used not unfrequently of *taking away with violence*. So 1 *Sam.*

not eventually to be strengthened by this great victory, his

and \* he shall cast down many ten thousands; but he shall not be strengthened by it. 13. For the king of the north shall return, and shall set forth a multitude greater than the former; and shall certainly come after certain years, † with a great army, ‡ and with much riches. 14. And in those times there shall many stand up against the king of the south: also the robbers of thy people § shall exalt themselves to establish the vision; || but they shall fall. ¶ 15. So the king of the north shall come, and east up a mount, and take the most fenced cities: \*\* and the arms †† of the south shall not withstand, neither his chosen people; ‡‡ neither shall there be any strength to withstand. §§ 16. But he that cometh against |||| him shall do according to his own will; and none shall stand before him: and he shall stand in the glorious land: ¶¶

xvii. 34, Job xxvii. 21, xxxii. 22, &c. But in these examples the verb is in Kal; in the text in Piel: to which latter form of the verb however Gesenius also gives the sense, *to take away*; adducing Amos iv. 2, as an example of it.—Or the verb may be here taken as in the Niphal, passively. \* Wintle, “Wherefore though?”

† Margin, Hebr. *at the end of times, even years.*

‡ Venema, p. 85, renders the clause *come to*, instead of *come with*: “Veniendo veniet ad robur magnum et possessionem multam.” Such, he says, is the usual use of the verb in this Chapter.

§ Marg. *the children of robbers*: used as *sons of Belial*, &c., for men of that character.—The word רֹבְדִים, rendered *robbers*, is often used of *violent and lawless men*. So Psalm xvii. 4, “The ways of the violent;” Ezek. xviii. 10, “If he beget a son that is a robber, a shedder of blood;” Jer. vii. 11, “Is this house become a den of robbers in your eyes?” Again in Isa. xxxv. 9, of *ravenous beasts*. Lee expounds it here as *violent lawless men, of (or belonging to) thy people*. The Sept. translates it *οἱ υἱοὶ τῶν λουμῶν, τοῦ λαοῦ σου*. Compare 2 Chron. xiii. 7, *συνήχθησαν πρὸς αὐτὸν ἄνδρες λουμοὶ υἱοὶ παρανομῶν* also Mac. x. 61.—Venema, on the other hand, explains it in a sense less opprobrious of high-spirited revolvers against the yoke of slavery: “impetuosi ad libertatem grassatores, sese superbiâ et temerariâ spe effequentes, jugumque excentientes.” p. 102.

|| Lit. “To make to stand a vision;” the definite article not being in the original Hebrew. So the Sept. *τοῦ σησαὶ ὄρασις*.—So, for example, in case of a vision being pretended by false prophets among the revolvers, in order to stir up the more violent to take up arms in favour of Antiochus, as an appointed deliverer, and to attack the castle of Jerusalem, then garrisoned by a strong Egyptian force; like as by Ahab’s false prophets, when urging the expedition against Ramoth Gilead. Compare too Isa. xxviii. 7, Jer. v. 31, xiv. 14, &c.

Such occurred to me as a not unlikely solution before consulting Venema. I find that he, not very dissimilarly, supposes a *vision* urged in order to this purpose: only not such a pretended vision as I have suggested; but the vision of Jewish restoration and final prosperity that is the burden of so much of Old Testament prophecy. p. 103. He compares Isa. xxvi. 17, 18, speaking of Israel’s previous disappointed hopes on this head; “We have been with child, we have brought forth wind, &c.”

¶ Or *fail*: literally, *totter, stumble*. \*\* Or, *city of munitions*. †† *βραχίονες*.

‡‡ Literally, *the people of his choices*. Marg. §§ Or “*stand*,” as before.

|||| “Against,” כִּנְיָ: a word meaning more generally *to*; but also used in the sense of *against*, as Gen. iv. 8, “Cain rose against Abel;” Ezek. xiii. 8, 9, “Behold I am upon, or against you:” &c.—Venema however prefers the usual meaning; and renders the clause, that whoever comes to him (the King of the North) will conform to his will. p. 114.

¶¶ אֶרֶץ יְפִיָּה; i. e. literally, “*in the land of the beauty, ornament, honour*.” In Dan. viii. 9 the same word יְפִיָּה is used, perhaps of *Judea*, and with the definite article, “waxed great toward the pleasant land;” the word *land*, however, not being there expressed. So again Dan. xi. 41, 45, “the land of glory, the glorious holy mount;” Jer. iii. 19, “*goodly heritage, or heritage of beauty*;” and in Ezek. xx. 6, 15, “the glory of all lands;” also 2 Sam. i. 19.—In Isa. xiii. 19, “the glory of kingdoms” is an appellative used of *Babylon*.

N. B. In Psalm cvi. 24, “They despised the pleasant land;” Jer. iii. 19, “Give thee a pleasant land,” and Zech. vii. 14, “They laid the pleasant land desolate,” the Hebrew phrase is different; being אֶרֶץ חֲפִצָּה, “land of desire.”



heart being lifted up (perhaps, as in Sennacherib's<sup>1</sup> or Uz-ziah's case,<sup>2</sup> against God himself) with that vanity which often precedes a fall, and after certain years the King of the North was to return, with great riches and a greater army than before, and in confederacy moreover with various other states and persons, including among them certain revolters or violent men of Daniel's people,—and, there being no power in the arms of the South to withstand him, would both take the city of munitions, and also stand in the glorious land, or land of the glory and beauty, that is, of Jerusalem and its sacred temple, which by his hand, whether in respect of its buildings or otherwise, should be perfected and made complete,—so *Ptolemy Philopator*, the victor of Raphia, instead of aggrandizement by his victory, abandoning himself thenceforth to his lusts and passions, made peace with Antiochus that he might the better indulge them; showed how his heart was lifted up by attempting, on a visit to Jerusalem now again subjected to him, to force his way into the Holy of Holies; and then in a few years died of his debauchery:<sup>3</sup>—whereupon (his infant son having succeeded him) *Antiochus*, who had meanwhile been indefatigably reconquering the eastern provinces of his ancestral dominion, returned after some fifteen years, as to an easy prey, against the Egyptian rival kingdom, with great riches and a mightier army than before,—the King of Macedon having confederated with him, the Jewish insurrectionists and profest patriots thrown off their

which by his hand shall be consumed."\* (Marg. *perfected*.) <sup>1</sup> Isa. xxxvii. 23.

<sup>2</sup> 2 Chron. xxvi. 16.

<sup>3</sup> So the Uuiṽ. Hist. ix. 220, referred to by Wintle.

\* "It shall be consumed, or perfected, *in, or by, his hand.*" Here, 1st, as the *verb* is in the *masculine* form, we might naturally deem the *it* masculine also: in which case, we should suppose, it would not answer to the ארץ, "*the land,*" which is feminine; but either to the word *beauty*, or the *He*, viz. *the King of the North*. But where the subject is in a state of construction with another noun, I am told that the predicate may agree in gender and number with the *latter*, not the *former*. So e. g. Gen. iv. 10, 1 Sam. ii. 4, Lev. xiii. 9. In the last of which cases the literal reading is thus: "when the *plague* (masc. noun) of leprosy *is* (*fem. verb*) in a man." It is to be observed too that the Hebrew language is, as Gesenius says, sparing in the use of the feminine forms. Thus Isa. xxxiii. 9, literally; "The land (*fem.*) mourneth (*masc.*) and languisheth (*fem.*)."—2. The Septuagint, agreeably with the Margin, gives the sense τελεσθησεται, "shall be *perfected,*" or *completed.*" And so Wintle and Bishop Newton. The verb is used Exod. xxxix. 32, 1 Kings vi. 38, of the completion of the *tabernacle* and *temple*. And here too it may refer to the *temple*, as the *beauty of holiness*; though without the אֶרֶץ of verse 45.

allegiance to Egypt, and many of the Egyptians themselves rebelled,—defeated Scopas utterly who was sent against him, besieged and took Sidon, the “city of munitions,” where Scopas had taken refuge, together with other fenced cities,<sup>1</sup> and then recovered Judea: where, as the Jews welcomed him as a deliverer, he acted like a deliverer and friend towards them; and, by repairing the city walls, gathering together to their own land more out of the Jewish dispersion, assisting the completion of the temple,<sup>2</sup> and other ways, did not a little contribute to the perfecting of the national restoration.—6. Whereas<sup>3</sup> the King of the North was, notwithstanding this success, and just when setting his face to enter with all his strength the southern

<sup>1</sup> Venema thinks *Gaza* especially referred to in the designated *city of munitions*.

<sup>2</sup> “Josephus informs us that Antiochus made a decree that the Jews should enjoy many immunities, and should live according to their own rites and laws, and that the work of the temple should be finished.” Wintle. So too Bishop Newton.

<sup>3</sup> 17. “He shall also set his face to enter with the strength of his whole kingdom, \* and upright ones with him: thus shall he do; † and he shall give him the daughter of women ‡ corrupting her. § but she shall not stand on his side, || neither be for him. 18. After this he shall turn his face unto the isles, ¶ and shall take many: \*\*

\* Or, “to enter with strength his whole kingdom,” i. e. the whole kingdom of the King of the South. So Venema and Wintle prefer to construe the clause; meaning *Egypt proper*, the centre and strength of Ptolemy’s kingdom. The verb  $\text{עָנָה}$ , *enter*, is used thus *transitively* Ps. c. 4, Gen. xxiii. 10, 18: also 1 Sam. xii. 8, Amos v. 19.

Perhaps the passage may be thus rendered and understood. “And he (the King of the North) shall set his face to enter with strength all his kingdom; . . . and shall give him . . . in order to destroy it:” the *it* thus referring to the kingdom of the South.

† The Greek renders these two clauses,  $\text{Και ευθεια παντα μετ αυτου ποιησει}$  and so the Vulgate, “Et recta faciet eum eo;” reading  $\text{רָצִיבָה}$  instead of  $\text{רָצִיבָה}$ : the former being a reading supported by one manuscript, and which Wintle and Bishop Newton approve. Then the whole clause  $\text{עָנָה בְּכָח כָּל מַלְכוּתוֹ}$  will be thus literally rendered; “And he shall make *rectitudes*, or *things straight*, with him;” that is, as in verse 6, *alliances*, or *an agreement*; or, as Aben Ezra, *peace*.  $\text{עָשָׂה}$  is as often to *make*, as to *do*. It is rendered *deal* in verse 7; *practise*, viii. 24.

‡ Some one so called  $\text{κατ' εξοχην}$ , for rank or beauty. So Houbigant. History explains it of the northern king’s own daughter.

§ Lit. “to corrupt or destroy her, or it:” the verb  $\text{פָּשָׁה}$  being used (like the Greek  $\text{φθειρω}$ ) both of *corrupting*, as Gen. vi. 12, “All flesh corrupted its way:” and of *destroying*, (a yet more common meaning,) as Dan. viii. 24, “He shall destroy the mighty ones,” Isa. xiv. 20, 2 Sam. i. 14, &c.—Perhaps the rendering here should be “to destroy it;” the *feminine* noun *kingdom*, mentioned before, being understood; not *her*. For the historical sense well agrees thereto; but very ill to the rendering of “to corrupt her.” Besides which, is there any example to justify the sense being attached to this word of *getting her treacherously to act for him* (viz. her father) *in her new marriage alliance*; so as Wintle, Newton, &c., would have it?

So, I now see, Venema takes the clause; “ad corrumpendum regnum,” p. 129.

|| “On his side,” or “for him,” is *supplied* from the clause following. It is not expressed in the original.

¶  $\text{לְיַם יָם}$ . Lit. *to islands*, or *maritime coasts*. The word is the same as that used for the *isles* of Chittim, and the *isles* of Elishah, or Greece, in Ezek. xxvii. 6, 7.

\*\* i. e. many *islands*: both substantive and adjective being masculine.

kingdom, to break off the apparently meditated design, make an agreement and reconciliation with the King of the South, (a plan of agreement involving the giving him his daughter in marriage,) and, as if with new and other views of aggrandizement, to turn his face to the isles, (the Grecian Isles,) and take many, till some prince or general, as one whose honour was shamed by the act, should repulse him, and make him return ignominiously to his own land, where he would stumble, and fall, and not be found,—so *Antiochus the Great*, when prepared to enter Egypt, changed his plan, made peace with the young Ptolemy, betrothed his daughter to him, and after a while conducted her to the marriage; then, as considering all secure in that quarter, turned his face toward the Grecian Isles, and with a great fleet and army took many, thereby offending the majesty of the *Roman Republic*, whose confederates they were: whereupon the Roman commanders caused the reproach to turn on *him*, attacked and defeated him utterly both at Thermopylæ and in the decisive battle of Magnesia, and so forced him to return to his own land a disgraced fugitive, the western half of his empire being surrendered, and an immense tribute imposed on him;<sup>1</sup> to obtain help towards the payment of which, when he had entered and sought to plunder some rich temple in Elymais, he was attacked, killed, and found no more.—7. As the next successor<sup>2</sup> of the King of the North was described as a raiser of taxes, or one that would cause an exactor to pass over the glory of his kingdom, then perish in a few days, but neither in angry brawl nor battle,—so Antiochus' son and successor *Seleucus Philopator* was scarcely known except as a raiser of taxes, to pay

but a prince, \* for his own behalf, † shall cause the reproach offered by him to cease: without ‡ his own reproach he shall cause it to turn upon him. 19. Then shall he turn his face toward the fort § of his own land: and he shall stumble, and fall, and not be found."

<sup>1</sup> The Articles of the Treaty are given in full in the Univ. Hist. ix. 268.

<sup>2</sup> 20. "There shall stand up in his estate || a raiser of taxes in the glory of his

\* מִלְחָמָה: a word used both of *civil magistrates* and *military commanders*: of the *first*, Micah iii. 9, "Princes or judges, that pervert equity;" of the *second*, Josh. x. 24, "the captains of the men of war." So too Judges xi. 6, &c.

† לְפָנָיו, "as to him:" i. e. as regards this general himself.

‡ Rather, "Besides, he shall make," &c. So Wintle.—He shall not only avert reproach from himself, but turn it on his assailant. So too Venema, p. 144; who compares Hos. xii. 14.

§ Lit. *fortresses*.

|| Literally *on his base*; i. e. on the base, or in the place, of the former kings. So in verse 7. See p. 65 Note †.

off a yearly tribute of 1000 talents imposed for 12 years by the Romans; his exactor of taxes, Heliodorus, being sent to gather them, not merely elsewhere and otherwise in the once glorious kingdom of Syria, but by plunder too of that which the revealing Angel might specially mean by "the glory of his kingdom," (though Seleucus did not so appreciate it,) viz. the temple of Jerusalem: very soon after which sacrilege, and in the twelfth or last year for which the Roman tribute of 1000 talents had been imposed,<sup>1</sup> having fulfilled his predicted character, he was killed; that same Heliodorus, who had been his instrument for spoiling the temple, treacherously assassinating him.<sup>2</sup>—8. Whereas

kingdom: \* but in few days † he shall be destroyed, neither in anger, ‡ nor in battle."

<sup>1</sup> So Wintle. Bishop Newton has not remarked this characteristic fact.

<sup>2</sup> 21. "And in his estate § shall stand up a vile person, || to whom they shall not

\* Literally, *one who makes an exactor to pass over the glory of his kingdom*. The Hebrew word for *exactor*, (שֹׁמֵר, so reading the word with the Lexicographers, instead of שֹׁמֵר,) and its cognates, are used of *money* exactions. So Dent. xv. 2, 3; "Every creditor, that lendeth aught unto his neighbour, shall . . . not *exact* it of his neighbour, or of his brother: . . . of a foreigner thou mayest *exact* it again:" and 2 Kings xxiii. 35; Jehoiakim taxed the land "to give the money according to the commandment of Pharaoh: he *exacted* the silver and the gold of the people of the land." In Zech. ix. 8, "And no *oppressor* shall pass through them any more," the same word is used.—"The glory" may mean simply the Northern king's (once) glorious kingdom:—or perhaps as Wintle explains it, the Jewish temple. See my Note ¶¶ p. 68 *suprà*, on verse 16.

Venema explains the clause otherwise, thus. "There shall stand up an exactor against his offshoot: [so he translates עַל כִּנֵּי:] and shall make the glory of the kingdom, or glory of reigning, to pass over to him." And so, he says, Heliodorus murdered Seleucus, and usurped the crown. But on this point of *translation* the almost uniform judgment of expositors is against him. And *historically* we may object the omission in this case of all notice of Seleucus from the prophecy.

† Within a year. Wintle.

‡ שֹׁמֵר, from שָׁח; a contracted verbal, (root שָׁח to breathe,) which 1st signifies the *breathing organ*, i. e. the *nose*, or *nostrils*; and 2ndly, because the *breathing of the nostrils* often expresses *anger*, means *anger* also. In this sense the word is often used: e. g. Gen. xxvii. 45, of the anger of *Esau against Jacob*, which made him seek to kill him; Judges xiv. 19, of that of *Samson against the Philistines*, which issued in a murderous attack upon them; and 1 Sam. xx. 30, &c., of that of *Saul against Jonathan*, under the influence of which he cast a javelin at him to slay him. So that this phrase in the text may very well mean, that the king should neither be slain in any *private angry brawl or quarrel*, nor in *public war*. Hence Wintle's recourse to the Coptic version for the different reading of אֲרִיבֵי, signifying *arms*, or *weapons of war*, seems quite unnecessary.

Compare Venema; p. 168, who explains the word of the ebullition of anger in a popular tumult, very much as I have suggested.

§ עַל-כִּנֵּי. So verses 7, 20, before. And, as before, Venema prefers to render it, *against his offshoot*. His historical explanation, which refers to the same Heliodorus, a man of contemptible rank, standing up against Seleucus' son, and usurping the kingdom, but being rejected by the people, is independent of the עַל-כִּנֵּי: and seems admissible, if we construe the next clause, "And one shall come in," of Antiochus Epiphanes.

|| אֲרִיבֵי, *one despised*: the same word that is used in Isaiah's memorable prophecy



the next king of the North was to be a man every way contemptible, and yet, contrary to all probabilities attendant on such a character, to obtain successes eventually against his rival such as none before, to succeed in the first instance

give \* the honour of the kingdom: but he shall come in peaceably, † and obtain the kingdom by flatteries. ‡ 22. And [with] § the arms of a flood shall they be overflowed || from before him, and shall be broken; yea also the prince of the covenant.

of Christ, liii. 3, "He is *despised*," &c.; and the Nihil Participle of פָּרַז to esteem lightly, to despise. So 2 Sam. vi. 16, 2 Kings xix. 21, &c.

\* i. e. "on whom they (the people) shall not confer the honour," &c.

† פָּרַז, in quietness. The word is used Prov. xvii. 1, "Better is a dry morsel, and quietness therewith;" as also Psalm cxxii. 7; and again Dan. viii. 25, "In peace (Ges. in the midst of peace) he shall destroy many." So too verse 24 infra.

‡ פָּרַז, lubricates, blanditiae; Trommius. Thus the word has a double sense; being applied both to the slipperiness of a path, and the slipperiness of flattery and deceit of the tongue. In the former sense it occurs Psalm xxxv. 6, "Let their way be dark and slippery:" in the latter its originating verb, פָּרַז, Prov. ii. 16, vii. 5, "The stranger that flattereth, or dissembleth, with her words:" and Prov. xix. 5, "A man that flattereth or dissembleth to his neighbour." In this latter sense the verbal seems to be used both here and in the verses 32, 34, below.—"Arts of dissimulation." Gesenius.

§ The *with* is not in the Hebrew. Therefore rather, "The arms of the overflowing shall," &c. So the Greek; και βραχיוεις του κατακλυζοντος κατακλυσθησονται απο προσωπου αυτου. The article is before *flood* in the Hebrew. Grotius, Newton, and Wintle explain this of Heliodorus' power, the usurper of the Syrian kingdom, which was broken before a general of Antiochus Epiphanes, and such Egyptian forces as gathered to support Heliodorus: Venema, of Egypt's power, as having previously under Euergetes overflowed into Syria. He suggests the Nile-flood as the symbol; and observes that the *arms* of the Nile was quite a common figurative expression. The overflowing of Syria's power into Egypt here spoken of, he considers to be a general and in a manner *anticipatory* statement: because it was not till Epiphanes' final expedition against Egypt that this could be said to be fulfilled.—The word פָּרַז covenant, by itself, is of as general application and sense in Hebrew as in English; and therefore Michaelis' rendering, *rex federatus*, quite sufficient to satisfy it: a rendering which Wintle approves.—The word פָּרַז translated *prince*, is also one of general meaning, and applied alike to chiefs *royal, military, civil, and ecclesiastical*: e. g. 1 Sam. ix. 16, x. 1, of *Saul*, the ruling prince over Israel; 1 Chron. xiii. 1, 2 Chron. xxxii. 21, of *military leaders*; 2 Chron. xxviii. 7, of a ruler over the palace; 1 Chron. ix. 11, and 2 Chron. xxxi. 13, of the *priest* that was ruler over the house or temple of God.—In Dan. ix. 25, 26, it is used alike of the *Prince Messiah*, and of the *Roman Prince* that was to come and desolate Jerusalem.

Such being the whole requirement of the two Hebrew words, Wintle explains them *historically* of the then king of Egypt; as the *rex federatus*, confederated by league with Antiochus Epiphanes, soon after the latter's establishment in the kingdom. In which application however of the clause, I think it would be better to refer rather to the previous treaty with the Egyptian king made by Epiphanes' father Antiochus the Great: as history records no new treaty made with him by Epiphanes himself. This is the view that I adopt in my text.

On the other hand Bishop Newton and others explain the words, chief of the covenant of the *Jewish High Priest Onias*, against whom Antiochus Epiphanes practised: and Venema (p. 208) of the *supreme heavenly head of the Jewish covenant*, viz. the *Messiah*; against whom Antiochus acted effectively in these his attacks on the Jewish religion, even as Sennacherib against God, when attacking Judah and Hezekiah. If *holy* had been added, as in verse 30, this view of the covenant meant would have been clear. But it is a word sometimes omitted; e. g. Ps. lxxiv. 20.

|| Or, as Prof. Lec, shall be swept along, or, away.

to the northern kingdom by flatteries, (the arms of the overflow, its previous usurping occupant, being overflow-

23. And after \* the league made with him † he shall work deceitfully. For ‡ he shall come up, § and shall become strong with a small people. 24. He shall enter peaceably || even unto the fattest places of the province: ¶ and he shall do that which his fathers have not done, nor his father's fathers: he shall scatter among them\*\* the prey and spoil and riches. And he shall forecast his devices †† against the strong-holds, ‡‡ even for a time. §§ 25. And he shall stir up his power and his courage against the king of the south, with a great army: and the king of the south shall be stirred

\* כן *from, out of*; and sometimes *after or by reason of*. Compare the כִּנְיָה in the important verse 31, and my Note on it p. 79 *infra*.

† Lit. "And after the (i. e. *their or his*) *being associated* with him he shall practise deceit:" Sept. *Και απο των συναμιξεων προς αυτον ποιησει δολον*. It is the Hithpael Syriac infinitive form (*to join oneself*), used as a noun, derived from כִּנְיָה, *to be joined or confederated*; a word so used Gen. xiv. 3.

‡ י, and.

§ Or, *go up*.

|| כִּנְיָה, as in verse 21; where see Note †. Wintle would prefer to construe this word with the last clause of the verse preceding; "shall become strong by *quiet measures*:" an idea with which the י of the next word well agrees.

¶ כִּנְיָה, *pinguetudines provincie*.—The word כִּנְיָה is thus used figuratively in Isaac's blessings on Jacob and Esau, Gen. xxvii. 28, 39; "God give thee of the *fatness* of the earth."—כִּנְיָה, like the English *province*, is a word used of some smaller division of a country or kingdom. So in Ezra and Daniel (e. g. Dan. ii. 48, iii. 2, 3) of the provinces of the Persian empire very frequently. In one case, Ezra v. 8, *Judea* is thus specified, "the province of Judea." And, as there is no specification of any particular province of either the Syrian or the Egyptian kingdom, and Judea was in a Jewish mind the province par excellence, I conceive that *this* is the one *here* intended; and not, as Wintle, the Delta of Egypt. This view best suits history, on Wintle's own report of it: "When Antiochus went to examine the southern parts of his dominion (2 Macc. iv. 21) he sent Apollonius with his retinue into Egypt; but it does not appear that he made an excursion thither himself."

And so, I now see, Venema explains it: observing, p. 229, that Epiphanes reduced Judea to the subject state very much of a *province*.

\*\* Among *whom*? *Newton* supposes among his own *Syrian* people; citing Polybius and 1 Mac. iii. 30 in proof of his munificence in gifts and public shows, on which the spoil and riches he acquired were spent: *Wintle*, that it refers to the large donations and bribes, from out of the plunder, with which he courted the Egyptians, which is also noticed in the 1st Maccabees, i. 16.—But may not the כִּנְיָה rather mean *belonging to them*, viz. to his father's fathers: that is, as stored up by them? So 1 Sam. xiv. 16, "the watchman of Saul," כִּנְיָהוּל, signifies *of or belonging to Saul*. This is a common sense of ל.

And so precisely, I now find, Venema explains it, p. 234: "Possessio eorum, sc. patrum et majorum, sensu facillimo, qui tamen fugit interpretes; qui pronomen כִּנְיָה ipsius vertunt, &c."

†† Or, *devise his devices*. The 25th verse should have begun, I conceive, with this clause.

‡‡ The Septuagint, for כִּנְיָהוּל, *strong holds*, seems to have read כִּנְיָהוּל, *Egypt*: its translation being επ' Αιγυπτον λογιεται λογισμους.—Venema thinks that the *arees* here referred to were the *sacras arees* of certain temple-treasuries which Antiochus Epiphanes attacked, specially those of Jerusalem and of Diana in the Elymais; the latter attack resulting in his death. Thus Venema makes this verse run on in a general sketch to the end of Epiphanes' career; and then return to a description of his expeditions into Egypt, more in detail.

§§ כִּנְיָהוּל; εως καιρου. Sept. Compare this with the "*at the time appointed*" of verses 27 and 29: also with the notices of time in verses 13, 14. The word כִּנְיָה, *time*, will be observed on in a subsequent note on verse 40.

ed from before him,)<sup>1</sup> to become strong with contracted means and a small people, to attack the King of the South, albeit united by treaty with him, (apparently by his father's treaty noted before in the prophecy,) to defeat him and his armies, (adding thereby to his ancestral riches, and profusely scattering the acquired plunder and treasure,) then, aided by treachery in the Southern King's court, to overflow into Egypt, scheme mischief against its king under the same roof, while making profession of friendship, and return (as if to give time for his policy to work) into his own land, there manifesting in some way or other a heart set against "the holy covenant," or covenant and religion of the Jews, God's holy people,—so *Antiochus Epiphanes*, brother to the late King, and not the lawful heir to the throne, escaping from Rome, where he had been long time a hostage, did by flattering alike the Romans, the Princes Eumenes and Attalus, and the Syrian people, obtain the Syrian kingdom, overwhelming the adverse power of the usurper

up to battle, \* with a very great and mighty army : but he shall not stand. For † they shall forecast devices ‡ against him : 26. yea, they that feed of the portion of his meat § shall destroy him ; || and his army shall overflow ¶, and many shall fall down slain. 27. And both these kings' hearts shall be to do mischief ; \*\* and they shall speak lies at one table : but it shall not prosper : †† for yet the end shall be at the time appointed. ‡‡ 28. Then §§ shall he return into his land with great riches : and his heart shall be against the holy covenant : ||| and he shall do exploits ; ¶¶ and return to his own land."

<sup>1</sup> So on Grotius' and Newton's view of "the arms of the flood" in verse 22, as meant of the usurper *Heliodorus*. If Venema's *Egyptian* reference be preferred, it is a view covered in my running historic commentary by what is afterwards said of the overflowing into Egypt.

\* Or, stir himself up for the war. † כִּי, for, because.

‡ As in verse 24. They shall devise devices, or plots. So Wintle.

§ כֶּסֶף וְחֵלֶב, costly food and delicacies from the royal table. Gesen. So Dan. i. 5, 8, 13, 15.

|| Wintle observes; "Instead of רִשְׁתֵּי-יָדָיו, shall bruise or break him, one manuscript reads רִשְׁתֵּי-יָדָיו, shall sell or betray him : " which last reading he adopts. And certainly, if the word bear this sense, (which seems however doubtful, for, according to the Lexicographers, רִשְׁתֵּי-יָדָיו means hire, bribe, not sell,) it well suits the context.

¶ "Shall be overflowed." So Vul. and Syr. passively, says Wintle; 26 MSS. dropping the ו in רִשְׁתֵּי-יָדָיו. \*\* כְּזָבִים, Sept. εἰς πονηρίαν; Wintle, to act maliciously.

†† That is, the policy shall not succeed, הֵצִיחַ, —a word so used in Isa. liii. 10, "The pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in his hand;" and Isa. liv. 17, "No weapon formed against thee shall prosper."

‡‡ Sept. ὅτι ἐτι περας εἰς καιρον. So Wintle; as also the authorized English translation. §§ Or, and.

||| כֵּתִיב קְדוּשָׁה, literally, covenant of holiness. The phrase is also used in verses 30, 32; and in all of the holy Jewish religion.

¶¶ Or prosper; or perhaps, do the thing his heart was bent on; i. e. the oppression of the holy covenant, or Jewish religion.

Heliodorus, become strong, though with a kingdom now reduced and disgraced, attack the Egyptian Prince Philometor his nephew, albeit allied by treaty<sup>1</sup> as well as blood, defeat him signally in a famous expedition, and enter and spoil Egypt of its riches; by the squandering of which, as well as of his ancestral treasures, in shows, gifts, and pageantry, he sought and gained the title of *Illustrious*, his true one being the *Vile*.<sup>2</sup> until, at length, having got Philometor into his hands,<sup>3</sup> and the Alexandrians having set up his brother Physcon in his room, he planned at the same table with Philometor a scheme of discord and division between the two brothers, whereby it seemed he might best prepare Egypt to be a little after his prey; then returning, while the scheme might work, to his own land, did in the way attack Jerusalem, massacring 40,000 of its inhabitants, and despoiling and profaning its temple, because of the Jews having broken into insurrection on a false report of his death. It was thus that he fulfilled the first part of the prophecy concerning him.—9. As, yet again, at “the time appointed” (a phrase designative apparently of some notable epoch) this same Northern King was to invade the kingdom of the South a second time, but with a result quite different from that of his former successful expedition,<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The treaty made by his father Antiochus the Great with Egypt, just before his turning his face to the isles of Chittim, was still uncanceled.

<sup>2</sup> An example of *allusive contrast*. See my Vol. i. pp. 113, 272, &c.

<sup>3</sup> This was when at *Memphis*. Alexandria had not yet submitted to Antiochus Epiphanes. For a brief sketch of the history, see 1 Mac. i. 17—23.

<sup>4</sup> 29. At the time appointed\* he shall return, and come toward† the south: but it shall not be as the former, or as the latter.‡ 30. For the ships of Chittim § shall

\* See on verses 24, 27, p. 74, note §§, and p. 75, note ††, *suprà*.

† Or, perhaps rather *into*. So Wintle, “*He shall advance again into the south.*”

‡ Or, as (*at*) the first time, or as (*at*) the latter time.—Wintle observes that the Hebrew may be rendered, “But the latter shall not be like the former:” and Grotius and Venema so translate it: not without reason. Compare Josh. xiv. 11 and 1 Sam. xxx. 24. Antiochus Epiphanes made indeed a primary *demonstration* against Egypt, and occupied the Province of Palestine, which more properly belonged to Egypt, before his grand campaign and success against it foretold in verses 25, 26. But it was not an expedition into Egypt; though many have so represented it, and hence reckoned *three* as the number of Antiochus Epiphanes’ anti-Egyptian expeditions. See Venema, pp. 273—276.—Some Hebrew noun signifying an *expedition* may be understood.

§ קַיִּים כִּיִּים; ships *from* or *of* Chittim. One manuscript, Wintle says, reads קַיִּים, as in the famous parallel passage, Numb. xxiv. 24; of which, says Prof. Lee (Euseb. Theoph. p. cviii.), this is manifestly an echo. (See Bochart, Phaleg. iii. 5.)

In Gen. x. 4, Isa. xxiii. 1, and Ezek. xxvii. 6, the word קַיִּים is spelt with *one* י, as here; in Jer. ii. 10 with *two*.—Gesenius says, “What particular part of the West



“ships from Chittim” coming against him, (the expression is most remarkable,) and causing his precipitate return to his own land, in indignation which would vent itself against “the holy covenant,” or Jews’ religion and law, and evil alliance with certain that forsook it,—so *Antiochus Epiphanes* returned the next year in a second expedition into Egypt, now prostrate before him; but, when expecting to reduce it finally under his sway, was stopt on a sudden by the unlooked-for intervention of Roman ambassadors, just arrived in ships from *Italy*, the scriptural *Chittim*: and being forced to resign the prey, groaning and grieving, as Polybius describes it, vented his indignation against the Jews and their holy covenant; attacked Jerusalem a second time with a detachment of his returning army,—a second time massacring its inhabitants,—a second time defiling its temple; and, building a garrison-fortress in the city of David, in conjunction with Menelaus the high priest and other apostate Jews of his party, issued a proclamation abrogating the Jewish religion and ritual, and enjoining the heathen worship of Jupiter Olympius in its stead.<sup>1</sup>

Thus we come to the close of the *first Part* of this pro-

come against him: therefore shall he be grieved,\* and return,† and have indignation ‡ against the holy covenant: so shall he do: § he shall even return, and have intelligence with them that forsake the holy covenant.”||

<sup>1</sup> See 1 Macc. i. 41—50.

The following chronological tabular view of the chief events of the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes, referred to in the prophecy, may be useful:—

it may mean is doubtful.” The writer of the 1st Book of Maccabees, i. 1, understands it of *Greece*; Vitranga, (on Isa. xxiii. 1,) distinctively of *Italy*. For “of the four sons of Javan he thinks *Elisha* means the Peloponnesians, *Tharsis* the Spaniards, *Dodanim*, or *Rhodanim*, the Gauls as distinct from the Celts, and *Cethim* the people of Italy.” Wintle. So too Venema, p. 278.—Jerome says ad loc., “*Sium* quippe, et *Chittim*, quos nos *trieres* et *Romanos* interpretati sumus, Hebræi *Italos* volunt intelligi atque *Romanos*.” And so Aben Ezra and Saadias Gaon.

\* “Shall be grievously humbled.” So Wintle. Sept. *ταπεινωθησεται*. Venema, p. 295, compares the *τεθρονωμενος τυ ψυχην*, said in 2 Macc. v. 11 of Antiochus Epiphanes on occasion of his attack on Jerusalem.

† Or, “shall again have:” a not unfrequent sense of this verb, where conjoined with another; as observed already Note † p. 67.

‡ *צַדִּיק*, “shall have indignation:” whence the verbal noun of the same radicals, used in verse 36 in the same sense of indignation, which will be there observed on.

§ It might be, “And he shall prosper, and he shall return.”

|| The existence of such *forsakers of the holy covenant* is an important characteristic of the time intended. On which point, as well as others, the history is well illustrated by 1 Macc. i. 52, &c., and Josephus. See Wintle, Newton, Venema, or the Universal History.

phesy. And, on the whole, I think the evidence has been such as to show that we can scarcely have been wrong in the historical application that we have founded on it. There are, no doubt, many obscurities and ambiguities of words and of construction,<sup>1</sup> more especially in regard of some of the pronouns personal;<sup>2</sup> with a view to the solution of which obscurities we have consulted the history supposed to be referred to, and affixed a meaning accordingly. In such particulars the parallelism exhibited between the prophecy and the history can have but little weight towards establishing the truth of our general explanation. But there is so much of the prophecy that seems in its grammatical sense clear, and in the particulars thus clearly predicted characteristic and distinctive,<sup>3</sup> and on these points, or rather this

B. C.	
176	Antiochus Epiphanes begins to reign.
171	His first expedition against Egypt, defeat of Ptolemy's forces between Mount Casius and Pelusium; advance to Memphis, and success in getting Ptolemy Philometor into his hands:—whereupon the Egyptians of Alexandria set up Philometor's brother <i>Ptolemy Physeon</i> . He attacks and spoils Jerusalem on his return to Antioch.
168	Antiochus' second expedition against Egypt. He invades Alexandria, and is repulsed by the Roman ambassadors. Returning, he detaches Apollonius and a part of his army against Jerusalem; who storms it, and sets up the statue of Jupiter Olympius in the temple.
165	Antiochus, after hearing, when near Babylon, of the defeat of his viceroy Lysias by Judas Maccabeus, hastens his return to Syria; and on the road dies miserably.

<sup>1</sup> One very notable verbal example of these ambiguities is that of the Hebrew word כָּלָה in verse 16: a word rendered in our English translation *consumed*; in other versions, we have seen, *perfected*:—a sense almost the reverse. Another example is connected with the word הַיְלֵדָהּ of verse 6: which the English translation explains as *her father*; Wintle and Boothroyd as *her son*; the Septuagint as *the young woman*; Aben Ezra as *her mother*. But here the different meanings arise out of differences of reading or punctuation. Other exemplifications have been given as we have gone on.

<sup>2</sup> Viz. verse 6, "Neither shall *he* stand;" a pronoun grammatically applicable either to the *King of the North* or *King of the South*:—verse 11, "And *he* shall set forth a great multitude, and the multitude shall be given into *his* hand;" where the sense requires different persons to be understood by the *he* and *his*: but who the one, and who the other, is only to be inferred from the history: \* verse 24, "Scatter among *them*," or "Scatter what is belonging to *them*;" where the pronoun *them* may be referred either to Syrians or Egyptians:—verse 25, "But *he* shall stand."

<sup>3</sup> Such is the series of particulars following;—the reconciliation of the primary difference between the two kingdoms by the marriage of the King of the South's daughter to the King of the North;—the failure of this expedient from the circumstance of her abandonment in the new country of her adoption, and apparently her murder; the avenging of her wrongs by her brother, the next King of the South, his triumphant invasion of the Northern King's territory, and deportation into Egypt not only of other spoil, but of sundry *gods* also of the people of the land;—the attempts of the next King of the North, and the next but one, at the recovery of their territory

\* The word "*For*," beginning verse 13 in our translation, does not help to determine the ambiguity: its original Hebrew being simply וְ, usually rendered *and*.

series of points, the agreement with it of the Ptolemæan and Seleucidæan history is so striking, that I conceive we may rest in the persuasion of its having being certainly thus far fulfilled, so as explained, with full and well-grounded satisfaction.

### § 2.—THE SECOND PART OF DANIEL'S PROPHECY.

In the second part (including from chapter xi. 31 to the end of chapter xii.) the prophecy naturally arranges itself under five sectional subdivisions:—1st, the prediction of the setting-up of the abomination of desolation, contained in verse 31;—2nd, the sketch of events following thereupon, till the rise of the self-deifying apostate King, given in verses 31—36;—3rd, the description of this apostate King in verses 36—39 inclusive;—4th, the resumed notice of the Kings of the South and North, and their enterprises, in connection with the apostate King's time and reign, verses 40—45;—5thly, and finally, the sketch of the concluding catastrophe, issuing in the grand consummation and the deliverance and blessedness of Daniel's people, contained in chap. xii.

1. Now with regard to the *first* of these sectional subdivisions,<sup>1</sup> were we simply to follow the course of history,

and honour; the total defeat of this latter in the first instance, and success in the second; and thereupon his making up the quarrel with the Southern King by some marriage-scheme, and turning his face to the isles of the Mediterranean, and capturing them, until sternly repulsed by some prince or general, on whom that attack was deemed an indignity, and dying soon after ingloriously;—then the reign of a mere raiser of taxes, as the next King of the North;—then his being followed by a king contemptible, and the very reverse of *επιφανης* (illustrious), and this last invading Egypt with more success than any of his predecessors, once and again, until stopped by the very singular intervention of *ships of Chittim*; and then, finally, venting his rage against the Jews and their religion, in alliance with certain apostates to heathenism from out of their own body.—All these points seem to be pretty well unambiguous, alike in the prediction and the historical fulfilment.

<sup>1</sup> 31. "And arms \* shall stand † on his part: ‡ and they shall pollute the sanc-

\* *בְּיָמָיו* βραχίονες, as before. † *עָלָה*, the same verb as in verse 3, &c.

‡ *מִן*, from *מִן* properly *from, out of*. So verse 7, "Out of a branch from her roots:" Dan. viii. 9, "Out of one of them came forth a little horn:" &c. Moreover it also indicates, chronologically, *after*. Venema indeed, p. 302, contests this. But the following examples will, I believe, prove that it is so:—Nehem. xiii. 21, "After that time they did not come on the sabbath;" 1 Chron. viii. 8, "After he had sent them away." 2 Sam. xxiii. 4, "After rain." And such I conceive to be the meaning here; understanding *him*, viz. the King of the North previously spoken of, as the noun after the preposition. So too Sir I. Newton, p. 203.—Wintle translates,

we might naturally suppose the prediction it contains to have reference to that same *Antiochus Epiphanes* that was the subject of the verses preceding, and his setting up of what might well be called an *abomination of desolation* in Jerusalem. For history tells us, that after the repulse of this Syrian King from Egypt by the stern mandate of the Roman ambassadors, he did not only show "*indignation against the holy covenant,*" by attacking the still holy city Jerusalem, breaking down in part its walls and houses, and massacring many of its inhabitants,—but that he also by a decree abrogated the Jewish worship, enjoined conformity on pain of death to the Greek heathen religion, defiled the temple by the blood of the Jewish worshippers, set up the statue there of Jupiter Olympius, and at the same time, placing a garrison in a strong fort built in the city of David, fell on all that might come up to worship after the Mosaic ritual, and thereby made the temple and the city desolate.<sup>1</sup>—Yet, on more careful consideration, strong reasons will I think strike the careful inquirer against this historical application of the passage. For, 1st, it will

tuary \* of strength; † and shall take away the daily *sacrifice*: ‡ and they shall place the abomination that maketh desolate." §

<sup>1</sup> Such however is Venema's view; who supposes the history to be continued onward to the end of Dan. xii., all with reference to Maccabean events and times.

"from these," viz. *the ships of Chittim*. And so, apparently, the Jewish interpreters mentioned by Jerome, and given in my Note <sup>1</sup>, p. 85;—"Post multa tempora *de ipsis Romanis* . . . *consurget rex Vespasianus.*" But the מְצֻרֵי is singular; and therefore, if understood of the Romans, can only have that meaning by reference to a representative of the nation.

Our English translation seems to me not happy in its rendering of this preposition; for it gives no idea of the various possible meanings of the phrase.

\* מְצֻרֵי. The verb is one of general application in the *Piel*, in the sense of *profaning* or *defiling* anything sacred, such as the *priests, sanctuary, sabbath, name of God*, &c.; Lev. xix. 8, xxi. 9, Mal. ii. 11, Exod. xxxi. 14, Lev. xviii. 21, &c.

† Literally, "*the sanctuary the fortress.*" So Psalm xvi. 6; "Beauty and strength are in *his sanctuary*:"—*strength*, not, I conceive, as some would have it, because of the temple being fortified, and therefore strong; but as implying the presence and protection of Him in whom is everlasting strength.—On the prefixing of the *two* definite articles Aben Ezra compares Josh. iii. 14, Jer. xxxii. 12, where the word for *strength* is מְצֻר, from which the word here used, מְצֻרֵי, is derived.

‡ So Dan. xii. 11 and viii. 11. Greek, τὸν ἐνδελειχισμόν. Compare Exod. xxix. 42, Numb. xxviii. 6, Ezra iii. 5, Nehem. x. 33, &c.

§ מְצֻרֵי מִשְׁתַּבֵּחַ. The same occurs again in Chap. xii. 11; only without the *article* prefixed to the first word, and with the second in the *Kal* conj. not the *Piel*. In ix. 27 we have also the same phrase, but with the word *abominations* in the plural.—The former word (translated in the Greek βέλυσμα) applies generally to things unclean (as *garments, food*, &c., Nahum iii. 6, Zech. ix. 7); but is used specially and most frequently of *idols*.



be found most difficult, if I mistake not, to explain the sequel of the prophecy consistently with it. With regard to the people spoken of immediately after as "*knowing their God*,"<sup>1</sup> antithetically to certain that are styled covenant-transgressors, they must on this hypothesis of interpretation be supposed the *Maccabean patriots*, that rose up in insurrection against Antiochus and his heathenish ordinance. But, as Bishop Newton observes, neither could it be said of them that "*they instructed many*,"<sup>2</sup> for there is no record of any grand accession of proselytes to the Jews' religion through their teaching: nor again could it be said of them that "*they fell by the sword, and flame, and spoil, and captivity [many] days*,"<sup>3</sup> indeed, as verse 35 seems to imply, until *the time of the end*: the fact being that (except in the case of some that would not resist when attacked on the sabbath-day)<sup>4</sup> they were from the very commencement successful in their patriotic enterprises, at first in more petty guerilla warfare, then soon after in a decisive battle with Antiochus' chief general, Lysias; <sup>5</sup> the result of which, besides probably precipitating the horrible death of Antiochus,<sup>6</sup> was the cleansing of the temple just three years from the setting up of Jupiter's image within it by Apollonius,<sup>7</sup> restoration of the Mosaic ritual, and establishment of the high priesthood and sovereignty over the Jewish people in the Maccabean family, where it continued thenceforward for several generations.<sup>8</sup>—Moreover in what follows after this about the *self-deifying King*,<sup>9</sup> and the *Kings of the South*

<sup>1</sup> Verse 32.<sup>2</sup> Verse 33.<sup>3</sup> Applying the "*they*," as these interpreters do, to the faithful and understanding ones of the former part of the verse. I shall remark under my next head on its possible, or rather *probable*, reference to a different class of persons.In most MSS. indeed the word *ימים*, *days*, stands without the addition of *רבים* *many*. But then comes in v. 35, "*to the time of the end*." <sup>4</sup> 1 Mac. ii. 32—38.<sup>5</sup> See the history in the chapters ii., iii., and iv. of 1 Mace.<sup>6</sup> Ibid. vi. 5—16. His death is said to have occurred, A.S. 149.<sup>7</sup> Compare 1 Mace. i. 54 and iv. 52. From the former passage it appears that it was on the 15th of the month *Chisleu*, (the ninth of the Jewish months, or January,) in the year of the Greeks, i. e. of the Seleucidæan Æra, 145, that the idol abomination was set up by Apollonius: from the latter, that it was on the 25th of the same month A.S. 148 that the temple was cleansed, and the altar re-dedicated.<sup>8</sup> See the Maccabean History in the Apocrypha, as before; or Josephus.<sup>9</sup> The often so-called *wilful King*. But, as will be noted when I come to the verse, his only claim to that title is because *he would do according to his will*; the same thing that is predicated also of Alexander the Great in verse 3, and of Antiochus the Great in verse 16.

and the North pushing at him,<sup>1</sup> the historical interpretation fails still as palpably as before: forasmuch as Antiochus Epiphanes, the supposed predicted King on this hypothesis, instead of not worshipping his fathers' God, like Daniel's self-deifying King,<sup>2</sup> was as much given to the worship of Jupiter as his Greek ancestors before him;<sup>3</sup> and neither was pushed at by Egypt's now prostrate king, nor (being *himself* in this prophecy the King of the North) could have had the King of the North come against him.—2. There are two expressions in the verse under consideration, designative alike of the *desolating arms* or *power*, and of the *desolation* itself, which seem to me to give intimation that the history of Antiochus Epiphanes is here broken off from, and another and different enemy of Daniel's people referred to. For the *former* is spoken of thus; "And arms shall stand up *from*, or *after*, him:" a phrase hardly to be interpreted, I believe, agreeably with the precedents of other analogous Hebrew phrases in the prophecy, except of some *new* prince or power, arising *after* in respect of *time*, or *from* him, in respect of *origin*, that was before the subject of description.<sup>4</sup> And the *latter* has the *definite article* prefixed

<sup>1</sup> Dan. xi. 36, 40.

<sup>2</sup> Verse 37.

<sup>3</sup> Nothing can better illustrate this than the manifest failure of Venema's elaborate attempt, from p. 382 to p. 421, at applying this prophetic passage to Antiochus Epiphanes. Says Livy of him; "Verè regius illi animus fuit . . . in Deorum cultu: magnificentiæ vero in Deos vel Jovis Olympii templum Athenis . . . potest testis esse; sed et Delon aris insignibus statuarumque copiâ exornavit." So again in his splendid games in honour of the gods. And indeed he forced the worship of Jupiter on the Jews at Jerusalem. How then could Epiphanes be said to have disregarded his father's god, as in verse 38? Because, says Venema, p. 420, he would so honour these gods "*in specie*" not in *reality*; his *mind* and *regard* not being given them: whereas his mind and regard would be given to a god whom his fathers knew not, viz. *Plutus*, the god of money; who might be designated under the name *Mahuzzim*, because of his being god of the *treasuries* in the sacraria of the inner temples. But how so? Did he then proclaim the worship of Plutus, and erect temples to him? Not so; as Venema frankly admits, p. 410. But his *heart-idol* was money. And was this love of money then peculiar to Antiochus Epiphanes, and aliene to the taste of all his fathers?—As to the god called the *desire of women*, whom also Daniel's predicted king was to disregard, Venema explains it to be *Venus*. But could disregard to *her* be charged on *Epiphanes*, of all men? Yes, says Venema, because it was the *Venus Urania*, or Venus of *honourable* love! And was *she* then the desired and honoured of Syrian women?

<sup>4</sup> See my Note † on the Hebrew preposition, p. 79 *suprà*; also those on עָמַד, בְּרַחֲיוֹן, and עָמַד, to stand, or stand up, pp. 60, 64.—Venema, p. 314, translating the phrase *ex ipso*, would have it to mean simply that the power that desolated was that which appertained to Epiphanes. But I think the parallel phrases that I have referred to show this to be improbable.

Compare too, as to the *figure*, a somewhat different one in Vol. i. p. 143 Note 4;

to it, "*The abomination making desolate:*" as if to designate either one particular desolating abomination previously made known to Daniel, (Dan. ix. 27,) or that which was to be emphatically *the* grand abomination of desolation:<sup>1</sup> on neither of which grounds could that spoken of in the passage before us mean the idol set up in the temple by Antiochus Epiphanes; there having been no previous prediction of it,<sup>2</sup> and the desolation it caused being one of very short duration.

And in fact, while thus excluding the abomination set up by Antiochus, this little but very significant particle in the prophetic language seems to me very strikingly to point out that which was afterwards set up by the *Romans*, as the one intended: both as being that which introduced the longest and greatest desolation of the Jewish temple and city, and that which alike other previous prophecies,<sup>3</sup> and more especially the one communicated to Daniel himself a little before by the angel Gabriel,<sup>4</sup> distinctly foretold.—Nor is there wanting yet other evidence to corroborate this conclusion as to the meaning of the prediction. 1st, the very singular circumstance of Gabriel's adoption of the language of Balaam's ancient prophecy,<sup>5</sup> when bringing the Romans just before on the prophetic scene, "And ships shall come from Chittim," might naturally be supposed to indicate not only that the same power was here intended by him that was intended by Balaam, but that the *desolation of the Hebrew nation* next after spoken of by him was the same also with that which was next after foreshown by the Spirit that broke through Balaam; which last was expressly said to be caused by *them of the ships from Chittim*.<sup>6</sup>—2.

where we read that *another neck growing out behind from his own*, was understood by Domitian to signify a new and different line of emperors.

<sup>1</sup> See Note § p. 80 *suprà*.

<sup>2</sup> In Dan. viii. 13, a *transgression of desolation* is spoken of, not an *abomination of desolation*. And in proof of its meaning something very different from the abomination set up in Jerusalem by Antiochus Epiphanes, see my explanation of that prophecy, Vol. iii. p. 423, &c.

<sup>3</sup> A desolation of Judah is often predicted, which was to last up to the time of her ultimate restoration and conversion. So, for example, Isa. iii. 26, compared with the sequel, vi. 11, xlix. 8, 21, lxiv. 10, &c.

<sup>4</sup> Dan. ix. 27.

<sup>5</sup> Numb. xxiv. 24; "And *ships shall come from Chittim*, and shall afflict (or oppress) Asshur, and shall afflict *Eber*, and he too shall perish for ever." See Prof. Lee on Eusebius' Theophanias, Pref. p. exiv.

<sup>6</sup> Venema indeed, p. 279, would explain Balaam's prophetic declaration "he shall

Our Lord's specification of the abomination of desolation that was to be set up by the *Romans* as the one spoken of by Daniel the Prophet,<sup>1</sup> though explicable by reference simply to the prophecy in Daniel's ninth chapter, does yet on the most natural interpretation imply a reference to this also.<sup>2</sup>—3. As from the *second* to the *third*,<sup>3</sup> so from the *third* of the four great empires to the *fourth*, a transition might surely be expected in the Angel's far-ranging prophecy: and for this there could be no fitter epoch, according to the evidence of history, than that when the Roman ambassadors arrived in ships from Chittim at Alexandria. For, as Mr. Mede has observed, that precise year was the epoch of the overthrow of the Macedonian kingdom, and its conversion into a subject-province by the Romans:<sup>4</sup> and indeed the very act of their thus dictating terms between the Syro-Macedonian and Egypto-Macedonian dynasties, was at the time a notification to the world that the *Roman* arms held now the world's supremacy, having, like the emblem on one of their standards,<sup>5</sup> stood up above the *Grecian*; just agreeably with this prophecy, which might almost beforehand have been deemed to signify as much.—4thly, and finally, it appears from Jerome that the Jews themselves in his time, who had the two interpretations alike before them,<sup>6</sup>

afflict *Eber*," not of the *Hebrews*, but of some quite different *trans-Euphratean* people. But I believe he stands nearly alone in this opinion.

<sup>1</sup> Matt. xxiv. 15: "When ye therefore shall see the abomination of desolation spoken of by Daniel the prophet stand in the holy place, (whoso readeth let him understand,)" &c.; compared with Luke xxi. 20, "When ye shall see Jerusalem compassed with armies, then know that the desolation thereof is nigh."

<sup>2</sup> This is the *only* passage where the precise phrase "*abomination of desolation*" is used, except in xii. 11, the sequel of this same prophecy. In Dan. ix. 27 the wording is, "For the overspreading of abominations he shall make it desolate;"—or, according to the reading of a manuscript of the 13th century, celebrated by Michaelis, and adopted by Clarke,—“And in the temple of the Lord there shall be abomination.” In Dan. viii. 13, as before said, it is “the *transgression of desolation*.”

<sup>3</sup> In verse 3. See pp. 60, 61 *suprà*.

<sup>4</sup> After the overthrow and capture of King Perseus in the battle of Pydna, B.C. 168.—So *Æmilius Sura*, as cited by the Roman historian Velleius Paterculus, i. 6, and quoted by Mede and Bishop Newton; “*Assyrii principes omnium gentium rerum potiti sunt; deinde Medi; postea Persæ; deinde Macedones: exinde, duobus regibus Philippo et Antiocho, qui à Macedonibus oriundi erant, haud multo post Carthaginem subactam devictis, summa imperii ad Populum Romanum pervenit.*”

<sup>5</sup> On the top of one of the well-known Roman standards an *open hand turned upwards* was the terminating ornament. Engravings may be seen in Montfaucon, or other books on Roman Antiquities. So too on some of the Roman quadrantes and other coins.

<sup>6</sup> For in the Book of Maccabees the application had evidently been made to Antiochus Epiphanes; and the Christians of Jerome's time many of them applied it to Antichrist, so as stated in the next Note.



did apply this prophecy, *not* to the abomination of desolation set up by *Antiochus*, but to that far more awful one set up by the *Romans*.<sup>1</sup>

This important preliminary point being settled, our course will be clearer for the sequel.

2. The *second* and next subdivision of this part of the prophecy sketches the events that would follow on this setting up of the abomination of desolation by the Romans (as I suppose) in the Jewish temple, down to the rise of the self-deifying King:—a sketch contained in verses 32—35, inclusive.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Jerome's* words are (*in loc.*):—"Judæi hoc nec de Antiocho Epiphane, nec de Antichristo, sed de *Romanis* intelligi volunt, de quibus supra dictum est, 'Et venient trieres (sive Itali atque Romani), atque humiliabitur.' Post multa, inquit, tempora de ipsis Romanis, qui Ptolemæo venere auxilio, et Antiocho comminati sunt, consurget rex Vespasianus; surgent brachia ejus et semina, Titus filius cum exercitu; et pollutent sanctorum, auferentque jure sacrificium, et templum tradent æternæ solitudini."—On the *trieres* see the notice from *Jerome*, in Note §, pp. 76, 77 *supra*.

The same *Father* on Matt. xxiv. 15, after referring to Dan. ix. 27, thus gives his own judgment on the *abomination of desolation*, meant by *Christ*:—"Potest aut de *Antichristo* accipi, aut de *immagine Cesaris* quod Pilatus posuit in templo, aut de *Hadriani equestri statuâ*:" or, again, as he adds, of all wrong doctrine that may stand in the *Holy Place*, i. e. in the *Church*.

I have already in my Vol. i. p. 632, given my own view of the abomination of desolation, in the time of the Romans, intended by *Christ* and *Daniel*; and shall have hereafter again to refer to it.

*Ambrose* too, on Luke xxi. 20 (Lib. x. 15,) thus notes the Jews' opinion. "Vere Hierusalem ab exercitu obsessa est, et expugnata à Romano duce; unde Judæi putaverunt tunc factam *abominationem desolationis*, [viz. that predicted alike in Dan. ix. and xi.] eo quod caput porci in templum jecerint, illudentes Romani Judaicæ ritum observantiæ." Which explanation, however, *Ambrose* himself reprobates.

Let me observe that the fact that *Ambrose* alludes to is confirmed and illustrated by a Roman medal of one of the Emperors, which on the obverse has the device of a *woman in bonds* standing under a palm-tree, with the legend *Judæa Devicta*, on the reverse a *sow with its litter*: it being said that the Emperor *Claudius* ordered a sow to be placed over the gate of the temple at Jerusalem.

In one manuscript *Wintle* observes, the word *arms* in this verse is followed by אַרְמֵי, that is, *of the sea*, or *of the West*: evidently, if a gloss, written by one who took the same view as the above of the meaning of the passage.

<sup>2</sup> 32. "And such as do wickedly\* against the covenant shall he corrupt† by

\* אֲשֶׁר-יַעֲשֶׂה, the participle Hiphil, from אָשַׁע, a verb (the opposite, says *Gesenius* to אָשַׁע) signifying, 1. *to be guilty*, 2. *to be wicked*, as Dan. ix. 15. This Hiphil form occurs again xii. 10, "The wicked shall do wickedly."

† אֲשֶׁר-יַעֲשֶׂה, the Hiphil form of אָשַׁע, *to be profaned*, or *polluted*; as Psalm cvi. 38, "The land was polluted with blood." The Hiphil here gives the active sense of *profaning* or *making profane* and *heathenish*. So *Gesenius*. And perhaps instead of *he* being the nominative understood, it may be something like the French *on*; "One shall corrupt," or, "They shall be corrupted."—But the Greek version and the Vulgate, (as also the Aramæan,) read the word as in the plural, not singular: Οἱ ἀνομουντες διαθηκην επαξουσιν εν ολισημασι. "Impii in testamentum simulabunt fraudulentum." Thus *Wintle* prefers to read; וְיַעֲשֶׂה; translating the clause, "Those that impiously disregard the covenant will dissemble in flatteries."

And it is supposed by Sir Isaac and Bishop Newton, and other interpreters who, in common with them and myself, understand the abomination meant of that placed by the Romans, that they whose character and history are

flatteries:\* but the people† that do know their God shall be strong, and do exploits. 33. And they that understand among the people shall instruct many:‡ yet § they shall fall || by the sword and by flame, by captivity¶ and by spoil, many days.\*\* 34. Now when they shall fall†† they shall be holpen with a little help;‡‡ but many shall

\* In the Critici Sacri in loc. one expositor thus renders the clause; “Et impiè deserentes fœdus inducet ut subdoloè agant per hypocrisin:” applying the charge of *flatteries*, or *hypocrisy*, to the *seduced*, not the *seducer*.—Venema otherwise thus: “Et fœdus sceleratè tractantes loripedes agere faciet in lubricitatibus:” so that “in lubricitates incident. . . ac in ruinam præcipitabunt.” pp. 315, 316. At p. 318 he refers to Schultens, in evidence of the Hebrew word  $\text{הִתְקַדֵּם}$  meaning “*pronus esse ad lapsum, et ad interitum vergere.*” But the examples in point seem to me questionable. For the nominative to *faciet* he suggests either *Antiochus*, whose history he supposes still carried on; or else rather, *reflectively*, “they each one shall make, &c.”

$\text{בְּהִתְקַדֵּם}$ . The similar word  $\text{הִתְקַדֵּם}$  occurs both in verse 21 *suprà* and verse 34 following: in the former case of Antiochus Epiphanes obtaining the kingdom by his *flatteries* and *dissimulation*; in the latter, (if Newton’s interpretation be correct,) of the *religious dissimulation and hypocrisy* of false professors of Christianity.—See Note || p. 68 *suprà*. The reader will see presently the necessity of attention to the possible *religious* reference of this word.

†  $\text{נַגַּז}$ , a word used as well of the *Jews*, while God’s people, as of the *Gentiles*: just in this respect like the use of  $\text{גִּז}$ , sometimes, e. g. Josh. x. 13, as observed by Venema, pp. 485, 486.

‡  $\text{וְהָיָה יְהוָה יִתְּנֵם בְּרִיבָהּ}$ , Greek *συνησουσιν εις πολλα* and so Wintle, “Shall have understanding in many things.” But the word may be *active*, in the sense to *instruct*. So Dan. viii. 16, Job vi. 24, Neh. viii. 8, 9, Psalm cxix. 34: in the two first of which passages the preposition  $\text{בְּ}$  follows the verb, as here.—It occurs in a different sense in verse 37 *infra*.

§  $\text{וְ}$ , and. Our translators vary much in the rendering of this conjunctive particle.—The ambiguity of the pronoun *they* should also be marked.

||  $\text{וְנִפְּלוּ}$ , Sept. *ασθενησουσιν*, from  $\text{נָפַל}$  to be weak, to totter and so to fall: a verb used in the *Niphal*, as here, in verses 14, 19 preceding: and also in verses 34, 35, 41 following. Compare 1 Sam. ii. 4, “They that *stumbled* (or *staggered*) are girded with strength;” said with reference to *weakness*: also Jer. vi. 21, “I will lay stumbling-blocks before this people, and the father and the sons together shall *fall upon* (or *over*) them:” Psalm cvii. 12, “They rebelled against the words of God; . . therefore he brought down their heart with labour, they *fell down*, and there was none to help;” and Jer. xxxi. 9, “I will cause them to walk . . in a straight way wherein they shall not *stumble*;” said of the *falling through God’s judgments on sin*.

¶  $\text{וְנִפְּלוּ}$ , Gr. *αιχμαλωσια*. The word is generally used as an *abstract* noun in this sense of *captivity*; but sometimes also in the *concrete* sense of *captives*. So in this Chapter, verse 8, of the *prisoners* taken and led into Egypt by Ptolemy Euergetes, in his great expedition against the Syrians; and not infrequently in the Books of Moses, (e. g. Numb. xxxi. 12.) the Psalms, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Ezra, Nehemiah, of *captives taken in war*, especially of the captivity of *Judah*.—The word used of persons imprisoned by the civil magistrate, as in Gen. xxxix. 20, is one quite different,  $\text{אֲסִיר}$ .

\*\*  $\text{וְהָיָה יְהוָה יִתְּנֵם בְּרִיבָהּ}$ , simply *days*, according to the best MSS. So read, it may indicate a longer or a shorter time. In 1 Sam. xxvii. 7, it means a *year*. But nine MSS., says Wintle, read  $\text{וְהָיָה יְהוָה יִתְּנֵם בְּרִיבָהּ}$ , many *days*. †† Wintle; “After they shall have fallen.”

‡‡  $\text{וְהָיָה יְהוָה יִתְּנֵם בְּרִיבָהּ}$ , *βοηθεια*, a word of general application, and not restricted to the case of helping such as have fallen, &c. The  $\text{וְהָיָה}$  connected with this noun in an *adjectival* sense in our English Version might very properly be rendered *adverbially* in the sense of a *little while*. So Ruth ii. 7, Hagg. ii. 6.

here given, are simply *the Christian body*; a body constituted just before Judah's desolation, and here depicted under the two-fold classification of its faithful and unfaithful members. For they think that no allusion is made to *the Jews* thenceforward in the prophecy: except in those chronological notices xi. 36, "Till the indignation be accomplished," and xii. 7, "When he shall have accomplished to scatter the power of the holy people;" wherein the Angel marked the end of the indignation against the Jews, and of their penal scattering, as the sign and epoch of the consummation. Thus the passage is explained by them in brief as follows:—"He (the Roman Emperor and his officers) shall by flattering offers induce *unfaithful* Christians, the transgressors of the new covenant, to apostatize from the faith; but the *faithful* Christians shall be strong and instruct many. Yet they shall fall many days by sword, flame, captivity, and spoil,—viz. in the ten Pagan persecutions;

cleave to them with flatteries.\* 35. And some of them† of understanding shall fall to try them, and to purge, and to make them white,‡ *even* to§ the time of the end:¶ because *it is yet for a time appointed.*"¶

\*  $\text{וְיִלְכְּדוּם}$ , as verse 21, on which see my Note. Nearly the same word occurs also in verse 32 just before.—The Greek version is,  $\text{Και προστεθησονται προς αυτους πολλοι εν ολισθημασι}$ . Wintle's; "Many shall be fastened upon them through flatteries."

†  $\text{וְיִנְיֵהוּ}$ ; "and from or out of;" i. e. *some* out of. Mark the *selection* here, in contrast with the *generality* of the statement in verse 33 just before. Unless indeed with Venema we connect verses 33, 35, making 34 parenthetical.

‡  $\text{וְיִבְּרָאוּם וְיִבְּהִימוּם וְיִבְּחִימוּם}$ . The same words occur again in chap. xii. 10, "Many shall be purified, and made white, and tried." An important corroboration, as it seems to me, of the idea that the prophetic intimation in *this* verse too, is very far prospective; indeed that it reaches even to the time of the end.

Wintle (on xii. 10) thus distinguishes the particular meaning of each:—"The word  $\text{בְּרָא}$  is borrowed from wheat cleansed from the chaff;  $\text{בְּהִימוּ}$  from cloth whitened by the fuller;  $\text{בְּחִימוּ}$ , from goldsmiths who try and assay the metal, and separate it from the dross." The prefix  $\text{ב}$  in  $\text{בְּרָא}$  seems otiose: or perhaps is in the sense of *on* them, as the objects of trial.—On the  $\text{בְּחִימוּ}$  compare Jer. iv. 11, "A dry wind . . . toward the daughter of my people, not to fan, nor to *cleanse*:" where however the verb is in the Hiphil, which is here in the Piel. And on the other words, Mal. iii. 2. "He is like a refiner's fire, and like fuller's soap:" the word there used for *soap* being  $\text{חֲרִיב}$ , which is derived from  $\text{בִּי}$ , and so from  $\text{בְּרָא}$ , to *cleanse*.

§  $\text{עַד}$ , either *during, whilst*, as Judg. iii. 26, Job i. 18: or, more commonly, *up to*, rather (which is the more common sense) *until*, as in Dan. xii. 9, "Till the time of the end;" also Gen. xlix. 10, "Until Shiloh come;" Josh. ii. 22, "Until the pursuers were returned, &c.:"—The two-fold meaning of the word, however, should be observed.

¶  $\text{עַד תְּמֹת הַיָּמִים}$ . So xi. 40, xii. 9: in the first of which parallel passages the phrase will be remarked on.—Venema, in order to make this suit with his idea of the Epiphanic persecution of the Jews being here still described, explains the phrase, p. 356, as "*ad finem afflictionis Epiphanicæ.*" But surely such limitation is unnatural.

¶ Mede and Wintle connect this last clause with the next verse.

till holpen by the little help of Constantine and his descendants' adoption and establishment of Christianity in the Roman Empire.<sup>1</sup> Then many shall cleave to them with flatteries, or hypocritically join themselves to the Church; and divers of the true and sincere Christians fall afterwards by new persecutions, to try them, and purify them, till the time of the end."

But I cannot but think that there may be here indicated *two* divisions of the people spoken of: viz. first, a division of the *whole Jewish people* into Jews rejecting Christianity, and Jews embracing it and becoming Christians: (this in the two former verses:) then, a further division of the *latter*, together with the Gentiles incorporated in their body, into the false and the true members of the professing Christian Church. For besides that we might expect, as I think, some notice of the desolated *Jewish people* at this sad crisis of their history, as well as of their desolate *city*,—just as in our Lord's prophecy of the destruction of Jerusalem,<sup>2</sup> and other earlier prophecies also,<sup>3</sup>—besides this, I say, there are various expressions in the two first verses of the passage under consideration which seem to me scarcely applicable, except to that unhappy people. Is the phrase "they that do wickedly against the covenant," a fit designation of the insincerity and worldliness in heart of such members of the Christian body as were *ultimately* induced in the time of Pagan Rome's persecutions to apostatize? Or, if previously open transgressors of the covenant, did they need at all to be corrupted? Again, was it the fact that the Roman emperors and chief magistrates did then seek by *flatteries* to draw Christians into apostasy from their faith; and this on a scale such as to be marked in history, and to answer to a notice like this in prophecy? Surely cruelty and violence, not flattery, were the characteristic weapons by which the Pagan powers sought to de-

<sup>1</sup> Compare the figure of the two wings of the great eagle, &c., being given the woman to help her, in Apoc. xiii. 14, 16.

<sup>2</sup> Luke xxi. 20, 24: "When ye see Jerusalem compassed with armies, then know that the desolation thereof is nigh. . . . And great wrath shall be on this people; and they shall fall by the edge of the sword, and shall be led away captive into all nations; and Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles, until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled."

<sup>3</sup> Deut. xxviii. 32, 52, 64, &c. &c.



stroy Christianity.<sup>1</sup>—Further, did the Christians, *as a body* or *people*, fall during these times of Pagan persecution, so as the expression in verse 33 seems to indicate; or only *a certain few* from among them?<sup>2</sup>—And, once more, could it be said of such as suffered in these persecutions, that they fell by *captivity*, as well as otherwise:—a word used in Hebrew, just like the words that represent it in the Greek, Latin, English, and other versions, not of imprisonment by order of the civil magistrate, but of the taking of prisoners in *war*, and holding them, so taken, in captivity and exile?<sup>3</sup>

Thus my impression is that the *Jews* must be here meant, not *Christians*. And on the whole,—supposing the first clause in ver. 32 to be read as by Wintle, “They that do wickedly against the covenant will *dissemble in flatteries*,”<sup>4</sup> I would thus briefly paraphrase the whole passage:—“In connexion with this time and fact of Jerusalem’s desolation, the Jewish people generally, though wicked transgressors of the holy covenant, (a covenant just before confirmed and illustrated among them by their Messiah,)<sup>5</sup> shall yet unite with this their transgression of it the show and profession of religious zeal, hypocritically dissembling:” —a character of the Jews of that æra prominently set forth in the awful reproofs of Christ himself;<sup>6</sup> and set forth also

<sup>1</sup> No doubt on certain occasions the presiding magistrates, like Pliny, whom Bishop Newton specially refers to, urged the Christians brought before them to spare themselves, and sacrifice to the emperor’s image. But these were not *flattering* offers. And as to the general and proper character of the Pagan mode of dealing with Christianity, let the reader, after perusing the history of the early persecutions in any ecclesiastical historian, judge for himself whether *flattery*, or *crudelty* and *terror*, was the weapon employed. Or see my historic sketch under the 5th Seal.

<sup>2</sup> Mark the contrast of expression between this general statement, “And *they* shall fall,” &c., and the particular and restricted statement in verse 35, “And *out of* them of understanding *some* shall fall,” &c. See my Note † on the word, p. 87.

<sup>3</sup> See my Note ¶ p. 86.

<sup>4</sup> Wintle does not give this translation in support of the historical explanation that I advocate; for he has followed Bishop Newton in his view of the prophecy. For some corroboration to it, see the ancient Greek and Latin versions in the top Note p. 86.

<sup>5</sup> So it had been foreshown to Daniel previously. “And He (the Messiah) shall confirm the covenant with many for one week; and in the midst of the week he shall cause the sacrifice and oblation to cease,” &c. Dan. ix. 27.—I can scarcely err, I think, in supposing that this previous prophecy was remembered and applied by Daniel, while hearing the Angel’s present revelations.

<sup>6</sup> Matt. xxiii. 13—33: “Woe unto you, scribes and pharisees, hypocrites,” &c.: xv. 7, 8; “Ye hypocrites, well did Esaias prophesy of you, saying, This people draweth nigh unto me with their mouth, and honoureth me with their lips, but their heart

as awfully by their own historian Josephus, in his description of them during the siege of Jerusalem.<sup>1</sup> Or else, if Venema's translation be sustainable, then thus:—"And they, the Jewish transgressors, shall stumble and fall to be broken:" just as predicted in the notable prophecy long before written by Isaiah.<sup>2</sup> "On the other hand, they that know their God, even Jehovah their then-revealed Messiah and Saviour, (such I cannot but believe to be the intent of the expression, especially as considering the time referred to,)<sup>3</sup>—the disciples who, taught from above, shall know what others cannot know,<sup>4</sup> viz. that mystery of godliness, *God manifest in the flesh*,<sup>5</sup> shall not only understand themselves, but, strong in faith and spirit, shall instruct and disciple many. Thus the Jewish people, as a nation, shall fall and be scattered, a monument of God's righteous indignation,<sup>6</sup> by the sword and by flame, by captivity and by spoil, many days: whilst meanwhile the understanding ones, or disciples of the Messiah, shall not only otherwise advance in their work, but be holpen even on this world's theatre with a little help.<sup>7</sup> Then, however, and on this

is far from me."—Compare Rom. ii. 23, written by St. Paul, characteristically in like manner of his nation, a few years later; "Thou that makest thy boast of the law, through breaking the law dishonourest thou God?" Compare too the prediction in Isa. xxix. 13, 14, declaring that the curse of moral blindness would be adjudged and attach to this dissembling people; even with the light shining around them.

<sup>1</sup> One grand division of the Jews,—the most horrid and blood-thirsty perhaps of all during the siege,—was that of the *zealots* for the law.

<sup>2</sup> Compare Isa. viii. 14, 15; "And he shall be . . . for a gin and a snare to the inhabitants of Jerusalem; and many among them shall *stumble*, and fall, and be broken, and be snared, and be taken."

<sup>3</sup> The phrase is one, I believe (I mean with the noun, the verb, and the possessive pronoun all together) by no means common. A somewhat near parallel occurs in Isaiah xl. 9, "Say unto the cities of Judah, *Behold your God!*"—a prophecy of the *ultimate revelation of Jesus* to them, as their Messiah the Lord Jehovah.—The passage in Isa. xi. 9, about the *knowledge of Jehovah* filling the earth," is also a partial parallel; though the possessive pronoun is wanting. And there too *Christ* seems to be meant. So also in Isa. lii. 7, "That saith unto Zion, Thy God reigneth." And Jer. xxxi. 34, "They shall teach no more every man his neighbour, saying, Know the Lord," &c.

<sup>4</sup> "He was in the world, and the world was made by him, and the world knew him not. He came unto his own, and his own received him not. But as many as received him, (and which were born not of blood . . . but of God,) beheld his glory, the glory as of the only-begotten of the Father:" &c. John i. 10—14.—Compare too 1 Cor. ii. 7, "We speak the wisdom of God in a mystery, . . . which none of the princes of this world knew; for had they known it, they would not have crucified the Lord of glory. . . . But God hath revealed it to us by his Spirit." Also John xiv. 9; "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father:" and Col. ii. 9; "In him dwelleth all the fulness of the godhead bodily."<sup>5</sup> 1 Tim. iii. 16.

<sup>6</sup> I borrow the words "*be scattered*" and "*indignation*" from the verses xi. 36, xii. 7 *infra*.

<sup>7</sup> See Note<sup>1</sup>, p. 88.

gleam of visible prosperity, hypocrisy shall insinuate itself even into their body. Many shall cleave to them that are mere dissemblers in religion,<sup>1</sup> just like the Jews before them, and so corrupt the professing people. And thus persecution shall arise against the sincere ones, even out of their own body; and this continue even to the time of the end. But the result shall be only, under the divine overruling, for their good: to try them, and purify them, and make them white; even as silver is purified, and the garment made whiter, by the fuller's soap and the refiner's fire."<sup>2</sup>

3. As to the *third subdivision*,<sup>3</sup> containing the Angel's prophetic sketch of one who has been often of late, but certainly not very happily, called *the wilful King*,—I would rather designate him as *the self-deifying King*,—my judgment acquiesces in the well-known interpretation given of it by Mede and the two Newtons: and this with satisfaction,

<sup>1</sup> So even in apostolic times, "the apostasy," said St. Paul, "doth already work."

<sup>2</sup> Compare and contrast with the above the comment of Ephrem Syrus on the parallel text in Dan. xii. 9, 19, "*Many shall be purified and made white,*" &c. "Designat futuram apostolorum electionem, et eredientium ad eosdem audiendos concursum, quos prædicat *baptismi lavaero dealbandos*: Judæos contra, Christi interfectores, severè judicandos et puniendos."

<sup>3</sup> 36. "And the king \* shall do according to his will: † and he shall exalt himself, and magnify himself above every god, ‡ and shall speak marvellous things against the god of gods; § and shall prosper till || the indignation ¶ be accomplished: for

\* Wintle translates "a king;" but the Hebrew has the article, מֶלֶךְ. As before noted, p. 87, he prefixes *here* the last clause of verse 35, thus; "For still for an appointed time a [the] king shall even (-) act, &c."

† A phrase used before of Alexander the Great, verse 3; and also of Antiochus the Great, verse 16, with reference to the time of his successes. Hence, as observed p. 81, the impropriety here of the title of *wilful king*, especially as a distinctive one.

‡ Venema, who supposes Antiochus Epiphanes to be still the subject of the prophecy, explains "every god" here to mean *omne divinum*, or dignities and powers vested with godlike prerogatives; especially the *angelic dignities*, p. 369. This would well agree with the *παντα λεγομενον θεον η σεβασμα* of St. Paul. So too Ps. lxxxiii. 6.

§ מִגְדָּלוֹת. Compare here too the prophecy of 2 Thess. ii. 4, speaking of the Antichrist as sitting in God's temple, as God; also Dan. vii. 25.—Wintle observes on the strength of meaning in the two verbs *exalt himself*, *magnify himself*.

|| מְדַ, as verse 24, p. 74; where see Note §§.

¶ מְדַ, the same word as in verse 30 of the indignation of the King of the North.—Gesenius says that it is a word specially used of *God's* anger. So Isa. lxvi. 14, "The *Lord's indignation* shall be known towards his enemies:" Zech. i. 12, "The cities of Judah against whom thou hast had *indignation*." Compare too Isa. x. 5, "O Assyrian, the rod of mine anger, and the staff in their hand is *mine indignation*: I will send him against an hypocritical nation:" also Ezek. xxii. 24, Mal. i. 4, Isa. xxvi. 20, &c.—The Greek version of this important clause is, *και καταθθυνη μεχρις ου συντελεσθη η οργη*.

in respect of most particulars. I conceive with them that *the king* mentioned means the king or ruling chief of

that that is determined shall be done. 37. Neither shall he regard \* the God of his fathers, nor the desire of women,† nor regard any god: for he shall magnify himself

\* נִבְּרָן, with the preposition עַל following it, (I presume in the sense of *concerning, as to*), before the noun; precisely as again elsewhere in this same verse, and also in verse 30 *suprà*, נִבְּרָן עַל עֲזָבָה, translated, “*He shall have intelligence with them that forsake the covenant.*” The same verb is used in verse 33 of this chapter, and twice over in verse 10 of chap. xii., without the עַל, or an accusative, in the sense of *to, understand*. Thus our English rendering in verse 30 seems a just and happy one: and, following this precedent, the phrase here must be considered to mean, He shall have no *joint intelligence, or alliance of mind and action*, with the gods of his fathers. So the Sept. *Ἐπι παντας Θεους των πατερων αυτου ου συνησει.*

† הַיְהוּדָה נְשִׂים. The question here is, Are we to consider *women* as the *subject* of the desire, or its *object*? in other words, the desire *felt by* women, or the desire (as of men) *for* women? And the question is so important that it is right that the investigator should carefully note the parallels that Scripture offers.

Now examples such as occur in Psalm cvi. 24, Jer. iii. 19, Ezek. xxvi. 12, Amos v. 11, Dan. x. 3, xi. 8, 38, 43, &c. &c., where we read *land of desire, houses of desire, vineyards of desire, &c.*, in the sense of *desired objects*,—all these examples, I say, and such like, (though they have sometimes, I think, one or another been referred to by expositors,) must be set aside as altogether irrelevant, because in the Hebrew, as the English, the word for *desire* there comes *last*, here *first*: the word הַמְדָה, *desire*, being in the constructive form, and so preceding the word for *women*.

Setting these aside, then, it is to be observed generally that in the case of nouns, so as here with הַמְדָה, in the constructive form, the word following *may* be understood either *objectively* or *subjectively*. E. g. הַרְפָּת מֵאֵב, Zeph. ii. 8, means *the reproach which Moab inflicted on others*; whilst הַרְפָּת עֲבָדָה, Ps. lxxxix. 51, is *the reproach which the servants of God themselves experienced*. Again, וְצַעַת דָּל, Prov. xxi. 13, is *the cry which the poor utter*: but וְצַעַת קָדָם, Gen. xviii. 20, is *the cry (probably) which Sodom caused others to utter*. And so again in Ezek. xii. 19, compared with Judg. ix. 24:—where the Hebrew for *violence* being in the constructive form, the one phrase means *the violence exercised by the inhabitants*; the other the *violence felt, or suffered, by the 70 men of Zerubbaal*.

As regards the particular noun in statu constr. in the clause under consideration, we have the following clear examples where the noun after *desire* in the genitive, so as the word *women* here, indicates the *subject, or feeler, of the desire*: viz. 1 Sam. ix. 20, “*On whom (or towards whom) is the desire of all Israel*”; that is, *the desire felt by Israel*: where the Hebrew is הַמְדָה יִשְׂרָאֵל; and 1 Kings xx. 6, Lam. ii. 4, Ezek. xxiv. 16, 21, 25, “*the desire of thine eyes*,” מַהֲמַד עֵינַיָהּ, &c.; (the Hebrew being there a derivative word, cognate to the former;) in the sense of *that which the eyes desire*. To which might be added also, in my opinion, the famous passage from Hagg. ii. 7, הַמְדָה כָּל-הַגּוֹיִם, *the desire of all the nations*; though this indeed is one of which the sense, albeit generally explained to a similar effect, as that which was the great object of the desire *felt by all nations*, is yet by some doubted.

Which being so, I cannot but incline to prefer this sense of the clause to that which Jerome advocated of old; viz. as meant of the *desire or appetite for women*. “*Antichristus simulabit castitatem, ut plurimos decipiat.*” As also the yet older expositor *Victorinus*: who, so understanding the expression, and applying it to Nero revived as the Antichrist, speaks of the total change of character that he would then manifest; “*Ait Daniel, ‘desideria mulierum non cognoscet,’ eum prius fuit impurissimus.*” B. P. M. iii. 420.

But what then is it, taking the phrase *subjectively*, which women desire? By Mede, Bishop Newton, and many other Protestant expositors, it is explained to mean *marriage*; a sense of the phrase itself well accordant with fact; and the non-regard of it here assigned, as they conceive, to the Antichrist notoriously applicable to the Roman Popes, as encouraging monasteries and vows of virginity, and discouraging marriage. Moreover the correspondence of this with St. Paul’s declaration that the



those false Christians just spoken of, that would in hypocrisy and mere profession have attached themselves to the Christian Church; in other words, the great Head of the Apostasy, *the Roman Pope*. For the *definite article* before the word *King* seems to me almost to tie down the meaning to some notable ruler, either of these false professors, or of the power just before mentioned as brought on the scene by the ships from Chittim, the same that would place the abomination making desolate: the Syrian *King of the North* (the only other previously-mentioned potentate whom that article might refer to) being excluded both by considerations elsewhere specified (p. 82, &c.), and by the chronology of the pas-

above all. 38. But in his estate \* shall he honour the god of forces: † (*margin*, the

"forbidding to marry" would be one marked characteristic of the great predicted antichristian apostasy, both before and after, will strike every reader.

The only objection is that, as the statement comes in a clause which seems to have for its subject the *gods* that Antiehrst would reject, "Neither shall he regard the god of his fathers, nor the desire of women, nor any god," this ought so to mean also. Accordingly Gesenius, in this view of the sense of the phrase, suggests some *Syrian goddess* to be meant, that was the special object of the worship of the Syrian women. And Venema, p. 387, 395, in the same view of it, explains it of the goddess *Astarte*, or "heavenly *Venus*," (contradistinctively to the impure *earthly Venus*), whose temple Antiochus Epiphanes invaded (2 Macc. i. 13, 15); for Venema supposes Antiochus Epiphanes to be still the subject of the prophecy. On the other hand, Protestant expositors ask, Why should not the phrase designate Him who to the *Hebrew women* was the special object of desire;—the promised *seed of the woman*, the *Messiah*? So Faber, S. C. ii. 164, 169. I have also met with the following expression of Professor Lee's opinion to the same effect, in his work on Eusebius' Theophania; Preface, p. cxxvi.: "This, occurring as it does in a context speaking of deities, was probably intended to designate the *Messiah*; who was the desire of women, as it should seem, among the ancient Hebrews."

\* עֲלֵ-כִנִּי; either in *his stead*, or *place*, as the words mean in verses 7, 20, 21, previous; that is, instead of the God of gods, or the god of his fathers, or any god noted in the preceding verse as rejected by him: or perhaps, as Wintle and other commentators prefer to explain them, *in his seat*, viz. in the seat of the God of gods; an expression which would then somewhat agree with the descriptive clause in St. Paul's prophecy of the Man of Sin (2 Thess. ii. 4), "sitting *in the temple of God*," &c.—Faber on the Prophecies, i. 401, explains it, "when he is established:" i. e. seated *in his own seat*: and in his S. C. (ii. 178) *in his office*, or *official station*.—Venema, as usual, "*super stirpe sua*."

† לְאֵלֹהֵי מְעֹדָיו יִבְהַר. The לְ prefix here may be explained either from the governing verb to *honour*, or *do honour to*, which follows: as this verb has sometimes elsewhere the same preposition marking the dative in construction with it; e. g. Psalm lxxxvi. 9, יִבְהַר לְשֵׁמֶךָ, "They shall honour, or do honour to, thy name;" and indeed in the clause of the verse before us next succeeding.

Noldius considers לְ to be used sometimes as a sign of the accusative: e. g. Lev. xix. 18, "Thou shalt love thy neighbour, &c.;" לְ-עֵינֶךָ: 1 Sam. xx. 30, "Thou hast chosen the son of Jesse;" לְבֶן. So too Isa. liii. 11. He compares the use by the Greek Septuagint sometimes, and also by the Evangelists, as Matt. ii. 11, John iv. 23, of the phrase προσκυνει τινα, with the *dative*, for προσκυνει τινα with the accusative. A use of the dative, so governed, which is explicable in the same way as the Hebrew preposition spoken of above.

sage ; a chronology now brought down into *Christian* times by the context immediately preceding. — And as to the other

god Mahuzzim :) \* and † a god whom his fathers knew not shall he honour with gold, and with silver, and with precious stones and pleasant things.‡ 39. Thus shall he do in the most strong-holds with a strange god,§ whom he shall acknowledge

\* מַחֲזִיזִים, *Mahoz*, in the singular means a *fortress*. It is used *literally* in verse 7 of this chapter; and in Psalm xxxi. 3, and elsewhere, is applied *figuratively* to God; “Thou art my strength,” (Eng. Vers.) or “fortress.”—In the present passage the question occurs whether the plural noun is to be taken, so as our English translation renders it, in the simple literal sense of *fortresses*; in which case it must be the genitive after Eloah, “the god of fortresses:” (so Venema, “*Deum arcium*,” meaning *Plutus*, the god of the treasures in the temple-sanctuaries; also Lee, “the god of fortifications:” or whether, with the margin, as an *appellative* of certain gods so designated. In common with most commentators,—and in accordance also with the Greek and Vulgate, (“*Deum Mahuzzim* in loco suo venerabitur,” Θεον Μωυζεμ επι τοπου αυτου δοξασει,)—I cannot hesitate to prefer the latter explanation. I am induced to do so by two obvious considerations, not to mention others: 1st, that the *god of fortresses*, the rendering of the clause offered by the former explanation, could only be a god answering to the Pagan *Mars*, and consequently one not merely not unknown to the ancient Romans, but one honoured by them almost above any other: 2ndly, that it is an historic fact that an appellative precisely answering to the word *Mahuzzim* was actually given to departed martyrs and saints under the Papal Apostasy; to which Apostasy, and its chief, it is plain (without entering into historic particulars which belong rather to the text and will there be noticed) that this prophecy *may possibly* apply.

*Theodoret* thus comments on the whole clause.—Των πατερων αυτου παντων την οικειαν φυσιν εγνωκοτων, και τον επι παντων θεον σφας αυτους ονομασαι μη τετολμηκοτων, ουτος θεον ισχυρον και δυνατον (τουτο γαρ σημαινει το Μωυζεμ) εαυτον προσαγορευει. Το γαρ επι τοπω αυτου αντι του εαυτον τεθεικε.

Malvenda, Vol. ii. p. 82, has a chapter on this subject. In common with most Romish expositors he doubts not that *Antichrist* is the subject of the prophecy. And, as to the *Mahuzzim* that Antichrist is to honour, he proffers three chief solutions, as what had most found favour with Romish expositors:—viz. 1st, that the god might be *Mars*;—or, 2ndly, the *Devil*;—or, 3rdly, *Antichrist himself*; which last he most of all approves. And he cites *Theodoret*, as above quoted by me, suggesting this view: and going on thus; “Eriget enim sibi ipsi templa; et auro et argento et lapidibus pretiosis ipse exornabit.” For the Greek of which see my Note, p. 95.

† The *τ* might be rendered *even*, in the exegetic sense which not seldom attaches to it: in which case the *eloah*, or *god*, next mentioned, will be in apposition with, or as explanatory of, the *Mahuzzim*. But I prefer to take it in its more usual and simple sense of *and*: and shall hope presently to give a most striking explanation of the descriptive statement as applicable to the Papal Antichrist.

‡ The verb for *honour* is מִשָּׁבַח, a word illustrated at p. 99 *infra*. The last clause is literally, “things of desire.” See the beginning of Note † p. 92.

§ מַחֲזִיזִים מְבָרָכִים מְבָרָכִים מְבָרָכִים מְבָרָכִים מְבָרָכִים. Here the word *Mahuzzim* recurs. מְבָרָכִים is the same that is rendered *strong-holds* in verse 24. (See p. 74 *supra*.) The sense is very obscure. The *Vulgate* turns it, “Et faciet ut munit Mahuzzim cum Deo alieno;” the *Greek*, και ποιησει τοις οχυρωμασι των καταφυγων μετα θεου αλλοτριου; and the *Syriac*, “Transibitque ad urbes munitas contra Deos alienos.”—Of modern commentators *Venema* (p. 421) translates, “Et faciet munitionibus arcium cum Deo peregrinitatem.” *Mede*, “And he shall make the strong-holds of the Mahuzzim withal (or jointly) to the foreign god.” *Bishop Newton*, “Thus shall he do to the defenders of the strange god whom he shall acknowledge.” *Windle*, “And he shall provide for fortresses of Mahuzzim together with God.” *Faber*, on Prophecy, “To the upholders of his tutelary gods, (or S. C. ii. 143, “restrainers of strong military protectors,”) together with the foreign god,” &c. *Cuninghame* (*Investigator*, iii. 280), “And he shall make for his fortified cities Mahuzzim, together with the strange god.” *Maramensis* (*ibid.* iv. 193), “And he shall make them [i. e. the images and temples which

two solutions that have been offered, and which would

he understands to be the "pleasant things" of the verse preceding] into the strong-holds of the Mahuzzim, together with the strange god." (It is to be observed that מְצֻדֹת, like the Latin *facio*, has the meaning to *make*, as well as that of *to do*.) *Melvnda*, ib. 84, gives also a list of versions, some the same, some different. He concludes, "Idem est ac, . . . Et faciet munitiones Mahuzim : id est, ædificabit templa et arces Ivo Mahuzim : " or, "Et faciet munimenta ipsius Mahuzim, hoc est templa Antichristi."

To all of these versions, as well as to the authorized English, there seem to be objections.—Mahuzzim, being an *appellative* before, must surely be either the appellative here, or else explanatory of the appellative ; and not *strong-holds*, as the English version and Greek. Mede overlooks the מְצֻדֹת. Mr. Cuninghame, and I think the Vulgate, construe as if it were מְצֻדֹת, not מְצֻדֹת. Bishop Newton and Faber give that same noun the figurative sense of *defenders, upholders* ; which sense, however, it has nowhere else in Scripture, being always used literally to signify *fortresses*, as in Numb. xxxii. 17, 36, Josh. x. 20, xix. 35, Isa. xvii. 3 : besides that they suppose it to designate the *priests* of the Mahuzzim ; an application of the figure singularly inapt, as it seems to me ; especially considering that the Mahuzzim themselves bear in that very title a figurative name of almost precisely the same character. Nor does Houbigant, quoted by Newton, at all justify it. Maramensis seems to be as little justified in explaining the "pleasant things" with which the Mahuzzim are to be honoured, as *temples* : an explanation essential, however, to his solution of the clause in question ; since it is that which furnishes him from the context preceding with what he may apply as a pronominal accusative, understood, designating the things which his so-called Wilful King will *make into Mahuzzim's strong-holds*.

Perhaps, if the present reading be retained, the clause *might* be construed thus ; "And he shall practise and prosper [so Dan. viii. 12, 24,] in the strong-holds of Mahuzzim, together with a strange god : " meaning by their strong-holds their *temples* ; as the *arx*, or *citadel*, was often the site of the tutelary god's temple of old ; for example the Parthenon at Athens, the Capitol at Rome, and, I may add, the Sanctuary of strength at Jerusalem. But then there occurs this objection :—the "together with" makes the *foreign god* a sharer in this *prosperity*. Or perhaps the two synonymous nouns may be taken *intensively, explanatorily* thus :—"And he shall make *them* into the strongest fortresses." Or, if we may suppose a final ׀ to have fallen out from the מְצֻדֹת, —an omission the rather supposable from the circumstance of a ׀ beginning the word following, and the slight change of vowel points involved in this supposition, viz. of ׀ for ׀, being one of little importance,—then, the text thus simply corrected, Mr. Cuninghame's translation becomes admissible, "And he shall make for fortified cities Mahuzim : " or the following, "He shall *make Mahuzzim for fortresses*, as well as a strange god." Of which two the latter translation most approves itself to my mind : because it both furnishes a reason for the appellative *Mahuzzim*,—how they would be so called because in some way made into מְצֻדֹת, or *fortresses* ; and also explains the cause of the apostate self-deifying King's honouring them, and his consistency in so doing ; inasmuch as *he would make them into* what they were, as objects of worship : and consequently, in setting them up for the popular veneration and honour, would be honouring himself, as their creator, still more.—All this applies also to the *strange god* spoken of in addition to the Mahuzzim ; which god would apparently be of the same fraternity with these latter, only more eminent ; the ׀ being here used, I conceive, in the conjunctive sense of *like as, as also* : a sense which it has in Eccles. ii. 16, and elsewhere. See Gesenius,—I may add that the word מְצֻדֹת, *strange*, is similarly used in Gen. xxxv. 2, of the *strange gods* carried with her by Rachel.

*Theodorel's* paraphrase of verse 39 is as follows. Και ποιησει τοις οχρωμασι των καταφυγων μετα Θεου αλλοτριου, ον εγνωρισε, και πληθυνει δοξαν, και υποταξει τους πολλους, και γην διελει εν δωροις. Αναστησει γαρ, φησιν, αυτην ναους, και αργυρω και χρυσι και λιθοις τιμιοις αυτους καλλωπισει, και υποταξει αυτοις πολλους, τους εξαπατωμενους δηλονοτι τοις τερασιν, η ταις κολασεισιν χανυμενους. Τοις δε υπηκοοις και ασεβειν αιρουμενοις και γην δωρησεται πλειστην.

Let me add a brief notice of some of the *early Reformers'* views of the Mahuzzim. "The *Pope*," said Luther, (Table Talk, ii. 40, 51,) "is the true *Antichrist* ; his castle



explain this King either of *revolutionary atheistic France*,<sup>1</sup> or of an *infidel Antichrist yet future*,<sup>2</sup> they too seem equally excluded by the marks laid down of this King's chronological date and political and religious origin and connexion. For did atheistic France rise up as the ruling Head either of the antichristian Apostasy of the fifth and sixth centuries, or of the *Roman* state and power from Italy and Chittim?<sup>3</sup> Or, again, could the characteristics of a king that was to rise before the *time of the end* mentioned in verse 40, and to prosper, for some time apparently,<sup>4</sup> till the indignation against the Jews was accomplished, be predicated of an *infidel Antichrist*, yet future, with a duration of but three and a half literal years, all

and\* increase with glory: and he shall cause them to rule† over many, and he shall divide the land for gain." †

<sup>1</sup> As Faber on the Prophecies, i. 404, and S. C. ii. 160.

<sup>2</sup> Maitland, Burgh, &c.

<sup>3</sup> There is no various reading.—Mr. Faber in the translation prefixed to the historic sketch on his work on the Prophecies, inadvertently overlooked the definite article of the Hebrew, and translated, "And a king shall do," &c.—In his 2nd Edition of the S. C. ii. 145, published soon after my first Edition, he corrected this inadvertence. "And that king shall do," is now his version: the reference being, as he supposes, to the seed or progeny of the Chittim, or Roman Empire, mentioned above, xi. 31.

<sup>4</sup> Compare the "many days" of verse 33.

and fort *Maosim, the mass*." "*Mass* cometh of the word *Mahuzzim*; i.e. a collecting of alms, stipend, or tax for the sake of the priests."—Again Joye gives this as from Melanethon and Ecolampadius; "The idol of destruction, or wasting image, he calleth *the god Maozim*: that is, a strong god of diverse churches, set or hanged up. The Hebrews call all images strange gods, and heathen rites abominable destructions; because wheresoever they be set up and honoured, in churches or in abbeyes, there have we a certain token that the same churches and abbeyes shall be made even with the ground, as Christ prophesied of Jerusalem."

Mr. Sims in his Appendix to Peyrani's Treatise on the Waldenses, p. 509, speaks of the Turkish Liturgy as address to "Rabbol Maizza," or "the God of forces":—a curious circumstance, if so it be; and which might suggest *Mahomet* as the King intended, did other points suit, not the Pope.

*Rosenmüller's* comment is: "*Deus munitionum* bellicus aliquis Deus erit, ejus tutelæ rex ille committit munitiones et præsidia, quibus securum præstat suum regnum; ita ut nihil æque ac munimenta, et quidquid est bellicorum præsidiorum, æstimet; adeoque, licet ab omni aliâ religione alienus, tamen hoc Numen, quod sibi ipse quasi creavit, studiosè colat." The comment seems to me worthy of remark, and will be referred to again.

\* There is no *and* in the original. The clause has therefore by some been rendered, "Whom acknowledging he shall increase the honour;" whether the increased honour accrue to them, or to himself. Venema, p. 421, applies it to the *former*; "Quos respexerit maectabit honore."

† א, *over*; as Esther ix. 1, Judges viii. 23.

‡ Or, *for a price*; מְכַרְתָּ. The word is used 2 Sam. xxiv. 24, of the purchase-price to be paid for Araunah's field; "Nay, but I will buy it of thee at a price." In Micah iii. 11 it signifies the price, reward, or hire, paid for mercenary priest's service; "The priests teach for hire."



*within* the time of the end?<sup>1</sup> Thus, I say, these two other suggested solutions of the self-deifying King of the prophecy seem to me as plainly inadmissible as that which would refer it to Antiochus Epiphanes: whereas, on the other hand, the *Pope* and *Papal power* seem to answer to the description, not merely in respect of his origin, as having been the head of the Apostates of Christendom from the sixth century, but in each other main particular also.

For he was alike *their* head, and the head also (in his time) of the same *fourth great dominant power*, the *Roman*, which had been introduced a little before into the Angel's prophetic sketch with "the ships from Chittim;" just accordantly both with the description here given of the self-deifying King, and with that other memorable prefiguration also, long before shown to Daniel,<sup>2</sup> which depicted the last ruling chief of the *fourth great heathen empire* as *a little horn*, with emblems betokening the *chief of a religious apostasy*.<sup>3</sup>—His *supremacy in power*—a supremacy that might well be equalled even to that of Alexander the Great, of whom the same expression is used<sup>4</sup>—is another point of correspondency.—And so too his *character and pride*, as exalting himself above every god; and thus, and therefore, disregarding alike the Pagan gods of his Roman ancestors, and the true God, and Christ "the desire of women;" (for so I take the phrase;<sup>5</sup>) and against the latter speaking marvellous things and blasphemies:—all which is but another version of what is said of the Antichrist alike in Dan. vii., 2 Thess. ii., and Rev. xiii.; and which, in respect of its application to the Pope, has been already elsewhere in other parts of this Book<sup>6</sup> abundantly illustrated by me.—As to what is said of the self-deifying King's honouring of

<sup>1</sup> The difficulty is not obviated by the explanation which some expositors of this class give to the abomination of desolation in verse 31, as if one to be set up by an infidel Antichrist, yet future. And the objection to it not merely from the context of the present prophecy, but from our Lord's prophecy in Matt. xxiv. 15, is one which, as it seems to me, cannot be overcome. <sup>2</sup> Dan. vii. 20—25.

<sup>3</sup> The horn had eyes as of a man, like an *επισκοπος*, or *overseer*.

<sup>4</sup> Compare my Note †, p. 91. The very different meaning of the English word *wilful* to that here intended, (that word being used by us of *disposition* and *temper*, whereas the prophetic phrase only indicates *absolutism of power*;) constitutes another objection to the appellation, *wilful King*. It is indeed hardly less than absurd.

<sup>5</sup> See my critical Note, p. 92.

<sup>6</sup> See my Vol. iii. pp. 189, 190, &c.

the god *Mahuzzim*, and also of a god whom his fathers knew not,<sup>1</sup> and which was to be glorified with gold and silver and precious stones, in place alike of his ancestors' gods and of the true God, it seems to me to be well and consistently explained by reference to the two grand objects of worship under the Papacy:—1st, to those *saints*, (the *Virgin Mary* primarily inclusive,) and their *relics* and *images*, which the Apostasy from its first development regarded and worshipped as the *Mahuzzim*, or *fortresses*, of the places where they were deposited:<sup>2</sup> saints whom the Papal Chief of Anti-Christendom, on the grant of the Pantheon at Rome,<sup>3</sup> solemnly adopted as tutelary deities; whom in the second Council of Nice he prevailed to have recognized as fit objects of worship, with apostate Christendom's most solemn sanction;<sup>4</sup> and whom afterwards, in the West, he elected and canonized as *Mahuzzim*, as his own peculiar prerogative, and by his own sole authority:<sup>5</sup>—2ndly, to the

<sup>1</sup> Hence probably the general patristic explanation respecting Antichrist, that he would put aside, and be an enemy to *idols*, the gods of his Roman ancestors; “*idola seponens*,” as Irenæus says. Which indeed the Papal Antichrist was, though a patron of *image* and *saint-worship*: asserting somewhat paradoxically the total difference of the two things; and declaring that he who called *images idols*, was anathema. The real difference was this:—the one was his creation; under his management; and moreover a most fruitful source of gain to him (as will be again observed presently) in Western Christendom: the other not.

<sup>2</sup> See on this Moshem vi. 2. 4. 4.—Sir I. Newton traces the progressive steps of the Apostasy to this point; first, the celebrating the *γενεθλια*, or martyrdom-days, of the martyred saints at their tombs; then making these tombs places of prayer; then attributing to the saints mediatorial functions; then connecting the favourable exercise of those functions with honour paid to their relics, and afterwards to their images. Whence those bodies, relics, or images, came to be regarded as pledges of the departed saints' protection; and the saints themselves the defenders and *fortresses*, as it were, or *mahuzzim*, of the places or persons dedicated to them. In fact they were called by this very name. So Basil in one of his Homilies, *Ασειστον την εκκλησιαν ταυτην φρουρουμενην τοις μεγαλοις πυργοις των μαρτυρων διατηρησον*. And again; *Ουτοι εισιν οι την καθ' ημας χωραν διαλαβοντες,\* οιοι πυργοι τινες συνεχεις ασφαλειαν εκ της των εναντιων καταδρομης παρεχομενοι*. Also Chrysostom; *Τουτο το σωμα τειχιζει την πολιν εκεινην ο παντος πυργου και μυριων εστι περιβολων ασφαλεστερον*. And again; *Τα των αγιων σωματα τουτων τειχους παντος αδαμαντος. ασφαλεστερον ημιν τειχιζει την πολιν.†*

<sup>3</sup> See Vol. iii. p. 303.

<sup>4</sup> It was under Adrian, then Bishop of Rome, that the Council was summoned and held: and very mainly through his influence and authority that the iconoclastic Decrees of the previous Council of Constantinople, which had stigmatized the saints and their images as *δαιμονικα σχηματα*,‡ (the very word here used in the Greek Version to express the Hebrew *Mahuzzim*), were reversed; the worship of saints and their images restored; and punishments awarded to those who maintained that God was the only object of religious adoration. See Mosh. viii. 2. 3. 13.

<sup>5</sup> Compare Rosenmüller's comment on the text, p. 95 *suprà*.—As to the historic

\* Compare what Daniel says of the Apostate King *dividing the land* for gain.

† Given by Bishop Newton.

‡ So Wintle on verse 39.

*transubstantiated breaden god*, the creation of his own matchless priestcraft; respecting which, in accordance which seems to me really marvellous with the prophetic language here used by Daniel, he has established the rule that it must "be glorified," or have rays of glory surrounding it, "of gold and silver and precious stones," wherever practicable in the crystal monstranza in which it is elevated for the adoration of the people; such glory as best becomes the divinity.<sup>1</sup> But how so, considering that he is represented as self-deified? Just because, as being the saint-maker and god-maker, he did, in promoting *their* worship, pro-

fact, it was at first the office of Provincial Councils, with a Bishop presiding, to settle which of the more recently departed might be regarded as saints and mediators, the demand for new saints having become large in corrupted Christendom; and the Pope was only referee on appeal in the matter:—then at length the Pope claimed it as his peculiar prerogative to create saints; the first saint so created by him being Udalric, Bishop of Augsburgh, canonized A.D. 993. See Mosheim ix. 2. 3. 4, and x. 2. 3. 4. Mosheim's words,—“The judgment of the Roman Pontiffs was respected in the choice of those that were to be *honoured* with saintship,” till “the Church of Rome engrossed to itself the *creation* of these *tutelary divinities*, which at length was distinguished by the title of canonization,”—are like a comment on the prophetic words, “Mahuzzim whom he shall acknowledge and *increase with honour* ;” and (if my rendering be correct), “*He shall make into fortresses* the Mahuzzim.” See on this Pope Alexander's Bull, Hard. ix. 1552: also my Vol. iii. p. 180.—Under Pagan Rome it was the *Senate's* prerogative to grant an *apotheosis*:—the very word this, by the way, applied sometimes on Papal medals to the saints' canonization: e. g. on that of Francis of Sales by Alexander VII. Bonanni, p. 654.

For some of the earliest cases of saints deified in the Latin Church as Mahuzzim, see my Vol. i. pp. 333, 334. For an example of such deified saint-protectors take that of Hilary Bishop of Poitiers, with the inscription on a pillar, “*Divo Hilario, urbis propugnatori fidelissimo, sanctissimo, certissimo, Pictavorum Episcopo.*” (Milner, p. 286).—In illustration of the Virgin Mary's worship as a Mahoz, take the extract following, from the authorized Litany in her honour called the Litany of Loretto. (ap. Cuninghame, p. 178.) “We fly to thy *patronage*, O holy mother of God! . . . Deliver us from all dangers, O ever glorious and blessed Virgin! *Tower of David, Tower of ivory, Ark of the Covenant, Refuge of sinners, Help of Christians, Queen of Angels, Queen of apostles, Queen of martyrs, Queen of all saints!* . . . We fly to thy *patronage*, O holy Mother of God! Deliver us from all dangers!”—In Vol. iii. p. 417 I have exemplified the Mariolatry still established in Rome, and elsewhere in Italy.

So too the Greeks in their Preces Horariæ; “O thou Virgin Mother of God, thou *impregnable wall, thou fortress of salvation.*” מְצִיזוּ יְשִׁיעִיָהּ. Compare Psalm xxviii. 8.

<sup>1</sup> Gesenius says, on the verb כָּבַד בָּבִיד, *honour, or glorify*, the noun כָּבֵד cognate to which, is used in verse 38; “כָּבֵד יְהוָה, δόξα κυρίου, (Sept.) *the glory of Jehovah*: that is, the shining splendour which surrounds the Deity when he appears to men, called by the Rabbins the *Shekinah*. Exod. xxiv. 16, xl. 34; 1 Kings viii. 10, 11; 2 Chron. vii. 1; Isa. vi. 3, 4; Ezek. i. 28, iii. 12, 23, viii. 4, x. 4, 18, xi. 22. Compare in N. T. Luke ii. 9.” To which let me add Hebr. i. 2; where Christ is called the ἀπαύλασμα of the Father's glory. The Romish Dr. Rock, in his Hierurgia i. 64, describes the *Ostensorium* as a species of vessel employed for showing the blessed sacrament [or consecrated wafer] to the people, to receive their worship; and that it is composed of a stem which supports a crystal case, *surrounded with rays of glory.*” A magnificent specimen of such a monstranza, 7 or 8 feet high, and with the rays of glory formed of gold and precious stones, was exhibited in the Spanish department of the great London Exhibition of 1851.

mote yet more and superlatively his own.<sup>1</sup> How he caused the saints to “*rule over many*,” attaching to each country, town, monastery, and church its patron-saint, and how effectually he thus “*divided the land among them both for gain*,” and “*at a price*,” is a further point of correspondence with the Apostate King of the prophecy, which previous interpreters have well explained; and which I have myself also, after them, illustrated elsewhere fully from history.<sup>2</sup>—Let me add that as the Head of that Apostasy under which the saints were many of them to fall, (to try them, and make them white, &c.) the Apostate King’s character of *persecutor of the saints* seems also intimated: and that, I think, not obscurely.<sup>3</sup> How this characteristic applied to the Popes of Rome I need not repeat.

Such I conceive to be the intent of the Angel’s prophecy, and that it thus had its fulfilment in the great and then future Papal Antichrist. And mark the intimation given in verse 36 as to the term of his continuance in power:—viz. that it was to be “*till the end of the indignation* ;” meaning apparently thereby the indignation against the Jewish people.<sup>4</sup>

4. So we come to the *fourth* sectional subdivision of the prophecy.<sup>5</sup> And as in Balaam’s far-ranging prophecy the

<sup>1</sup> Nothing can better illustrate my text than some of the engravings given in my 3rd Volume, pp. 180 and 185, from Bonanni and other Roman authorities; e. g. one with the Pope’s *transubstantiated god*, with its “*glory*” (תִּכְבֹּד) of the jewelled monstranza of honour; other of the *saints deified* by him, with the inscription “*Their glory is his honour*.” (Compare Note \*, p. 96.) See too, on the former, the description of the bread-made God’s part in Leo Xth’s procession, Vol. ii. p. 59.

<sup>2</sup> See especially my Vol. ii. pp. 9, 10, 17, 27, &c., with the illustrative Notes. How it was “*at a price*” appears in Note <sup>1</sup> p. 27; “*Cœlum est venale, Deusque*.” See too ib. pp. 72—75, in further illustration of the Pope’s dividing the land at a price. Also compare what is said in our Homily on Peril of Idolatry, Part 3, both on the *Mahuzim*, and on *dividing the land for gain*.

<sup>3</sup> Mr. Faber objects the *absence* of this mark, in proof that the Wilful King (as he calls him) here mentioned was not the Pope. Let me suggest, besides what I have said in the text, that the direct mention of this characteristic is wanting also in St. Paul’s prophecy of the *Man of Sin*; which yet Mr. F. explains of the Papacy.

<sup>4</sup> Wintle, on verse 36, notices the same point; citing that famous observation of Kimchi on Obadiah, which I have also myself elsewhere cited, that, “*when Rome shall be laid waste there shall be redemption for Israel*.”

<sup>5</sup> 40. “*And at the time of the end \* shall the king of the South push at*

\* וְיָרֵץ בְּיָמָיו; Gk. *εν καιρον περατι*. This is a very important phrase, and one



prediction of the overthrow, first of Ashur, and then of Eber, by ships from Chittim, was followed by one respect-

him.\* And the king of the north shall come against him like a whirlwind, with chariots, and with horsemen, and with many ships: and he † shall enter into the coun-

needing careful investigation, in order to the right understanding of this part of the prophecy.

תָּמָּ is the common Hebrew word for *time*; and used thus generally in Dan. xii. 1, תָּמָּ תָּמָּ, *at that time*. To express the *mystical times* of prophecy, "a *time times and half a time*," other words are used:—in Dan. xii. 7, the sequel of the present prophecy, תָּמָּ, the same word that is used in Gen. i. 14, "for signs and for *times*;"—in Dan. vii. 25, תָּמָּ: the same word that is used also in Dan. iv. 16, (Hebr. 13,) &c., to express the *seven times* that were to pass over Nebuchadnezzar.

Again תָּמָּ is a word equally common, in the sense of *end*. So Psalm xxxix. 4, of the end of a man's life; Ezek. vii. 2, of the end of a kingdom; also in the present prophecy, Dan. xi. 27 *suprà*, "For yet an *en* at the appointed time;" meaning the end of the Syrian king's schemes of subduing Egypt.

The two words occur *together*, as here, only I believe in Dan. xi. 35, "To make them white even to the time of the end," תָּמָּ תָּמָּ, *έως καιρου περας*,—Dan. xii. 4, 9, "The words are closed up and sealed until *the time of the end*," (same Hebrew and Greek,)—and Dan. viii. 17, "Understand, for at (or to) the *time of the end*, תָּמָּ תָּמָּ, shall be the vision." In the two first of which passages the *epoch of the consummation* seems pretty clearly referred to: in the third, if our English version at be retained, *certain latter times*; viz. times later than that of the quadruple division of Alexander's kingdom, and flourishing of the four kingdoms consequent; in fact (if my explanation be correct, given in Part v. Chap. vii.) those of the rise of the Turkish Empire. But the תָּמָּ may be rendered *to*, not *at*: and then the *time of the end* will be there, as in the other cases, the epoch of the consummation, or *term* of the vision about the Turkman.—Compare the *εν ύστεροις καιροις* of 1 Tim. iv. 1, and *εν εσχάτω χρονω*, or *εν' εσχάτου των ήμερων*, of Jude 18 and 2 Peter iii. 3: used, the former of the *times of the great apostasy*, which was to end in the Popedom; the latter probably of the times more immediately preceding the consummation.

It is in the larger and less strict sense, and as tantamount to the *ύστεροι καιροι* of St. Paul, that Mede and the two Newtons here take the phrase; and so too Wintle on Dan. viii. 17. Certainly to myself it seems that the stricter sense is the more natural. Yet they are possibly justified in their explanation by the *ύστεροι καιροι* or *χρονοι* of the New Testament; especially as the definite article is not prefixed to the word תָּמָּ in the Hebrew. Prof. Lee, in his Preface to Eusebius' Theophania, would have "the last days" of the Old Testament prophecies to signify in still larger sense the whole time of the Gospel dispensation.

N.B. In Dan. xi. 13, תָּמָּ תָּמָּ תָּמָּ, "at the *end of the times, even years*," said of Antiochus the Great's certainly then returning against Egypt, it is the *end of times, not time of end*.

\* תָּמָּ תָּמָּ, the Hithpael of תָּמָּ. This verb is used in the *Kal*, Exod. xxi. 29; "If the ox were wont to *push* with his horns," &c.: and the *Piel* of the same verb applied in the *literal* sense, Ezek. xxxiv. 21, Dan. viii. 4, and *figuratively*, as Deut. xxxiii. 17, 1 Kings xxii. 11.

Wintle says that one manuscript omits the תָּמָּ, *at him*. And so perhaps the Greek translator read the clause. For he renders it Συγκερατισθησεται μετα του βασιλεως του νοτου, "He shall *push with, or at, the king of the south*:" making the *self-deifying king*, before spoken of, the nominative. A various reading to be observed, if the "time of the end" be construed strictly: also, yet more, that תָּמָּ may mean *conjointly with*, as well as *at or against*.

Venema, who still applies the prophecy to the Epiphanic history, explains the *time of the end* to be the end of God's indignation *at that time* against Israel; an ending marked by the success of the Maccabees. Another difficulty in his way! See pp. 81, 102.

† Mark here the pronominal ambiguity: for *he* may refer either to *the king of the*

ing the fall of the *Chittim* power itself, ("He shall afflict Ashur, and he shall afflict Eber, and *he* too shall perish for ever,") so too may this section of Daniel's prophecy, with

tries \* and shall overflow and pass over. 41. He shall enter also into the glorious land; † and many countries ‡ shall be overthrown: and these shall escape out of his hand, even Edom and Moab, and the chief of the children of Ammon. § 42. He shall stretch forth his hand || also upon the countries, and the land of Egypt shall not escape. 43. But he shall have power over the treasures of gold and silver, and over all the precious things of Egypt; and the Libyans and Ethiopians ¶ shall be at his steps. \*\* 44. But tidings out of the east and out of the north shall trouble him: †† therefore he shall go forth with great fury to destroy, and utterly to make away many. ‡‡ 45. And

*north, or the self-deifying king, Antichrist.* And hence in fact a variance, as will be seen, in the historic explanation. The early Fathers explained it in the latter sense, of Antichrist; Venema of the King of the North attacking the King of the South.

\* *בְּאֶרְצוֹתָם*, "into lands;" the Hebrew word being as general, and as little distinctive of any particular lands, as the word *lands* in the English.

† *וְיָצְאוּ מִיָּדוֹ*, the same expression as in verse 16 preceding; and also in Dan. viii. 9, but with *land* understood.—Doubtless Judæa, says Venema, p. 451.

‡ *Many* is feminine in the Hebrew; and therefore some such feminine noun as *רְאִיזוֹתָם*, *lands, countries*, must be understood.

§ Compare Isa. xi. 14; a prophecy in which Edom, Ammon, and Moab are similarly conjoined: conjoined, however, as those who are *not* to escape, when the Lord restores his people Israel. "They shall spoil them of the East together: they shall lay their hand upon *Edom* and *Moab*: and the children of *Ammon* shall obey them." See too Jer. xxv. 21; where they are mentioned together as those that would have to drink of the wine-cup of God's fury.

|| An expression indicating the *exercise of power* over, on, or against (אֶת) the countries. So in Exod. vii. 19, viii. 5, &c., of Moses stretching out his hand over the rivers of Egypt; also in Isa. v. 25, Ezek. xvi. 27, &c., of God doing so in judgment.

¶ *וְאֶת־אֲרָצוֹת־לִבְיָנוֹן*; the *Cushim* meaning the Abyssinians, perhaps inclusive of those inhabitants of Upper Egypt that immediately adjoined Abyssinia: the *Lubim* the inhabitants of the northern coast of Africa, west of Egypt. So Acts ii. 10, "The parts of *Libya* about *Cyrene*."—They are mentioned together in 2 Chron. xvi. 8, as having united in the attack on King Asa: also in Nah. iii. 9, as joint supporters of "No," or the Egyptian Thebes.

\*\* Gesenius explains the clause, "*At his steps*;" that is, *in his train*." The word is the common one used to signify a man's steps or paces: as in 2 Sam. vi. 13. Compare Judg. iv. 10, "Barak went up with 10,000 men *at his feet*."

Venema here sufficiently shows his inability to carry the Epiphanic solution of the prophecy further. Admitting that it cannot apply in any way to Antiochus Epiphanes himself, he refers this passage to Epiphanes' son Eupator. But did Eupator then conquer Egypt, and have the Libyans and Ethiopians at his steps? Not so, Venema admits; but he had them *in imagination*: "*Ægyptum Cushæam et Libyam actu quidem non intrabit; . . . attamen eas partim sui juris esse, et suæ potestati subjectas reputabit.*" "*Successum imaginarium.*" pp. 454, 458.

†† Venema (p. 458) compares Isa. xxxvii. 7, "I will send a blast upon him, and he shall hear a rumour, and return to his own land;" said of Sennacherib.

But mark here another ambiguity as to the intent of the pronoun. By the "*him*" thus to be troubled, is the *King of the North* meant, or the *self-deifying apostate King*? The early Fathers, having understood the *he* in verse 40 of the latter, naturally explained this verse also of the same Apostate King, or Antichrist. And they applied it in illustration of what is said in Dan. vii. of the Little Horn of the fourth Beast cutting off *three* out of its ten horns:—the three horns so plucked up being explained by them to mean the Libyans, Egyptians, and Ethiopians.—Others explain it (so e. g. Venema, Newton, &c.) of the King of the North.

‡‡ Wintle, "to devote to utter perdition;" the verb being one of devoting by a curse. Theodoret a little amplifies the Septuagint translation: *Ἡξει ἐν θυμῷ πολλῶν, του αναθεματισαι και του αφανισαι πολλους.*

its sequel next following, be a prediction of the same also. But it is a passage which has more than one considerable ambiguity and obscurity attached to it.

The primary difficulty of the passage, considered critically, and with a view to its historical explanation, arises out of those words at its very commencement, "at *the time of the end.*"<sup>1</sup> Taken in their strictest and most proper sense, they must indicate the epoch of the end of the present *αιων*, or dispensation: a sense which attaches to them in the two other places in which they occur in this same prophecy. And then the predictions they introduce must be considered as for the most part still future.—If, however, the phrase may be construed less strictly, viz. in the sense of *the latter days*, or *later part of the times of the Christian dispensation*,<sup>2</sup> then, and if we retain the reading and rendering "push *at him*" in verse 40,<sup>3</sup> the solution of Mede<sup>4</sup> and Newton becomes admissible: explaining the *King of the South*, and what is said of him, of the *Saracen* and his attacks on Roman Christendom; and what is said of the *King of the North*, of the *Turk's* attacks on Roman Christendom also, at a later æra. And certainly it tends to give

he shall plant the tabernacle of his palaces \* between the seas, † and in the glorious holy mountain. ‡ Yet he shall come to his end, and none shall help him."

<sup>1</sup> See Note\* p. 100, just preceding.

<sup>2</sup> "In the latter days of the Roman empire," says Bishop Newton.

<sup>3</sup> Besides assuming that "at" or "against him" is to be taken in verse 40 as the true reading and sense, I also assume that the *him* is to be understood, in its most natural sense, of the apostate king before spoken of.

<sup>4</sup> p. 816.

\* מִצְבֵּי. Gesenius and Wintle refer, in illustration of the meaning of this word, to a passage from Jonathan's Targum on Jer. xliii. 10, ("He shall spread his royal pavilion,") where the same word is used, and where it signifies *royal beauty and splendour*. Thus it is here thought to mean his *royal military tents*.

Venema explains the phrase as meaning *tents of a red colour*: "Plantabit tentoria tunica sua coccinea inter maria;" i. e. says he, "tents with a red flag above them, in sign of battle." pp. 468, 472.

† Compare Joel ii. 20; "His face toward the east sea, and his hinder part toward the utmost sea;" and Zech. xiv. 8; "In that day living waters shall go out from Jerusalem; half of them toward the former sea, and half of them toward the hinder sea:" where the Dead Sea and the Mediterranean seem to be meant.—So Venema explains the words, as well as other expositors.

‡ קָדְרָה מְצֻרָה. The word קָדְרָה may be a *mountainous chain* or *range*, as well as a *single mountain*. Thus it is used of the hill country of Judah in Jos. xxi. 11: and so too Exod. xv. 17, "Thou shalt plant them in the *mountain* of thine inheritance;" Numb. xiii. 17; and Dent. iii. 25, "Let me go over, and see the good land that is beyond Jordan, that *goodly mountain*, and Lebanon." Of which passages Adam Clarke, on Isa. v. 1, says; "Judæa in general was a mountainous country, whence Moses sometimes calls it *the mountain.*"—Compare on the other hand Psalm ii. 6, xliii. 3; where the *holy mountain* is used specially for *Mount Zion*.

plausibility to this as the true solution, that both the little that is here said of the King of the South's proceedings, and the fuller and more particular prediction of those of the King of the North, well agree with the history of the Saracenic and Turkish invasions of Christendom. The *Saracen*, after occupying Egypt, and so standing on the ground of the Ptolemies,<sup>1</sup> did push from thence against Western as well as Eastern Christendom; and both conquered Spain and Sicily,<sup>2</sup> and even attacked the Pope and Rome itself, in expeditions up the Tiber.<sup>3</sup> Again, the *Turk* came afterwards against apostate Christendom like a whirlwind, with chariots<sup>4</sup> and horsemen, and with many ships; and overflowing like a flood, entered both into it and into the once glorious land of Judæa:—moreover, though Edom, Ammon, and Moab, or the Arabs of the neighbouring desert, escaped from his hand, yet did he further extend his dominion over Egypt,<sup>5</sup> the Upper as well as the Lower; and over Libya also, or Northern Africa; so that from all the three Libyan principalities of Tunis, Algiers, and Morocco, “they were at his steps,” i. e. sent forth auxiliary forces at his command. Of the terribleness of which invader to the Popes of Rome the Papal Councils for some four or five centuries furnish abundant evidence; as also the solemn deprecatory processions at Rome, and efforts of successive Popes at rousing the secular powers of Western Christendom against him.<sup>6</sup>—And, presuming the sense to be thus far as stated, and the Turkish invasion of Christendom to have been the thing predicted in verses 40—43, the interpreters I speak of suggest further as the most natural, though not indeed *necessary*, explanation of the prediction in verse 44 next following,<sup>7</sup> (“And tidings out of the East

<sup>1</sup> Wintle, in explaining this of the Saracens, cites a quotation in Bochart from a book called *Juchasin*, in which the appellation *King of the South* is given to the Saracen ruler.—All the *Arabian* part of the first Ptolemy's dominion was occupied by Mahomet ere he attacked any neighbouring country; then the *Cœle-Syrian* province, which also was a part of Ptolemy's rightful dominion, was conquered by the Caliphs; and then *Egypt*;—whence at length they extended their conquests further westward.

<sup>2</sup> A part, as I have observed Vol. iii. p. 171, of the Pope's own Metropolitan Episcopate.

<sup>3</sup> See Vol. i. p. 466.

<sup>4</sup> I mean the *αμαξαι* which generally accompany a Scythian or Asiatic army. Gesenius explains the word  $\text{אֲמָצִי}$  as chariots, or *waggons*.

<sup>5</sup> A. D. 1517.

<sup>6</sup> Even up to the sixteenth century. For example, there was a deprecatory procession at Rome, on this account, at the time of the fifth Lateran Council.

<sup>7</sup> Not *necessary*, because of the ambiguity of the pronoun *him*.



and out of the North shall trouble *him*,") that *it* too should be referred to the Turkman, as being the subject of all the four verses previous: and thus that *he* must be considered as the Prince that is to go forth with great fury, and plant the tabernacles of his pavilion between the seas, in the mountain-country probably of Jerusalem; and there come to his end, and none help him.<sup>1</sup>—So, I say, these expositors; as of an event yet future. But indeed if the Turk be the King of the North meant, it seems by no means impossible that even this part of the prophecy may have *already* and *elsewhere* had its accomplishment. For, admitting that his early *Seljukian* greatness, though extended Westward as far even as to Jerusalem,<sup>2</sup> and with political influence too over Egypt, suffices not to answer what is said of the Northern King's supremacy over Egypt and Libya, and that to meet that part of the prediction we must pass on with Mede and Newton to the later epoch of the *Othman* Turk's extremist extent of African greatness, yet we are not without prophetic precedent<sup>3</sup> for supposing that there may be here perhaps a retrogradation to mark certain notable events in his progress to that greatness. Which supposed all answers. The tidings of Zenghis Khan from the East, and of the crusades from the North, troubled and for a while checked the Seljukian career of conquest:<sup>4</sup> and so too, under the later Othman dynasty, that of the last onset of Frank chivalry in the war of Nicopolis from the North, and that of the Tartar Tamerlane from the East.<sup>5</sup> Then he went forth in fury after that trouble, bent on destroying the Christian Empire; and taking Constantinople, fixed his seat of Empire between "the two seas" of Marmora and the Euxine, a local peculiarity often celebrated in the very

<sup>1</sup> It is a curious fact that a prophecy somewhat accordant therewith has been long rife among the Turks themselves. I heard this myself in 1819 from a Janissary Tartar attached to the British Embassy in Constantinople, who spoke of it as a common subject of talk in the Turkish coffee-houses. It was to the effect that the Moslem crescent would be forced back from Constantinople in the latter days, first to Brusa, and thence to *Damascus*; and that it would *there* continue waning till *the end of the world*.—Compare the earlier Turkish prophecy noticed in the 7th Session of the 5th Lateran Council; "Alionorus (regis Armeniæ frater) in orientali scribit historiâ esse apud Mahumetanos hostes indubiam prophetiam, cujus prætextu ad annum 1500 à Christi ortu duraturam eorum sectam pro comperto asseverat." Hard. ix. 1703. Also that mentioned by me Vol. i. p. 451.

<sup>2</sup> See my Vol. i. p. 499. <sup>3</sup> See p. 74 Note †. <sup>4</sup> See my Vol. i. pp. 501, 502.

<sup>5</sup> See *ib.* pp. 531, 532.

terms of our prophecy:<sup>1</sup> there in the mount of Santa Sophia,<sup>2</sup> (a glorious holy mountain, as being professedly the Eastern Capital of Christianity),<sup>3</sup> pitching his royal tent; another singularly appropriate phrase; as Montesquieu describes the Turks to be a people *encamped* in Europe.<sup>4</sup>—If such be admitted as the solution, then all that yet remains to be fulfilled about the Turkish King of the North is that he shall come to his end, and none help him.<sup>5</sup>

But, if the expression "*time of the end*," in verse 40, introductory of this closing sketch of the history of the Kings of the South and the North, be construed strictly, then the chronographic phrase must indicate a time subsequent to the sounding of the seventh Trumpet;<sup>6</sup> that is, a time sub-

<sup>1</sup> Captain Slade, in his "Travels in Turkey," p. 242, (Ed. 1854,) states that over the Seraglio gate, or Sublime Porte, there is an inscription in Arabic, from which the following, as translated by him, is an extract, descriptive of the Sultan, its founder: "By the assistance of God, and his good pleasure, *Lord of the two continents and seas*, the shadow of God amongst men, . . . the victorious emperor Mahomet, son of Amurath, laid the foundation of this august building. . . May the Almighty perpetuate his empire, and exalt it above the lucid stars of the firmament." Hence, as Delloway observes, (Constantinople, p. 41,) "the public style and title" of the Turkish Sultan is "Governor of the earth, and *Lord of three continents and two seas*." See too his notice of this characteristic of the site of Constantinople as between "*the two seas*," p. 15.

Three centuries ago the great Luther, in his Table Talk, ii. 2, not only noted, but compared with the prophecy before us, this local peculiarity of the Turkish Capital: "The Turk ruleth *between two seas* at Constantinople." And somewhat remarkably, the same is remarked on in a work by Louis Napoleon, the present Emperor of the French,—"*The geographical position of Constantinople is such as rendered her the queen of the ancient world. . . Situated between two seas of which she commands the entrance, &c.*"

<sup>2</sup> The Sultan's own Palace at the Seraglio point is, as all visitors there well know, on the hill of the *Santa Sophia*, and indeed includes it within the royal enclosure. That famous Church, the metropolitan and holiest of Eastern Christendom, was originally built by the great Constantine, and dedicated to the *Santa Sophia*, or Christ the *Divine Wisdom*; then rebuilt, yet more magnificently, by Justinian, his architectural masterpiece. See the authorities cited in Bingham viii. 2, 3; also Paul Warnfrid, B. P. M. xiii. 165.

<sup>3</sup> Whether by expressions like this in Daniel, with chronological reference to *Christian* times, before the Jews' restoration and conversion, we may understand the sacred localities of the *Christian* religion, or only those of the old *Jewish*, is one question that here meets the inquirer: another, whether a place or people may be called *holy* in prophecy from its *professing* Christianity, after having become corrupted. I have had to express my opinion on them in the affirmative, in my explanation of Dan. viii. some time since. See Vol. iii. pp. 438—440.—It should however be observed further that the Turk has pitched the ensigns of one of his Pashaliks in the holy mountain of *Jerusalem* also, between *its* two seas.

<sup>4</sup> *Sur la Grandeur, &c.*

<sup>5</sup> The prophecy in Apoc. xvi. 12 of the end of the Turkman power by *exhaustion*, like as of the drying up of the inundation of Euphrates, seems not inconsistent with the view of its end thus given by me; or with that given in Dan. viii. 25. And the present vain attempts by some of the Christian European powers at revivifying "the sick man," add peculiar force to the prophetic statement applied.

<sup>6</sup> See, as before, Note\* p. 100.

sequent to the French Revolution. And, if we so take it, I would suggest whether that reading of the manuscript Wintle mentions, and also of the Greek Septuagint, which omits *im* "at him," may not be the true one:<sup>1</sup> or else, rather, whether the *im* may not be construed *conjointly with*, instead of *at*, or *against* him. In the former case all intimation of a King who includes Egypt in his dominions pushing *against* the Roman self-deifying Sovereign, or against Papal Christendom, at the time of the end, (a thing under present political circumstances so improbable,) is eliminated out of the prophecy. In the latter case, which I prefer, the self-deifying Man of Rome, and the last King of the South, (possibly the French Chieftain,)<sup>2</sup> push *together*. Then, as to the last King of the North coming against him like a whirlwind, with chariots and horsemen and ships, and *his* overflowing thereupon into both other countries and the "glorious land," a question rises whether this "*he*" in the last clause of verse 40 is still the King of the North, or the self-deifying King, Antichrist, of verse 39 preceding; including the Southern power confederate with him.<sup>3</sup> The latter is the general explanation of the Fathers.<sup>4</sup> And so they bring Antichrist and his confederate hosts upon the mountains of the Holy Land, between its two seas, at the last great crisis. There, as it would then seem, he is to overflow for a while with mighty power: then, on occasion of tidings from the North and from the East troubling him, to go forth in fury, bent on destruction. But in vain. "He shall come to his end, and none shall help him."

<sup>1</sup> See Note \* p. 101 *suprà*.

<sup>2</sup> For the power so meant need not be one simply confined to Egypt. When the French under Bonaparte in 1799 occupied and ruled Egypt, they might have been considered the representatives of the former Kings of the South. The same were France, which already possesses the old Roman African province, yet again to get possession of Egypt; which has long been a favourite object with her. If so, every thing looks as if it would be in alliance with the Pope. The intrigues of French Papal missionaries in Syria, Egypt, Abyssinia, are sufficiently known; and have been already adverted to by me in the last Chapter of my 3rd Volume.

<sup>3</sup> There is nothing in the phraseology or construction to forbid this. See the examples alluded to in Note <sup>2</sup> p. 78, of pronouns in the earlier part of the prophecy having reference to other persons, and not those last spoken of. The *constructio ad sensum*, as Prof. Lee calls it, (on Prophecy, p. 181,) has to be followed.

<sup>4</sup> So I believe universally. See Note †† p. 102, just preceding. E. g. Irenæus says of the Antichrist; "*Transferret regnum in Jerusalem:*" as if from Rome to Jerusalem. See for further exemplification Malvenda i. 593; who has there a Chapter on this particular passage.

—And then, and thereupon, as stated in the next Section, comes the fated time of Israel's restoration, with certain other extraordinary events accompanying it. To which we must now next turn.

5. It does not however need that I here enter at all fully or particularly into this fifth and last sectional subdivision of the prophecy before us.<sup>1</sup> Its subject-matter is that which in more than one important point chiefly concerns the Millennium, and consequently rather belongs to our next chapter. Suffice it therefore at present to note *three* points prior to it in time; *two* clearly declared here, the *other* more ambiguously and obscurely. The *first* is, that there will be then (*viz.* at the time when either the Turk “shall

<sup>1</sup> Dan. xii. 1. “And at that time shall Michael \* stand up, the great prince which standeth for the children of thy people: and there shall be a time of trouble, such as never was since there was a nation even to that same time: and at that time thy people shall be delivered, every one that shall be found written in the book. 2. And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt. † 3. And they that be wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament; ‡ and they that turn many to righteousness as the stars for ever and ever. 4. But thou, O Daniel, shut up the words, and seal the book, even to the time of the end. § Many shall run to and fro, and knowledge shall be increased. 5. Then I Daniel looked, and, behold, there stood other two, the one on this side of the bank of the river, and the other on that side of the bank of the river. 6. And one said to the man clothed in linen, which was upon the waters of the river, How long shall it be to the end of these wonders? 7. And I heard the man clothed in linen, which was upon the waters of the river, when he held up his right hand and his left hand unto heaven, and swore by him that liveth for ever that it shall be for a time, times, and an half; || and when he shall have accomplished to scatter the power of the holy people, all these things shall be finished. 8. And I heard, but I understood not. Then said I, O my Lord, what shall be the end of these things? 9. And he said, Go thy way, Daniel: for the words are closed up and sealed till the time of the end. ¶ 10. Many shall be purified, and made white, and tried: \*\* but the wicked shall do wickedly: and none of the wicked shall understand; but the wise shall understand. 11. And from the time that the daily sacrifice shall be taken away, and the (or *an*) abomination that maketh desolate set up, †† there shall be a thousand two hundred and ninety days. 12. Blessed is he that waiteth, and cometh to the thousand three hundred and five and thirty days. 13. But go thy way till the end be: for thou shalt rest, and stand in thy lot at the end of the days.” ‡‡

\* See on Michael my Vol. iii. p. 30, Note <sup>1</sup>.—I see that Wintle, on Dan. x. 13, follows Lightfoot in explaining the Michael of Apoc. xii. 7 as Christ. And so too Venema, pp. 479, 490.

† The question as to the nature of the resurrection meant will be the subject of Ch. iii. next following.

‡ Compare the remarks p. 86 on the same class of persons, as described verse 33 *suprà*. § יָדָעַתְּ, the same expression as in xi. 40.

|| Compare Apoc. x. 6, and my remarks on the passage, Vol. ii. pp. 128—131.

¶ Same as in verse 40.

\*\* See Wintle *ad loc.* Also my remarks Note § p. 87 on xi. 35.

†† שְׁלֹשֵׁים וְשָׁלֹשׁ יָמִים.

‡‡ יָמֵי יְהוֹשֻׁעַ, with the article.



have come to an end, and none help him," or when the last King of the North, or the Roman Antichrist, with the secular power of the King of the South supporting him, shall have overflowed in might into Judæa,) "a season of tribulation such as never was since there was a nation:"—an expression this probably proverbial; but which, from having been used by our Lord in his prophecy of the siege and destruction of the ancient Jerusalem by the Romans, brings the horrors of that siege irresistibly before the mind, as the standard of comparison.—The *second* is, that God's faithful servants then alive, (whether Gentiles, or Jews, or both,<sup>1</sup>) "all that are written in the book," shall (after partaking apparently in the tribulation) be delivered.—As to the *third*, it is one that has reference to the chronology of the consummation: and both from its importance, and the measure of obscurity attending it, is one that needs a fuller explanation.

It was the Angel saying then, we read, that the *wonder*, or *mystery*,<sup>2</sup> should come to an end after a time times and half a time, or 1260 *days*:—also that from the time of the daily sacrifice being taken away, and an abomination making desolate set up, there should be 1290 *days*:—and finally that at the end of 1335 *days* an age of blessedness would begin. Now with regard to these several periods, we may, I conceive, conclude unhesitatingly that they are all three to be measured from one and the same commencing epoch; viz. that stated in verse 11 about the daily sacrifice and abomination that would make desolate.<sup>3</sup> Nor, I think,

<sup>1</sup> So again the question recurs whether Daniel's fellow-countrymen, the Jews, be meant, or the Christian servants of God. This is evident, that if *Jews* it must be converted Jews, having their names written in God's book of life. Compare Apoc. iii. 5, xx. 13. See too Wintle ad loc.

<sup>2</sup> "How long to the end of the wonders?" verse 6; meaning, I conceive, How long from the beginning to the end of the *grand wonder* of the prophecy, viz. that concerning the Apostate King? There was no wonder in what was foretold about the Kings of the North and South.

<sup>3</sup> Mr. Faber in his Sacred Calendar, ii. 137, makes the 1260 and 1290 prophetic days to run parallel with each other for the larger half of their length: counting 1290 days, or years, (which latter he singularly places first,) from the Roman desolation of the Jewish temple, A.D. 70, down to Wicliff, "the morning-star of the Reformation," and when "many began to be purified and made white," A.D. 1360; the 1260 from Phœas' Decree, A.D. 604, down to A.D. 1864. But the 1335 days (in my opinion most inconsistently) he makes to be quite a new period, beginning A.D. 1865, at the end of the 1260. Its inadmissibility seems to me obvious. May he not, however unconsciously, have been led into the idea, with a view to help a

can we well doubt, that the interval between the 1260 and the 1335 days gives us the duration of the great struggle and troubles of the consummation : or that the 1290 days are specified as marking (at *their* expiration) some notable epoch in the course of that “*time of the end.*”<sup>1</sup> As to the question whether these periods are to be reckoned as *years*, on the year-day principle, or simply and literally as *days*, it may be deemed at first sight more doubtful: because this whole prophecy of Dan. xi. xii. is not, like those of Dan. vii. and viii., or of Apoc. xii. xiii., enunciated connectedly with any *individualizing symbolization* of the *ruling powers*, prophesied of: save and except that in verse 36 “*the King*” is the *individualizing appellative* given to *one power*, noted near the conclusion. However, though *this* my primary ground for the enlarged chronological scale of interpretation may less clearly apply, yet the second defined ground for it seems so to apply as to warrant the application, though perhaps with less certainty, of the year-day principle.<sup>2</sup>—Then, as to the epoch from which the periods are to be reckoned, (an epoch marked by the setting up of some desolating abomination,) there is one thing very important to note, though hitherto, I believe, overlooked by expositors,—viz. that the *definite article* is wanting before the word *abomination* in verse 11:<sup>3</sup> so that the correct rendering of the clause would be, “From the time that the daily sacrifice shall be taken away, and *an* abomination that makes desolate set up, there shall be 1290 days.” By this not only is the desolating abomination of xi. 31 (the same that we saw reason to interpret of the Roman armies that desolated Jerusalem under Vespasian) not plainly and specifically referred to, but rather almost<sup>4</sup> *excluded* from being the subject of reference. A

certain millennial theory of his own which I shall have to state in the next chapter?

Jerome, like the mass of modern interpreters, makes both the 30 and the 45 days an addition to the 1260. “Beatus, inquit Daniel, qui, interfecto Antichristo, dies supra numerum præfinitum quadraginta quinque præstolatur. Quare autem post interfectionem Antichristi 45 dierum silentium sit, divinæ scientiæ.”—So too Porphyry.

<sup>1</sup> I am here supposing that the expression is to be construed strictly.

<sup>2</sup> See my Chapter on the year-day, Vol. iii. pp. 262, 264.

<sup>3</sup> The word is דָּרָגָה. Compare Note §§ p. 80, on the word in Dan. xi. 31.—In our translation this omission of the article is unattended to.

<sup>4</sup> I say *almost*, because there is not the same uniform attention to the article in Daniel, I believe, as in the earlier Hebrew: although quite enough for my present

point this of no little consequence; since, if correct, it removes the difficulty, felt by almost every expositor of prophecy, of calculating these prophetic periods from the epoch of the Roman overthrow of Jerusalem: whence measured they conduct to no terminating chronological points, whether on the day-day or the year-day scale,<sup>1</sup> that can at all satisfy the conditions of the prophecy.—What *the abomination making desolate* meant is another question. The ancient fathers, partly no doubt from its stated period being that of Antichrist in Dan. vii., thought that it was Antichrist's desolating abomination that was specially intended; by transition from Antiochus Epiphane's type to the Antichrist's antitype. And, calculating on the *year-day* principle, we cannot but in the first instance think of the setting up of the abomination of the *Papacy* by "the King" of verse 36: that which was the grand wonder or mystery of the prophecy;<sup>2</sup> and whereby, in the *causal* sense, (just as in the case of the *desolating transgression* of Dan. viii. 13,) the mystical Jerusalem might be said to have been desolated, or had desolation brought on it:—an event this of which the *primary* commencing epoch was shown to be about A.D. 530; from which epoch the corresponding period of the 1260 years in Dan. vii. and Apoc. xiii. would also seem *primarily*, as before shown, to be calculated. The circumstance of a period of not 1260 years only, but also one of 1290 years, reckoned from that same commencing epoch, proving in fact to end each at a very remarkable æra in these latter days,—the one that of the French Revolution in 1790, the other of the Greek Insurrection in 1820,—seem, as I shall have again hereafter to observe, to give corroboration of this view: as also the fact of Daniel's full prophetic interval of the 75 years being likewise the interval between the two most notable commencing epochs of the establishment of the Popedom.<sup>3</sup> But we must not forget that the additional 75 years *may* be measured from

argument. Thus I find Prof. Lee arguing, from the absence of the article in Dan. ix. 24, and elsewhere.

<sup>1</sup> See e. g. the notice of Mr. Faber's solution, p. 109, Note<sup>3</sup>.

<sup>2</sup> See Note<sup>2</sup>, p. 109: and compare St. Paul's phrase, "The *mystery* of iniquity," used of the Papal Apostasy in 2 Thess. ii. 7.

<sup>3</sup> See Vol. iii. pp. 299—305, and 447, &c.

the full completion of the 1260 years in 1866, or 1867, as well as from the imperfect in 1789: and, when we revert to the subject, grave reasons will appear for it.<sup>1</sup> Another abomination making desolate (indeed the only other of past times I can think of) was that of *Mahommedism*: by which, as the *causal agent*, alike Christendom and Jerusalem were desolated:<sup>2</sup> and dated from the rise of which the 1260, 1290, and 1335 years would end about 1866, 1896, and 1941, A.D. respectively.—If under the peculiar circumstances of the case it be by any preferred to take the three periods here as periods of *literal days*, they must then, and in that case, be measured from either the last King of the North, or the Papal Antichrist's setting up the abomination of his apostasy in his last desolating invasion of the holy mountain-district of Judah, just a little while since considered:<sup>3</sup> the *literal 1260 days*, with its adjunct periods, supervening in that case as the notable term and limit to the long period of the *mystical 1260 days*; in other words, of the 1260 *years*. A supposition possible, as before said, without violating the principle of the year-day; though I think very far from probable.

As to the very remarkable statement about “many that sleep in the dust of the earth” then awaking, and Daniel himself “standing in his lot at the end of the days,” and the question whether the resurrection meant be literal or figurative,—I shall, as before intimated, here pass it over in silence; reserving its consideration, as for a fitter place, to my next Chapter on the great Millennial question. Before entering on which however, and before bringing the present Chapter and subject to a close, it will be well to take a passing glance at what other prophecies also intimate to us of the circumstances attending the last crisis:—that crisis which is to precede the restoration of the Jews, and constitute the introduction to new times of blessedness; with some kind of resurrection also accompanying the counterpart of this in Daniel.

<sup>1</sup> See my Ch. v. § 1 *infra*.

<sup>2</sup> See the Greek Patriarch's observation, Vol. i. p. 449, on the Caliph Omar's entering the Patriarchal Church of Jerusalem; “The abomination of desolation is in the Holy Place!”

<sup>3</sup> So Jerome on Dan. xii. speaks of Antichrist perishing on the Holy Mount Olivet.



§ 3.—THE CRISIS INTRODUCTORY TO THE JEWISH RESTORATION, AND BLESSEDNESS OF THE CONSUMMATION, AS DESCRIBED BY CERTAIN OTHER PROPHETS.

Of predictions of this kind by other prophets the most circumstantial and illustrative are, perhaps, those by the four prophets Isaiah, Joel, Ezekiel, Zechariah: the two first dating before the Babylonish Captivity, the third during its continuance, the fourth after the Jews' return from it. There is here this advantage, that comparatively little of one kind of ambiguity attaches to them that attaches to much in Daniel's closing prophecy. They are at least in respect of grammar for the most part comparatively clear and simple. I will cite them in the chronological order of their delivery.

1. *Isaiah* xxiv., xxv.—xxiv. 17. "Fear, and the pit, and the snare, are upon thee, O inhabitant of the earth. 18. And it shall come to pass, that he who fleeth from the noise of the fear shall fall into the pit; and he that cometh up out of the midst of the pit shall be taken in the snare: for the windows from on high are open, and the foundations of the earth do shake. 19. The earth is utterly broken down, the earth is clean dissolved, the earth is moved exceedingly. 20. The earth shall reel to and fro like a drunkard, and shall be removed like a cottage; and the transgression thereof shall be heavy upon it; and it shall fall, and not rise again. 21. And it shall come to pass in that day, that the Lord shall punish the host of the high ones that are on high, and the kings of the earth upon the earth. 22. And they shall be gathered together, as prisoners are gathered in the pit, and shall be shut up in the prison, and after many days shall they be visited. 23. Then the moon shall be confounded, and the sun ashamed, when the Lord of hosts shall reign in mount Zion, and in Jerusalem, and before his ancients gloriously."—xxv. 1: "O Lord, thou art my God; I will exalt thee, I will praise thy name; for thou hast done wonderful things; thy counsels of old are faithfulness and truth. 2. For thou hast made of a city an heap; of a defenced city a ruin: a

palace of strangers to be no city; it shall never be built. 3. Therefore shall the strong people glorify thee, the city of the terrible nations shall fear thee. 4. For thou hast been a strength to the poor, a strength to the needy in his distress, a refuge from the storm, a shadow from the heat, when the blast of the terrible ones is as a storm against the wall. . . . 6. And in this mountain shall the Lord of hosts make unto all people a feast of fat things, a feast of wines on the lees, of fat things full of marrow, of wines on the lees well refined. 7. And he will destroy in this mountain the face of the covering cast over all people, and the vail that is spread over all nations. 8. He will swallow up death in victory; and the Lord God will wipe away tears from off all faces; and the rebuke of his people shall he take away from off all the earth: for the Lord hath spoken it. 9. And it shall be said in that day, Lo, this is our God; we have waited for him, and he will save us: this is the Lord; we have waited for him, we will be glad and rejoice in his salvation.”<sup>1</sup>

Also Chap. xxxiv., xxxv.—“1. Come near, ye nations, to hear; and hearken, ye people: let the earth hear, and all that is therein; the world, and all things that come forth of it. 2. For the indignation of the Lord is upon all nations, and his fury upon all their armies: he hath utterly destroyed them, he hath delivered them to the slaughter. 3. Their slain also shall be cast out, and their stink shall come up out of their carcases, and the mountains shall be melted with their blood. 4. And all the host of heaven shall be dissolved, and the heavens shall be rolled together as a scroll: and all their host shall fall down, as the leaf falleth off from the vine, and as a fallen fig from the fig-tree. 5. For my sword shall be bathed in heaven: behold, it shall come down upon Idumea, and upon the people of my curse, to judgment. 6. The sword of the Lord is filled with blood: it is made fat with fatness, and with the blood of lambs and goats, with the fat of the

<sup>1</sup> The song and subject continue onward in the next chapter xxvi.: at verses 18, 19, of which we read; “We have been with child; we have been in pain; we have as it were brought forth wind; we have not wrought any deliverance in the earth, neither have the inhabitants of the world fallen. Thy dead shall live: my dead body they shall arise, &c.”—with reference to some kind of resurrection.

kidneys of rams : for the Lord hath a sacrifice in Bozrah, and a great slaughter in the land of Idumea. 7. And the unicorns shall come down with them, and the bullocks with the bulls ; and their land shall be soaked with blood, and their dust made fat with fatness. 8. For it is the day of the Lord's vengeance, and the year of recompences for the controversy of Zion. 9. And the streams thereof shall be turned into pitch, and the dust thereof into brimstone, and the land thereof shall become burning pitch. 10. It shall not be quenched night nor day ; the smoke thereof shall go up for ever : from generation to generation it shall lie waste ; none shall pass through it for ever and ever. 11. But the cormorant and the bittern shall possess it ; the owl also and the raven shall dwell in it : and he shall stretch out upon it the line of confusion, and the stones of emptiness. 12. They shall call the nobles thereof to the kingdom, but none shall be there ; and all her princes shall be nothing. 13. And thorns shall come up in her palaces, nettles and brambles in the fortresses thereof : and it shall be an habitation of dragons, and a court for owls. 14. The wild beasts of the desert shall also meet with the wild beasts of the island, and the satyr shall cry to his fellow ; the screech owl also shall rest there, and find for herself a place of rest. 15. There shall the great owl make her nest, and lay, and hatch, and gather under her shadow : there shall the vultures also be gathered, every one with her mate. 16. Seek ye out of the book of the Lord, and read : no one of these shall fail, none shall want her mate : for my mouth it hath commanded, and his spirit it hath gathered them. 17. And he hath cast the lot for them, and his hand hath divided it unto them by line : they shall possess it for ever, from generation to generation shall they dwell therein."

" xxxv. 1. The wilderness and the solitary place shall be glad for them ; and the desert shall rejoice, and blossom as the rose. 2. It shall blossom abundantly, and rejoice even with joy and singing : the glory of Lebanon shall be given unto it, the excellency of Carmel and Sharon, they shall see the glory of the Lord, and the excellency of our God. 3. Strengthen ye the weak hands, and confirm the feeble

knees. 4. Say to them that are of a fearful heart, Be strong, fear not: behold, your God will come with vengeance, even God with a recompence; he will come and save you. 5. Then the eyes of the blind shall be opened, and the ears of the deaf shall be unstopped. 6. Then shall the lame man leap as an hart, and the tongue of the dumb sing: for in the wilderness shall waters break out, and streams in the desert. 7. And the parched ground shall become a pool, and the thirsty land springs of water: in the habitation of dragons, where each lay, shall be grass with reeds and rushes. 8. And an highway shall be there, and a way, and it shall be called The way of holiness; the unclean shall not pass over it; but it shall be for those: the wayfaring men, though fools, shall not err therein. 9. No lion shall be there, nor any ravenous beast shall go up thereon; it shall not be found there; but the redeemed shall walk there: 10. And the ransomed of the Lord shall return, and come to Zion with songs and everlasting joy upon their heads: they shall obtain joy and gladness, and sorrow and sighing shall flee away."

Also Chap. lxi. 6. "A voice of noise from the city, a voice from the temple, a voice of the Lord that rendereth recompence to his enemies. 7. Before she travailed she brought forth; before her pain came she was delivered of a man child. 8. Who hath heard such a thing? who hath seen such things? Shall the earth be made to bring forth in one day? or shall a nation be born at once? for as soon as Zion travailed, she brought forth her children. 9. Shall I bring to the birth, and not cause to bring forth? saith the Lord: shall I cause to bring forth, and shut the womb? saith thy God. 10. Rejoice ye with Jerusalem, and be glad with her, all ye that love her: rejoice for joy with her, all ye that mourn for her: 11. That ye may suck, and be satisfied with the breasts of her consolations; that ye may milk out, and be delighted with the abundance of her glory. 12. For thus saith the Lord, Behold, I will extend peace to her like a river, and the glory of the Gentiles like a flowing stream: then shall ye suck, ye shall be borne upon her sides, and be dandled upon her knees. 13. As one whom his mother comforteth,



so will I comfort you ; and ye shall be comforted in Jerusalem. 14. And when ye see this, your heart shall rejoice, and your bones shall flourish like an herb : and the hand of the Lord shall be known toward his servants, and his indignation toward his enemies. 15. For, behold, the Lord will come with fire, and with his chariots like a whirlwind, to render his anger with fury, and his rebuke with flames of fire. 16. For by fire and by his sword will the Lord plead with all flesh : and the slain of the Lord shall be many. 17. They that sanctify themselves, and purify themselves in the gardens behind one tree in the midst, eating swine's flesh, and the abomination, and the mouse, shall be consumed together, saith the Lord. 18. For I know their works and their thoughts : it shall come, that I will gather all nations and tongues ; and they shall come, and see my glory. 19. And I will set a sign among them ; and I will send those that escape of them unto the nations ; to Tarshish, Pul, and Lud, that draw the bow, to Tubal, and Javan, to the isles afar off, that have not heard my fame, neither have seen my glory ; and they shall declare my glory among the Gentiles. 20. And they shall bring all your brethren for an offering unto the Lord out of all nations upon horses, and in chariots, and in litters, and upon mules, and upon swift beasts, to my holy mountain Jerusalem, saith the Lord ; as the children of Israel bring an offering in a clean vessel into the house of the Lord. 21. And I will also take of them for priests and for Levites, saith the Lord. 22. For, as the new heavens and the new earth, which I will make, shall remain before me, saith the Lord, so shall your seed and your name remain. 23. And it shall come to pass, that from one new moon to another, and from one sabbath to another, shall all flesh come to worship before me, saith the Lord. 24. And they shall go forth, and look upon the carcases of the men that have transgressed against me : for their worm shall not die, neither shall their fire be quenched ; and they shall be an abhorring unto all flesh."

2. *Joel* ii. 30.—“ And I will shew wonders in the heavens and in the earth ; blood, and fire, and pillars of

smoke. 31. The sun shall be turned into darkness, and the moon into blood, before the great and the terrible day of the Lord come. 32. And it shall come to pass that whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be delivered: for in mount Zion and in Jerusalem shall be deliverance, as the Lord hath said, and in the remnant whom the Lord shall call.”<sup>1</sup>

iii. 1. “Behold, in those days, and in that time, when I shall bring again the captivity of Judah and Jerusalem, 2. I will also gather all nations, and will bring them down into the valley of Jehoshaphat, and will plead with them there for my people and for my heritage Israel, whom they have scattered among the nations, and parted my land. 3. And they have cast lots for my people: and have given a boy for an harlot, and sold a girl for wine, that they might drink. 4. Yea, and what have ye to do with me, O Tyre, and Zidon, and all the coasts of Palestine? will ye render me a recompense? and if ye recompense me, swiftly and speedily will I return your recompense upon your own head? 5. Because ye have taken my silver and my gold, and have carried into your temples my goodly pleasant things: 6. The children also of Judah and the children of Jerusalem have ye sold unto the Grecians, that ye might remove them far from their border. 7. Behold, I will raise them out of the place whither ye have sold them, and will return your recompence upon your own head: 8. And I will sell your sons and your daughters into the hand of the children of Judah, and they shall sell them to the Sabeans, to a people far off: for the Lord hath spoken it. 9. Proclaim ye this among the Gentiles: Prepare war, wake up the mighty men, let all the men of war draw near; let them come up: 10. Beat your plowshares into swords, and your pruninghooks into spears: let the weak say, I am strong. 11. Assemble yourselves, and come, all ye heathen, and gather yourselves together round about: thither cause thy mighty ones to come down, O Lord. 12. Let the hea-

<sup>1</sup> This passage is referred to by St. Peter (Acts ii. 19); but evidently as being then only a primary accomplishment, as he judged, of a particular part of prophecy: St. Peter expecting that the rest would soon have its accomplishment also, as he supposed the second advent of Christ not to be far off. Compare Acts iii. 19—21; a passage that I shall have to comment on in my next Chapter.

then be awakened, and come up to the valley of Jehoshaphat: for there will I sit to judge all the heathen round about. 13. Put ye in the sickle, for the harvest is ripe: come, get you down; for the press is full, the fats overflow; for their wickedness is great. 14. Multitudes, multitudes, in the valley of decision: for the day of the Lord is near in the valley of decision. 15. The sun and the moon shall be darkened, and the stars shall withdraw their shining. 16. The Lord also shall roar out of Zion, and utter his voice from Jerusalem; and the heavens and the earth shall shake: but the Lord will be the hope of his people, and the strength of the children of Israel. 17. So shall ye know that I am the Lord your God dwelling in Zion, my holy mountain: then shall Jerusalem be holy, and there shall no strangers pass through her any more. 18. And it shall come to pass in that day, that the mountain shall drop down new wine, and the hills shall flow with milk, and all the rivers of Judah shall flow with waters, and a fountain shall come forth of the house of the Lord, and shall water the valley of Shittim. 19. Egypt shall be a desolation, and Edom shall be a desolate wilderness, for the violence against the children of Judah, because they have shed innocent blood in their land. 20. But Judah shall dwell for ever, and Jerusalem from generation to generation. 21. For I will cleanse their blood that I have not cleansed: for the Lord dwelleth in Zion."

3. *Ezekiel* xxxviii., xxxix.<sup>1</sup>—"1. And the word of the Lord came unto me, saying:—2. Son of man, set thy face against Gog, the land of Magog, the chief prince of Meshech and Tubal; [or rather, the chief of Ros, Meshech, and Tubal;<sup>2</sup>] and prophesy against him, 3. and say: 'Thus

<sup>1</sup> Ch. xxxviii. follows Ch. xxxvii., with its vision of the valley of dry bones, indicating the resurrection of the house of Israel.

<sup>2</sup> Heb. גִּי נְשִׂיאֵי מֶשֶׁךְ וְתֻבַל וְרֹס אֲרֻמֵּי מַגּוֹג. In the Septuagint the passage in xxxviii. 2—4 reads thus. γὰρ ἀνθρώπου στήρισον το πρόσωπον σου ἐπὶ Γωγ, καὶ τὴν γῆν του Μαγωγ, ἀρχοντα Ἰως Μεσοχ καὶ Θοβελ, καὶ προφητεύσου ἐπ' αὐτον, καὶ εἶπον αὐτω, Ταδε λεγει Κυριος Κυριος. Ἴδον ἐγω ἐπὶ σε ἀρχοντα Ἰως Μεσοχ καὶ Θοβελ. Καὶ συναξω σε, καὶ πασαν τὴν δύναμιν σου, κ. τ. λ. All this is to happen, it is said in verse 8, ἐπ' ἐσχάτων ἐτών.

Of Magog, Meshech, and Tubal, the following illustrative notice occurs in Gen. x. 2: "Of the sons of Japheth, Gomer and Magog and Javan and Tubal and Meshech:" it being added verse 5; "By these were the isles of the Gentiles divided in their

saith the Lord God, Behold I am against thee, O Gog, the chief of Meshech and Tubal : 4. And I will turn thee back, and put hooks into thy jaws, and I will bring thee forth, and all thine army, horses, and horsemen, all of them clothed with all sorts of armour, even a great company with bucklers and shields, all of them handling swords: 5. Persia, Ethiopia, and Libya with them: all of them with shield and helmet: 6. Gomer, and all his bands, the house of Togarmah of the north quarters, and all his bands; and many people with thee. 7. Be thou prepared, and prepare for thyself, thou, and all thy company that are assembled unto thee, and be thou a guard unto them. 8. After many days thou shalt be visited: in the latter years thou shalt come into the land that is brought back from the sword, and is gathered out of many people, against the mountains of Israel, which have been always waste: but it is brought forth out of the nations, and they shall dwell safely all of them. 9. Thou shalt ascend, and come like a storm; thou shalt be like a cloud to cover the land; thou, and all thy bands, and many people with thee. 10. Thus saith the Lord God; It shall also come to pass, that at the same time shall things come into thy mind, and thou shalt think an evil thought: 11. And thou shalt say, I will go up to the land of unwalled villages; I will go to them that are at rest, that dwell safely: all of them dwelling without walls, and having neither bars nor gates; 12. To take a spoil, and to take a prey; to turn thine hand upon the desolate places that are now inhabited, and upon the people that are gathered out of the nations, which have gotten cattle and goods, that dwell in the midst of the land. 13. Sheba, and Dedan, and the merchants of Tarshish, with all the young

lands." So that the original European stock would seem to have come probably from them; *Javan*, we know, being the chief father of the Greeks. The general idea about *Gog* is that his region of colonization was the Caucasian countries and Seythia: also that *Meshech* and *Tubal* colonized the Slavonic Russian countries; of which the names Moscow and Tobolsk are still memorials. The colonizing progress of *Magog* and *Ros* seems traceable by the name *Maotis*, or *Magogitis*, still attached to the well-known lake north of the Euxine; and by the name *Rosh* affixed by the Arabs to the river Araxes, flowing into the Caspian. See Bush on the Millennium, pp. 159—161.

Of *Gog* and *Magog* Coquæus, ap. Benedictine Editors of Augustine C. D. xx, 11, thus writes: "Eusebius Libro ix. De Demonstrat. Evangel. c. 3, arbitratur Gog esse Romanum imperatorem, Magog Romanum imperium. Ambrosius, Libro 2 De Fide, cap. ult. de *Gothis* cogitat." Augustine, like Ambrose, makes Gog the *Getæ* or *Goths*. Jerome expounds *Ros* as an appellative.



lions thereof, shall say unto thee, Art thou come to take a spoil? hast thou gathered thy company to take a prey? to carry away silver and gold, to take away cattle and goods, to take a great spoil? 14. Therefore, son of man, prophesy and say unto Gog, Thus saith the Lord God; In that day when my people Israel dwelleth safely, shalt thou not know it? 15. And thou shalt come from thy place out of the north parts, thou, and many people with thee, all of them riding upon horses, a great company, and a mighty army: 16. And thou shalt come up against my people of Israel, as a cloud to cover the land: it shall be in the latter days: and I will bring thee against my land, that the heathen may know me, when I shall be sanctified in thee, O Gog, before their eyes. 17. Thus saith the Lord God: Art thou he of whom I have spoken in old time by my servants the prophets of Israel, which prophesied in those days many years that I would bring thee against them? 18. And it shall come to pass at the same time when Gog shall come against the land of Israel, saith the Lord God, that my fury shall come up in my face. 19. For in my jealousy and in the fire of my wrath have I spoken, Surely in that day there shall be a great shaking in the land of Israel: 20. So that the fishes of the sea, and the fowls of the heaven, and the beasts of the field, and all creeping things that creep upon the earth, and all the men that are upon the face of the earth, shall shake at my presence, and the mountains shall be thrown down, and the steep places shall fall, and every wall shall fall to the ground. 21. And I will call for a sword against him throughout all my mountains, saith the Lord God: every man's sword shall be against his brother. 22. And I will plead against him with pestilence and with blood: and I will rain upon him, and upon his bands, and upon the many people that are with him, an overflowing rain, and great hailstones, fire, and brimstone. 23. Thus will I magnify myself, and sanctify myself: and I will be known in the eyes of many nations; and they shall know that I am the Lord.

“ 1. Therefore, thou son of man, prophesy against Gog, and say, Thus saith the Lord God; Behold, I am against thee, O Gog, the chief of Ros, Meshech, and Tubal: 2.

And I will turn thee back, and leave but the sixth part of thee, and will cause thee to come up from the north parts, and will bring thee upon the mountains of Israel: 3. And I will smite thy bow out of thy left hand, and will cause thine arrows to fall out of thy right hand. 4. Thou shalt fall upon the mountains of Israel, thou, and all thy bands, and the people that is with thee: I will give thee unto the ravenous birds of every sort, and to the beasts of the field to be devoured. 5. Thou shalt fall upon the open field: for I have spoken it, saith the Lord God. 6. And I will send a fire on Magog, and among them that dwell carelessly in the isles: and they shall know that I am the Lord. 7. So will I make my holy name known in the midst of my people Israel; and I will not let them pollute my holy name any more: and the heathen shall know that I am the Lord, the Holy One in Israel. 8. Behold, it is come, and it is done, saith the Lord God; this is the day whereof I have spoken. 9. And they that dwell in the cities of Israel shall go forth, and shall set on fire and burn the weapons, both the shields and the bucklers, the bows and the arrows, and the handstaves and the spears, and they shall burn them with fire seven years: 10. So that they shall take no wood out of the field, neither cut down any out of the forests; for they shall burn the weapons with fire: and they shall spoil those that spoiled them, and rob those that robbed them, saith the Lord God. 11. And it shall come to pass in that day, that I will give unto Gog a place there of graves in Israel, the valley of the passengers on the east of the sea: and it shall stop the noses of the passengers: and there shall they bury Gog and all his multitude: and they shall call it 'The valley of Hamon-Gog. 12. And seven months shall the house of Israel be burying of them, that they may cleanse the land. 13. Yea, all the people of the land shall bury them: and it shall be to them a renown the day that I shall be glorified, saith the Lord God. 14. And they shall sever out men of continual employment, passing through the land to bury with the passengers those that remain upon the face of the earth, to cleanse it: after the end of seven months shall they search. 15. And the passengers that pass through the

land, when any seeth a man's bone, then shall he set up a sign by it, till the buriers have buried it in the valley of Hamon-Gog. 16. And also the name of the city shall be Hamonah. Thus shall they cleanse the land. 17. And thou, son of man, thus saith the Lord God; Speak unto every feathered fowl, and to every beast of the field, Assemble yourselves and come; gather yourselves on every side to my sacrifice that I do sacrifice for you, even a great sacrifice upon the mountains of Israel, that ye may eat flesh, and drink blood. 18. Ye shall eat the flesh of the mighty, and drink the blood of the princes of the earth, of rams, of lambs, and of goats, of bullocks, all of them fatlings of Bashan. 19. And ye shall eat fat till ye be full, and drink blood till ye be drunken, of my sacrifice which I have sacrificed for you. 20. Thus ye shall be filled at my table with horses and chariots, with mighty men, and with all men of war, saith the Lord God. 21. And I will set my glory among the heathen, and all the heathen shall see my judgment that I have executed, and my hand that I have laid upon them. 22. So the house of Israel shall know that I am the Lord their God, from that day and forward. 23. And the heathen shall know that the house of Israel went into captivity for their iniquity: because they trespassed against me, therefore hid I my face from them, and gave them into the hand of their enemies: so fell they all by the sword. 24. According to their uncleanness and according to their transgressions have I done unto them, and hid my face from them. 25. Therefore thus saith the Lord God; Now will I bring again the captivity of Jacob, and have mercy upon the whole house of Israel, and will be jealous for my holy name. 26. After that they have borne their shame, and all their trespasses whereby they have trespassed against me, when they dwelt safely in their land, and none made them afraid. 27. When I have brought them again from the people, and gathered them out of their enemies' lands, and am sanctified in them in the sight of many nations; 28. Then shall they know that I am the Lord their God, which caused them to be led into captivity among the heathen: but I have gathered them unto their own land, and have left none of them any

more there. 29. Neither will I hide my face any more from them: for I have poured out my spirit upon the house of Israel, saith the Lord God."

4. *Zechariah* xii.—xiv. "1. The burden of the word of the Lord for Israel, saith the Lord, which stretcheth forth the heavens, and layeth the foundation of the earth, and formeth the spirit of man within him. 2. Behold, I will make Jerusalem a cup of trembling unto all the people round about, when they shall be in the siege both against Judah and against Jerusalem. 3. And in that day will I make Jerusalem a burdensome stone for all people: all that burden themselves with it shall be cut in pieces, though all the people of the earth be gathered together against it. 4. In that day, saith the Lord, I will smite every horse with astonishment, and his rider with madness; and I will open mine eyes upon the house of Judah. . . . 9. And it shall come to pass in that day, that I will seek to destroy all the nations that come against Jerusalem. 10. And I will pour upon the house of David, and upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the spirit of grace and of supplications: and they shall look upon me whom they have pierced, and they shall mourn for him, as one mourneth for his only son, and shall be in bitterness for him, as one that is in bitterness for his firstborn. 11. In that day shall there be a great mourning in Jerusalem, as the mourning of Hadadrimmon in the valley of Megiddon. 12. And the land shall mourn, every family apart: the family of the house of David apart, and their wives apart; the family of the house of Nathan apart, and their wives apart; 13. The family of the house of Levi apart, and their wives apart; the family of Shimei apart, and their wives apart; 14. All the families that remain, every family apart, and their wives apart."

xiii. 1. "In that day there shall be a fountain opened to the house of David, and to the inhabitants of Jerusalem, for sin and for uncleanness. 2. And it shall come to pass in that day, saith the Lord of hosts, that I will cut off the names of the idols out of the land, and they shall no more be remembered: and also I will cause the prophets and the unclean spirit to pass out of the land." . . . xiv. 2. "For I



will gather all nations against Jerusalem to battle : and the city shall be taken ; . . . and half the city shall go forth into captivity, and the residue of the people shall not be cut off from the city. 3. Then shall the Lord go forth, and fight against those nations. . . . 4. And his feet shall stand in that day upon the Mount of Olives : . . and the Mount of Olives shall cleave in the midst thereof toward the East and toward the West, and there shall be a very great valley ; and half of the mountain shall remove toward the North, and half of it toward the South. 5. And ye shall flee to the valley of the mountains ; for the valley of the mountains shall reach unto Azal : yea, ye shall flee like as ye fled from before the earthquake in the days of Uzziah king of Judah : and the Lord my God shall come, and all the saints with thee. . . 8. And in that day living waters shall go forth from Jerusalem : . . 9. And the Lord shall be King over all the earth.”

In summing up and comparing these several prophecies, the first conclusion that we are I think irresistibly led to respecting them, is that one and all refer to the same great crisis of the consummation :—that which is to be marked by the apostate nations’ last conflict against God’s cause and people ; and to end in the Jubilean blessedness of a regenerated world. As to particulars, we must turn to each prophet separately.

1. And, 1st, in *Isaiah’s* various prophecies, besides the general repeated notices of the gathering against God’s people and destruction of the Gentile nations, just as in the Apocalyptic war of Armageddon, we have to mark that it is especially on *Edom* that one grand part of the curse is described as falling ; whether the *literal* Edom, or some enemy of Christ *figuratively* designated under that name : also that that judgment is to be one by fire and by the sword ; not without a tremendous earthquake accompanying : the fire being that which is to go up for ever ; and the desolation of whatsoever of the territory is not destroyed by the fire and smoke and sulphur to be a perpetual desolation, the land being habitable only by wild beasts, like that of the ancient Babylon at the present day :—also

that there is to be attendant on this some mighty revolution, involving the dissolution of all the then ruling powers and systems of government both religious and political; much like that of the old Roman Pagan religion and empire, as figured in the vision of the sixth Apocalyptic Seal. Once more there will be marked what is said of the glory of the divine revelation immediately after following, and the Lord Jehovah's reigning thenceforth in Zion *before his ancients* gloriously; together with some such *resurrection of the dead* synchronically, as to constitute a swallowing up of death in victory: the creation of a new heaven and new earth following; whereof they that participate will go forth and look on the carcases of them that have fallen, whose worm dieth not, nor is their fire quenched, and who are to be an abhorring unto all flesh.—As to the real intent of the *Edom* mentioned, it can scarce be supposed different from that meant by Bozrah (which was Edom's capital) in the parallel prophecy in Isaiah lxiii. 1—6; where its destruction is spoken of under the figure of a winepress-treading by the conquering Messiah. And both the Apocalyptic evidence of the subjects of the final winepress-treading by Christ being specially the apostate nations allied with the Roman Antichrist, and the uniform testimony of Jewish opinion as to the Edom of Isaiah's prophecy meaning Rome, unite to fix us in *that* view of it. Whether the *Zion* meant be the literal *Jewish Zion*, or figuratively the *Christian Church*, is another question. But the two views of it are in no wise antagonistic, and may well be both included. For, in case of the Jews' conversion and restoration to their father-land,—a fact clearly declared, I think, in Is. xi. 11 and elsewhere,—the earthly *Zion* would be the metropolis of the millennial Christian Church.

2. In *Joel* we have to mark the name of the scene of conflict, viz. the *Valley of Jehoshaphat*: a figurative name evidently, as no such literal locality was known in ancient Palestine; and which means the valley of God's judgment. We have to mark also that God's judgments are here noted under the Apocalyptic figures of the *harvest* and *vintage* of the earth: and further that among the subjects of it are specified Tyre, Sidon, Egypt, Edom; the

two latter of which are specially singled out as destined to desolation. As to the question about *Zion*, it seems here to be answered, to the extent of the Jews *literally* and *nationally* having a part at least in the deliverance and the restoration. For the gathering of the nations is represented as occurring on "the bringing back of the *captivity* of Judah and Jerusalem:" a description inapplicable surely to the Christian Church.

3. In *Ezekiel* the fact seems clearly confirmed of the *literal* return at this time of the *Jewish people*. Also the conjecture is suggested by his prediction that the King of the North who is to be prominent in the last great conflict against Messiah, having come up from the North like a tempest-cloud with chariots and horses, may very possibly be the *Russian* power: the terms *Ros*, *Meshech*, *Tubal* answering too well to *Russ*, *Moscow*, *Tobolsk*, not to suggest a thought to this effect. Connected with which is the fact that two of the peoples that Daniel hints at as those that would be probably at the last *Northern King's* steps, (though the pronominal ambiguity of the passage admits of the alternative exposition referring it to the steps of the *Anti-christ*, in confederacy with the last *King of the South*,<sup>1</sup>) viz. Ethiopia and Libya, are mentioned here as those that would be allied with the *Ros* or *Gog* invading. The scene of the great conflict, and of the defeat of the enemy, is said to be *the mountains of Israel*. And, as to the mode and instruments of destruction, we read that there is to be the judgment of pestilence and of the sword, as well as of hail-stones: also (a new feature this) that they are to perish in part by mutual destruction; much as in the case of Midian before Gideon, where every man's hand was against his brother. To the field of slaughter the fowls of heaven are called, just as in the Apocalypse: and an awful idea given of the slaughter by the statement that for seven years the restored Jews will be occupied in burying the dead, and burning the spears and arrows of the foe.—Further, there is the remarkable fact foretold of a judgment of *fire* falling synchronically on *Magog* and them that dwell carelessly (or confidently) in the isles, i. e. in the coasts of the Mediterranean

<sup>1</sup> See p. 107. Daniel's *Egypt* probably included *Ethiopia*.

and Western Europe: also, and finally, that, after looking upon the conflict, the heathen not engaged therein will recognise God's hand in the judgment, and thenceforward praise and serve him; "God setting forth his glory among the heathen."<sup>1</sup>

4. From *Zeehariah's* prophecy we infer that the anti-christian enemies will form the siege of Jerusalem, after its being possest and inhabited by Jews of the national stock, now resettled in their native land and city: and that it will be at first taken by the besiegers, and half of the Jews go into captivity: also that there is to be then some such supernatural interposition as in Apoc. xix. 11; ("The Lord my God shall come, and *all his saints with him*;" ) and that in the destruction of the enemy ensuing there is to be both a mutual slaughter by the swords one of another, and the agency also of pestilence. Further, it would seem that there is to be then a great earthquake accompanying; whence, besides its other effects, there is to result a change in the visible localities of Jerusalem itself and Mount Olivet: and that then, and thenceforth, the times of holiness and happiness are to begin. "The Lord will be King over all the earth, and his name one: and those that are left of all the nations which came up against Jerusalem shall go up continually to keep the feast of tabernacles:"—Jerusalem being thus apparently the centre and capital of a Christianized world.

In fine all seems sufficiently to agree with what we have inferred as probable from the Apocalyptic prophecy, and (though with more of uncertainty and doubt) from Daniel's also; to the effect that there is to be the destruction of some grand anti-christian confederacy in the mountain-country very probably of Judah, with fearful physical convulsions attending, and the agency of fire and sword, immediately at, or before, the final conversion and restoration of the

<sup>1</sup> In comparing this prediction in Ezekiel with that in Apoc. xx. about Gog, the difference will strike the least observant, that the one is an event pre-millennial, the other post-millennial: also that whereas in what Ezekiel describes, hailstones were to be one agency of destruction, in the Apocalyptic it would be fire from heaven alone: also that while in the former case a sixth part were to escape (Ezek. xxxix. 2), in the case described in the Apocalypse there would escape not one.



Jews, and the commencement of the consequent glorious predicted times of universal blessedness. So that, as it seems to me, we shall probably not err in looking for the nearly coincident occurrence of the two grand events following:—viz. 1st, the homeward return of the Jews from their dispersions; in fulness and strength like as when the mighty Euphratean stream, on the willows of whose banks the harps of their earlier captivity were suspended, was each day forced backward by the mightier influence of the tide of the Southern Ocean:<sup>1</sup> 2. the gathering, and the destruction, probably in Judæa, of some great anti-Christian as well as anti-Jewish confederacy, including the powers of both the Roman and the Greek apostasies; the spirit of infidelity giving of course its meet assistance to those of antichristian priestcraft and Popery.—Thus, as already before against evangelic doctrine and evangelic missions generally, so now in fine perhaps against the evangelization of the Jews specially, and their restoration to the land of their fathers, it might seem as if there is to be the last and fiercest outbreak of these spirits of evil.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Psalm cxxvi. 4: "Turn our captivity, O Lord, *as the rivers in the south.*"

Surely what I have hinted above is the meaning of this beautiful figure. The idea of streams dried up in the southern desert flowing again (of course in their old channels) on the rains commencing,—an idea suggested by Lowth, Horne, and other commentators in explanation,—ill suits the main point that the figure is evidently meant to illustrate, viz. the *turning back again* of the Jewish captivity.—Nor, though far better, does the explanation of the great Lord Bacon, in his metrical version of the Psalm, seem sufficient.

"O Lord, turn our captivity,  
As winds that blow at south  
Do pour the tides, with violence  
Into the river's mouth."

For rare indeed must be opposing winds of such force as *of themselves*, to turn back a river's current. And the Psalmist's reference seems to be to an occurrence obvious and constant.

On the other hand what I suggest is a figure perfectly correspondent with the thing figured; and one which to the captive Jews in Babylon must have occurred as a figure equally appropriate and grand. For the force of the tide on the river, coming up as it did as far as Bussorah, must have been familiar to their minds: and have appeared to them fully as striking as it did to the Macedonian soldiers of Alexander, when first brought from the tideless coast of the Mediterranean, to see the ocean tides of the Persian Gulf, or of the Indian Sea.

<sup>2</sup> I put the case *somewhat* doubtfully as regards the Jews, nationally considered; though, as will appear yet further in the sequel, decidedly inclining myself to the idea of their national restoration, and the conflict connected with it, being included in the Scripture prophetic sketch of the future. As regards the final deadly war of the antichristian powers with Christ's spiritual Israel, under the present dispensation, there seems to me no doubt of its being a prominent fact in the predicted close of the great mundane drama.

## CHAPTER III.

## THE MILLENNIUM.

“AND I saw an angel coming down<sup>1</sup> from heaven, having the key of the bottomless pit,<sup>2</sup> and a great chain in his hand. And he laid hold on the Dragon, that old serpent, which is the devil and Satan, and bound him a thousand years; and cast him into the bottomless pit, and shut him up, and set a seal upon him, that he should deceive the nations<sup>3</sup> no more, till the thousand years should be fulfilled. And after that he must be loosed a little season.—And I saw thrones;<sup>4</sup> and they sate upon them; and judgment was given unto them: and *I saw* the souls of them that had been beheaded<sup>5</sup> for the witness of Jesus, and for the word of God; and whosoever<sup>6</sup> had not worshipped the beast, neither his image, neither had received his mark upon their forehead, or on their hand: and they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years. But the rest of the dead lived not<sup>7</sup> until the thousand years were finished. This is the first resurrection. Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection: on such the second death hath no power: but they shall be priests of God and of Christ, and shall reign<sup>8</sup> with him a thousand years.

“And when the thousand years are expired, Satan shall be loosed out of his prison: and shall go out to deceive the nations which are in the four quarters of the earth, Gog and Magog, to gather them together to war;<sup>9</sup> the num-

<sup>1</sup> καταβαινοντα.

<sup>2</sup> της αβυσσου. the same word that was used before in Apoc. ix. 1, xi. 7, xvii. 8. See my Vol. i. pp. 440, 441.

<sup>3</sup> τα εθνη.

<sup>4</sup> So the Greek; θρονους, without the article.

<sup>5</sup> των πεπελεκισμενων.

<sup>6</sup> Οιτινες: either *those whosoever*; *those* being the accusative after *I saw*;—or, *of those whosoever*; *of those* being the genitive after ψυχας.

<sup>7</sup> The reading of the received text is ανεζησαν, *lived again*. But the reading in A, B, adopted by Griesbach, Scholz, Tregelles, Wordsworth, is εζησαν; the same word as in verse 4. In Apoc. ii. 8 this latter word is used of Christ's resurrection; 'Ος εγενετο νεκρος και εζησε.

<sup>8</sup> βασιλευσουσι. So Scholz and Tregelles, agreeably with the received text. Wordsworth, after the MS. A, reads βασιλευουσι in the present tense.

<sup>9</sup> εις τον πολεμον: as if *to the war*. So A, B, and the critical Editions of Scholz, Tregelles, and Wordsworth. Griesbach, in common with the received version, omits the τον.

ber of whom is as the sand of the sea. And they went up on the breadth of the earth, and encompassed the camp of the saints about, and the beloved city. And fire came down from God out of heaven, and devoured them. And the devil that deceived them was cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, where the beast and the false prophet *are*; <sup>1</sup> and they shall be tormented day and night for ever and ever.<sup>2</sup>

“And I saw a great white throne, and him that sate upon it; from whose face the earth and the heaven fled away, and there was found no place for them. And I saw the dead, small and great, standing before the throne: <sup>3</sup> and books were opened: and another book was opened, which is the book of life: and the dead were judged out of those things which were written in the books, according to their works. And the sea gave up the dead which were in it. And death and hades gave up the dead which were in them: and they were judged every man according to their works. And death and hades were cast into the lake of fire. This is the second death.<sup>4</sup> And whosoever was not found written in the book of life was cast into the lake of fire.

“And I saw a new heaven and a new earth: for the first heaven and the first earth had past away; <sup>5</sup> and there was no more sea.”—Apoc. xx. 1—xxi. 1.

We now enter on the great subject of the MILLENNIUM. In the Apocalyptic revelations, the vision of the Beast and False Prophet being cast into the lake of fire was followed by that of the binding of the Dragon, now again explained to be the old Serpent, the Devil, and Satan,<sup>6</sup> (the same that from the beginning even to the end had been the

<sup>1</sup> This verb is not in the original.

<sup>2</sup> εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰῶνων: the same strong phrase of time as in Apoc. xix. 4 of the smoke of the fire of Babylon.

<sup>3</sup> ἐν ὧπιον τοῦ θρόνου. So A, B, and the critical Editions generally; instead of Θεοῦ in the received text.

<sup>4</sup> A, B, and after them Scholz, Tregelles, and Wordsworth, read more fully thus: οὗτος ὁ θάνατος ὁ δευτέρος ἐστίν, ἡ λίμνη τοῦ πυρός. Griesbach and Mill omit the last four words.

<sup>5</sup> ἀπηλθον. So A, B, and the critical Editions of Griesbach, Scholz, Tregelles, Wordsworth. The received text reads παρηλθε. In either case the aorist form of the verb is adopted; but in the sense of the *pluperfect*, “had past away.” So ἀπηλθεν, verse 4.

<sup>6</sup> See my Vol. iii. p. 13, Note<sup>2</sup>, on the same phrase, as used in Apoc. xii. 9.

Spirit ruling in the hearts and the politics of the children of disobedience,) by an Angel that descended from heaven, and shut and sealed him up in the bottomless pit, or abyss, for 1000 years; so as that he might during that time have no more power to deceive the nations:—it being added, however, that he would afterwards be loosed for a little season. On the other hand thrones of judgment and royalty appeared set in the vision, whereon Christ and his saints were seen to take their sitting: it being the privilege of these latter to live and reign with Him the thousand years.<sup>1</sup> St. John specifies particularly, as if conspicuous among them,<sup>2</sup> the souls of them that had been beheaded for the word of God and the witnessing of Jesus; evidently the same individuals that he had beheld gathered under the altar, in a symbolic vision long antecedent, the victims of the persecutions of Rome Pagan;<sup>3</sup> and others also, who-

<sup>1</sup> That is, plainly, *the same* thousand years. The article prefixed four times to that phrase, (viz. in verses 3, 4, 5, and 7,) after its first mention as the term of Satan's binding in verse 2, identifies the period. So Pareus justly observes, p. 506; in answer to Brightman's theory of the saints' millennium of reigning being one that would follow after Satan's millennium of incarceration; a view advocated also by Bengel.

<sup>2</sup> It seems to me that the souls of them that were beheaded, &c., were seen, not as the only persons that took seat on the thrones, but only among them. This is a point important to note; as a contrary view of the intent of the phrase has by some been supposed, and argued from.

Assuredly there is nothing in the text to negative my idea. For, 1st, it is not unusual, either in common or in prophetic narrative, to specify but part only of objects that may have been seen. So, for example, in John xx. 18, where Mary Magdalene only mentions having seen *Jesus*, though she had actually seen *two angels* also. Or, to exemplify from this present Chapter, in the very verse under consideration *Christ* is not specified as seen enthroned, though he must surely have been there; as verse 4 states it was with him that the risen saints reigned. And, indeed, his presence is afterwards expressly notified, on the not improbable hypothesis of the time of the great white throne of verse 11 being synchronic with that of the saints' thrones in verse 4.\* Further, 2ndly, we know from abundance of other Scriptures, as Dan. vii. 22, Apoc. iii. 21, v. 10, &c., that *the saints generally* are to be admitted to a participation in Christ's millenary throne and reign.

<sup>3</sup> Πεπελεκισμένων, a verb derived from πελεκυς, an axe; which, together with the *fascēs*, was conspicuous in the insignia of the consuls and other officers of the Roman Government, and signified their having authority to punish with death.† Hence the passive verb came to signify being put to death by sentence of him to whom the power of the axe belonged, whatever the mode of execution; and not the mere particular death of decapitation.‡ So Vitranga.

\* Of this more hereafter.—On the usual hypothesis of the first placing of the great white throne being post-millennial there occurs the example in point of *the dead* only being specified as those seen by John standing before it before judgment, though we know there must have been present also those alive at the time.

† So Polybius, i. 7, &c.; cited by Eichhorn ad loc. μαστιγωσαντες απαντας κατα το παρ' αυτους εθος επελεκισαν.

‡ Similarly Tertullian (Apolog. 5) uses the phrase "Cæsariano gladio ferocisse"



soever had not worshipped, and did not at the time of the judgment worship,<sup>1</sup> the Beast or his Image.—In order thus to reign with Christ they *rose to life again*: whereas “the rest of the dead lived not till the thousand years were finished.” This was the *first resurrection*. “Blessed and holy,” it was said, “is he that hath part in the first resurrection; on such the second death hath no power: but they shall be priests of God and of Christ; and shall reign with him a thousand years.”

And here the famous question opens, In what way are we to understand this vision and prophecy of the Millennium? What the *first resurrection* spoken of, literal or figurative? Who the persons that partake of it? What the nature of the devil’s synchronous binding and incarceration? What the state of things on earth corresponding? What the chronological position and duration of the Millennium? What the sequel of events, on the devil’s being loosed again at its termination? Finally, what the relation of this millemary period and its blessedness to the New Jerusalem, afterwards exhibited in the Apocalypse; and what also to the paradisiacal state predicted in the Old Testament prophecies, as to be introduced on the Jews’ conversion and restoration?—I propose in the present chapter to discuss and answer the general question, *What the first resurrection*, with which the Millennium is to open: then in the next to consider more in detail, upon the principle of interpretation thus previously established, the probable *order of events introductory* to its establishment, and *state of things during the Millennium, and after it.*<sup>2</sup>

Under the emperors, as I have elsewhere observed, *the sword* came to be the ensign of this judicial power, in place of *the axe*; (see my Vol. i. pp. 154—158;) though not indeed to the supersession of the *axe*. For this was still used as an instrument of punishment at Rome; for those I presume that were condemned by the *consular* and other inferior courts, distinctively from the *imperial*. Thus we read in Dion Cassius that Caracalla found fault with the executioner of Papinian, *ὅτι ἀξίνῃ αὐτὸν καὶ οὐ ξίφει δέχρησατο*.

<sup>1</sup> *οἵτινες οὐ προσεκυνήσαν*. Mark here the use of the first aorist; and its possible comprehensive significancy of time past, as reaching continuously to time present, so as expressed by me in the text. So *εβασανισαν* is used in Apoc. xi. 10.

<sup>2</sup> In finally revising this Chapter, I have had the advantage of comparing its statements and arguments with those urged in certain more or less elaborate Treatises against the premillennial view, published subsequently to my 1st Edition; especially

of Nero’s persecution of Christians to death, generally; though in many cases their death was by fire, wild beasts, or crucifixion.

## § 1. THE CHIEF MILLENNARY THEORIES.

With regard then to our present subject,—viz. THE MILLENNIAL FIRST RESURRECTION,—it is to be observed that there have been *four* principal solutions offered of it, to which yet a *fifth* has been recently added, in brief as follows.

The *first*,—which was that of the earliest Fathers of the Church, as Papias, Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Tertullian, and other Fathers, a little later, of the third century, as Hippolytus, Cyprian, Victorinus, Methodius, Lactantius, &c.,—explained this *resurrection* to be *literally* that of departed martyrs and saints, then at length resuscitated in the body from death and the grave:<sup>1</sup>—its *time* (agreeably with the order of the vision in the Apocalyptic narrative) to synchronize with, or follow instantly after, the destruction of the Beast Antichrist, on Christ's personal second advent:—the *binding of Satan* to be an absolute restriction of the powers of hell from tempting, deceiving, or injuring mankind, throughout a literal period of 1000 years, thence calculated:—the *government of the earth*,<sup>2</sup> in this its millennial age, to be administered by Christ and his risen saints; the latter being now *ισαγγελοι*, in nature like angels:<sup>3</sup>—

that by the Rev. D. Brown, and that by Mr. (now Bishop) Waldegrave, in his Bampton Lectures; as well as with the earlier anti-premillennial Treatise of the late Mr. Gips. More especially the first mentioned of these several Treatises has had my best attention, as being particularly able and elaborate. I shall refer from time to time to one or other of them, as I proceed.

<sup>1</sup> Of the earlier Fathers let me cite Justin Martyr and Tertullian, as about the fittest exponents of the general view entertained by this class of patristic expositors. 1. *Justin Martyr*. Εγω δε, και ει τινες εισιν ορθογνωμονες κατα παντα Χριστιανοι, και σαρκος αναστασιν γενησεσθαι επισταμεθα, και χιλια ετη εν 'Ιερουσαλημ οικοδομηθειςη και κοσμηθειςη και πλατυνθειςη. [ως] οι προφηται Ιεζηκιηλ και 'Ησαιας και οι αλλοι ομολογουσι. So in the Dial. cum Tryph. (Ed. Colon.) p. 307. And again, ib. p. 309. Ανηρ τις ω νομα Ιωαννης, εις των αποστολων τον Χριστου, εν Αποκαλυψει γενομενη αυτη, χιλια ετη ποιησει εν 'Ιερουσαλημ τους τω ημετερω Χριστω πιστευσαντας προεφητευσε και μετα ταυτα την καθολικην και συνελοντι φαναι, αιωνιαν ομοθυμαδον υμα παντων αναστασιν γενησεσθαι και κρουν. Moreover he speaks of this as the *παλιγγενεσια* of those that expect Christ in Jerusalem.—2. *Tertullian*. “Nam et confitemur in terrâ nobis regnum repromissum: sed ante cælum; sed alio statu; utpote post resurrectionem in mille annos in civitate divini operis Hierusalem cælo delatâ, quam et Apostolus matrem nostram sursum designat, &c. . . Post cujus regni celestis mille annos, intrâ quam ætatem concluditur sanctorum resurrectio, pro meritis maturius vel tardius resurgentium, tunc, et mundi destructione et judicii conflagratione commissâ, demutati in atomo in angelicam substantiam, . . transferemur in cæleste regnum.” Adv. Marcion, iii. 25.

<sup>2</sup> The world to come, η *οικουμενη η μελλουσα*, of Heb. ii. 5.

<sup>3</sup> Luke xx. 36; “but are as the angels, . . being children of the resurrection.”

and that under it, all false religion having been put down, the Jews and saved remnant of the Gentiles been converted to Christ, the earth renovated by the fire of Antichrist's destruction, and Jerusalem made the universal capital, there would be a realization on earth of the blessedness depicted in the Old Testament prophecies, as well as of that too which was associated with the descent of the New Jerusalem in the visions of the Apocalypse: <sup>1</sup>—until at length, this Millennium having ended, and Satan again gone forth to deceive the nations, the final consummation would follow; the new-raised enemies of the saints, Gog and Magog, be destroyed by fire from heaven; and then the general resurrection and judgment take place, the Devil and his servants be cast into the lake of fire, and the millennial reign of the saints extend itself into one of eternal duration.<sup>2</sup>

The *second* chief theory of interpretation,—one suggested in the Christian Church ere the end of the fourth cen-

The angelic nature of the risen saints in the Millennium is clearly stated by some of these Fathers. So *Tertullian* Adv. Marcion v. 38, and De Resur. c. 36; "Similes enim erunt angelis, qua non nupturi:" also *Justin Martyr*, ubi supra: who, like Tertullian, expressly quotes Christ's saying, Luke xx. 36, declaring that the just, when raised, should neither marry nor be given in marriage, but be *ισαγγελοι*, like angels: also, again, *Methodius*:—*Ἐσομένης γὰρ καὶ μετὰ τούτου τοῦ αἰῶνα γῆς ἀνάγκη πᾶσα εἶσθαι καὶ τοὺς οἰκησούτας· οὐκετι τεθνήξομενους καὶ γαμήσουτας καὶ γεννησομένους, ἀλλ' ὡς ἀγγέλους ἀμεταστροφῶς ἐν ἀφθαρσίᾳ ταῦτα πάντα πράξουτας.* So, too, similarly, *Irenæus*, ii. 62; *Cyprian* ad Fortunat. 12; and *Lactantius*, vii. 6. From the last-mentioned Father let me cite. "Ut, similes angelis effecti, summo Patri ac Domino in perpetuum serviamus, et simus æternum Deo regnum:" and again ib. 24; where he thus distinguishes between the raised saints, and men still living in the body; "Tum qui erunt in corporibus vivi non morientur, sed per eosdem mille annos infinitam multitudinem generabunt: . . qui autem ab inferis suscitabuntur ii præerunt viventibus, velut iudices."

The reader should carefully observe this, as quite different representations have sometimes been given of the early Fathers' views of the millennarian state: Dr. Whitby actually saying that "Methodius is the only one who denies that they shall be thus employed after the resurrection." He strangely mistakes what was said of *men still alive* on the earth, as if said of *the saints raised*; though so expressly distinguished, as e. g. by Lactantius.

<sup>1</sup> So most of the Fathers I speak of: e. g. Tertullian and Justin Martyr, as above cited. Lactantius however seems to make the New Jerusalem state *post-millennial*, vii. 24; though the passage is by no means clear and decisive.

<sup>2</sup> So, for example, *Justin Martyr* expressly. Speaking of the filthy garments on the High Priest Joshua in Zechariah's vision, as not unfitly depicting the blasphemies heaped on Christians by the Jews, he adds: *ἀ ῥύπανα ἐνδύματα, περιτεθέντα ἰφ' ἡμῶν πᾶσι τοῖς ἀπο τοῦ ὀνόματος Ἰησοῦ γενομένοις Χριστιανοῖς, δεῖξει αἴρομενα ἀφ' ἡμῶν ὁ Θεός, ὅταν πάντας ἀναστήσῃ, καὶ τοὺς μὲν ἐν αἰῶνι καὶ ἀλυτῷ βασιλείᾳ ἀφάρτους καὶ ἀθανάτους καὶ ἀλυπούς καταστήσῃ, τοὺς δὲ εἰς κόλασιν αἰώνιον πύρος παραπιψῇ.* Ib. 345.—"*Irenæus* too, v. 32, speaks of the mystery "justorum resurrectionis et regni" as "*principium incorruptelæ*:" and

tury,<sup>1</sup> very much in consequence of the abuse and misapprehension of the literal views just detailed, as if of carnal tendency,<sup>2</sup> and which is best known from its full development by Augustine,—may be called the *spiritual* theory. It supposed the resurrection meant to be that of dead souls from the death of sin to the life of righteousness:<sup>3</sup>—that the *time* of its commencement was to be dated from Christ's first coming and ministry, when the Devil, the strong man armed, was according to Christ's own saying bound and expelled from the hearts of his disciples,<sup>4</sup> and so their reign over him, though indeed but a *regnum militiæ*,<sup>5</sup> made to

again, v. 26, says; "Christus est lapis . . . qui destruet temporalia regna, et æternum inducet, quæ est justorum resurrectio." And so again *Lactantius*, quoted p. 135. Also *Victorinus*.

<sup>1</sup> Already in the *third* century *Origen*, and others of his school, had controverted the literal millenary view; but they do not seem to have suggested any counter-view in its place, that gained hold in any degree of the mind of Christendom. Rather the course with them mostly was to throw doubt on the apostolic origin of the Apocalypse, which seemed to favour the literal view. So in the case of *Dionysius of Alexandria*, of whom I have spoken in my Preliminary Essay, Vol. i. pp. 3—7; also of *Eusebius*, whose opinion I have noticed *ibid.* p. 28. In his view of the jubilean times predicted by the Old Testament prophets, which we generally associate and identify with those of the Apocalyptic Millennium, the latter was naturally influenced to an immense extent by the Christianization of the Roman world under Constantine. See my Vol. i. pp. 255, 256.

As regards *Origen* himself, he opposed the *literal* view as Judaic: and spoke mysteriously of some millennium of converse with angels; οἱ γὰρ ἐξ ἀνθρώπων εἰς ἀγγέλους μεταστάντες χιλία ἐτη μαθητεύονται ὑπο τῶν ἀγγέλων. De Princip. ii. 11. 6; (cited by Gieseler i. § 61; and *ib.* 12. But I am not aware of any millenary system worked out by that Father.

*Epiphanius* says; "There is indeed a millennium mentioned by St. John: but the majority of pious men look on these words as true indeed, but to be taken in a spiritual sense." Τὴν Βιβλίον ἀναγιγνωσκόντες οἱ πλείστοι καὶ ἐνλαβείας, περὶ τῶν πνευματικῶν εἰδοτές, καὶ ἐν αὐτῇ πνευματικῶς ἐχόντα λαμβανόντες, ἀληθῆ μὲν ὄντα, ἐν βαθυτητι δὲ σαφηνιζόμενα πεπιστευκασίν. Her. lxxvii. 26. ap. Whitby.

<sup>2</sup> *Augustine* tells us that he was himself induced by reasons of this kind to abandon the older chiliastic theory, and embrace this other. "Quæ opinio [viz. that of the literal and corporeal primary resurrection of the saints at Christ's coming, to the enjoyment of a millennial sabbath] esset utemque tolerabilis, si aliquæ deliciae spirituales in illo sabbato adfuturæ sanctis per Domini præsentiam crederentur. Nam etiam nos hoc opinati fuimus aliquando. Sed cum eos qui tunc resurrexerint dicant immoderatissimis carnalibus epulis vacaturos, &c., . . . nullo modo ista possunt nisi à carnalibus credi." C. D. xx. 7. 1. A strange conclusion, surely!—that because some perverted the doctrine to carnal views, (as the heretic Cerinthus very early, and others after him,) therefore it should be rejected: though Augustine knew that the earlier Fathers had quite otherwise held it; and indeed himself too, at one time, as we find it expressed in his 259th Sermon: "Regnabit enim Dominus in terrâ cum sanctis suis, sicut dicunt Scripturæ; et habebit hic Ecclesiam separatam atque purgatam ab omni contagione nequitie," &c.

<sup>3</sup> C. D. xx. 6. 1.

<sup>4</sup> C. D. xx. 7. 2.

<sup>5</sup> C. D. xx. 9. 2.—Augustine's *regnum militiæ* may remind my readers of those beautiful lines of our spiritual poet Cowper;

His warfare is within: there unfatigued  
His fervent spirit labours: there he fights,



begin; *the Beast* conquered by them meaning here the wicked world, and *its image* a hypocritical profession: <sup>1</sup>—that it was a resurrection, moreover, not then completed, but one which would still go on wherever the gospel was preached; its subjects being *the election of God*, (so the *nations* or *ἔθνη* of verse 3, whom Satan might not deceive, were explained,<sup>2</sup>) and its term of continuance all that remained of what Augustine regarded as the world's sixth chiliad of existence,<sup>3</sup> even until Antichrist's coming at the end of time:—which last enemy's manifestation and persecution of the saints (including the Jews then at length converted,<sup>4</sup> as well as the Gentile Church) was supposed to be prefigured under the emblematic appellation of Gog and Magog:—the destruction of whom by fire from heaven would introduce the literal and *universal* resurrection of the dead, (a resurrection both of good and bad,) and consequently thereon, the final judgment: after which that eternal blessedness of the saints would begin in heaven, which alike the Old Testament prophecies, and the Apocalyptic prophecy in its two last chapters, (so Augustine explained the matter,) prefigured under the symbol of the glorified Jerusalem.<sup>5</sup>

And there obtains fresh triumphs o'er himself,  
And never-withering wreaths, compared with which  
The laurels that a Cæsar reaps are weeds.

<sup>1</sup> C. D. xx. 9. 3;—“*Bestia . . . populus infidelium: imago vero ejus simulatio ejus mihi videtur, in eis videlicet qui velut fidem profitentur, et infideliter vivunt.*”

<sup>2</sup> Those “*ex quibus prædestinata constat ecclesia.*” C. D. xx. 7. 4; 8. 1. Elsewhere, ib. 9. 1, Augustine markedly excludes from any part in this millennial reign with Christ the mere *professors* in the Church. “*Regnant cum Christo etiam nunc sancti ejus: . . . nec tamen cum illo regnant zizania; quamvis in ecclesiâ cum tritico crescant.*” Let this Augustinian distinction never be forgotten.

The *abyss* into which Satan was cast, Augustine viewed as the hearts of the “*multitudo innumerabilis impiorum:*” C. D. xx. 7. 3.

<sup>3</sup> C. D. xx. 7. 2.—I have before mentioned that Augustine followed the Septuagint chronology; according to which Christ's first coming had taken place at, or about, the middle of the world's sixth chiliad. See my Vol. i. p. 397.

<sup>4</sup> “*Ultimo tempore ante judicium Judæos in Christum verum, id est in Christum nostrum, esse credituros, celeberrimum est in sermonibus cordibusque fidelium.*” C. D. xx. 29.

<sup>5</sup> It should be added that Augustine included the idea of the Church *in heaven*, (the souls of the martyrs specified being a part for the whole,) as well as the true Church *on earth*, participating in this reign with Christ. “*Regnat cum Christo nunc primum ecclesia in vivis et mortuis.*” C. D. xx. 9. 2.

This view prevailed from Augustine's time, among certain writers more or less of the Augustinian school, throughout the middle ages, down to the Reformation. For example in the sixth century *Primasius* advocated it; in the 9th *Ambrose Ansbert*. So too in yet later times *Archbishop Usher*, as I infer from Vitringa, p. 1124.

The *third* chief theory and solution may be called the *ecclesiastical* theory of the past :—I say *ecclesiastical*, as distinguished from Augustine's *spiritual*, inasmuch as the party triumphing over Satan was in it supposed to be not the mere chosen and faithful in heart *individually*, but the professing Christian Church as a corporate body ; and its millennial triumph over him one visible before men upon the world's theatre.—From the simple substitution of "the Church" for the *true* members of the Church (a substitution which, as we have seen, involved in itself one main principle of the apostasy,)<sup>1</sup> there arose a habit very early in the middle age of *ecclesiasticizing* in a manner Augustine's spiritual theory : the apostolic and (as some would say) post-apostolic miracles, the silencing of Pagan oracles, and travelling onward of the Church to political supremacy over Paganism, being appealed to in proof of the visible binding of Satan under the Church's power, even from the epoch of its first constitution.<sup>2</sup> And in this more or less ecclesiastical form<sup>3</sup> Augustine's theory was perpetuated down to the Reformation ;<sup>4</sup> indeed yet beyond it, even to the present day.<sup>5</sup> In order however to a presentable *ecclesiastical* form, the theory needed of course some marked commencing epoch

<sup>1</sup> See my Vol. i. pp. 278, 282, &c.

<sup>2</sup> So e. g. the bishop *Andreas*.—So too in later times *Bossuet* ; who particularly dwells on the martyrs' part in the reign, as shown by the miracles wrought by their relics, and their appointment moreover in the Canon as intercessors.

<sup>3</sup> I say *more or less* ; because some were more simply *ecclesiastical* in their statements of the theory, some with more decided admixture of the *spiritual*.

<sup>4</sup> At p. 470 of Vol. i. I have noted the general consternation of Western Christendom on the approach of the year A.D. 1000 ; a consternation arising out of this view of the prophecy.

<sup>5</sup> After the Reformation various Protestant Doctors advocated it, with certain modifications. So e. g. *Luther* himself, *Bullinger*, *Bale*, *Paræus*, &c. : (*Paræus* very elaborately :) the exacerbation of Papal tyranny under Gregory VII. A.D. 1073, as well as first rise of the Seljukian Turks, being supposed by them to mark the end of the Millennium. On the other hand many Romanists thought to see evidence of Satan's loosing, in the then rise of Waldensian and other heretics.

In the present day the theory, in its mixt form, has been revived by *Dr. Wordsworth*. *Dr. W.* dwells largely and earnestly on the earthly and visible Church's privileges. "It is not a corporeal but a spiritual resurrection." "Our first resurrection is our death unto sin and new birth unto righteousness ; . . . our incorporation [sc. by baptism] into the body of Christ." "The erroneous application of the passage to a mere bodily resurrection . . . is ascribable to low and inadequate notions of the baptismal privileges and obligations." pp. 54—57. *Dr. W.* makes his millennium extend to the end of the present dispensation ; and so to include the long period of the reign of the Papacy, which nevertheless he identifies with that of the Apocalyptic Beast ! His explanation of this strange apparent inconsistency will be given in Note 1 p. 144 infra.

of the visible Church's visible triumph over Satan's power ; as well as some more consistent solution of the Beast as pre-millennial. Such a commencing epoch presented itself in the Constantinian triumph over Paganism early in the 4th century ; and in that alone of all the events of past ecclesiastical history. And it was accordingly fixed on by one and another expositor, from soon after the Reformation, as the commencing epoch of the Apocalyptic Millennium :—first, I believe, by the Romanist *Genebrard*;<sup>1</sup> then afterwards by *Grotius*<sup>2</sup> and *Hammond*, whose names are more famed as its authors. According to them the Apocalyptic Beast, (alike the ten-horned and the two-horned,) instead of figuring the *then* future Antichrist, so as all the ancient Fathers supposed, meant in fact only the then persecuting power of *Rome Pagan*: the destruction of which, through Constantine's instrumentality, these interpreters expounded to be the event symbolized in the preceding (i. e. the sixth) chapter of the Apocalypse. The Millennium of triumphant Christianity, thus and then begun, was made by them to extend through the period of one thousand years thence following ; i. e. from the 4th to the 14th century : at which latter time they considered the rise of the Othman Turks from Scythia, and their attack on Christendom, to have fulfilled what is said in the prophecy about Gog and Magog coming up and encompassing the camp of the saints. Upon the destruction of which Turkish Mahommedan power, whensoever it might take place, they looked for the fulfilment of what was figured by the great white throne, and the standing of the dead before it, (verses 11, 12, &c.) in the universal resurrection, final judgment, and subsequent heavenly and eternal blessedness of the saints.

This millennial view, which followed naturally on Grotius' view of the Beast as the symbol simply of *Rome Pagan's* persecuting power, presented itself as one fit and easy of adoption to various Roman Catholic expositors of a later æra.—With regard to *really* Protestant expositors,

<sup>1</sup> So in his *Chronograph*. Lib. iv. p. 688, as referred to by Malvenda, Vol. ii. p. 217. *Genebrard* was Professor of Hebrew at Paris, in the latter half of the 16th century, and a zealous anti-Hugonot. His *Chronographia* was published in 1567. I know not whether he propounded the Grotian view of *the Beast*.

<sup>2</sup> A.D. 1650.

such as explained either the ten-horned or the two-horned Beast of the Roman *Papal* power, they could of course only adopt it imperfectly, and by supposing the vision of Apoc. xx. to be retrogressive. Such was the martyrologist *Foxe's* idea. And then as to the loosing of Satan at the end of the millennium, they gave a Protestant turn to the symbol by supposing it to have had fulfilment not only in the Othman Turks' invasions of Christendom in the xiiiith and xivth centuries, but in the then rising to its acme of power of Papal arrogance, impiety, and tyranny.

The *fourth* chief theory of solution is what we may call the *ecclesiastical theory of the future*. It was first fully propounded, I believe, by Whitby,<sup>1</sup> then advocated by Vitringa soon afterwards, at the opening of the xviiiith century; and from that time down to the present has continued to be perhaps the most prevalent and favourite of all the millennial theories, at least among English Protestant expositors. Among its later and living advocates Mr. Faber has long been eminent; and more recently Mr. Brown. It explains the *first resurrection* in question to signify a resurrection of the cause, principles, doctrine, spirit, and character too of the Christian martyrs and saints departed; being thus in part *spiritual*, in part *ecclesiastical*: and indeed in part too, as I should add, *national*; inasmuch as it is supposed that the Jews will be then nationally restored, as well as converted, to take a share in it. The *time* they consider as still future; and that it is to begin, agreeably with Apocalyptic order, after the destruction of the Beast, the *Papal Antichrist*:—that then, the delusions alike of Popery and

<sup>1</sup> Whitby speaks of this in the Preface to his Treatise as a discovery of his own: "Conceiving that I have . . . found out the true sense of those words Apoc. xx. 4, which usually are alleged as the foundation of the supposed Millennium, &c."

Vitringa however, who alludes to Whitby's as a work just published (p. 1141), makes brief citations from two earlier writers, Conrad of Mantua and Carolus Gallus, as expressive of the same general view. *Conrad*: "Credimus hic describi resurrectionem quandam cujus aliquoties fit mentio in Scripturis: et est cum hi qui mortui putabantur vivi adhuc reperiuntur; cum vero sic reperti fuerint non minore admiratione excipiuntur ac si ab inferis resurrexissent:" said in reference to those "qui, evangelii causâ, Papæ indignationem incurrerant." *Carolus Gallus*: "Vaticinatur de singulari adeoque mirandâ ecclesie resurrectione et renovatione: quod nimirum illa, novissimâ hâc ætate, ex Judæis et Gentibus, vivis ac mortuis, conspicua erit; et mirum in modum, gloriosius quàm unquam antea, ex mortuis . . . reviviscet, innovabitur, restaurabitur, et reflorescet." Vitringa, p. 1159. Conrad's Treatise on the Apocalypse is dated Basle 1574. Car. Gallus, I believe, wrote a little later.



Mahommedanism having past away, and Satan been restricted from any more deceiving mankind, the doctrine of the martyrs long branded as heretical will triumph, their characters be appreciated, and their spirit revive afresh, as did that of Elias in John the Baptist;<sup>1</sup> the Church founded on their principles thenceforth flourish universally; the earth enjoy for 1000 years paradisiacal blessedness; and the separate spirits of the martyrs and saints in heaven sympathize with its joy.

Thus far, for the most part, the advocates of this view agree. On the sequel of the vision, however, there are important differences among them. Thus, as regards the implied *second resurrection*, while Vitringa, like the advocates of all the three other theories already sketched, supposes it to be the resurrection of the literal dead, small and great, connected with the judgment of the great white throne, Dr. Whitby, Mr. Faber, and Mr. Brown explain it as the uprising again of antichristian principles, immediately at the end of the Millennium, in the persons and confederacy of Gog and Magog.—Besides which there is a difference also in their explanations of the *New Jerusalem*. Alike Vitringa and Whitby would have this to signify the blessedness of the *earthly Church*, now enlarged and purified, the bride of Christ *during the Millennium*. But Mr. Faber and Mr. Brown explain it as *post-millennial*: supposing it to include the whole company admitted to heaven and life eternal from among men; that is, as settled by the judgment of the great white throne, after the general resurrection.

Such are in brief the *four* most famous solutions of the Millennial prophecy that have been offered in the Christian Church, from the time of the publication of the Apocalypse

<sup>1</sup> So *Whitby*. "As John the Baptist was Elias because he came in the *spirit* and *power* of Elias, so shall this be the Church of martyrs, because the spirit and purity of the times of the primitive martyrs shall return."—So too *Archbishop Whateley*, in his Chapter on the Millennium in his *Essays on a Future State*. "It may signify not the literal raising of dead men, but the raising up of an increased Christian zeal and holiness:—the revival in the Christian Church, or in some considerable portion of it, of the *spirit* and *energy* of the noble martyrs of old, even as John the Baptist came in the spirit and power of Elias; so that Christian principles shall be displayed in action throughout the world in an infinitely greater degree than ever before." He adds; "And this for a considerable time before the end of the world; though not perhaps for the literal and precise period of 1000 years."

down to the time now present. To which I must add yet a *fifth*, first suggested by the late Mr. Gipps, and which may be called distinctively and explicitly the *witness-resurrection of the past*;—making the vision, as it does, to retrogress to the commencement of the Beast's or Papal Antichrist's reign; and those who lived and reigned with Christ to be men endowed with the spirit of the early anti-Pagan martyrs, now revived as it were to testify for Christ against Papal falsehood: after which, and the end of the Beast's as well as witnesses' concurrent (!) millennial reign, the second and glorious resurrection of *the rest of the dead* is to be fulfilled, he thinks, in the Jews' conversion and restoration.<sup>1</sup> This has made no way, however, in the credence of the Christian public,<sup>2</sup> and therefore needs no such prominent place in any sketch of millennial theories as the four others.—As regards these theories it will now be my object to show that to all but the first there exist objections such, and so decisive, as to set them aside from the arena; and so to leave to that first and earliest (that is, the *literal* view held by the primitive Christians) possession of the field.

<sup>1</sup> The mode in which Mr. G. educes this from the sacred text is this. He premises (pp. 133, 134) that the word *προσεκυνησαν*, being in the *aorist*, must have the sense of the *imperfect*, "Whosoever *were not* (at that time) *worshipping* the Beast;" and hence argues the synchronism of this millennium of the *saints'* reign with the *Beast's* reign. Which premised, his explanation of the *first resurrection* as the rising up of the *spirits of the martyrs* slain under *Pagan Rome's* persecutions, (Apoc. vi. 9.) in the persons and preaching of Claude of Turin, the Waldenses, the Wicliffites, Hussites, &c., and other witnesses for Christ throughout the period of *Papal supremacy* (p. 148), follows not unnaturally. The *second resurrection* he considers to be implied in the Apocalypse, as one of the same character. So (*ibid.*) it naturally follows with him to explain it of the Jews' conversion, according to the prophecies in Ezek. xxxvii. and Rom. xi. 15; as well as of that of the multitude of the Gentiles with them, at the close of the millennium of the Beast's reign. After which event he supposes that Gog and Magog will attack the converted Jews; so the prophecies of Ezek. xxxix. and Apoc. xx. on this point be alike fulfilled; and then the literal resurrection, and judgment of the great white throne, follow.

<sup>2</sup> The American *Prof. Bush*, indeed, quite independently, as it seems, has also constructed a very similar theory. He supposes the binding of the Dragon in this xxth Apocalyptic Chapter to have answered to Theodosius' utter overthrow of Paganism: this binding vision being in fact, not a sequel to that in Apoc. xix., but a *resumption of the broken-off history of the fallen Dragon in Apoc. xii.* (p. 94—97.) The *thrones* in Apoc. xx. he makes to mean the new thrones of the *ten Romano-Gothic kingdoms*; (p. 127;) and the *first resurrection*, and *living of martyrs with Christ*, to signify the vigorous life of those that were witnesses for Christ, in opponency to the Dragon's successor, or Popes of Rome (139): herein agreeing with Mr. Gipps. The invasion afterwards of Gog and Magog he supposes (p. 155) to be that of the Turks under which Constantinople fell, A.D. 1453, or 1000 years after Theodosius.

And *Bishop Waldegrave* too, in his later Bampton Lectures, has also propounded a Millennial witness-theory essentially similar to that of Mr. Gipps.

And in respect of *three* out of the four spoken of, I mean *Augustine's, Grotius', and Gipps'*, it will not, I think, need any lengthened criticism to convince us of their total inadmissibility.—1. As to *Augustine's theory*, it may suffice to observe that the millennial vision is in the Apocalyptic narrative *essentially* and *necessarily* subordinated to, and consequent upon, those of Apoc. xiii. and xix., which describe the Beast's reign and destruction, seeing that among the partakers of Christ's millennial reign those "that had not worshipped the Beast"<sup>1</sup> are expressly specified: and, as to any view of the Beast not worshipped by the enthroned ones, such as Augustine fancies in aid of his theory, as if *the world*, or anything other than the 3½ years' Beast or Antichrist of Apoc. xiii., it is utterly out of the question.<sup>2</sup> Just agreeable with which is the inference from Daniel's vision of the enthroned ones. For the Apocalyptic millennial enthronization of the saints with Christ is plainly identical with that which Daniel there describes: which latter is spoken of as taking place *upon*, and *after*, (not *before*,) the destruction of the Little Horn of the fourth Beast, i. e. the Antichrist.<sup>3</sup>—Yet once more it must be considered, by Protestants at least, as a direct historical contradiction to this theory, that for above 1200 out of the 1800 years during which it would represent Satan to have been bound and restricted from deceiving the nations, and Christ with his saints to have been reigning, I say that for above 1200 years of this period there should have prevailed over both

<sup>1</sup> Οἱ τινες οὐ προσεκύνησαν τὸ θηρίον. The circumstance of the verb being in the aorist, not the pluperfect, does not at all invalidate this argument; the aorist being often so used in the Apocalypse. See p. 145 Note 2.

<sup>2</sup> I might argue from Christ's bridal also, mentioned Apoc. xix. 7; "Let us rejoice and be glad, for the marriage of the Lamb hath come, and his wife hath made herself ready." And indeed Vitringa, from whom I have copied the arguments in this case, considering the *New Jerusalem* to be the *bride* spoken of, and the time of its manifestation the Millennium, does argue from it. But I prefer to pass it over for the present; because the chronological position of the New Jerusalem vision is a point much disputed, and perhaps doubtful. It will however be remarked on, and my views given of it, in the next chapter.

<sup>3</sup> The following tabular comparative view of the two prophecies is copied from Mede by Vitringa.

Dan. vii. 2.	Thrones placed ( <i>positi</i> ).	Ap. xx. 4.	I saw thrones.
10.	The judgment sate.		They sate on them.
12.	Judgment given to the saints.		Judgment was given to them.
	Saints obtained the kingdom.		They lived and reigned with Christ 1000 years.

Eastern and Western Christendom the two grand Satanic delusions of Popery and Mahommedanism. Had Augustine himself lived to see this, I am well persuaded, considering his evangelical views of Christian doctrine, that he would have been the first to repudiate his own millennial theory, as that which had been falsified beyond dispute by plain matter of fact. For, though making the saints' millennial reign to be spiritual, and in the hearts and lives of the faithful individually, yet his view supposed a multitude thus true and genuine to be living and energizing in the Church during the millennial period: insomuch that he considered Antichrist's manifestation, Apocalyptically fore-shown under the figures of Gog and Magog, and the consequent reduction of the true Church to a mere paucity, persecuted and opprest, to mark the end of the millennium. Strange that any Protestant expositor, who verily believes Popery to be the Beast, should yet positively, and in despite of such belief, even now afresh propound the Augustinian theory as tenable!<sup>1</sup>—2. As to *Hammond's* and *Grotius's* theory, it is an essential preliminary to it, admitting as they do the subordination of Apoc. xx. to Apoc. xix., that the Apocalyptic Beast be interpreted as Rome *Pagan*, not Rome *Papal*: a point as to which, after all that has preceded in this Commentary,<sup>2</sup> it will I trust be the reader's judgment that it would be a mere waste of words to offer any fresh evidence in refutation of it. Besides which there is that same *historic* objection to it as to Augustine's theory, of its making the dark ages, and earlier times of the delusions of Popery and Mahommedanism, to be those of Christ's reigning on earth and the Devil's incarceration. I ought to add that by expounding what is said respecting Gog and Magog as meant of the 'Turks and their invasion of Christendom, it makes the "*little time*"<sup>3</sup> of Gog and

<sup>1</sup> I allude especially to Dr. Wordsworth. Is it asked, How can he possibly reconcile such essentially contradictory views? It is as follows. Christ bound the Devil, he says, *ἵνα μὴ πλανησῆ*, "in order that he should not deceive the nations:" so marking *object*, not *effect*. And "the corruptions of Popish times and countries . . . show that men have despised what Christ has done for them, and have loosed the *enemy* who was bound by Christ!" pp. 50, 51. But in Apoc. xx. 3, 7, is not the time of Satan's *actual* incarceration defined as 1000 years; and the epoch of his *actual* loosing defined as not till the end of the 1000 years?

<sup>2</sup> See my Part iv. Chapters iv—ix.

<sup>3</sup> *μετα ταυτα δε αυτον λυθηναι μικρον χρονον.*



Magog's insurrection to mean a period, according to these interpreters' own reckoning, of already above 500 years; that is, dating from the rise of the Turkish *Othman* dynasty: or, if we more rightly compute the interval, of near 800 years; since we ought to date it from the Turkman power's earliest epoch of rise, in the dynasty of *Seljuk*.<sup>1</sup>—3. As to *Mr. Gipp's* theory, (as if St. John, retrogressing to the times of the opening of the Beast's reign, meant, "I saw the souls of the old *anti-Pagan* martyrs revived in those who were now not worshipping the Beast,") there are the obvious and decisive objections against it, 1st, that there is no warrant whatsoever for supposing such retrogression, 2ndly, and no warrant for construing the aorist *προσεκυνησαν* as an imperfect,<sup>2</sup> 3rdly, and none for construing "*and* whosoever" in the sense of "*in* whosoever." Moreover, according to this view, Satan would be shut up in the pit of the abyss, and the pit closed, at the very time during which (as Mr. G. would with myself explain Apoc. ix. 1) the pit was opened in order to the deceiving of the nations by the Mahommedan delusion:<sup>3</sup>—the time of Christ's Witnesses' sackcloth-robing, and persecution even unto death, as pictured in one part of the Apocalypse, would quite self-contradictorily be made to coincide with that of the Witnesses' reigning and ruling in another:—and, once more, as the resurrection of the Witnesses, spoken of Apoc. xi. 7, would be the second resurrection, (their first rising to protest against the Papacy being

<sup>1</sup> So Vitranga.— See the continuity of the Seljukian and Othman Turks fully discussed and established in my Vol. i. p. 501, &c.

<sup>2</sup> The pluperfect sense, here given by our English translators, is quite common to the aorist. So in Apoc. xi. 10, *εβασανισαν*, *had tormented*; in Apoc. xxi. 1, *απηλθον*, *had past away*; &c.

With regard to *Professor Bush*, his fundamental supposition that in Apoc. xx. 1, the history of the Dragon, or Spirit of Roman Paganism, is resumed from Apoc. xii.—his being *east down from heaven* in the great revolution begun under Constantine, and completed under Theodosius, answering to the figure of his being *shut up in the abyss* of Apoc. xx.—is, I conceive, in the Apocalypse itself distinctly negatived. For whereas, according to Professor Bush, this Dragon ought to have been from after Theodosius' time shut up, so as not to deceive the nations, he is in Apoc. xii. xiii. represented distinctly as after that time not only sending out floods from his mouth to overwhelm the woman, and driving her into the wilderness, but afterwards, with a view to prosecute his enmity against the remnant of the woman's seed who kept the word of God and the testimony of Jesus, himself evoking the seven-headed beast, Antichrist, which was but *his creature*, from the abyss: giving him up his throne; and, by seducing the nations to believe on him, furnishing him *all through his reign* with power and great authority.

<sup>3</sup> The same applies substantially to Waldegrave's modification of Gipp's theory.

the first,) their previous death, there also told of, would be, properly speaking, *the second death*.

Thus it is clearly *Whitby's futuro-figurative* theory alone that can, with any show of plausibility, compete against the earlier and more *literal* explanation of the millennial prophecy given by Papias and Irenæus, and sketched the *first* in my list. Nor, I think, if we do but carefully sift it, will *its* refutation be found less clear and complete (though it will necessarily occupy us much longer) than that of the others. I proceed then to show this, and coincidentally; and in contrast, to show the evidence for the *literal* view, in two separate Sections; viz. as drawn successively, 1st from the *Apocalyptic* testimony itself, 2ndly from that of *other Scriptures* at large.

§ 2. APOCALYPTIC EVIDENCE AGAINST WHITBY'S FUTURO-FIGURATIVE THEORY, AND IN FAVOUR OF THE LITERAL THEORY, OF THE MILLENNIAL FIRST RESURRECTION.

Under this head it may be well to consider separately what is Apocalyptically intimated concerning the *death* raised from, and what concerning the *resurrection itself*.

1st, what is Apocalyptically intimated about the *death*.

It is of course fully granted by me that the term *resurrection* here made use of, and its cognate words, are often used *figuratively*, as Whitby says, to denote a revival *national, official, or spiritual*. In Ezekiel's vision, Ch. xxxvii., the figure of the dry bones gathering together, and re-adjusting themselves into form, and then into life, may very possibly signify simply the *political* resuscitation of the Jews.<sup>1</sup> In St. Luke the prodigal's *spiritual* revival was designated by the phrase, "He is alive again."<sup>2</sup> And again, in the Apocalypse itself, both the Beast's *living again*, after having had the wound with the sword, and the two Witnesses *living again*, after being killed by the Beast,<sup>3</sup> indicated a revival of the persecuting empire, and revival of the witnessing line, cause, and testimony, respectively. But in these and all such cases we must mark most carefully

<sup>1</sup> I say *simply*, because not Christian expositors only, but Jewish, have supposed an actual contemporary resurrection of the faithful dead of Israel to be also meant. I shall again refer to this point in a later part of this chapter.

<sup>2</sup> Luke xv. 32.

<sup>3</sup> Apoc. xiii. 3, 14, xi. 11.

one rule that is observed,—a rule the propriety of which will approve itself at once to every discriminative mind;—viz. that of making the *resurrection of corresponding character* with the *death*, from out of which it is a revival. Thus in Ezekiel it was a change from *national extinction* to *national revival*; in Luke from *spiritual death* to *spiritual life*; in the earlier Apocalyptic visions from *political and official annihilation* to *political and official resuscitation*.<sup>1</sup> So constant is the observance of this rule, and so stringent its requirement by the proprieties of diction, that it needs but, in any doubtfully expressed case of *resurrection*, to ascertain the nature of the *death* revived from: and, if this can be ascertained, an explanation of the resurrection conformable thereto must almost necessarily be the true one.

And what then the *death* in the present case? What is stated both in the passage itself, and in its Apocalyptic parallels, seems to me inconsistent with the Whitbyite theory of *figurative death*, as of the Christian cause or party; and such indeed as to force us to understand it of *natural individual death*.—For, *first*, we find expressly and prominently specified among these dead the souls of those that had been beheaded for the witnessing of Christ; a form of expression which identifies them with those that St. John had seen on the fifth Seal's opening, long before, under the altar, the victims of the persecutions of Rome Pagan: whereas, had the death now meant been the *figurative death* of the Christian cause or party, the event would necessarily have been one of recent occurrence, altogether distinct from, and independent of, the deaths of those anti-Pagan martyrs ages before.—*Secondly*, had there been any such recent *figurative death*, or, in other words, extinction and overthrow, of the Christian cause and party, we might surely expect that some striking symbolization of it would have been given previously; just as of the figurative death of Christ's two sackcloth-robed witnesses in Apoc. xi. 7, some time before. But no such symbolization is to be found in the immediately preceding context; nor a hint, even the

<sup>1</sup> So again in Luke ii. 34; "This child *κειται εις πτωσιν και αναστασιν πολλων εν Ισραηλ*, is set for the *fall and rising again* of many in Israel." And, somewhat similarly, Ezra ix. 8; "that the Lord may give us a *little revival* in our bondage."

slightest, of any such great event. The last previous notice of Christ's witnesses represented them as ascended into the political heaven just before the 7th Trumpet's sounding, that Trumpet of which the seven Vials are the development; and in none of those Vials is there an intimation of any fresh slaying of the witnesses. There is reported indeed, introductory to the last of them, the gathering of the hostile powers of the Dragon Beast and False Prophet to the war of the great day of God Almighty; but this implies of itself the existence of saints to war against: while the apparently synchronical visions of the three flying Angels in mid-heaven indicated activity and life in the Christian party, not deadness or extinction.<sup>1</sup> And indeed the very last-noticed events prior to the Messiah's joining battle with the Beast, are first the fearful earthquake in which the Beast's great city fell into three parts, then its utter destruction.—To the same effect, *thirdly*, is the argument from the mention just afterwards of "*the rest of the dead*," and *their* reviving and resurrection:—an argument this to which I must beg the most careful attention. For the expression is one which, as it seems to me, absolutely and necessarily connects this *remainder of the dead*, later raised to life, with *the other dead* just before said to have been earlier raised to life; as having been originally, and prior to the abstraction of the dead first taken, part and parcel of *the same community of dead*, in whatever sense, whether literal or figurative, that word *dead* be meant:—just as a *remnant* of cloth must needs have been once *on*, and *of*, the same piece as *the part* whose abstraction left it a remnant; just again as "*the rest*" said by Luke to have escaped to land, some on boards and some on broken pieces of the ship, were of the same ship's company with those that had escaped by swimming;<sup>2</sup> or (to take an Apocalyptic example) as "*the rest of the men*" in Apoc. ix. 20, that were not killed by certain plagues, were of the same political community, as men of Christendom, with those that had been killed by the plagues.<sup>3</sup> Apply we then this test, in

<sup>1</sup> See my Part v. Chap. viii.; and in this Volume pp. 2—5.

<sup>2</sup> Acts xxvii. 44.

<sup>3</sup> At p. 236 Mr. Brown half intimates a derivation and meaning to the phrase *οι λοιποι* quite different from that which I am arguing from; as if *all the rest of the Beast's party* were meant, except the Beast himself and his False Prophet; because



order to determine the death in which both the parties mentioned were once thus conjoined; alike the martyr-company earliest raised to life, and the λοιποὶ later raised. On the nature of the death from which the λοιποὶ were raised the Whitbyite expositors differ in opinion. The most of this class of expositors, as Faber, Scott, Brown, Clemens, and the British Quarterly Reviewer, follow Whitby in explaining "the rest of the dead" of the Antichristian cause and faction slain, as described in Apoc. xix., by him that sat on the white horse, and revived in the persons of Gog and Magog.<sup>1</sup> But will this view of the λοιποὶ stand the test just laid down? Could the dead martyrs, previously to their rising, have been so *united* in death with the anti-Christians? Surely not. How could both the *Christian* body or cause, and the *Antichristian*, be dead thus figuratively *at one and the same time*?<sup>2</sup> The death of the one would be the life of the other. Assuredly, as to any community in *political* or *official* death between the two parties *here* spoken of, just before the millennial resurrection, the thing was nothing less than impossible.—On the other hand, Vitringa (in common with all the three first-mentioned classes of expositors) explains the *death* of the λοιποὶ in the phrase I am discussing of *natural death*;—that natural death from which their rising would be at the general resurrection, preparatorily to the judgment of the great white throne.<sup>3</sup> But then what the character of the death of those whose abstraction left them the λοιποὶ, viz. of the beheaded ones, &c., mentioned verse 4? Of course the same; i. e. natural death. Very curiously Vitringa does not advert to this point. Had he done so he could scarce but have seen that it involves the overthrow of his millennial theory.<sup>4</sup>—To the same effect, *fourthly*, is the use of the term "*the dead*," τῶν

in Apoc. xix. 21 it is said of the former, "And *the remnant* (οἱ λοιποὶ) were slain with the sword, &c." But, with the notice before him of the dead and risen martyrs intervening, in Apoc. xx. 4, he shrinks from insisting on it. "*The rest of the dead* (οἱ λοιποὶ)," says he, p. 237:—"dead, that is, in the same sense in which *the other party* are meant as dead, in respect of the cause they espouse."

<sup>1</sup> Faber, iii. 334; Brown, p. 236; Clemens, p. 92; British Reviewer, p. 189.

<sup>2</sup> Besides which how is it, were this explanation by Dr. Whitby correct, that ἀνεζησαν, or some such word, is not used on mention of Gog's expedition; to indicate, so as in the case of the millennial saints, the resuscitation of the fallen cause?

<sup>3</sup> p. 1161. He calls this view of the death of the λοιποὶ "simplex et clarus."

<sup>4</sup> Since writing this I see that Mr. Gipps, at pp. 111, 112, had preceded me in urging this argument from "*the rest of the dead*" against the Whitbyite millenarian theory.

νεκρων, generically, in the announcement on the 7th Trumpet's sounding of what was to be fulfilled under it: the events announced as the grand result of that Trumpet being evidently, as indeed most of the Whitbyite expositors allow, (alike Vitranga, Faber, and Brown,<sup>1</sup>) the very same with those symbolized afterwards in Apoc. xviii., xix., and xx. 1—6. "We thank thee," it was said, "O Lord God Almighty, because thou hast taken to thyself thy great power, and assumed the kingdom: and the nations were angry; and thy wrath is come; and the time of the dead to be judged,<sup>2</sup> and that thou shouldest give reward to thy servants the prophets, and to the saints, and to them that fear thy name, small and great; and shouldest destroy them that destroy the earth." Could "the dead," thus generically exprest, designate in figurative sense a particular dead cause and party, viz. the Christian:—one by the way that at the epoch of the 7th Trumpet's sounding was clearly not dead? Even so; say Vitranga and Mr. Brown. No! says Mr. Faber; the phrase is too large and generic: it means both parties, Christian and Anti-Christian.<sup>3</sup> But how so? The old difficulty recurs:—could both causes and parties be dead at the same time? Clemens appreciates the inconsequence and difficulty; and will have "the dead" to mean here the *literally dead, small and great*, who were to be judged before the great white throne: <sup>4</sup> so handing over this judgment of the dead, for which the time was said to have come at the sounding of the 7th Trumpet, (or at least within the period embraced by that Trumpet,) absolutely and altogether, to an epoch above 1000 years later! Can this be so? It is surely more natural, while supposing

<sup>1</sup> Vitranga, pp. 679, 680, 683; Faber, iii. 244; Brown, 211, &c. I may refer the reader on this point to my remarks on Apoc. xi. 18, at the close of my 2nd Volume.

<sup>2</sup> The verb κρινεσθαι is one applied to the good as well as bad. So Apoc. xx. 12, 13. And so too κριμα, and other cognate words; as e. g. John ix. 39.

<sup>3</sup> Mr. Faber's observations (p. 244) are curious. "Since, with reference to the *literal* day of judgment, the word *dead* imports universality as to the persons who are finally judged, either for acquittal or condemnation, in the final judgment of all mankind,—so, analogously, with reference to this *figurative* day of judgment [viz. that of the 7th Trumpet] the word *dead* must similarly import universality as to the persons who are temporally judged, either for acquittal or condemnation, in the temporal judgment of the Roman empire." So he proceeds to say that he considers "the dead [in Apoc. xi. 18] to be first universally and collectively said to be judged; afterwards, in the two succeeding clauses, divided into the saints who fear the name of God, and the wicked who destroy the earth." What! both figuratively dead together?

<sup>4</sup> p. 104.

with him "the dead" in Apoc. xi. 18 to mean the *literally* dead, to suppose with Brown, Faber, and Vitringa, that the opening time, at least, of the judgment on these dead is at the opening of the millennium: the righteous dead having then adjudged them an abundant entrance into Christ's kingdom; the wicked dead exclusion from it,<sup>1</sup> prior to their other and final judgment.

Thus in fine, and upon these *four* accounts, I find myself absolutely constrained to view the *death* that the martyrs and their associated brethren were raised from as death in its *literal* sense: and, by consequence, the *resurrection* predicated of them as not, so as Whitby would have it, a *figurative*, but rather a *literal* resurrection.

2. To the same conclusion tend the following Apocalyptic intimations with reference to *the resurrection itself*.

For, *first*, it is in this *resurrection*, together with its immediate precedents of the fall of Babylon and the Beast, that there is confessed to be the fulfilment of what was said in Apoc. xi. 18 of "the time having come to give reward (*τον μισθον*, *the reward*) to God's servants the prophets and saints:"—confessedly, I mean, by most of the chief advocates of Whitby's hypothesis. "The *reward* meant," says Mr. Brown, "is just the destruction of Babylon, as the enemy of Christ's truth and people, and their triumphant exaltation in her stead."<sup>2</sup> And so too Vitringa and Faber.

<sup>1</sup> I beg attention to this point. I conceive judgment on the wicked to have thus, *even then, begun*. Compare my remarks on Dan. xii. 2 and Isa. lxvi. 24, pp. 193, 194 *infra*.

<sup>2</sup> Free Church Magazine for 1846, pp. 270, 271. "The reward given to God's servants," he adds, "is not personal." I cite from his Letter address to me in the Free Church Magazine; as I have not observed in the 2nd Edition of his published work any so distinct notice of this particular point.

Vitringa on Apoc. xi. 18, p. 679: "Martyres sensu mystico et spirituali *mercedem* dicuntur accipere, quando his illorum prædictionibus et expectationi satisfit."

Faber, Sac. Cal. iii. 245: "The recompence here spoken of . . . must mean a recompence of vengeance upon the heads of their long triumphant enemies and oppressors."

The *British Quarterly Reviewer*, p. 183, half grants, half hesitates at granting, that the epoch meant in Apoc. xi. 18 is the same with that in the passage before us. "Mr. E. has assumed the identity of the parties described in the two passages, though he supports himself in so doing by the consent of Vitringa. . . Grant that Rev. xi. 15—18 refers to the same epoch as Rev. xix. 11—xx. 15" (rather,—xx. 4). He does not contest the point.

*Clemens* however here separates from the other Whitbyite theorists. He seems unable to bring himself to believe that such is "*the reward*" held out to the saints. "It can scarcely be said that these things were fulfilled at the commencement of

But surely *the reward* set before Christ's people in Scripture, in order to animate them amidst their many labours and trials, is something very different from this.<sup>1</sup> "Blessed are ye," said Christ, "when men shall reproach you, &c., for my sake: rejoice and be exceeding glad; for great is your reward (*μισθος*) in heaven." And again; "He that reapeth receiveth wages (*μισθον*); and gathereth fruit unto life eternal." So again St. Paul to the Hebrew Christians; "Knowing that ye have in heaven a better and an enduring substance, cast not away your confidence which hath great recompence of reward (*μισθαποδοσιαν*): for ye have need of patience, that after ye have done the will of God ye may receive the promise: for yet a little while, and He that shall come will come." And yet once more in the Apocalypse itself; "Behold I come quickly; and my *reward* (*μισθος*) is with me, to give every man as his work may be." Surely, it would be but poor comfort to the weary and tried and persecuted Christian, to be told that some day, at a longer or shorter interval after his death, and while he himself still rested in the world of separate spirits, the sacred cause in which he was interested would at length be successful upon earth, and all the chief enemies of it destroyed: and that, in effect, this their destruction, and this its triumph, was "the reward" destined for him.<sup>2</sup>—*Secondly*, the Apocalyptic designation of the millennial resurrection as "*the first resurrection*" seems to me little consistent with the Whitbyite view of it. For, were it simply the resurrection of *the martyrs' cause*, how, I ask, could it be called *the first*, and not rather *the second*, or, as I might indeed say, *the third* resurrection; seeing that the Apocalypse, as these expositors in common with myself

the millennium. . The time had *not* come that God should give reward to those who feared his name small and great: &c." p. 105. So, as before said, Clemens explains those words of the song on the 7th Trumpet's sounding, "*The time is come of the dead to be judged, and that thou shouldest give reward, &c.,*" to mean the time of the general resurrection *after* the millennium.

<sup>1</sup> My argument here is of course greatly strengthened by what is said in Daniel xii. 12 of his "*standing in his lot* (*κληρος*) *at the end of the days*:" i. e. at the end of the 1335 days, just after Antichrist's final destruction. But of this more when I speak of the evidence of Old Testament Scripture. See p. 168 *infra*.

<sup>2</sup> I have copied the above from a Letter written by me in reply to Mr. Brown, and printed in the Free Church Magazine for 1846, p. 341. In the same Magazine for 1847, p. 29, there was an answer by Mr. Brown, but no answer to this argument. Nor do I see any in the 2nd Edition of his Book on the Second Advent.



expound it, had itself already prefigured two great *previous* revivals of the Christian martyr or witness cause:—the one in the Constantinian revolution; that same that was celebrated in the eucharistic song, “They overcame the Dragon by the blood of the Lamb, and by the word of their *martyr-testimony* (μαρτυρία):”<sup>1</sup> the other in the Protestant Reformation of the 16th century: which latter was indeed expressly figured as a *resurrection* of the *martyr-cause* and *line*, in the vision of the two Witnesses’ death and resurrection,<sup>2</sup> prior to the seventh Trumpet’s sounding?<sup>3</sup>—*Thirdly*, there occurs the important consideration that, as to any notable revival of the distinctive *spirit* of the old martyrs in times of millennial blessedness, such as the Apocalypse implies, with the Devil bound and the saints triumphant, it is almost a contradiction in terms. The spirit of Elias might and did revive in John the Baptist; because he, like his predecessor, had to witness in a corrupt generation for the truth, even unto death. But here, where the similarity? Mr. Gipps, one of the most decided as well as most able of all the modern opponents of the literal chiliastic theory, so strongly felt the force of this consideration, that it sufficed almost of itself to make him set aside Whitby’s theory as untenable:<sup>4</sup> though only indeed for another on the same spiritualizing principle, which seems to me equally untenable, as I have shown elsewhere.<sup>5</sup> And so

<sup>1</sup> So Mr. Brown himself, p. 3, thus writes of the Constantinian revolution as a resurrection of the Christian martyr-cause:—“The martyred testimony of Jesus *lived and reigned*: but the martyrs themselves lived not. The Gospel slew the great red Dragon: Paganism was defeated in the high places of the field: Christianity ascended the throne of the Cæsars.”

<sup>2</sup> Mr. Brown agrees with me in referring the death and resurrection of the Witnesses to the epoch and events of the Reformation: (Free Church Mag. 267:) and so too Clemens. Mr. Faber would have the vision fulfilled in the banishment, and then re-establishment in their valleys, of the Waldenses. This makes no difference in my present argument. In explaining the vision of Apoc. xi. 7—13, the Whitbyite interpreters all admit that it signifies some notable death and resurrection of the Christian martyrs’ cause before the 7th Trumpet’s sounding.

<sup>3</sup> Mr. Brown replied to this argument when urged by me in the Free Church Magazine for 1847, p. 35, that the objection might be equally made against the literal view of the pre-millennial resurrection; because certain saints rose literally and bodily at the time of Christ’s resurrection, and therefore the pre-millennial resurrection, if literal, would be only a second, not first resurrection. “‘But no,’ Mr. E. will say: ‘Only a handful rose then; whereas this is *the whole*.’ Just so: and that is *my* answer to him.” But does it make no difference that the Apocalypse itself, which here uses the phrase “first resurrection,” should have strongly and prominently figured a previous revival of the Christian witnesses’ cause and party as a *resurrection*?

<sup>4</sup> p. 109.

<sup>5</sup> See p. 145 *suprà*.

too the British Reviewer: at least to the extent, if I rightly understand him, of abandoning what Whitby says of the revival of the martyrs' *spirit*; his own view being the same as Whitby's and Brown's of the revival and triumph of the martyrs' *cause*.<sup>1</sup>

Thus, on much various evidence inferable from *the Apocalypse itself*, I come to the conclusion of the inadmissibility of Whitby's millennial theory, just as decidedly as of each of the other anti-literal theories: and at the same time, since all the counter-evidence has gone to confirm the literal theory, to a conviction of all this constituting a strong presumption in favour of that *literal* theory of Irenæus and the early Chiliasts. A presumption further confirmed by the simple but important fact, that the doctrine of *a first literal resurrection of God's saints* was no new doctrine in St. John's time; but one that had past downward to it from early currency in the Jewish Church, as will appear in my next Section.<sup>2</sup>

It needs however, ere passing on from this part of my subject, that I make an explanatory observation or two, by way of answer to certain difficulties and objections that have been urged from the Apocalyptic passage against it.

And, 1st, the application of the word *ψυχας*, *souls*, to the saints and martyrs raised to reign with Christ, (which some have objected,) forms no real objection to the literal view. For it is but a term designative generally of their state *just previous*; and specially marking the identity of some of

<sup>1</sup> I say, if I rightly understand him: for I am not sure that I do. He says, p. 183: "The principle that where a resurrection to life is spoken of, it must be a resurrection of corresponding character with the death from out of which it is a revival, is a true principle; and, as such, is fatal we conceive to Whitby's interpretation." Yet from his remark p. 176, "When the fulness of the Gentiles is brought in, and all Israel saved, . . . God's martyrs will triumph in the victory of the cause for which they had suffered during so many centuries," and again, p. 189, that "the rest of the dead, like the martyrs, are the representatives of a cause, and . . . supposed in their turn to triumph when Satan their leader is unbound," it seems to me that it is only in respect of what Whitby says of a revival of the *martyr spirit* that he differs from him.

Mr. Brown, p. 242, seems to think that the revival of the old martyrs' spirit of *faithfulness to Christ* will suffice to answer the conditions of the case on that head. And so Clemens, p. 89. But I cannot agree to this. It seems to me contrary not only to the simple requirements of the symbol, but also to the analogy of the previous Apocalyptic case of figurative resurrection,—I mean that of the two witnesses, as explained alike by both of us. It was not the *cause* and *faithfulness* of Huss and the Waldenses that alone revived in Luther and his associates; but their *martyr-spirit* even unto suffering also.

<sup>2</sup> See especially p. 168, *infra*.

the enthroned individuals with those ψυχας that St. John had seen long previously, after their slaughter, under the altar.<sup>1</sup> And thus it no more indicates that they were still mere ψυχαι, *incorporeal souls*, than the title νεκροι, just after in verse 12, ("I saw *the dead*, small and great, stand before God,") implies that these last were still, at that very time of their standing before Him, *dead men*.<sup>2</sup>—2ndly, as to the objection that St. John specifies only the souls of *martyrs* and of *confessors against the Beast*, as taking seat on the thrones of judgment, not departed saints generally, I answer that this does not necessarily imply that they were the only enthroned ones; but only that they particularly arrested St. John's regard, or that he had particular reasons for recording them. Must not Christ, *though unmentioned*, be supposed to have appeared in this self-same vision, since the enthroned ones are spoken of as *reigning with Christ*? I have already elsewhere argued from these parallels,<sup>3</sup> and must beg leave to repeat the argument:<sup>4</sup> also, as to the fact of the martyrs not being the only enthroned ones, that it may be inferred distinctly from the generally admitted parallel passages of Apoc. xi. 17, 18, and Dan. vii. 18:—seeing that in Dan. vii. 18, 22, it was for "the saints of the Most High," *generally*, that the thrones were set, and to whom the judgment was given: and that in Apoc. xi. 18 the reward was declared to belong, not to martyrs only, but to God's prophets and saints and all that feared his name small and great; "the dead" specifically.<sup>5</sup>—The

<sup>1</sup> Apoc. vi. 9.

<sup>2</sup> Let me add another example or two, as the point is important, and one on which arguments have been frequently founded. Luke vii. 15; "And the *dead man* sat up;" ὁ νεκρὸς ἀνεκαθίσεν. Matt. ix. 33, "The *dumb man* spake;" ὁ κωφὸς ἐλάλησε. So, again, Matt. xi. 5, xv. 31, Luke vii. 22, &c: and, in the Old Testament, Exod. vii. 10, 1 Sam. xxvii. 3, &c.—Thus it seems quite needless to urge the frequent use of ψυχαι for *persons*, by way of explanation.

<sup>3</sup> p. 132, Note.

<sup>4</sup> Mr. Brown (Free Church Mag. for 1847, pp. 31, 32) in reply to these my parallels,—1st expresses doubt of Christ having appeared enthroned in the vision. But what says Daniel in his corresponding vision? The Son of Man (Dan. vii. 13, 14) is specially noted as the *visible* holder of the kingdom. 2. He thinks that the word νεκροι, *dead*, in Apoc. xi. 12 includes in itself the living too: just as in the saying, "in Adam *all die*," albeit that some are to be alive when Christ comes to judgment. But I cannot think this counter-parallel sufficient. The death derived from Adam is spiritual death, as well as bodily. And in the former character at least it passes to those who shall be alive at Christ's coming, as well as the rest.

<sup>5</sup> The circumstance of Mr. Brown's distinctly acknowledging the parallelism of Apoc. xi. 18 with Apoc. xx. 1—4 makes me wonder that he should take so much

reason of the martyrs being so prominently specified here seems to me easy of apprehension.<sup>1</sup> It was, I conceive, to remind the reader of the vision of the souls under the altar slain by Pagan Rome, to whom an avenging was promised: and likewise of that of the confessors under Papal Rome; on whom a similar trial of faith and patience had been enjoined, with a simple similar resting on the promise.<sup>2</sup> In the specification before us it was strikingly set forth that, though delayed, the promise had not been forgotten; and was now at length to have fulfilment.<sup>3</sup>—As to the objection from what is said of the *rest of the dead* not living again “*till* the thousand years were finished,” as if indicating that they lived again *immediately after the ending of that millennium*, (in which case all explanation of their living again by reference to the general resurrection of the dead to judgment mentioned in verse 11 afterwards, before the great white throne, then first set, as our theorists suppose, would be precluded, because of “*the little space*” of the Devil’s loosing, and Gog’s invasion, intervening between the millennium’s ending and that general judgment,) the objection is founded on a quite mistaken assumption of the requirements of the preposition *till*. The tempest-angels of Apoc. vii. were charged not to blow *till* the servants of God were sealed:<sup>4</sup> but it was not until after the further interval of a little space, subsequent to the com-

pains to make it appear that there were none but martyrs seen in the latter vision. For he admits that in the former *all the saints* are noted as participators in the martyrs’ triumph.

<sup>1</sup> “Why, if this is to be, [viz. a resurrection of *all* the saints,] was the specification so limited as it here is? We must leave the difficulty; . . . for we see no solution of it.” So the Brit. Qu. Reviewer, p. 184.

<sup>2</sup> See Apoc. xiii. 10.—In the vision too of the souls under the altar, slain by *Pagan* Rome, it had been said that *their* vindication would not be till after the slaying of other martyrs their brethren, i. e. those slain under *Papal* Rome; and consequently the vindication of the *latter* synchronous with *theirs*.

<sup>3</sup> It will already have been observed that the ancient Fathers supposed, as I do, that the pre-millennial resurrection would be one of *all* God’s saints, of both Old and New Testament dispensations. See p. 134 *suprà*.

In further illustration of this being the view held by the early Fathers, let me add to my previous citations from Justin Martyr and Tertullian the following from Cyprian. “Vivere *omnes* dicit et reguare cum Christo: non tantum qui occisi fuerint, sed et quique in fidei suæ firmitate et Dei timore perstantes imaginem bestię non adoraverint, neque ad funesta ejus et sacrilega edicta consenserint.” And again; “Nec solos animadversos et interfectos divinæ pollicitationis manent præmia; sed etiam si ipsa passio fidelibus desit, fides tamen integra atque invicta perstiterit, . . . ipse quoque à Christo inter martyres honoratur.” Ad Fortunat. De Exhort. Mart. c. 12.

<sup>4</sup> ἀχρῖς οὐ σφραγισωμεν τοὺς δούλους τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν. Apoc. vii. 3.



pletion of the sealing, that the first Trumpet sounded, and the tempests began. In Luke xxiv. 49 the Saviour's charge, "Remain in Jerusalem *till* ye shall have been endued with power from on high," did not imply that they were then instantly after to end their sojourn there. And so too in other passages.<sup>1</sup> Which being the case, the objection appears to be groundless: and we may without hesitation explain what is said about the resurrection, or living again, of "*the rest of the dead*" after the millennium as fulfilled in the uprising of the dead generally to judgment before the great white throne, supposing our theorists' view correct of this vision; contradistinctively to the martyrs and saints spoken of just before, as raised premillennially to live and reign with Christ.

Such, and so strong, is the various proof deducible from *the Apocalyptic passage itself*, with its context and parallels, against Whitby's *futuro-figurative* view, and in favour of the *literal* view, of *the first resurrection* in Apoc. xx.; and consequently of the *resurrection of the just* (as it is elsewhere called<sup>2</sup>) being *premillennial*. As the point, however, is one so controverted, as well as so surpassingly interesting and important, it is clearly incumbent on every earnest inquirer after truth to consider the *Scripture evidence* that may bear upon it on a larger scale. This constitutes the *second* branch of my argument. Nor, I think, will its examination fail to issue in a deeper, fuller persuasion of the truth of the *premillennial* theory of *Christ's second advent*, and *premillennial resurrection* coincidently of *his saints*.

### § 3. GENERAL SCRIPTURE EVIDENCE AGAINST WHITBY'S FUTURO-FIGURATIVE THEORY, AND IN FAVOUR OF THE LITERAL THEORY OF THE MILLENNIAL FIRST RESURRECTION.

Under this head I shall hope to prove the *synchronism of the departed saints' resurrection*, and of *Christ's second*

<sup>1</sup> E. g. Matt. i. 25; *Και ουκ εγινωσκειν αυτην εως ου ετεκε τον υιον αυτης τον πρωτοτοκον* where, from the nature of the case, there must have past some time after the end of the *εως*; even supposing that the old Catholic view respecting the Virgin Mary, as still after Christ's birth *αι παρθενος*, is not to be insisted on.

So again Cyril, Catech. xv., argues from the *till* in 1 Cor. xv. 25, "He must reign till he hath put all things under his feet."

<sup>2</sup> Luke xiv. 14.

and glorious advent, alike with the epoch of *Israel's promised conversion and restoration*, with that of *the temporarily opening blessedness of the world*, and with that of *the fall of Antichrist*:—some other and different points of evidence being added afterwards.

And, in preparation for this important branch of my argument, it may be well first to trace the subject of Scripture promise somewhat fully, and from the fountain-head.

Every after-promise then made to man was wrapt up (if I may so say) and contained in that original and primary promise made to our first parents after their fall, “The seed of the woman shall bruise the serpent’s head.” Now on this promise we have what I may call an inspired comment, in the apostle’s saying, “For this purpose the Son of God was manifested, that He might destroy the works of the devil.”<sup>1</sup> And, as Satan’s work was the introduction of both natural and moral evil,—including alike a curse on man, with death as its special sign and accompaniment, and a curse too on the creation made for man, (“for the creation was subjected to vanity, not through any voluntary act, but by reason of him who subjected it,” i. e. if we construe the word of the *instrumental* cause, the Devil,<sup>2</sup>) therefore the undoing of his work involved a twofold restoration and removal of the curse; the moral restoration of man, with abolition of death, and the physical restoration of this created earth of his habitation. Nor, I think, is it mere unfounded conjecture to suppose that Adam, Abel, Enoch, so understood, and hoped *themselves* to profit by it.<sup>3</sup>—The promise was not jeopardized by the judgment of a flood of waters which God would bring on the earth to destroy all flesh: for, together with his declaration of the coming judgment, God made the saving declaration to Noah, “But with *thee* will I establish *my*

<sup>1</sup> 1 John iii. 8.

<sup>2</sup> Rom. viii. 20. Some commentators prefer to explain this of *God*, as the judicial subjector of the outward creation to vanity. But if the *instrumental cause* be meant, it *must* be either the *Devil* or *Adam*,—the tempter to original sin, or the sinner; seeing that the curse on the creation followed the sin. Which of these, is immaterial to my argument.

<sup>3</sup> By the use of propitiatory sacrifices these early patriarchs expressed their hope in the promise.

*covenant:*"<sup>1</sup> that is, my original covenanted promise made to Adam.—Yet again, in the tenth generation after Noah, when the world was afresh beginning to be filled with an apostate population, and so the covenant to be afresh endangered, He virtually repeated it to Abraham; "Get thee out of thy country to a land which I will show thee; . . . and *in thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed.*"<sup>2</sup>—there being added soon after, very remarkably, a grant of *the land itself* to which he was called, as if in some way particularly connected with the accomplishment of the previous comprehensive promise: not only "Unto *thy seed* will I give this land;"<sup>3</sup> but "To *thee* will I give it, *and to thy seed*, for ever."<sup>4</sup> It is not the mere human expositor that has noted the fact of these terms of the promise having apparently given to Abraham a *personal* interest in the land as *its inheritor*, and similarly to Isaac and Jacob after him:<sup>5</sup> else we might argue that the promise of Abraham's possessing it was fulfilled in his seed's possessing it.<sup>6</sup> But one inspired seems so to explain the matter:<sup>7</sup> and perhaps God himself, long before.<sup>8</sup>—But how then was the promise to be realized by him and them? He was but a stranger and sojourner in the land; not having had, nor expecting in this life to have,<sup>9</sup> so much as a foot of it in possession:—indeed it was expressly intimated to him, in a vision that had a horror of great darkness as its meet accompaniment, that he was himself to die and be buried in a good old age, like his fathers before him:<sup>10</sup>—whereas the inheritance promised implied fruition as a possessor, and that possession

<sup>1</sup> Gen. vi. 18.<sup>2</sup> Gen. xii. 3.<sup>3</sup> Gen. xii. 7.<sup>4</sup> Gen. xiii. 15. And so again, xv. 7, xvii. 8. In the former of these two passages the notable term *inherit* is introduced for the first time into the Bible; "I am the Lord that brought thee out of Ur of the Chaldees, to give thee this land to *inherit* it." In xvii. 8, the strong expression is used; "I will give unto *thee*, and to thy seed after thee, the land wherein thou art a stranger, all the land of Canaan, *for an everlasting possession.*"<sup>5</sup> Gen. xxvi. 3, xxviii. 13, xxxv. 12.<sup>6</sup> So Gen. xlvi. 4; "I will go down with thee (Jacob) into Egypt, and I will also surely *bring thee up again*:" i. e. in his seed. For we can hardly understand the words of the bringing up of his corpse.<sup>7</sup> Viz. St. Stephen, Acts vii. 5; "And God gave him none inheritance in it, no not so much as to set his foot on: yet He promised that He would give it to *him* for a possession, and to his seed after him."—Irenæus, v. 32, dwells much on this intent of the promise to Abraham.<sup>8</sup> Exod. vi. 4.<sup>9</sup> Compare the words "wherein thou art a stranger," of Gen. xvii. 8, quoted above.<sup>10</sup> Gen. xv. 15.

one *for ever*.<sup>1</sup> The memorable act of his proceeding, according to the Divine command, to slay Isaac, the very son in whom the promise was to have its fulfilment, furnished occasion (as the inspired apostle explains to us) for the manifestation of his views on this point. “He accounted that God was able to *raise him up even from the dead* ;”<sup>2</sup> and in fact did, as it were, receive him back from death (and of course all Isaac’s seed in him) in a type or figure.<sup>3</sup> That is, I conceive, his faith realized the possibility, and rested on it, of the promise connected with Isaac having its fulfilment through the intervention of, and after, *a resurrection from the dead* :—a figure of the manner in which he himself, doubtless, as well as Isaac and Isaac’s seed, (Christ, the promised seed *κατ’ ἐξοχην*, specially included,<sup>4</sup>) might expect to realize the promised inheritance.<sup>5</sup> So “by faith he sojourned in *the land of promise*, (a place which he should after receive for an inheritance,) as in a strange country; dwelling in tabernacles with Isaac and Jacob, the heirs with him of the same promise :”<sup>6</sup> yet looking for the promised inheritance, with the world itself as its appendage,<sup>7</sup> after death and resurrection: and for all in a state quite different from what was then before his eyes; even as a world renovated, a Canaan made heavenly,<sup>8</sup> “a city which had foundations, whose builder and maker was God.”<sup>9</sup>

<sup>1</sup> I do not forget the often restricted use of this phrase. But, admitting Abraham’s *personal* interest in the gift, the restricted use can here scarcely apply.

<sup>2</sup> Heb. xi. 19.

<sup>3</sup> *εν παραβολη*, *ibid.*

<sup>4</sup> Compare Heb. ii. 14.

<sup>5</sup> Compare Rom. iv. 17; “He believed in God that *quickeneth the dead*, and calleth things which are not, as though they were.”

<sup>6</sup> Heb. xi. 8, 9.

<sup>7</sup> Rom. iv. 13; “For the promise that he should be the *heir of the world* was not to Abraham, or to his seed, through the law, but through the righteousness of faith.”

<sup>8</sup> Heb. xi. 16.—Tertullian thinks there may have been a reference to the double blessing to the faithful seed of Abraham, the *earthly* blessing and the *heavenly*, in the double comparison of the number of his seed to the sand on *earth* and the stars in *heaven*. “*Quid tibi videtur; cum Abrahæ semen post primam promissionem, quàm in multitudinem arenæ repromittitur, ad instar quoque stellarum destinatur, nonne et terrænæ et cœlestis dispositionis auspiciâ sunt?*” Adv. Marcion iii. 25.

Canaan is often spoken of as a type of *heaven*. But I read not a word of *heaven* in the promise to Abraham, in *local* distinction from Canaan.

Compare Justin Martyr’s application to Christians of Abraham’s call, and of the promise to Abraham. *Και ἡμας δε ἀπαντας δι’ ἐκείνης της φωνης ἐκαλεσε και ἐξήλθομεν ἠδη ἀπο της πολιτειας εν ἣ ἐζώμεν κατὰ τα κοινὰ των ἀλλων της γης οικητορων, κακως ζωντες και συν τῷ Αβρααμ την ἀγιαν κληρονομησομεν γην, εις τον ἀπεραντον αιωνα την κληρονομιαν ληψομενοι.* Dial. cum Tryph. p. 347.

<sup>9</sup> Heb. xi. 10.—Macknight on Heb. vi. says that “the covenant with Abraham might with great propriety be termed the gospel of the patriarchs and of the Jews.”



Meanwhile there had been revealed to him (it was in the vision that had the horror of great darkness accompanying it) a new and most important *appendix* in God's purpose to the old covenant of grace. The question was permitted to be asked by Abraham, (by Abraham not in his individual character, I conceive, but as the representative and federal head, like Adam before him, of his seed interested in the promised inheritance,) "Lord God, *whereby shall I know that I shall inherit it* (the land)?"<sup>1</sup> And, as in answer, God told him that his seed (his *natural* seed evidently) should, after sojourning and suffering in a land not theirs for above 400 years, come out in the fourth generation; and, *as a nation*, occupy that same land of Canaan.<sup>2</sup> This therefore was to be after Abraham himself, and Isaac too, had died. So that there now opened before him the vista of a new line of covenant-promise, not annulling or superseding,<sup>3</sup> but only co-ordinate with, and corroborative of, the older covenant-promise:<sup>4</sup>—the new promise being that of his *natural* seed as a living nation occupying the earthly Canaan; as if for an actual guarantee, and sign to perpetual generations, of his *spiritual* seed (the holy election of grace out of the natural seed<sup>5</sup>) at length after death, and through the medium of a resurrection, inheriting the same Canaan, in some way at length *made heavenly*, and with God himself revealed therein as their God.<sup>6</sup> Besides which important object, this new national dispensation was

<sup>1</sup> Gen. xv. 8.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* verse 16. See on this Brooks' Elements, ch. ii.

<sup>3</sup> So St. Paul, Gal. iii. 17; "This, I say, that the *covenant* that was confirmed before of God in Christ, the *law* which was 430 years after cannot disannul, that it should make the promise of none effect. For if the inheritance be of the law, it was no more of promise: but God gave it to Abraham by promise."

<sup>4</sup> So Rom. iv. 11; "He received the *sign* of circumcision;—a *seal of the righteousness of faith*, [and of course of the *promise thereto attached*,] which he had yet being uncircumcised; that he might be the father of all them that believe, though they be not circumcised;" even of "many nations." See Macknight on Rom. ix. 8; also his Essay V., prefixed to the Epistle to the Galatians, Introduction, and § 3.

Compare the sign given to Moses in Exod. iii. 12: a sign of something smaller and yet future, to assure him and his people of the fulfilment of something greater, and which in its full comprehensiveness embraced a yet more distant futurity. So too the sign given by Samuel to Saul, in proof of the latter possessing the kingdom, 1 Sam. x. 2, &c.; that to Hezekiah, 2 Kings xix. 29, and that to Ahaz, Isa. vii. 14, in proof of God's perpetual purposes of mercy to Judah.

<sup>5</sup> The admissibility of Gentiles was scarcely revealed.

<sup>6</sup> This is always expressed, or implied, as the grand glory of the reward; from Gen. xv. 1, "Fear not, Abraham; I am thy shield, and thy *exceeding great reward*;" to Levit. xxvi. 12, "I will be your God, and ye shall be my people."

made subservient in a thousand ways both to illustrate, and as a schoolmaster to train up the people for participation in, the earlier covenant of heavenly promise : setting forth, as appeared afterwards in its wonderful ritual and code of law, so strikingly as probably nothing else could have done, the vastness of the alienation caused by Adam's sin between a holy God and sinful man, and consequent vastness of the difficulty of effecting what the original covenant implied, in respect of man's (and inclusively the creation's) restoration and reconciliation : and the need consequently of an all-perfect atoner, mediator, and purifier, such as might indeed do the work, and realize the wonderful ideas, now first fully set forth, of *redemption* and a *redeemer*.—No wonder that the faithful servants of God in every age should have found in the varying history of the Jewish nation,—of its rebellions and its punishments,—its stubbornness, and his treatment of its stubbornness,—its repentances and its partial restorations,—types of their own spiritual history, and of God's unwearied faithfulness in his covenant to save.<sup>1</sup> That nation, and its natural history, seem to have been almost set forth to Abraham, in God's first announcement concerning it, as a sign and type of the spiritual history, and ultimate spiritual blessedness, of the spiritual seed. I say a sign of its ultimate spiritual blessedness. For the final and ultimate view of the *natural* Israel, (as well as of the *spiritual*,) as predicated in all prophecy concerning it,—from the prophecies by Moses<sup>2</sup> to those by Christ<sup>3</sup> and St. Paul,<sup>4</sup>—was that of its ultimate blessed union with God ; though not till after a long and fearful æra of alienation and judgment, and the temporary passing away in consequence of the supremacy and glory from Israel.

And here then there might naturally arise a question with the believer of old, as he looked forward into the distant future, Would there be any coincidence in respect of *time*, as well as of *earthly scene*, between the fulfilments of the ultimate blessings predicted in respect of either [covenant] ?—in other words, a synchronization of the *spiritual* Israel's

<sup>1</sup> Compare 1 Cor. x. 6.

<sup>2</sup> Deut. xxx. 1—9.

<sup>3</sup> Luke xxi. 24, Matt. xxiii. 39.

<sup>4</sup> Rom. xi. 25, 26.

*resurrection from the dead*, in order to its inheritance both of a renovated earth and of God himself its Redeemer, with the *natural* Israel's restoration to their renovated land and to the favour of their Redeemer-God? A question this, bearing directly, the reader will see, on the point of our present investigation: and to which the scriptural answer, I believe, is this, that the chronological connexion of the two consummations was a thing intended; and neither unforeseen to, nor unforeseen by, the saints of God, alike before, and at, and after, the time of Christ.—I proceed to give proof of this; and shall endeavour in doing so to keep the *national Israel's* promised ultimate happiness in view, as distinguished from *the renovated world's* ultimate happiness, which is to be the subject of my next head: though indeed the one is so mixed up with the other, that it is hard to keep the view of the two altogether distinct and separate.

1. The intimated synchronism of the *spiritual* Israel's *resurrection from the dead* with the *restoration* of the *natural* Israel to God's favour and their own land.

On *Moses'* views in this matter there is scarce evidence sufficient to enable us to pronounce: though it seems that he understood the distinction of the two covenant-promises; and, as one written in God's book of the living,<sup>1</sup> looked himself for the reward of the same *heavenly* country as his fathers:<sup>2</sup> a country identified almost by the very language of his law<sup>3</sup> with that earthly Canaan to which, in fulfilment of the lesser promise made to Abraham, and in type of the future spiritual seed's great Prophet and Leader,<sup>4</sup> he was now conducting the nation of Israel.—But, passing onward in Jewish history, in the writings of *David* (Christ's most

<sup>1</sup> Exod. xxxii. 31; "And Moses said unto the Lord, Oh this people have sinned a great sin. . . Yet now if thou wilt forgive their sin—; and if not, blot me, I pray thee, out of the book that thou hast written. And the Lord said unto Moses, Whosoever hath sinned against me, him will I blot out of my book." This book is called in Psalm lxi. 28 and Isa. iv. 3 the *book of the living*; in Ezek. xiii. 9, the *writing of the house of Israel*; in Dan. xii. 1, simply *the book*; ("Thy people shall be delivered, every one that shall be found written in the book;") in Phil. iv. 3, and Rev. iii. 5, xx. 15, xxi. 27, the *book of life*; in Luke x. 20, and Heb. xii. 23, a *writing in heaven*. Compare also Apoc. vii. 4. <sup>2</sup> Heb. xi. 26.

<sup>3</sup> "The land shall not be sold for ever; for the land is mine: for ye are strangers and sojourners with (before) me." So Lev. xxv. 23, on the Jubilee. <sup>4</sup> Deut. xviii. 15.

eminent type in the *kingly*, as Moses in the *prophetic* character) an expectation does, I think, appear of this synchronism; even as by one who had been taught the secret of God's covenant.<sup>1</sup> Himself raised to be king of Israel, and foreknowing that he was to be the father according to the flesh, as well as the royal type, of King Messiah, (the self-same seed of the woman, and seed of Abraham, that had been promised to Adam and to Abraham,) that Messiah's ultimate reign of glory, after certain previous and mysterious sufferings,<sup>2</sup> was a subject on which he loved to dwell. And he *thus* spoke of it:—viz. as a reign that would be established on *earth*,<sup>3</sup> a manifestation of his personal glory accompanying its introduction;<sup>4</sup> with *the gathering of his saints* to Him, such as had made a covenant with Him by sacrifice,<sup>5</sup> and an act and process also before heaven and earth of some tremendous judgment by fire, and opening of the pit of hell, upon the wicked:<sup>6</sup>—the result being a most blessed and universal reign of righteousness; *Zion*, now at length *restored and rebuilt*, forming the central point of the Messiah's manifestation,<sup>7</sup> with "the seed of his servants to inherit it," and Israel now "gathered from among the heathen:"<sup>8</sup> and, on the view of this judgment, and report from *Zion* of his glory, the conversion of the distant heathen following, and so the whole earth becoming filled with his glory.<sup>9</sup> Now among this seed of blessed inheritors, and saints then gathered to the King Messiah, as joined in covenant with Him by sacrifice, it would seem that *David himself* (who on earth felt as a *stranger* and *pilgrim*, like his fathers,<sup>10</sup>) expected to have a part. For, when contrasting in one place *death feeding on the wicked*, and the upright having dominion over them *in the morning*, while *their beauty consumed in Hades* as its proper dwelling, he expresses his belief of God redeeming *his* soul individually from the power of the grave:<sup>11</sup> and moreover elsewhere uses the

<sup>1</sup> Psalm xxv. 14. I think this was *part* of the secret.

<sup>2</sup> Psalm xxii. &c.

<sup>3</sup> Psalm viii., compared with Heb. ii. 6, &c.; Psalm xlvii., lxxii., xevii., &c. &c.

<sup>4</sup> Psalm l. 2, eii. 16, &c.

<sup>5</sup> Psalm l. 5. Compare 2 Thess. ii. 1.

<sup>6</sup> Psalm ix. 16, 17; l. 3; xevii. 3—5, &c.

<sup>7</sup> Psalm eii. 16, xlvi. 1, 2, 11, lxxxvii. 1, 2, 3, xevii. 8, xcix. 2, &c.

<sup>8</sup> Psalm lxix. 36, 1 Chron. xvi. 33, 35. <sup>9</sup> Psalms lxxii., xevi., xevii., xeviii., &c.

<sup>10</sup> Psalm xxxix. 12, cxix. 19.

<sup>11</sup> Psalm xlix. 14, 15. See Marg. This most remarkable passage is quoted by



same phrase, *the morning*, κατ' ἐξοχην, to express the time of God's ultimate *deliverance of Israel*, and overthrow of evil on the earth.<sup>1</sup> To which it may be added that, having in one place spoken of *his own waking up after God's likeness* (evidently *at his resurrection*) as the supreme object of his satisfaction,<sup>2</sup> he yet elsewhere notices *the establishment of Messiah's kingdom on earth* as the ultimate object of his prayers;<sup>3</sup> and in yet another place, connectedly with a description of the same *earthly* reign of King Messiah, God's having made an everlasting covenant with *himself*, ordered in all things and sure, the which was all his salvation and all his desire.<sup>4</sup>

In the *Prophets* after David the same coincidence of time between Israel's restoration and the saints' resurrection is also expressed, only much more clearly. Take, for example, *Isaiah's* prophecy (already elsewhere cited by me,<sup>5</sup> in illustration of the circumstantial attendants on Israel's restoration) in his chapters xxiv.—xxvii. He there speaks of some terrible shaking of the earth under God's judgment, and the host of the high ones, and kings of the earth, being then as prisoners gathered into the pit of their prison; of the contemporaneous reigning of the Lord of hosts in *Mount Zion* and in *Jerusalem*, before *his ancients*, with a glory that should make the sun itself ashamed: of the Lord's then opening to *all people* a feast of fat things, and destroying the veil of the covering cast over them, and *swallowing up death in victory*, and wiping away tears from off all faces, and taking away the rebuke of his people from off all the earth, and punishing with his great and strong sword the crooked serpent, and purging away the iniquity of *Jacob*, and causing them that come of *Jacob* to take root, and *Israel* to blossom and bud, and fill the earth with fruit. When partially citing this prophecy before, the reference of which to the final restoration of the national

Macknight in his Essay V., prefixed to his Comment on the Galatians, to the same effect.

<sup>1</sup> Psalm xlvi. 5 (Marg.), "God shall help her *when the morning appeareth*." Compare Psalm cx. 3; where also, perhaps, the *resurrection morning* may be referred to. So Hancock, Feast of Tab. p. 198.

<sup>2</sup> Psalm xvii. 15.

<sup>3</sup> Psalm lxxii. 19, 20; "And blessed be his glorious name for ever, and let the whole earth be filled with his glory! Amen and Amen! The prayers of David, the son of Jesse, are ended."

<sup>4</sup> 2 Sam. xxiii. 1—5.

<sup>5</sup> p. 113 *suprà*.

Israel seems hardly to be mistaken, I left the question as to what *swallowing up of death in victory* might be intended, and whether in a *literal* or a *figurative* resurrection, an open question. It is now my place to answer it. And the answer is already at hand, as given by the Apostle St. Paul; who as expressly identifies the fulfilment of those words, "He shall swallow up death in victory," with the time of *the saints' resurrection*,<sup>1</sup> as the prophet identifies it with that of *the natural Israel's restoration*: at the same time that the other details of the prophecy are, I may say, almost the same, point by point, as those in the Apocalyptic prefiguration of the events introducing the Millennium.<sup>2</sup> To the same effect are the prophecies in Isaiah's two last chapters, also cited in my last preceding Chapter: where the *restoration of Israel* is connected with the creation of "*new heavens and a new earth*," like those in the Apocalypse; and moreover with that punishment of transgressors, of which Christ also speaks as of a punishment to be adjudged *at his coming*,<sup>3</sup> viz. "the worm that never dieth, and the fire that is never quenched."<sup>4</sup> Further evidence might be easily added from the same evangelic prophet, did my limits permit. But it may be better to pass on now to two or three of the other prophets.—And first to Isaiah's contemporary, *Hosea*. "The iniquity of *Ephraim*," says he, with reference to the time of *Israel's ultimate repentance and restoration*, "is bound up; his sin is hid: the sorrows of a travailing woman shall come upon him: he is an unwise son: for he should not stay long in the place of the breaking-forth of children. *I will ransom them from the power of the grave; I will redeem them from death; O death, I will be thy plagues; O grave, I will be thy destruction.*"<sup>5</sup> And what this redemption from death? That of the nation in figurative sense of the phrase? Not so. Again St. Paul may be cited,<sup>6</sup> in proof of *the literal*

<sup>1</sup> 1 Cor. xv. 54.

<sup>2</sup> Especially the statement of the Lord's reigning in Mount Zion *before his ancients*, or Sanhedrim council, such as appeared seated on the thrones in Apoc. xx. 4, will not be overlooked by the reader. And with it will be compared Zechariah's parallel prophecy of "the Lord my God coming (at the time of Israel's restoration), *and all his saints with him.*"

<sup>3</sup> Compare Mark ix. 44, Matt. xiii. 42, xxv. 41.

<sup>4</sup> Isa. lxvi. 24.

<sup>5</sup> Hosea xiii. 12—14.

<sup>6</sup> 1 Cor. xv. 55.

*resurrection of the saints* being the thing meant in the latter verses; and consequently of the chronological coincidence of this their resurrection from the grave with Israel's restoration.<sup>1</sup>—Next turn we to *Ezekiel's* celebrated vision of the dry bones.<sup>2</sup> And here, if the case be more equivocal, yet I may observe that according to the exposition of the earlier Christian Fathers,<sup>3</sup> derived in part perhaps from the earlier Jewish Rabbins, those bones and that resurrection are to be construed, not simply of *the living Jewish people*, and *their* fall and resuscitation, but of *the Jewish saints departed* also, and their *literal bodily* resurrection, in common with *Christian saints*, at the time of Israel's restoration.<sup>4</sup>—Yet once more, (to close my Old Testament citations,) I must refer to two of the famous prophecies of *Daniel*. The first is that in Dan. vii.; which prefigured the four great persecuting empires that, commencing from the time of Israel's unfaithfulness, and consequent temporary rejection by God, would in succession hold the world's supremacy; until at length, after the destined 1260 days (or years) of the last of the four, in its last or antichristian form, judgment should be given to *the saints of the Most High*, and the time come for *the saints possessing the kingdom*:—possessing it, mark well,<sup>5</sup> “for

<sup>1</sup> To much the same effect is the prophecy by another contemporary of Isaiah's, *Micah*, ch. v. 3. See my Vol. iii. p. 284, Note <sup>3</sup>. <sup>2</sup> Ezek. xxxvii.

<sup>3</sup> For example, *Irenæus*, v. 15, after citing the whole vision in proof of the doctrine of a resurrection, sums up thus: “Demiurgo et hic vivificante corpora vestra mortua, et resurrectionem eis repromittente, et de sepulchris et monumentis suscitacionem et incorruptelam donante.”\* And so again v. 34.—Similar to this is *Tertullian's* explanation of the resurrection in *Ezekiel's* vision; though he allows that it may also signify the Jews' restoration; (*De Resurr. Carn.* ch. 30;) and also *Cyprian's* *Testim.* iii. 58; and that of *Cyril Hierosol.* Cat. 18.—The *Author of the Quest. et Respons.* appended to *Justin Martyr's* Works, *Quæst.* 45, unites either view, p. 418. (Ed. Colon.) Ἦν δὲ ἐπὶ τοῦ Ἰεζεκὴλ τὰ πάντα ὀπτασία, καὶ ὀστῆα, καὶ ἡ τούτων ἀναστάσις· δεικνύσι δὲ τῆ προφητῆ ταυτην τὴν ὀπτασίαν ὁ Θεός, προηγουμένως μὲν μνησθῶν δι' αὐτῆς ἐσομένην διὰ Χριστοῦ πάντων κοσμικῆν ἀναστάσιν τὴν ἐκ νεκρῶν, εἰπεὶα δὲ καὶ τὴν ψυχὰ γωγίαν τῶν Ἰσραηλιτῶν τῶν ἀπογνοῦντων ἑαυτοὺς τῷ δεδουλωσθαι, ὅτι ἐλευθεροὶ ἐσονται τῆς τῶν Βαβυλωνίων βασιλείας.—And so too *Augustine* in his *De Genesi ad Lit.* x. 8. For, on first referring to it, he says; “Apud Ezechielem prophetam demonstratur *resurrectio mortuorum* :” but then adds presently after; “Etiam si illo loco non resurrectionem carnis, qualis propriè futura est, sed inopinatam desperati populi reparationem per Spiritum Domini figuratâ revelatione prævidit.”

<sup>4</sup> Let me beg to refer on this to *Davison on Prophecy*, pp. 270, 511.

<sup>5</sup> The rather as the argument hence arising has been too generally overlooked.

\* Isa. xxvi. 19, “Thy dead shall live; [*together with*] my dead body shall they arise;” is another Old Testament prophecy here also cited by him.

ever and for ever:" *their everlasting kingdom thus dating from the fall of Antichrist.* The second that of Dan. xii., which depicted the two events of the *resurrection of the just*, so as to shine as the sun in the firmament, and *Israel's last trouble and deliverance*, as occurring each and either near about the end of the same 1260 days, or years, of Antichrist's abomination of desolation: the declaration being made in chronological terms yet more exact, that at the end of the 1335 days, or years, 75 days or years beyond the former, the time of blessedness would begin; and *Daniel himself stand in his lot* (i. e. his inheritance<sup>1</sup>) at the end of those days.<sup>2</sup>

I have hinted that it was thus that the *Jewish* expositors that lived between the return from Babylon and destruction of Jerusalem understood the passages cited: in proof of which statement I subjoin a few extracts.<sup>3</sup> And though

<sup>1</sup> κληρονομια. See my Note <sup>4</sup>, p. 159. And compare Col. i. 12; *την μεριδα του κληρου των αγιων εν τω φωτι.*

<sup>2</sup> יָמֵי־הַיְיָ. The *article* must be observed. It fixes the meaning to the days just before mentioned, viz. the 1335 days. See my remarks pp. 109—112 *suprà*.

<sup>3</sup> 1. On Hosea vi. 2, "After two days will he revive us; in the third day He will raise us up, and we shall live in his sight," the *Chaldee Targum* (a comment probably of the century before Christ) thus expounds the passage. "Vivificabit nos diebus consolationis qui venturi sunt:—die resurrectionis mortuorum suscitabit nos; et vivemus cum ipso." (Schoettgen, vi. 6.)

2. On Hosea xiv. 8, the *Rabbi Eliezer the Great*, who is supposed to have lived just after the second temple was built, thus applies it to the pious Jews who seemed likely to die without seeing the glory of Israel; "As I live, saith Jehovah, I will raise you up in the time to come, in the resurrection of the dead; and I will gather you with all Israel." (Brooks' *Elements*, p. 36; referring to his *Capit.* 34.)

3. The *Author of the Book of Wisdom*, an Alexandrian Jew of one or two centuries probably before the Christian æra, (see *Gray's Key*), says in chap. ii. verses 7, 8, of the *dead*; "In the time of their visitation they shall shine, and run to and fro like sparks among the stubble; they shall judge the nations, and have dominion over the peoples; and their Lord shall reign for ever."

4. In 2 *Maccab.* vii. 9, the *second* of the seven brethren put to death by Antiochus is represented to have said, "Thou takest us out of this present life, but the king of the world shall raise us up, who have died for his laws, to everlasting life." The *fourth* brother (verse 14) said; "It is good, being put to death by man, to look for hope from God, to be raised up again by him." "As for thee thou shalt have no resurrection to life." And the *youngest* showed that they expected this resurrection to life by virtue of the *covenant with Abraham*: saying, verse 36, "For our brethren, who now have suffered a short pain, are dead *under God's covenant of everlasting life.*" For, says Macknight, *Essay* v. § 3, prefixed to his *Comment* on *Epistle* to the *Galatians*, "What covenant of everlasting life did God ever make with the Jews, under which they could die; unless it be the covenant with Abraham, in which He promised with an oath to give him and his seed *the land of Canaan for an everlasting possession?*" So, after citation of the passage from the *Maccabees*.

The author of this *Second Book of Maccabees* is judged to have lived a century, or thereabouts, before Christ at Alexandria.

5. When the *Rabbi Gamaliel* (St. Paul's Master) was asked by the Sadducees to



a different construction has been put upon them by ancient as well as modern anti-premillennarians, as if they were *simply* prophecies of *the revival and resuscitation of Israel*, (as well as of *the world* with it,) from a state of national and religious depression,<sup>1</sup> still, while allowing that this is *in part* their subject, (and its being so is of course an essential point in my argument,) yet I cannot but think that the Jews rightly viewed them as including also predictions of the *literal resurrection* of the saints *literally dead*, contemporaneously with Israel's *figurative* resuscitation. For, in some cases at least, the language<sup>2</sup> seems all but un-

prove out of the Scripture the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead, he is said to have cited among other passages, Deut. xi. 21, "That thy days may be multiplied, . . . in the land *which the Lord sware to thy fathers to give them;*" and xxxi. 16, "But thou (Moses) shalt sleep with thy fathers : " also Isa. xxvi. 19, "Thy dead men shall rise," &c. : which last seemed to give explanation how the fathers, though asleep, were yet to inherit." Gemara Sanhedrim, ap. Mede, Book iv. Ep. 43; and Vitringa on Isa. xxvi. 19, Note A.—The *Sadducees*, says Vitringa, argued for a *figurative* sense.

There are a few extracts from the *Gemara Sanhedrim* given by Heinrichs on Apoc. xx. 4, 5, to much the same purport.

<sup>1</sup> So *Vitringa* in his *Apocalypse*, p. 1159, and in his *Commentary* on *Isaiah* xxvi. 19: referring to the prophecies, not only of *Ezek.* xxxvii. and *Hosea* vi. 2, but even of *Dan.* xii. 2, as to be taken in the same sense.—So too *Rosenmüller* on *Ezek.* xxxvii.; who cites these same passages from the other prophets. He also quotes *Jerome's* Comment on *Ezek.* xxxvii. to the same effect.

<sup>2</sup> I may especially rest on the prophecy in *Dan.* xii. 2, compared with xii. 13 of the same chapter. — *Clarius*,<sup>6</sup> (an anti-premillenarian commentator in the *Critici Sacri*), constrained by the clearness of the language, writes thus on *Dan.* xii. 2, 13, and notices the general concurrence both of Jewish and Christian expositors in so explaining it: "Hic apertissimè locus est de *resurrectione*, etiam *Judeis* sapientioribus consentientibus;\* tametsi eùm *Chiliasis* videantur sentire.—Omnium Catholicorum et peritorum Hebræorum consensu in hoc ultimo versu resurrectionis promittitur." And so too *Calmet*.

Even *Grotius* himself, one of the most bold of anti-premillennarians, after a primary exposition of *Dan.* xii. 2 as figuring Maccabean triumphs, and *Dan.* xii. 13, as if "Thou shalt stand in thy lot" meant *Præfecturam quam habes retinebis*, and "at, or to, the end of the days," *ad plenissimam senectutem*, yet is forced to add, "Videntur tamen studio ita concepta verba ut illud *quiesces* de morte sumi possit, et *stabis* significare *αναστησθαι*, (quomodo vertit Theodotion,) et *finis dierum* finem universi." (He takes no notice of the article, "the days.")—So too *Porphyrus*, cited by him, and by *Wintle* in loc. Also *Vitringa* on *Isa.* xxvi. 19; and *Venema*, p. 498; all of whom give a Maccabean primary solution to *Dan.* xii. 2.

*Mr. Brown* too (p. 200) thus writes. "Conceiving that the time more immediately in view in this passage (*Dan.* xii. 2) was that of the deliverance of Daniel's people, and taking this to mean their future conversion, I applied the whole in my former edition *primarily* to that blessed period when (in bright anticipation of the times of the restitution of all things) judgment shall be given to the saints of the Most High. . . But, whether right in supposing any such *primary* reference in the words, or

\* So, for example, the middle-age Rabbi *Saadias Gaon*, thus interpreting *Dan.* xii. 2:—"This is the resurrection of the dead of Israel, whose lot is to eternal life: but those who do not awake are the destroyed of the Lord, who go down to the habitation beneath, that is, Gehenna; and they shall be an abhorrence to all flesh." (*Bickersteth* on *Prophecy*, 303: 7th Ed.)

equivocal; and the apostolic comment fixes the sense in others.<sup>1</sup>

And so the promise came down to New Testament times, —the promise of *the world's renovation, Abrahamic inheritance, and establishment of Messiah's kingdom*, all in supposed connexion with the promise to the *national Israel*. And both in the gospel-narratives of Christ's own life and ministry, and in the apostolic records afterwards, we shall I think find recognition of the current supposition, as really true.

At the very outset, on the infant Jesus' presentation in the temple, the priestly seer who recognized in him the promised seed of the woman, and seed of Abraham, and Son of David, in whom all the families of the earth were to be blessed, was inspired thus to declare the *literal Israel's* foreseen share in the blessing; (I say *literal Israel*, because expressly distinguished from the Gentiles;) viz. that "he was to be the light of the Gentiles, and the glory of God's people Israel:" the latter however not till after he had been first the occasion of *fall*, and then afterwards of *rising again* (in the figurative sense evidently), "to many in Israel."<sup>2</sup> And, as to the time of that rising again and glorification of the long-fallen Israel, Christ's own words of promise to his disciples, "Ye which have followed me shall in the regeneration, *when the Son of Man shall sit in the throne of his glory*,"<sup>3</sup> sit also upon twelve thrones, *judging the twelve tribes of Israel*,"<sup>4</sup> seemed surely to fix

not, I never for a moment doubted that the only adequate fulfilment of the prediction will be at the *literal resurrection* of both classes of men" (i. e. good and evil).

<sup>1</sup> Hence Lowth, on Isa. xxv. 8, allows that that prophecy of the swallowing up death in victory can only be fulfilled at the general resurrection.

<sup>2</sup> Luke ii. 32, 34.—The reader will see that in interpreting the nature of the *rising again* of Israel from the nature of the *fall* risen from, I have followed the principle laid down pp. 146, 147 *suprà*.

<sup>3</sup> It will be well to mark, in passing, the clear distinction here set before us of the epoch of Christ's glorious enthronization in *his* kingdom, from that of his taking seat on the Father's throne (so Apoc. iii: 21) after his ascension. There has been often a confusion of times and things on this matter. I shall have to recur to the point in my notice of the Messiah's kingdom under my 4th head of argument.

<sup>4</sup> Matt. xix. 28.—We may compare the parallel passage in Luke xxii. 28—30; "Ye are they which have continued with me in my temptations: and I appoint unto you a kingdom, as my Father hath appointed unto me: that ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom, and sit on thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel." Also Matt. viii. 11; "Many shall come from the east and west, and shall sit down with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob (*ανακλιθῶσονται*, sit down to supper)

it as that of the saints' resurrection. For how, at an epoch of time distant ages afterwards, could the twelve disciples be present, and have rule over the tribes of Israel, except only by a resurrection from the dead; that same which Christ elsewhere<sup>1</sup> in remarkable manner designated distinctively as "the resurrection of the just?" To the same effect was Christ's statement, just before his passion, that "Jerusalem should be trodden by the Gentiles till the times of the Gentiles were fulfilled:" (i. e. probably the times of the four Gentile dominant empires of Daniel's prophecy :) especially as compared with another cognate prediction of his, "Your house is left unto you desolate; for ye shall not see me henceforth till ye shall say, Blessed is He that cometh in the name of the Lord."<sup>2</sup> For, whereas in the former of these two prophecies alike its connexion with the disciples' previous question, "What shall be the sign of *thy coming*, and of *the end of the world*," and also the almost immediately consequent context describing variously Christ's acts of judgment on his second coming,<sup>3</sup> might seem to mark the ending epoch of Jerusalem's treading down by the Gentiles as the epoch also of Christ's second and glorious advent,—in the other prophecy the ending of Jerusalem's desolation was pretty plainly hinted at as the foreseen epoch of the repentant Jews visibly recognizing the true Messiah in Jesus whom they had pierced: which recognition St. John expressly associates with his glorious second coming in the clouds, and every eye seeing him.<sup>4</sup> Nor should we omit to observe that after Christ's resurrection, and when He had been speaking to the disciples on "the things pertaining to *the kingdom of God*," upon their asking him, "Wilt thou at this time *restore the kingdom to Israel*," as if there were truth in the then commonly received Jewish view of the synchronism of Israel's national restoration, and the establishment of God's or Christ's kingdom on earth, Christ did not correct them in

in the kingdom of heaven:" and Matt. xxvi. 29; "I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine, till I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom."—Of "*the regeneration*" mentioned in Matt. xix. 28 I shall speak under my next head.

<sup>1</sup> Luke xiv. 14, Compare Luke xvi. 22; speaking of the expectants of this resurrection as gathered into *Abraham's bosom*.

<sup>2</sup> Luke xxi. 24, xiii. 35, Matt. xxiii. 38, 39.

<sup>3</sup> Luke xxi. 27, 36, Matt. xxiv. 3, 37, &c.

<sup>4</sup> Apoc. i. 7. Comp. Zech. xii. 10.

the idea, but only told them that it was not for them to know the times and seasons.<sup>1</sup>—And as the Master, so too the Apostles afterwards. First and foremost St. Peter in that most remarkable address to the Jews, within but few days after the descent of the Holy Spirit, “Repent ye, and be converted, that *times of refreshing* may come, and *he may send Jesus, &c.* ;” as if the epoch of *the Jews’ repentance and conversion* was to be the epoch of *Christ’s return from heaven* : a passage however which I prefer to consider in detail under my next head, as having prominent reference to the times of *the world’s* universal restoration and happiness, as well as to the *Jews’* restoration in particular. And so again in various places the Apostle St. Paul. Such, e. g. was the purport of his declaration before Agrippa, that he was judged for “*the hope of the promise made of God to the fathers* ; to the which promise *the twelve tribes*, instantly serving God day and night, *hoped to come* ;”<sup>2</sup> compared with his previous saying, “Of *the hope and resurrection of the dead* I am called in question.”<sup>3</sup> For there can be no doubt that the promise to which the hopes of the *twelve tribes* were instantly directed, was that of *the restoration of the kingdom to Israel* : which event consequently was thus distinctly associated by the Apostle with *the resurrection of the just*. Besides which we have, as before said, his comment in 1 Cor. xv. 54, 55 on certain prophecies already cited from Isaiah xxv. and Hosea xiii., which seem plainly to refer to the time, circumstances, and blessedness of *the literal Israel’s restoration* :<sup>4</sup> a comment expounding them as what would be fulfilled at the time, and in the fact, of *the departed saints’ glorious resurrection*, and *living saints’ glorious change and rapture*, to meet the Lord Jesus in the air at his second coming.

<sup>1</sup> Acts i. 3, 6, 7.<sup>2</sup> Acts xxvi. 6, 7.<sup>3</sup> Acts xxiii. 6, xxiv. 21.<sup>4</sup> 1 Cor. xv. 54 ; “So when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory. 55 ; O death, where is thy sting ? O grave, where is thy victory ?”In the former of these verses St. Paul’s reference is to *Isa. xxv. 8* ; “In this mountain he will destroy the veil that is spread over all nations ; he will swallow up death in victory.” In the latter he refers to *Hosea xiii. 14* ; “I will ransom them from the power of the grave ; I will redeem them from death : O death, I will be thy plagues ; O grave, I will be thy destruction.”I might perhaps add Christ’s own reference to *Isaiah lxvi. 24*, in *Mark ix. 44*, &c. But it is there the dark accompaniments of the æra that he speaks of.



Such is my first head of argument.—The anti-premillenarians of course present a very different view of the whole subject. Thus, as regards the *Abrahamic covenant*, there was no *local* interest in *Canaan*, they contend, given to Abraham himself, or to his spiritual seed. “Abraham expected *Canaan* for his posterity, and a *mansion in heaven* for himself.”<sup>1</sup> But, except as contained in the promise of *Canaan*,<sup>2</sup> where, let me ask, was local promise given him of *heaven*?<sup>3</sup> And how was he to be “*heir of the world*?” The renovated earth (inclusive of its atmospheric heaven) seemed ever hinted at as the local scene of the saints’ inheritance.<sup>4</sup> Which being so, why should not that one part of the new earth be peculiarly the scene of Christ’s manifestation; i. e. peculiarly *heavenly*?—Again, as regards those passages cited from the *prophets*, in which predictions that the New Testament explains of *the resurrection time and state* are connected with predictions of *the earthly happiness of the restored Jews and Jerusalem*, this connexion of the two, it is said, does not imply their synchronism: but arises only out of the comprehensive glancings of prophecy, embracing and interlacing together in its view the whole history and results of Christ’s redemption, in its various chief stages of development; from that of its first promulgation by Christ to that of its universal reception in the world on the Jews’ conversion, and then yet further that of the post-millennial stage of the redeemed saints’ heavenly and everlasting blessedness following their resurrection.<sup>5</sup> And, no doubt, sometimes there are comprehen-

<sup>1</sup> So the venerable T. Scott on Hebr. xi. 12.

<sup>2</sup> That of God as his great reward might be on earth as well as heaven.

<sup>3</sup> See p. 160, Note <sup>b</sup> *suprà*.

<sup>4</sup> Else what the meaning of the *new heaven and new earth* in Isaiah, Peter, and the Apocalypse? So too in 1 Thess. iv. 17 the raised saints are said to meet the Lord “*in the air* :” not in another planet; or in some imagined world above the stars.

<sup>5</sup> So Mr. Brown, pp. 179—189:—a disquisition written with his usual force and ability; but which has left a strong impression on my own mind of the inability alike of himself and the eminent expositors cited by him, (Calvin, Lowth, Scott,) to construe the passages fairly on their anti-premillennarian hypothesis.

It is to be remembered that the *Jews’ restoration* is generally admitted by them.—“If the perpetuity of the Abrahamic covenant, as respects the *natural* seed, be admitted on the authority of the apostle (Rom. xi. 26—29), it will be difficult I think to avoid admitting their *territorial restoration*: the *people* and the *land* of Israel being so connected in numerous prophecies of the Old Testament, that whatever *literality* and *perpetuity* are ascribed to the one must, one would think, on all strict principles of interpretation, be attributed to the other also.” So *Brown*, p. 434.

sive glancings at, and interminglings of, different future æras in prophecy. But in various chief passages urged by me, it is not a mere intermingling of subject that we find, but a direct chronological *synchronization* of the saints' resurrection and resurrection state with the earthly blessedness of the restored Jews and Jerusalem. So e. g. in Hosea xiii. 12—14; "The iniquity of *Ephraim* is bound up: his sin is hid: the sorrows of a travailing woman shall come upon him: he should not stay long in the place of the breaking forth of children. I will ransom them from the power of the grave; I will redeem them from death. O death, I will be thy plagues: O grave, I will be thy destruction. Repentance shall be hid from my eyes." So again in Isaiah lxv., lxvi.: "Behold I create new heavens and a new earth; and the former shall not be remembered, nor come into mind. But be glad and rejoice for ever in that which I create: for I create Jerusalem a rejoicing and her people a joy." . . . "And I will take of your brethren for priests and Levites, saith the Lord. For, as the new heavens and new earth which I will make shall remain before me, so shall your seed and name remain: &c." So, yet again, in Dan. xii. 13; "And thou Daniel shall stand in thy lot at the end of the days:" i. e. of the 1335 days, or years, measured from the beginning of Antichrist, when Israel's final trial was to end in its final deliverance. Surely nothing but violence can set aside the synchronism of the resurrection state of the saints, and restoration state of the converted Israel, as exprest in such passages.—Once more, in regard to *New Testament passages* like that in Matt. xix. 28, which associate the *apostles* and the *twelve tribes of Israel* together, as the rulers and ruled in Christ's glorious kingdom, the following counter-view is given;—"The world and the Church shall (at the last day) be judged according

—"I dare not absolutely deny what they (the early Fathers) all positively affirm, that the city of Jerusalem shall be then rebuilt and the converted Jews return to it, because this probably may be gathered from the words of Christ, 'Jerusalem shall be trodden down till the time of the Gentiles is come in.'" So *Whitby*.—In *Mr. Faber's* exposition the restoration of Israel is a point not only admitted but prominent.—The *British Reviewer* indeed (p. 175) expresses himself as "strongly of opinion that the Jews' return is *nowhere promised*." Yet he too "will not affirm" that they are not to be restored.—I shall have to recur to this in my next Chapter.

to their doctrines.”<sup>1</sup> But can the sitting as assessors in the *judicial condemnation of unbelieving Jews* be really the *reward* to his apostles here intended by Christ?

2. Next mark the predicted synchronism of *Christ's advent and the saints' resurrection* with the time of the *promised blessedness of the world*:—a subject, as before observed,<sup>2</sup> intermingled in sacred prophecy with the promises just considered to *Israel*;<sup>3</sup> but which for distinctness' sake, in regard of a few chief New Testament prophecies, I think it well here to consider separately.

As a *first* example, then, take that passage from Matt. xix. 28, already cited by me to illustrate the *Jewish* bearing of the question under my preceding head, which makes mention of the great future expected *παλιγγενεσια*, or *regeneration*. For what the *παλιγγενεσια* spoken of but the state when Christ shall make all things new,<sup>4</sup> and this earth be restored again to Paradisiacal blessedness?<sup>5</sup> In which state, however, and over which renovated earth, Christ here declares that the apostles shall, together with their Lord, have the authority and government:<sup>6</sup> a connexion and rule scarcely explicable except on the supposition of their previous resurrection in order to entering on it.

My *second* passage is that notable one in St. Peter's sermon, Acts iii. 19, on occasion of the miraculous restoration of the lame man by the temple-gate, just after the Holy Spirit's effusion on the day of Pentecost, and which was also cursorily cited by me under my former head on account

<sup>1</sup> So Mr. Scott in loc. cited by Mr. Brown.

<sup>2</sup> p. 163 *suprà*.

<sup>3</sup> Gen. xii. 3, xxii. 18; “In thee (and in thy seed) shall all the families (and nations) of the earth be blessed.”—Compare Rom. xi. 12, 15; “If the casting away of them be the reconciling of the world, how much more their fulness?” “If the casting away of them be the reconciling of the world, what shall the receiving of them be but life from the dead?”

<sup>4</sup> Apoc. xxi. 5; “And he that sate upon the throne said, Behold I make all things new.” With which, as before, compare the prophecy in Isa. lxxv., lxxvi.

<sup>5</sup> I cite what follows from Schleusner on the word *Παλιγγενεσια*. “Metaphoricè *omnis magna et insignis pristini alicujus rei status instauratio, et institutio*: . . . *speciatim ille rerum humanarum status quo tristia tempora alia ac lictiora excipiunt fata*. Sic v. c. apud Græcos Scriptores *παλιγγενεσια* tribuebatur terræ, veris tempore formam suam mutanti; et apud Stoicos mundi in statum meliorem restitutio *παλιγγενεσια* dicebatur.” He adds that the Syriac translation renders it in Matt. xix. 28, “*in sæculo novo*.”

<sup>6</sup> Compare Heb. ii. 5.—The Jews supposed angels to be appointed over this earth and its several kingdoms, as I have observed Note<sup>7</sup>, p. 58 *suprà*.

of what there is of *Jewish* allusion in it:—"Repent ye, therefore, and be converted, to the end that your sins may be blotted out; that times of refreshing may come from the presence of the Lord, and he may send Jesus Christ which before was ordained (προκεχειρισμενον) for you: whom the heavens must receive until the times of the restitution of all things, of which God hath spoken by the mouth of his holy prophets since the world began." A passage this of such decisive bearing on the point in hand, that it is impossible to give it too careful a consideration. I subjoin therefore the best critical text in the original;<sup>1</sup> and in order to its correct understanding premise the three critical remarks following:—1st, that in the second clause my rendering "*that* the times of refreshing may come," instead of the authorized version's "*when* the times," is just the most natural, if not necessary, rendering of the original Greek:<sup>2</sup>—2ndly, that the word *restoration* or *restitution*, in our received English version, is also the most accurate expression of the sense of the Greek αποκαταστασις in verse 21, accordantly alike with its etymological intent, and frequent use both in Scripture and elsewhere:<sup>3</sup>—3rdly, that the antecedent of the

<sup>1</sup> Μετανοησατε ουν, και επιστρεψατε, εις το εξαλειφθηναι υμων τας αμαρτιας· οπως αν ελθωσι καιροι αναψυξεως απο προσωπου του Κυριου, και αποστειλη τον προκεχειρισμενον \* υμιν Ιησουν Χριστον· ον δει ουρανον μεν δεξισθαι αχρι χρονων αποκαταστασεως παντων, ων ελαλησεν ο Θεος δια στοματος των αγιων αυτου προφητων απ' αιωνος.

<sup>2</sup> οπως αν ελθωσι καιροι αναψυξεως. In proof that mine is the most natural rendering of the conjunction, let me refer to a parallel or two:—e. g. Luke ii. 35, οπως αν αποκαλυψθωσιν εκ πολλων καρδιων διαλογισμοι "that the thoughts of many hearts may be revealed;" and Psalm li. 4, (Sept.) οπως αν δικαιθης εν λογοις σου "that thou mightest be justified in thy sayings:" &c. My rendering is in fact almost universally allowed by expositors,—anti-premillennarians, as well as others: e. g. by Whitby, Vitringa, Lightfoot, Doddridge. So too the critic Rosenmuller:—"Οπως αν, eum in finem, ut: nam particula οπως cum conjunctivo juncta notat ut, ita ut, Matt. vi. 5, xxiii. 35, Acts xv. 17, Rom. iii. 4." And so, as Whitby observes, Irenæus and Tertullian expounded the phrase of old.† Our English version's rendering of it as a participle of *time*, "*When* the times," &c., is much less simple and natural.

<sup>3</sup> Καταστασις means the *actual state, condition, or constitution*; and consequently αποκαταστασις must most naturally mean a *new and different constitution* of things, generally by *restoration* to what it was originally.

For *Scripture* examples I may refer to Matt. xii. 13; Αποκατεσταθη υγιης ως η αλλη "His hand was *restored* whole as the other:" Matt. xvii. 11; "Ελις απο-

\* The received text, followed by our English translation, reads here προκεκηρυγμενον, before preached. But all the best critical Editions read προκεχειρισμενον.

† Irenæus thus; "Pœnitentiam igitur agite, et convertimini, uti delectantur peccata vestra, et veniant vobis tempora refrigerii." iii. 12. Tertullian thus: "Resipiscite ad abolenda delicta vestra, ut tempora vobis superveniant refrigerii," &c. De Resur. 23.



relative *ὧν* in the same verse, which, in so far as the grammatical structure of the sentence is concerned, might be either the *παντων* or the *χρονων*,<sup>1</sup> seems clearly determined by the sense of the sentence to be the word *χρονων*, *times* :

*καταστησει παντα, shall restore all things :*" Acts i. 6; Ει . . αποκαθιστανεις βασιλειαν τῃ Ισραηλ, "Wilt thou restore the kingdom to Israel : " Jer. xvi. 15; Αποκαταστησω αυτοις εις την γην αυτων' &c. So the verb. The substantive itself occurs here alone in the New Testament.—I observe that the only three meanings which Schleusner gives to *αποκαταστασις* in his Scripture Lexicon are;—1. "*Rei in primum locum reductio, restitutio* ;—2. *Omnis restitutio prioris status* ;—3. *Reductio rerum in meliorem statum*." This is the more observable, as he adds the expression of his own inclination to take the word here in *Hesychius'* "rarior" sense of *τελειωσις* ; but, apparently because of the inadequacy of the authority, does not urge that meaning. Kuinoel, with similar inclination, is equally unable to discover a case in point : for he takes refuge in the Septuagint version of Job viii. 6, which is *not* to the point.

By classical authors the noun and verb are similarly used in the sense of *restoration* :—*surgically* of the setting or restoration of diseased or broken limbs ; *astronomically* of the sun returning into his old sign in the Zodiac ; *politically* of hostages or exiles returning to their country. (See Schleusner and Scapula.)—And so again the Jewish writers Josephus and Philo, as Kuinoel observes on this passage.

So too the early Fathers, as the exemplifications following show.—1. *Ignatius*, ad Smyrn. § 11 ; Αποκατεσταθη αυτοις το ιδιον σωματειον' said of the Church of Antioch being restored to the Church Catholic, of which it was a member.—2. *Irenæus*, i. 10 ; Τοτε δε και την αποκαταστασιν των ὄλων εφη (scil. the heretic Marcus) γινεσθαι, ὅταν τα παντα καταλθοντα εις το ἐν γραμμα, μιαν και την αυτην εκφωνησιν ηχησῃ' no correction being here given to Marcus : and i. 14 ; Τον ἡλιον εν δεκαδο μησι τερματιζοντα την κυκλικην αυτου αποκαταστασιν.—3. *Clemens Alex.* in his "Quis Dives ;" Αυτον αποκατεστησε τη εκκλησια' restored the young man to the Church.—4. *Origen*, *Contrà Cels.* Lib. iv. ; ὅτι ουδ' αποκατασταθισονται, said of the Jews being restored to their country.—5. *Theophanes.* Αναστασις εστιν ἡ εις το αρχαιον αποκαταστασις.

<sup>1</sup> Αχρι χρονων αποκαταστασιως παντων ὧν ελαλησεν ὁ Θεος δια στοματος των ἁγιων προφητων.—Mr. Faber indeed declares the reference of *ὧν* to *χρονων* as its antecedent an impossible construction ; "Such a syntax, forced and unnatural in itself, though grammatically possible, is constructively impossible. We may properly say, Until the times concerning which God hath spoken ; but we cannot properly say, Until the times which God hath spoken." (S. C. iii. 325.) But what can be his meaning in so writing ? He cannot surely intend to say that the relative *ὧν* may not be explained either by understanding *περι* before it, or as placed in the genitive from the Attic attraction : seeing that it is on one or other of these principles that this relative in the genitive must be explained, even though construed with *παντων*. The only possible sense which I can attach to his objection is, that out of two preceding antecedents, each alike agreeing otherwise with a relative, the one nearest must necessarily be the one connected with it. A rule notoriously far from universal.

Since however in his "Eight Dissertations," recently published (i. 8), he cites *Prof. Gaisford*, adjudging that *παντων* must be the antecedent, not *χρονων*, I will fortify my assertion by an example or two. So then Jude 15, Πери παντων των εργαων αυτων ὧν ησειβησαν' where the antecedent of *ὧν* is *εργων*, not *αυτων* : also 2 Pet. ii. 15, "following in the way του Βαλααμ του Βοσορ ὅς μισθον αδικιας ηγαπησεν" in which passage the *ὅς* does not refer to the proximate noun in the genitive, *Βοσορ*, but to that preceding it, *Balaam*. This construction arises from considering the phrase made up of the first noun and connected genitive of the next, grammatically, somewhat as if one.—Compare such passages as Luke xxiv. 13, εις κωμην απεχουσαν σταδιους εξηκοντα απο Ιερουσαλημ, ἡ ονομα Εμμαους : v. 9, επι τη αγρα των ιχθυων ἢ συνελαβον' or the following from Dion Cass. lxxviii. 33 ; εις Σελιουοντα της Κιλικιας ελθων, ἦν δὴ και Τραιανουπολιν καλουμεν' where the *ἦν* refers not to the immediate noun *Κιλικιας* for its antecedent, but to *Σελιουοντα*. Unquestionably the reference to the *χρονων* as antecedent is most legitimate. And so Dr. Routh, according to Mr. Cuninghame : also Rosenmüller, as cited by me Note<sup>3</sup> p. 178.

because if we took the *παντων*, there would then be needed, in order to avoid absurdity, a restriction in the sense of the *παντων*<sup>1</sup> quite unnatural. Let me also premise that *the times of refreshing* in the first clause<sup>2</sup> would seem to be the same with *the times of restitution* in the second: only one great æra of refreshing being foretold; and that in connexion with Messiah's glorious earthly reign. Which four points admitted, the intent of the apostle's expostulatory address to the Jews is as follows:<sup>3</sup>—"Repent ye, in order that the Messiah Jesus may come again from heaven; and the times of refreshing and restitution begin which have been the favourite theme of all the prophets: the order and concatenation of events in God's purpose being this, that your conversion to him is to be the occasion of his return; and his return, as the Jew's reconciled Messiah, to be the introduction of the times of refreshing." Thus expounded the passage assumes a decided premillennarian form.—And what the anti-premillennarian mode of evading its force? Dr. Whitby, and after him Faber and others, have tried to escape from it by a totally different rendering of *αποκαταστασις*, as if meaning *fulfilment*, not *restitution*, and construction of the *των* with *παντων* as its antecedent: the result being a translation and sense as follows, "Whom the heavens must receive till the times of the fulfilment of all things that the prophets have spoken;" this "*all*" including, argue they, the millennium itself, and so fixing Christ's second advent as post-millennial. But this rendering of

<sup>1</sup> Restricted, I mean, to those things distinctively that had been prophesied of as to be restored, and of which the restoration had not already been effected.

<sup>2</sup> *Καιροι αναψυξεως*. The verb *αναψυχω* is used by the Septuagint in Judges xv. 19, 1 Sam. xvi. 23, and 2 Sam. xvi. 14, of Samson's revival from extreme thirst,—Saul's from the evil spirit, on David's playing the harp,—and David's from the weariness and sadness of his retreat from Jerusalem, on Absalom's rebellion.

<sup>3</sup> *Rosenmüller's* view on all these four points, and the general purport, is similar to my own. "Winzerus rectè monet pronomen *ων* non ad *παντων* sed ad *χρονων* respicere: quod ex versu 24 intelligitur; ubi, post Mosem antea memoratum, omnes etiam reliquos vates *τας ημερας ταντας* annuntiasse declarat Petrus. Porro Winzerus observat ad Judæos orationem habere Petrum. Scilicet, tanquam præmium fidei in Christum, sperare eos jubet *καιρους αναψυξεως* et *χρονους αποκαταστασεως παντων*, quæ phrases inter se non differunt. Jam vero *αποκαταστασις* de restitutione in pristinum statum in integrum, ut Græci, ita Judæi scriptores dicere consueverunt. Polyb. iv. 23. 1, Diod. Sic. xx. 34; Septuag. Gen. xli. 13, Job viii. 6, Jer. xxiii. 8. Coll. Matt. xii. 13, Marc. iii. 5, viii. 25, Luc. vi. 10, Act. i. 6."—So, he adds, the Jews expected Messiah to restore Paradise, making a "renovationem mundi physici:" and that St. Peter expected the same appears from 2 Pet. iii. 7, &c. He compares too Apoc. xxi. 1.

αποκαταστασις is quite untenable: <sup>1</sup> and would indeed if admitted, with its connected παντων, involve (unless doubly restricted) <sup>2</sup> the postponement of Christ's second coming, not only till after the millennium, but till after the general judgment and everlasting happiness of God's people; seeing that that general judgment and final blessedness is one of the things that the prophets have spoken of.—Mr. Brown, with better tact, admits the usual rendering of αποκαταστασις; and contends not for the conjunction of ων with παντων, rather than χρονων.<sup>3</sup> But he argues from the *imperfection* which he supposes to attend the *millenary state* itself that it cannot be regarded as the restitution of all things; and that for such a restitution we must look to the creation of the new heavens and earth beyond the millennium: there being however previously “*times of refreshing*,” answering to the jubilean times of Old Testament prophecy, and the millennial of the Apocalypse; which times St. Peter expected would begin with the Jews' conversion: and that Jesus Christ would descend from heaven *at their termination*: and then, and so, the restitution of all things take place.

<sup>1</sup> They ground this on Hesychius' and Phavorinus' explanation, τελειωσις,—on the Syriac and Arabic versions which render the clause, the one, “*Till the fulness of the time of all things*,” the other, “*Till the times in which all things shall be perfected or finished*,”—and on Irenæus' version as represented by the Latin *dispositionis*, and Tertullian's *exhibitionis*;—without one really parallel passage to support them, from Scripture, the Classics, or the Fathers.

Now, 1st, as to Tertullian's version *exhibitionis*, whatever it mean, it does not mean *fulfilment*:—2. as to Irenæus, he wrote in Greek, so that the *dispositio* is only his translator's; while his own idea of αποκαταστασις appears from the extracts given from him in my Note p. 177 to be the common one of *restoration*:—3. that the Arabic version is doubtful, and the *Syriac* tantamount to “the dispensation of the fulness of times,” spoken of in Eph. i. 10.\*—4. As to Hesychius' explanation, it means only, I conceive, that *completion* or *consummation* which is by *restoration*: such as of the year, by the sun's restoration to his previous place in the heavens; or of nature, in the expected αποκαταστασις κοσμου. So Julius Maternus in his *Thema Mundi* (Engl. Transl.), pp. 56, 64. This idea was held forth prominently in the Platonic philosophy: it being one of its most prominent doctrines that by the action of its animating principle, or soul, the world would accomplish certain periods; on which everything would return to its ancient place and state. This periodic revolution of nature was called the Platonic or Great Year.† The same idea appeared in the philosophy of Zoroaster; on whose αποκαταστασις κοσμου see M. Stuart, *Introduct.* § 3. So too Irenæus, in one of my citations from him, p. 177.

<sup>2</sup> I mean *doubly*, as being restricted alike in regard of the *past* and of the *future*. See Note <sup>1</sup> p. 178.

<sup>3</sup> See his pp. 147—149.

\* So Mr. Cuninghame. I am myself ignorant of these versions.

† So Virgil in his 4th Eclogue;

Ultima Cumæi venit jam carminis ætas;  
Magnus ab integro sæclorum nascitur ordo.



But, passing over just now, and till my 4th main Head, (though not without protest,) Mr. B.'s unscriptural view, as I cannot but regard it, of the imperfection of the millenary state, let me here observe, 1. that the times of refreshing seem to be as much connected by Peter with Christ's return to earth as the times of restitution:<sup>1</sup> 2. that prophecy connected the restitution of all things with Elias' coming;<sup>2</sup> and that his coming and ministry was assuredly understood to be introductory to the Jews' restoration and conversion, not 1000 years after it: 3rdly, that, as before shown by me, Isaiah's new heavens and earth, and attendant restoration of all things, were prophesied of as synchronic with the earthly Jerusalem's restoration and blessedness.—Thus, if I mistake not, Mr. Brown's post-millennarian construction, distinguishing the *times of refreshing* from those of the *restitution* [or *regeneration*] of all things, and making the one to precede Christ's coming, the other to follow it, breaks down as entirely as Whitby's and Faber's.<sup>3</sup> And the very striking evidence of St. Peter's statement, taken in its most natural sense, remains unshaken; to the effect that *Israel's conversion* is to synchronize with, or immediately precede, Christ's return from heaven, his risen saints of course accompanying him; and the restoration of this fallen world, with the blessed times of refreshing told of by all the prophets, to follow *as its immediate consequence*.

My *third* passage is that notable one in *Rom.* viii. 18, &c., which defines the destined *epoch* of the creation's deliverance from corruption, as coincident with the manifestation of the sons of God.—St. Paul had been speaking of Christ's true disciples, alike Gentiles and Jews, (for the mystery had now broken on the apostles of the equal admission of be-

<sup>1</sup> So Rosenmüller, as cited Note <sup>3</sup> p. 178; and again; “Καιροι αναψυξεως sunt tempora quietis; id est summæ felicitatis, in regno Messiae expectandæ, quod Christus è celo rediturus olim inaugurabit.” So too Whitby ad loc. “These times of *refreshing* were to come by the sending of that Jesus who was ascended into heaven, and was not to come thence till the day of judgment. . . I therefore incline to the opinion of the ancients, which refers this to the time of Christ's second coming, to give his servants . . . rest with him, as 2 Thess. i. 6—8.” On the absence of the article before *καιροι*, we may compare the *καιροι εθνων* in Luke xxi. 24.

<sup>2</sup> Matt xvii. 11; where the same verb is used, *αποκαταστησει παντα*.

<sup>3</sup> Vitringa, on Isa. xxv. 3—5, supposes the expression *times of refreshing, καιρους αναψυξεως*, to have arisen out of figurative passages predicting the future blessedness, like those in Isa. xxv. 4, xlix. 10; “Neither shall the heat nor the sun smite them: &c. ;” the former in connexion with the swallowing up of death in victory.



lieving *Gentiles* to the spiritual blessings of the Abrahamic covenant,) as those with whose spirits the Holy Spirit itself witnessed that they were children of God; and how, if children, they would be then heirs, heirs of God and joint heirs with Christ; if so be that they suffered with him that they might be also glorified together. Then he thus goes on: <sup>1</sup>—“For I reckon that the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory which shall be revealed in us. For *the earnest expectation of the creature*<sup>2</sup> waiteth for *the manifestation of the sons of God*. For the creature was made subject to vanity, (not willingly, but by reason of him who hath subjected the same,<sup>3</sup>) in hope;—because the creature itself shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption, into the glorious liberty of the children of God. For we know that the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together, until now. And not only they, but ourselves also which have the first-fruits of the Spirit, even we ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body.”—Now, on one point that has been controverted in this passage, viz. the meaning of the word *κτισις*, rendered *creature* and *creation*, I am not careful. Unquestionably it *may* mean *the whole visible earthly creation*, animate and inanimate. And if it be so understood here, as the early Christian Fathers did in fact understand it,<sup>4</sup> and I think not without reason, then the premillennial

<sup>1</sup> The Greek of this important passage is as follows in Scholz's text.

Λογίζομαι γὰρ ὅτι οὐκ ἀξία τὰ παθήματα τοῦ νῦν καιροῦ πρὸς τὴν μελλουσαν δόξαν ἀποκαλυφθῆναι εἰς ἡμᾶς. Ἡ γὰρ ἀποκαταδοκία \* τῆς κτισίως τὴν ἀποκαλύψιν τῶν υἱῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀπέκδεχεται. Τῇ γὰρ ματαιότητι ἡ κτίσις ὑπέταγη (οὐχ ἔκουσα, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸν ὑποτάξαντά), ἐπ' ἐλπίδι ὅτι καὶ αὐτὴ ἡ κτίσις ἐλευθερωθήσεται ἀπὸ τῆς δουλείας τῆς φθορᾶς εἰς τὴν ἐλευθερίαν τῆς δόξης τῶν τέκνων τοῦ Θεοῦ. Οἰδαμεν γὰρ ὅτι πᾶσα ἡ κτίσις συστεναζεῖ καὶ συνωδῖνει ἀχρὶ τοῦ νῦν· οὐ μόνον δέ, ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτοὶ τὴν ἀπαρχὴν τοῦ Πνεύματος ἔχοντες, καὶ ἡμεῖς αὐτοὶ ἐν ἑαυτοῖς στεναζομεν, υἰοθεσίαν ἀπέκδεχομενοι, τὴν ἀπολυτρώσιν τοῦ σώματος † ἡμῶν.

<sup>2</sup> κτισίως.

<sup>3</sup> Both Griesbach and Scholz mark the parenthesis.

<sup>4</sup> Irenæus says, v. 32, 36; “Opportet ergo et ipsam conditionem ‡ redintegratam ad pristinum sine prohibitione servire justis: et hoc Apostolus fecit manifestum in eâ quæ est ad Romanos; sic dicens, Nam expectatio creature revelationem filiorum Dei expectat.” And Tertullian, *Contrâ Hermog.* 11; that then will be an end to evil, “eum revelatio filiorum Dei demerit conditionem à malo, utique vanitati sub-

\* Literally, a turning or stretching of the head in intent expectation.

† St. Paul not infrequently conjoins this word *σῶμα* in the *singular* with persons in the *plural*, though meaning their *bodies*, in the literal sense, plurally. So Rom. vi. 12, ἐν τῇ θνητῇ ἡμῶν σωματι· and also 1 Cor. vi. 19, 20, 2 Cor. iv. 10. Compare Isa. xxvi. 19, “My dead body they shall arise.” ‡ i. e. *the present state of things*.

conclusion I contend for follows immediately: the restoration of *this lower world* to its original paradisiacal state, and freedom from the curse consequent on man's sin, (if only we are to believe the prophetic accounts of the earth's blessedness on Israel's conversion,) being in that case made to succeed after the redemption of the body,<sup>1</sup> and visible glorification of the predestinated children of God;<sup>2</sup> in other words, upon and after *their resurrection*.<sup>3</sup>—But the word *may* mean also, as Whitby would have it, and as I am content for present argument's sake to admit, the *rational* creation of God in this world, that is *mankind*, simply and alone.<sup>4</sup> In regard of whom the *earnest expectation* attributed to them by the apostle is well explained by Whitby: "desire and expectation being," as he says, "ascribed in the sacred dialect to creatures in reference to things they want, and which tend to their advantage, though they explicitly know nothing of them."<sup>5</sup> Now, this being premised, we have only to mark carefully two particulars in the passage, in order to see that still the same conclusion as before follows from it. The one point is the distinction in it between *the creature* (i. e. *mankind* generally) spoken of, and *the saints*, or predestinated children of God, in particular:—a distinction *expressed* by the *apostle*,<sup>6</sup> as well as *implied* through the whole context. The other point is the object of the *creature's* expectation;

jectam."—Our English translation renders it here *creation*, as well as *creature*. And Schleusner on the word *κτισις*, gives, as one meaning, "*Omnes res à Deo creatæ, omnis rerum natura, univcrsum*;" referring to *this* passage in exemplification, as also to Rom. i. 25, &c. Mr. Scott too, though an anti-premillenarian, so takes it.

<sup>1</sup> Compare Isa. xxvi. 19.

<sup>2</sup> Compare verse 29.

<sup>3</sup> Irenæus, v. 31, notes certain *heretics*, who expected the saints' *glorification* to follow immediately after death, and before their resurrection; "non suscipientes salutem carnis suæ, contentmentes autem repositionem Dei, . . . simul atque mortui fuerint dieunt se supergredi cælos et Demiurgum." And so Justin Martyr, Dial. cum Tryph. Οἱ καὶ λεγούσι μὴ εἶναι νεκρῶν ἀναστάσιμ, ἀλλ' ἅμα τῷ ἀποθνήσκειν τὰς ψυχὰς αὐτῶν ἀναλαμβάνεσθαι εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν.—Patristic views, by the way, which ill agree with that of the Church of Rome, defining in its Florentine Council (Hard. ix. 422) that the souls of saints (properly purified saints) instantly go to heaven.

<sup>4</sup> So Mark xvi. 15, "Preach the gospel to every creature," *πᾶσιν τῇ κτίσει*. Compare Col. i. 15, "The firstborn of every creature," *πρωτοτοκος πᾶσης κτίσεως*: and in verse 23, "to every creature," *ἐν πᾶσιν τῇ κτίσει*.

<sup>5</sup> Hence, he says, the Messiah is called in Gen. xlix. 10, *Προσδοκία τῶν ἐθνῶν*, the *expectation of the Gentiles*, and in Haggai ii. 7, the *desire of all nations*.

<sup>6</sup> "Not only *they*," he says in verse 23, (that is the *κτισις*, or *creature*, generally,) "but even *ourselves*, which have the first-fruits of the Spirit, do groan, &c."

—I mean of the *creature* as distinguished from Christ's elect saints. *We*, says the apostle, wait for *the adoption, the redemption of our body*. But the *creature* (or *creation*) generally has its earnest expectation bent upon *the manifestation of the sons of God*. Manifestation of whom? I pray the reader to mark this point. Clearly of the glorified saints, the predestinated sons of God. And to whom? Not surely a manifestation of them to *themselves*, (for who ever heard of a revelation or manifestation of oneself in this manner to oneself?) but to angels, to men, to the universe: more especially to that same *creature, or creation*, whose longing expectation is directed thereto, and which is thereupon to receive its blessing and deliverance.—Anti-premillennial expositors have too generally overlooked this in their comments; and confounded the *saints'* hope with that of the *creation*.<sup>1</sup> Taking it in its proper construction, the premillennial cogency of the apostle's statement is evident. Nor do I see how there can be escape from it, except in a depreciation of the world's millenary jubilean state such as Mr. Brown contends for; but against which I must again protest as unscriptural, till noticing it more directly. In sooth is it credible, that in the times of millennial bliss and holiness the saints will go on *groaning and travailing in pain* together, even as now?<sup>2</sup>

Let me just add, *fourthly*, ere I pass on from the present head, that this result to the creation in general from the manifestation of the glorified saints, (the children of God, and so children of the resurrection,)<sup>3</sup> seems to be the same that our Lord intended in a most observable, but, as I conceive, too often misapprehended and misapplied passage,

<sup>1</sup> Thus *Origen*; "They expect *the time* when those things shall be revealed which are prepared for them that are sons of God." *Whitby*; "That which it (the *κρίσις*) groans for, is *its redemption from corruption*." *Macknight*; "Though the Gentiles in particular knew nothing of the revelation of the sons of God, the apostle calls their looking for a *resurrection from the dead* a looking for that revelation: because the sons of God are to be revealed by their being raised with incorruptible bodies:"—and again, "their earnest desire of a *resurrection*."—*Scott* is more faithful to Scripture in his comment: but neither suggests, nor obviates, the difficulty hence arising in the way of his own anti-premillennial system.

<sup>2</sup> Said *Huss*: "Let Antichrist rage as he will, yet shall Christ destroy him with the spirit of his mouth: and *then shall the creature be delivered out of the servitude of corruption, &c.*:" so connecting the time of the fulfilment of *this* promise with that of *Antichrist's fall*." *Foxe* iii. 505.

<sup>3</sup> Luke xx. 36.

in his intercessory prayer, John xvii. 23. "I pray not," says he in the first instance, "for *the world*, but for them which thou hast given me out of the world;"<sup>1</sup> i. e. the election of grace. For which last his final prayer was,<sup>2</sup> that they might all be *one*, (evidently at the time of their *glorification*,<sup>3</sup> the only time of perfect unity which the Bible holds out to the Church of the faithful,<sup>4</sup>) and that they might see and partake of his glory; of course after their resurrection. Then follows a notice, twice over, of the foreseen *effect of this their conjoint glorification on the world*: (it is to this I was alluding :) verse 21, "*that the world may believe that thou hast sent me*;" verse 23, "*that the world may know that thou hast sent me, and hast loved them as thou hast loved me.*"

Thus do these four notable passages concur to establish the 2nd synchronism contended for; viz. that of *our earth's predicted jubilean blessedness* with the manifestation of Christ's risen and glorified saints at his second coming.

3. To the same effect is St. Paul's synchronization, in his famous prophecy about the *Man of Sin*, of the time of *Christ's second coming*, and the contemporary *gathering of both dead and living saints* to meet him, with that of the *destruction of the said Man of Sin*, or *Antichrist*.

For let but the prophecy be considered. "We beseech you, brethren, concerning (so the word is<sup>5</sup>) the coming of our

<sup>1</sup> Verses 9, 6.

<sup>2</sup> Verses 21—24.

<sup>3</sup> "And whom God justified," says St. Paul (Rom. viii. 30) of the predestinate, or election of grace, "them he also *glorified*:" meaning, I conceive, *in his purpose*.—So what God does *in purpose* is spoken of Jer. i. 5; "Before I formed thee in the belly . . . I sanctified thee:" also 1 Sam. xv. 28; &c.

<sup>4</sup> Compare John xi. 52, Ephes. i. 10.—I think had this point of divine revelation been duly considered, there would not have been advocated theories of an *earthly* ecclesiastical unity, such as have been broached by Romanists and semi-Romanists; or even of any earthly association of none but true Christians, such as by some Protestants too; e. g. the Plymouth Brethren, and others.

<sup>5</sup> *ὑπερ της παρουσιας*. I have in a former Note on this clause, Vol. iii. p. 91, given some references from *Rosenmüller* in evidence of the sense *concerning* attaching to *ὑπερ*; and mentioned *Whitby*, *Macknight*, *Schleusner*, &c., as all here giving that meaning to the word. The first-named, *Whitby*, is specially observable, on account of his being an eminent anti-premillennarian. He enumerates, we saw, as examples of *ὑπερ* being used in this sense, Rom. ix. 27, *Ἡσαιας κραζει ὑπερ του Ισραηλ*, where our translation renders it *concerning*; and also 2 Cor. vii. 4, ix. 3, Phil. i. 7: adding, "Phavorinus saith it is used *ὁμοιωσ τω περι*."—Similar is the use of it by *Arrian*, in his Introduction to the History of Alexander the Great; *Αλλου μεν δη αλλα ὑπερ Αλεξανδρου ανεγραψαν ουδ' εστιν ὑπερ οτου πλειους* having just



Lord Jesus Christ, and our gathering together unto Him,<sup>1</sup> that ye be not soon shaken in mind, or be troubled, neither by spirit, nor by word, nor by letter as from us, as that the day of Christ is at hand. Let no man deceive you by any means. For that day shall not come except there come first the apostasy;<sup>2</sup> and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition, who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, &c. . . And now ye know what withholdeth, that He might be revealed in his time. For the mystery of iniquity doth already work: only he that now letteth will let, until he be taken out of the way. And then shall that Wicked One be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with *the brightness of his coming.*"<sup>3</sup>—What, we ask preliminarily, was the occasion of this prophecy? The first verse that I have quoted expressly and professedly defines it. The Thessalonian Christians were agitated under an impression (whencesoever originating<sup>4</sup>) that the day of Christ's advent (*παρουσία*) was imminent;<sup>5</sup>—that advent (let my readers well observe) which was associated in the apostle's and the Thessalonian Christians' minds with *the saints' επισυναγωγή* or *gathering* to Him. And how does

before said, *περι Αλεξανδρου*.—On the other hand I doubt if *ὑπερ* ever bears the *adjective* sense *by*, which our translators here give the word.

<sup>1</sup> ἡμῶν επισυναγωγῆς ἐπ' αὐτον.

<sup>2</sup> ἡ ἀποστασία.

<sup>3</sup> τῇ ἐπιφανείᾳ τῆς παρουσίας αὐτου.

<sup>4</sup> Its origin is thus stated; "That ye be not soon shaken in mind, or be troubled, neither by spirit, nor by word, nor by letter, as from us:" i. e. says Whitby, "neither by any pretended *revelation*—nor by *word* spoken by us, and by others misunderstood,—nor by *anything contained in our former epistle*, as in iv. 15, v. 2," where *Christ's second coming* is spoken of.—"Or rather," he however adds, "in ii. 16;" where *wrath* is said to *have come on the Jews to the uttermost*.

Thus this eminent opponent of the pre-millennial advent admits, as do also most other commentators, a reference to St. Paul's 1st Epistle to the Thessalonians in the clause, "*nor by letter as from us.*"—On the other hand Mr. Faber, also eminent as an anti-premillennarian, argues against this explication of it. For he judges that if this reference to St. Paul's former Epistle be admitted,—then, since the *παρουσία*, or coming of Christ, in 1 Thess. iv. 15 was *indisputably* his *personal coming to judge the quick and dead*, there must naturally be attached the same meaning to the *παρουσία* here noted in 2 Thess. ii. 1, and consequently to the *παρουσία* of Christ in verse 8. But, says he, the expression "*by letter as from us,*" shows that it was a *forged* Epistle that St. Paul referred to. And so Mr. Brown, p. 48.

Now it seems to me that the explanation generally given is the most natural one. Certainly the *ὡς δι' ἡμῶν* does not necessarily imply a forged letter. But the point is not worth disputing. It is the fact of the *παρουσία* in 2 Thess. ii. 1, the *introductory verse to the prophecy about the Man of Sin*, being clearly *Christ's personal coming*, that constitutes the grand difficulty against any different view of the *παρουσία* in verse 8.

<sup>5</sup> On the propriety of this version of *ἐνεσηκε* see my Vol. iii. p. 92, Note 5.

St. Paul meet and correct it? By telling them that some great and famous apostasy must first intervene:—an apostasy of which the seeds were even then sown and germinating; and which would at length have the *Man of Sin* as its child and head: not till the end of whose reign would Christ's expected advent occur; the glory of that advent being in fact the Man of Sin's extinguisher and destruction.—And what then the nature of this his *παρουσία*, or advent, *personal* or *providential*? Surely it were nothing less than violence to the sacred text to explain it as any other than his promised *personal second advent*. Four times is the expression used in this sense in St. Paul's former Epistle to the Thessalonians; and in this sense exclusively and alone.<sup>1</sup> And then,—after solemn reversion in the first Chapter of the 2nd Epistle to the same great subject,<sup>2</sup>—in the first and introductory verse of this second Chapter, St. Paul's connexion with it of the *επισυναγωγή*, or *gathering* of the saints into Christ's presence, fixes the same meaning on the *παρουσία* or advent of Christ *there* mentioned: (for what gathering could this be but that spoken of 1 Thess. iv. 16, 17 previously, as to take place at the saints' resurrection?)<sup>3</sup> and, by necessary consequence, (considering not the proximity of the two clauses only, but their argumentative connexion,) on the *παρουσία* in verse 8 also; whereat and whereby the Man of Sin, Paul declared, was to be destroyed.—In effect few anti-premillennarian expositors contest the personal character of the *παρουσία* in *verse 1*. Alike Whitby allows this;<sup>4</sup> and also Scott, Brown,

<sup>1</sup> Viz. ii. 19, iii. 13, iv. 15, v. 23.

<sup>2</sup> 2 Thess. i. 7—10. It is here called Christ's *αποκαλύψις*.—The parallelism of the words *αποκαλύψις* and *παρουσία* is illustrated by the use of the one in verses 3 and 8 of ch. ii., of the other in verse 9, to signify the same coming of the Man of Sin.

<sup>3</sup> Whitby indeed offers a quite different *primary* explanation of this *επισυναγωγή* of the saints to Christ; in connexion with his primary explanation of the *παρουσία*, as Christ's coming to destroy Jerusalem. It may mean, he says, the speedy gathering of Jewish converts to *Christian churches*; who, till Jerusalem's destruction, often worshipped separately in their *synagogues*!—Were the Thessalonian converts then, we ask, or Paul himself, among these Jewish semi-separatists; so as to answer to the *ἡμῶν* in the clause, "*our gathering to Him*?"

Mr. Brown, pp. 64, 460, admits the natural sense of the *επισυναγωγή*; and consequent determination of Christ's *παρουσία* in the 1st verse as meaning his personal second advent. So too Clemens, p. 121. Mr. Faber strangely omits all notice of the expression; the British Quarterly Reviewer allusion even to the prophecy.

<sup>4</sup> Considering, he says, the uniform use of the phrase *παρουσία Χριστου* in the first Epistle, to signify *Christ's coming at the day of judgment*, "it may be thought more reasonable to refer this passage to the same (i. e. the second personal) advent."

and others. On what principle, then, can they have justified to themselves the giving it in *verse 8* a quite different meaning: whether, as Whitby, that of Christ's coming *providentially* to destroy Jerusalem;<sup>1</sup> or, as Scott, Faber, and Brown, that of his coming, still *providentially*, not *personally*, to inflict judgment on the apostate Roman Empire? On none, most assuredly, but that of escaping from the premillennial inference necessarily consequent on their giving the word the same meaning.—I say necessarily consequent. For, admitting the *παρουσία* to be *Christ's second personal coming*, it follows instantly and necessarily that there can intervene no millennium of universal holiness and gospel-triumph before it. The whole interval between St. Paul's time and Christ's second coming is represented in this comprehensive sketch as occupied and spanned, from beginning to end, by the great apostasy:—an apostasy which, as I before said, was even then, in St. Paul's time, sown and secretly germinating;—then destined soon to break out into fuller development;—then to reach its culminating point in the headship and domination of the Man of Sin, the Papal Antichrist;<sup>2</sup>—and, under that domination, to continue and prevail, even until his and its destruction by the brightness of Christ's own personal second coming.<sup>3</sup>

So St. Paul; very like Daniel before him. And let me suggest, ere passing forward, how their respective prophecies of Antichrist's overthrow by Christ's coming do, on this point, mutually support and illustrate each other. In St. Paul it must needs be Christ's *personal* coming, because it is that on which the *gathering of the saints* takes place round him. In Daniel's it must needs be the same; as that which begins the saints' *eternal reign* in Christ's kingdom.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> In support of his exposition Whitby refers to Christ's prophecy in Matt. xxiv.

<sup>2</sup> Compare my sketches of the prophetic portraiture and the historical realization, Vol. iii. pp. 91, 172, &c.—Alike Vitringa (p. 780), Faber, and Brown agree with me in the propriety of this historical application of the predicted Man of Sin: and so too Mr. Gipps. Also Whitby admits it as an *alternative* solution of the prophecy.

<sup>3</sup> Compare what St. Paul writes in the immediately preceding context, 2 Thess. i. 7—10, of Jesus Christ's "revelation from heaven with his mighty angels, *in flaming fire taking vengeance on them that know not God, and obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ; when he shall come to be glorified in his saints, &c.*" How and when glorified in his saints? Surely when his saints are gathered to him, to admire and reflect his glory, at the first resurrection. And who the parties destroyed by fire, but Antichrist and his apostate adherents?

<sup>4</sup> See pp. 167, 168 *supra*.

4. With all which perfectly agrees what Christ tells us in his *Parable of the Tares and Wheat* of the two destined states and stages of his kingdom: the *one*, while preached *preparatorily* on earth, ever *mixt, imperfect, defiled*:—the *other pure and glorious*, after purification by fire, and the manifestation in it of the King and his saints in glory.

The kingdom of heaven, He said, would in its earthly history resemble a field first sown with wheat, then, by an enemy, with tares. These both were to grow together intermixed,—the tares with the wheat, the wheat with the tares,—until the harvest; that was, until the end of the world, or rather of the world's present *αιων*. Then at length (not before) the tares should be eradicated. "As therefore the tares are gathered and burned in the fire, so shall it be at the end of the age. (ΕΝ ΤΗ ΣΥΝΤΕΛΕΙΑ ΤΟΥ ΑΙΩΝΟΣ.) The Son of Man shall send forth his angels, and they shall gather out of his kingdom all things that offend, and them which do iniquity; and shall cast them into a furnace of fire: there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth. Then shall the righteous<sup>1</sup> shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father."—What is here said respecting the righteous as then shining forth like the sun in God's kingdom,<sup>2</sup> fixes the epoch as that of the *resurrection* of such as shall have been previously numbered with *the righteous dead*. For the glory of the saints *living* at the time of Christ's coming, and end of the present *αιων*, is not to anticipate that of them that *sleep*;<sup>3</sup> nor the glory of the *latter* to begin till their *resurrection*.<sup>4</sup> And that there can have been no millennium previously, such as Whitby's hypothesis supposes, follows surely from Christ's statement of the mixture of tares and wheat continuing in the gospel-field uninterruptedly up to it.—Mr. Brown indeed argues strongly that the millennial state is one of imperfection; and so, still, of tares and wheat. But does

<sup>1</sup> οἱ δίκαιοι—*a phrase distinctive, it is to be observed, as of a particular class.*

<sup>2</sup> Compare Dan. xii. 2, 3; "And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, &c.: and they that be wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament; and they that turn many to righteousness as the stars for ever and ever:"—Daniel himself (verse 12) among them. And this "*at the end of the days*:" i. e. of the 1335 days. See p. 168 *suprà*.

<sup>3</sup> 1 Thess. iv. 15.

<sup>4</sup> So Phil. iii. 21; "Who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body;" and 1 Cor. xv. 43; "sow in dishonour, raised in glory."



prophecy so depict it? We read that then the people shall be *all* righteous; *all* individually knowing the Lord, from the least to the greatest; as well as with the knowledge of him outwardly covering the earth as the waters cover the sea; just in fulfilment of the Church's prayer for ages, "May thy kingdom come, may thy will be done *on earth* even as it is done in heaven:"—also that there will be then no *ανομια*; the *ανομος* and the mystery of *ανομια* having been destroyed with Antichrist: nor any scandals; for "they shall not hurt in all my holy mountain." Can this suit the state of the intermixt tares and wheat; with *ανομια* and *σκανδαλα* ever continued onward, (Matt. xiii. 41,) till the fire purges them out?—Admit that with earth's inhabitants, in consequence of the continued Adamic taint, holiness will in one sense not be absolutely perfect. That will not constitute them *tares*.<sup>1</sup> Christ's true servants now, though imperfect, and with the taint of natural corruption remaining in them, are yet *wheat*, not *tares*. And so, I conceive, only with much less of imperfection, there will be only wheat then, according to the prophetic word, and no tares. How indeed could there well grow that which is the produce of the Wicked One's sowing, at a time when the Wicked One is shut up and sealed, as in Apoc. xx. 3, from deceiving and tempting men any more?

5. A *fifth* argument against Whitby's theory of the *post-millennial* resurrection of the saints, and in favour of that of their *premillennial rising* at Christ's coming, to take part in his millenary reign, (for his appearing and kingdom synchronize,<sup>2</sup>) is soon stated, but I think of great weight; viz. that this resurrection, glorification, and participation in his kingdom are uniformly noted, I believe, as the reward of *hard service, suffering, conflict*. "Ye are they which have continued with me *in my temptations*, and I appoint unto you a kingdom," &c. :<sup>3</sup>—"The kingdom of heaven suffereth violence:"<sup>4</sup>—"If we *suffer with Him* that

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Brown seems to me mistaken in supposing the wheat and tares of the parable to signify the good and evil that there may be in the same person; as well as the godly as a class, and the ungodly. See Brown, p. 325—334.

<sup>2</sup> So 2 Tim. iv. 1, "Who shall judge the quick and dead at his *appearing* and *kingdom*."

<sup>3</sup> Luke xxii. 28—30.

<sup>4</sup> Matt. xi. 12.

we may be also glorified together:”<sup>1</sup> “Our light affliction, which is but for a moment, worketh for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory:”<sup>2</sup> “He that *overcometh* shall inherit all things:”<sup>3</sup> &c. &c. So the faithful companions of the typical David’s time of hardship, exile, and suffering, had the fit rewards of office and promotion on his establishment in the kingdom. But can the righteous in the *millennial* dispensation come under the same category of hard service and suffering for Christ? <sup>4</sup> To whom, however, Whitby’s theory would equally assign a part in the first resurrection, and Messiah’s kingdom of glory.

6. I might add perhaps yet *another* argument, of a quite different and *chronological* character, from the term *sabbatism* applied by St. Paul to the *departed saints’ expected rest*.<sup>5</sup> For if the word indicate, so as it might seem to do, (at least to the Hebrew Christians to whom St. Paul’s Epistle was address,) some *septenary* of time,—the which could scarce be any other than the *seventh millennium of the world*,<sup>6</sup>—then, without entering at all minutely into chronological details, it is evident from our present actual position *near the end*, on the lowest computation, *of the world’s sixth millenary*,<sup>7</sup> that were we to postpone its commencement yet a thousand years,—in other words, were we to admit of a millennium of earthly bliss still intervening before the *departed saints’* entrance on *their* promised blessedness, then their *rest*, even though this Millennium were to begin instantly, would be postponed long after the opening of the *seventh millenary*; and consequently be, in the then generally understood sense of the term, no *sabbatism*.<sup>8</sup>—But the more exact consideration of this last ar-

<sup>1</sup> Rom. viii. 17; Apoc. i. 9; 2 Tim. ii. 12.

<sup>2</sup> 2 Cor. iv. 17.

<sup>3</sup> Apoc. xxi. 7.

<sup>4</sup> Mr. Brown indeed (pp. 389—397) contends that the way of life will be strait even in the millennium; and the lust of the flesh and eye, and the pride of life, to be resisted then as now. And so too Mr. Conder; saying that the temptations to *sloth*, &c., during the millennium, will be sufficient to keep up the warfare between flesh and spirit, p. 498. But I cannot but repeat that this seems to me a very unscriptural depreciation of the millenary dispensation.

<sup>5</sup> Heb. iv. 9.

<sup>6</sup> This will appear in my last chapter.

<sup>7</sup> See *ibid.*

<sup>8</sup> Mr. Brown, p. 484, objects that “God’s holy day is called the sabbath, not from its being a *septenary* of time, but from the *rest* enjoined and enjoyed on it; from *שבת*, to rest.” But was not the Jewish holy day of rest, or *sabbath*, so fixed to

gument, as well as of the ancient Jewish and Christian Fathers' opinion concerning it, will find perhaps its fitter place in my concluding Chapter. I therefore till then reserve it.

So my premillennial argument ends. I conclude on the evidence of *General Scripture Testimony*, just as I did before on that of the Apocalyptic passage itself, that *Whitby's* theory is as untenable as those of *Augustine* and *Grotius*, and that the only true one is the *literal*:—which theory, held by the earliest Fathers, has been lately revived among us,<sup>1</sup> and been embraced by most modern prophetic expositors of note:<sup>2</sup> as well as by many others also whose studies, though not directly prophetic, have yet bordered on the subject; such as Mr. *Greswell*<sup>3</sup> and the late learned Bishop *Van Mildert*.<sup>4</sup>—For my own part I cannot but feel much struck at the *consistency*, as well as *variety*, of the evidence in its favour. If evidence has been brought from Scripture to show the synchronization of the saints' resurrection alike with *Israel's conversion and restoration*,—with the *world's restoration to paradisiacal blessedness*,—and with *Antichrist's destruction* also,—it seems to appear from quite other Scriptures that these various events, which thus synchronize with *it*, are likewise to synchronize with each other: viz. *Israel's restoration with the earth's restoration*, and each and either with *Antichrist's destruction*.<sup>5</sup>—Nor can I help observing also on the consistency of the Apo-

the *seventh* day as to convey the idea of a septenary almost necessarily to a Jewish mind? See on this point my fuller consideration of the subject of the world's sabbatism, in my last Chapter.

<sup>1</sup> Mede and Newton, unlike the early Fathers, and without Scripture warrant, as I have endeavoured to show, would confine the first resurrection to the martyrs.

<sup>2</sup> Mr. Faber and Mr. Brown are perhaps the most eminent living exceptions. The British Quarterly Reviewer also and Clemens are united with them in the view.

<sup>3</sup> See the Introduction to his work on the Parables.

<sup>4</sup> The Bishop's opinion is as follows: "Respecting the Millennium, or reign of the saints on earth for 1000 years after these events shall have taken place, there is room for a great variety of conjecture. Whether . . . we are to expect that a resurrection and triumph of the saints shall precede the general and final resurrection, or whether we hold that it is not to be a reign of persons raised from the dead, but a renovated state of the Church, flourishing gloriously for 1000 years after the conversion of the Jews, and the flowing in of all nations to the Christian faith,—it is not necessary to determine. The former interpretation seems to offer the least violence to the language of Scripture, and is supported by great authority." I extract this from Bickersteth on Prophecy, p. 301.

<sup>5</sup> See pp. 46, 54, 108—110, 175, 176 *suprà*, &c.

calyptic statement, thus explained, respecting the first and second resurrection, with St. Paul's famous declaration on a similar subject in 1 Cor. xv. 23, 24, &c. :—"But every man in his own order: Christ the first-fruits: *afterward*<sup>1</sup> they that are Christ's at his coming: *then* cometh the end,<sup>2</sup> when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father; when he shall have put down all rule and all authority and power: for he must reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet. The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death." In this passage three several distinct epochs, as if with intervals of time between them,<sup>3</sup> appear to be marked; that of Christ's own resurrection,—that of the saints' resurrection at his coming,—and that finally of his destroying the last enemy, death. All which seems exactly to correspond with our Apocalyptic theory of the *saints'* resurrection taking place *premillennially* on Christ's second coming, long after his own resurrection; and then, at the interval of yet a thousand years, on the completion of the resurrection, Christ's finally casting Death and Hades into the lake of fire.—On *Whitby's* theory the duration of the *εἶτα* of St. Paul would be reduced to a nothing.

Yet a word or two ere I conclude this Chapter, on certain *chief difficulties*, not yet touched on, urged against it.

1. And, 1st, as to the difficulty which has been supposed to arise out of St. Peter's description<sup>4</sup> of the earth's being burnt up at Christ's second coming, before the promised new heavens and new earth: and consequent impossibility of that new earth's having living inhabitants in the flesh remaining on it.

Now on this I must beg to remark, *first* and *foremost*, that by St. Peter's words, "We, *according to his promise*, look for new heavens and a new earth, &c.," the new hea-

<sup>1</sup> *επειτα.*

<sup>2</sup> *εἶτα το τέλος.*

<sup>3</sup> That the *εἶτα* generally implies *some* interval of time will appear from the following examples:—Mark iv. 17, *εἶτα θλιψεως γενομενης*, "*afterward* tribulation arising," &c.; ib. 28, "*first* the blade, *εἶτα σταχυς*, *then* the ear;" 1 Cor. xv. 5, "He was seen of Cephas, *then* of the twelve;" and 1 Tim. ii. 13, "Adam was first formed, *then* Eve."

<sup>4</sup> 2 Peter iii. 10.



vens and earth that he alluded to were identified with the new heaven and earth promised in Isa. lxxv., lxxvi.;<sup>1</sup> in Isaiah's description of which alike *Jews* and *Gentiles*, distinct the one from the other, figure as the still remaining inhabitants; and Judah's city too, the *earthly Jerusalem*. So that, supposing their identity irrefragable, as I believe it to be,<sup>2</sup> inhabitants in the flesh are declared by Scripture itself to exist upon St. Peter's new earth, however preserved to it.—*Secondly*, let me suggest that the earth of St. Peter's conflagration, at its *primary* outbreak at least,<sup>3</sup> seems by no means certainly *the whole habitable world*; any more than the earth covered by the Noachic deluge must be certainly regarded as the whole terraqueous globe; (St. Peter's own case of parallelism;) or, in fact, any other than the *Roman earth*, which we have seen on Apocalyptic evidence is to be destroyed premillennially by fire at the time of Antichrist's destruction:—and, in any case, that He who saved a remnant out of the *watery deluge*, may well be supposed to have his own ways of saving alive a remnant now again out of the *deluge of fire*. Indeed He intimates as much.<sup>4</sup>—*Thirdly*, I am quite unable to understand, were the conflagration *postmillennial*, how the scoffers just before it, and with the millennium in immediate recollection, could exclaim “that all things had continued as they were from the beginning of the creation.”—Thus, on this head, the anti-premillennarian difficulties seem much the greatest.

2. There is urged the objection that alike Dan. xii. 2 and John v. 28<sup>5</sup> indicate that the resurrection and judg-

<sup>1</sup> As also with the *παλιγγενεσία*, or *new creation*, spoken of by Christ, Matt. xix. 28.

<sup>2</sup> I have already alluded, p. 173, to Mr. Brown's attempted but vain solution of this difficulty, on the anti-premillennial hypothesis, by supposing Isaiah's to be a *comprehensive* sketch of the Christian Church in all its various stages.—The only other attempted anti-premillennarian solution is to the effect that Isaiah's is a *figurative* new heaven and earth, Peter's *real*. So Mr. Gipps, p. 63, followed by Bishop Waldegrave, p. 587. And so, I believe, Mr. Faber; though he has strangely omitted, and apparently shunned, all allusion to Isaiah, when insisting on 2 Pet. iii. 10. But how could Peter refer to Isaiah's prophecy as a promise of a *real* new heaven and earth, if it meant merely a *figurative* one, and consequently something quite different?

<sup>3</sup> See my next Chapter, p. 217.

<sup>4</sup> So Isaiah li. 16, 17; “And I have covered thee in the shadow of mine hand, that I may plant [Heb. stretch out] the heavens, and lay the foundations of the earth, and say unto Zion, Thou art my people.” A passage thus followed; “Awake, awake, stand up, O Jerusalem, which has drunk at the hand of the Lord the cup of his fury, &c. :” so fixing the time as that of Judah's restoration.

<sup>5</sup> “And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake; some to

ment of the *just* and of the *unjust* are to take place *at one and the same time*.—But, as regards Daniel, I must suggest that it is more than doubtful whether the Hebrew original of the passage makes any assertion at all about *the resurrection of the unjust*:<sup>1</sup> and, as regards St. John, that no inference as to the simultaneousness of the *bodily* resurrection of the two classes can be justly drawn from the circumstance of their being those conjointly mentioned; any

everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt. And they that be wise shall shine," &c. Dan. xii. 2.

"The hour cometh when all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good to the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil to the resurrection of condemnation." John v. 28.

<sup>1</sup> So certainly say many of the most learned expositors, both Jewish and Christian.

E. g. of the Jewish, the Rabbi *Saadias Gaon*, already cited p. 169 *suprà*: who thus interprets Dan. xii. 2, by reference to Isaiah lxvi. 24; "This is the resurrection of the dead in Israel, whose lot is to eternal life: but those *who do not awake* are the destroyed of the Lord, who go down to the habitation beneath, i. e. Gehenna: and they shall be an abhorrence to all flesh."—So too *Aben Ezra*; as referred to by Tregelles.

So again, of Christian expositors, *Venema*, p. 501, on Dan. xii. 2: "Prius (membrum) mortuos distribuit in *eos qui evigilarent*, et *eos qui in statu mortis manerent*: posterius cum resuscitatorum, tum reliquorum in pulvere terræ perseverantium, diversam conditionem; *illorum gloriosam et beatam, horum contemptibilem et execrabilem, ob oculos ponit*. Quo sensu voculæ אלה et אלה, *illi et illi*, non dividunt, ut putatur, *resuscitados*, sed *resuscitados et residuos in pulvere*. . . . Priores אלה *illi* sunt resuscitati; posteriores אלה *illi* sunt relictii in morte." At p. 503 he refers, like Saadias Gaon, to Isa. lxvi. 24, in support of this interpretation.—He also, p. 502, notes the interpretation as one propounded by *Cocceius*.

To the same effect is the explanation given by the American Hebrew Professor *Bush*, in his *Valley of Vision*, p. 50. "The awaking is evidently predicted of the *many*, and not of the *whole*. Consequently the '*these*,' in the one case, must be understood of the class that awakes; the '*those*,' in the other, of that which remains asleep. There is no ground whatever for the idea that the latter *awake* to shame and contempt. It is simply because they do *not* awake, that this character pertains to them. The error in our translation has arisen from rendering the pronouns אלה, אלה, '*some*,' '*and some*,' instead of '*these*,' '*and those*,' referring respectively to subjects previously indicated. By the former method a distinction is constituted between those who *are awakened*; by the latter between those who *are*, and those who *are not* awakened."—He illustrates his argument by the three following examples; the full force of which, however, he says, none but the Hebraist can understand:—Josh. viii. 22; "So they were in the midst of Israel; *these* on this side, and *those* on that side:" 2 Sam. ii. 13; "And they sat down; *these* on the one side of the pool, and *those* on the other side of the pool:" 1 Kings xx. 29; "And they pitched, *these over against those*, seven days."

So too *Tregelles*, on Dan. xii. p. 136: who states that the translation to this effect is given, as undoubtedly correct, in *Gerard Kerkherder's* Prodrömus Danielicus.

In *Kitto's Cyclopædia*, Art. *Pharisees*, Josephus is cited saying of them; "They believe that souls have an immortal vigour in them, and that under the earth there will be rewards or punishments, according as men have lived virtuously or viciously in this life. *The latter are to be detained in an everlasting prison*, but the former shall have power to revive and live again." Again, "they say the souls of good men only are removed into other bodies; but the souls of bad men are subjected to eternal punishment." p. 514. So again p. 515, 1st Col.

Compare, on the general subject of this Chapter, Macknight's original and curious Note on 1 Thess. iv. 16.

more than the simultaneousness of the *spiritual* resurrection of all of the spiritually dead who might hear Christ's voice, mentioned in the verse preceding.<sup>1</sup> It is to be remembered that if the resurrections of the just and unjust are here mentioned together, there are many other passages in which the resurrection of the just is spoken of separately; indeed as if constituting *the* resurrection distinctively.<sup>2</sup> So that even if from the two passages in John and Daniel, *considered by themselves*, we might not unreasonably have expected that the resurrections of the just and unjust would synchronize, we might just as reasonably perhaps have anticipated from the others, *considered alone*, that the resurrection of the just was one peculiar, and would take place separately. Which being the case, and the connexion of distant times, as I have said, not unusual in prophecy, it would, I think, be very unsound reasoning to infer a refutation of the *literal* theory of the first resurrection, (especially evidenced as that theory is,) from this inconclusive passage in St. John, and the yet more inconclusive passage in Daniel.<sup>3</sup>

3. There is yet a third objection to the premillennial view, which has been urged with much force of late, above all by Mr. Brown. It is to the effect that at Christ's second coming (whenever that may take place) Christ's Church will be complete, the effective interposition of Christ's intercession and the Holy Spirit's sanctifying influences terminated; and so the day of salvation past, and the millennial

<sup>1</sup> "The hour is coming when the dead [i. e. *spiritually* dead] shall hear the voice of the Son of God." Here by *the hour* is meant the whole long period of the Christian dispensation, though beginning from Christ's first advent and ministry.

<sup>2</sup> E. g. Luke xiv. 14; "Thou shalt be recompensed at *the resurrection of the just*:" Luke xx. 36; "They are the children of God, being the children of the *resurrection*:" Acts xxiii. 6; "Of *the hope and resurrection of the dead* I am called in question."

Again on 1 Cor. xv. 51, Whithy observes justly that throughout the chapter, as all expositors, ancient and modern, have remarked, the apostle by *the resurrection*, which is his subject, means simply *the resurrection of the just*. Neither in this chapter, (e. g. verse 52, "In a moment the dead shall be raised incorruptible," &c.) nor in 1 Thess. iv. 16, ("For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, and the dead in Christ shall rise first; then we which are alive," &c.) is a word said to suggest that there would be accomplished at the same time the resurrection of the wicked. And these two passages (especially 1 Cor. xv.) are the fullest prophecies existing on the subject of the resurrection.

<sup>3</sup> Let me just add that were the two resurrections mentioned in Daniel synchronous, the statement in Dan. xii. 13 about Daniel himself rising to his inheritance at the end of the 1335 days, would fix at *that* epoch the resurrections of both.

inhabitants of earth lost.—But it seems to me that in the two last inferences Mr. Brown is not warranted by Scripture testimony. The Church of the firstborn,<sup>1</sup> the bride, may be complete; but it does not follow that none afterwards can be saved. What is said of the kings of the earth walking in the light of the heavenly Jerusalem, seems to me to imply an enjoyment of the blessing by other parties, beside those that constitute Christ's bride, the New Jerusalem. The very statement of Christ's being a priest upon his throne (if applicable as I think it is, in part at least, to the millennial æra) implies Christ's still exercising his intercessory and other priestly functions. And, if I am correct in my view of John xvii. 21, 23,<sup>2</sup> it was a marked point in his earliest intercessory prayer that *the world's* believing on him, generally, might be the result of the distinctive manifestation in glory of the Church of his disciples of the present dispensation;—that manifestation which, as all agree, will be only at his second coming.<sup>3</sup>

## CHAPTER IV.

### SUGGESTIONS AS TO THE PROBABLE ORDER OF EVENTS INTRODUCTORY TO, AND STATE OF THINGS DURING, AND CONSEQUENT ON, THE MILLENNIUM.

IN the Apocalyptic prophecy of chap. xix., the scene depicted as immediately preceding Christ's destruction of Antichrist, and the introduction of the Millennium, was that of a battle-field, to which both Antichrist and his confederate powers had been gathered, under the invisible guidance of three associated spirits of evil; there specially to conflict (though but as part of a universal war) against Christ's cause and people.<sup>4</sup> It also appeared from other prophetic notices, that the voice of gospel-preaching wonderfully revived on the sounding of the 7th Trumpet, and voice of protest against Antichrist's deadly errors, and the

<sup>1</sup> Compare Heb. xii. 23 with Apoc. xiv. 4 and James i. 18.

<sup>2</sup> See pp. 183, 184, *suprà*.

<sup>3</sup> In my next Chapter I shall have to recur briefly to the millennial æra and state.

<sup>4</sup> See pp. 21, 52, 53, *suprà*.



warning-voice finally of a tremendous destruction by fire impending on Babylon and Antichrist, would be going forth previously far and wide; and make itself heard not in professing Christendom only, but throughout the whole habitable world.<sup>1</sup>—And this seemed also to be foreshown, that the destruction of Babylon by fire would precede (by however short an interval) that of Antichrist.—There was intimation given further, in the prefiguration of Babylon's overthrow, of the state of mind that would just at that time characterize its inhabitants, as if one of complete carnal security:<sup>2</sup>—an intimation well agreeing with Ezekiel's notice of the state of those in the isles of Chittim on whom destruction by fire would fall, nearly contemporarily with that of his antichristian Gog and Magog,—viz. as “dwelling carelessly in the isles:”<sup>3</sup> and agreeing also exactly with Christ's description of the state of those on whom judgment will fall at his coming; “As it was in the days before the flood,—they were eating and drinking, marrying and giving in marriage, until the day that Noe entered into the ark, and knew not until the floods came, and took them all away, so shall also the coming of the Son of Man be.”<sup>4</sup> To which St. Peter adds the further prophecy of open scepticism prevailing to a vast extent on the subject of the nearness of Christ's advent: “There shall come in the last days scoffers, walking after their own lusts and saying, *Where is the promise of his coming?* for, since the fathers fell asleep, all things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation.”<sup>5</sup>—It would seem therefore that in this state of things and of feeling in professing Christendom, all suddenly and unexpectedly, and conspicuous over the world as the lightning that shineth from the East even to the West,<sup>6</sup> the second advent and appearing of

<sup>1</sup> See pp. 3—5, &c., *suprà*.

<sup>2</sup> Apoc. xviii. 7; “She saith in her heart, I sit a queen, and am no widow, and shall see no sorrow: therefore shall her plagues come in one day:” &c.

<sup>3</sup> Ezek. xxxix. 6; cited at p. 122 *suprà*.

<sup>4</sup> Matt. xxiv. 38, 39.

<sup>5</sup> 2 Peter iii. 3, 4: a passage already alluded to, and argued from, in reference to the pre-millennial question, at p. 193.

<sup>6</sup> Matt. xxiv. 27, Luke xvii. 24.—In the context of this latter passage, verses 20, 21, there is an expression of our Lord which has, I believe, been universally misconstrued; and used, in consequence, to inculcate quite incorrect ideas of Christ's coming and kingdom.—I therefore think it may be well to subjoin a criticism on the text, originally published by me in the Investigator.

Christ will take place: that, at the accompanying voice of

“Being demanded of the Pharisees, when the kingdom of God should come, He answered them and said, The kingdom of God cometh not with observation. Neither shall they say, Lo here! or Lo there! for behold the kingdom of God is within you.”

Οὐκ ἐρχεται ἡ βασιλεία του Θεου μετα παρατηρησεως. Οὐδε ἐρουσιν, Ἰδου ὡδε ἡ, Ἰδου ἐκεῖ ἰδου γαρ ἡ βασιλεία του Θεου εντος ὑμων εστιν.

1. According to the usual interpretation of this passage, it was our Lord's meaning, that the kingdom of God was simply a *spiritual* kingdom:—its seat the heart; its rise and progress therein indiscernible. So Campbell, Scott, &c.

To this there occurs the decisive objection, that the observation was addressed, not to Christ's *disciples*, but to the *Pharisees*;—i. e. to his *enemies*.

Moreover, it is obvious, from our Lord's connecting the subject in the verses following with his own *second* advent, that he was answering the Pharisees according to the real intent of their question; and speaking not of any *preparatory* spiritual reign of Messiah over men's hearts, but of the glorious *establishment* of his reign on earth, such as will be seen at his appearing and kingdom.

2. Sensible of the force of the first objection noted, Beza, Grotius, Raphelius, Doddrige, Whitby, and others, have adopted the *marginal* rendering. Instead of *within you*, they translate the *εντος ὑμων among you*; and explain the passage of the Messiah's kingdom already beginning to be preached among the Jews.

But to this the objection remains in full force, that the subject-matter of discourse was the kingdom as it is to be manifested at Christ's *second* advent. Besides which it has been reasonably objected, “that the *εντος* never has the meaning they give it in Scripture, and scarce ever in the Greek writers.” So Scott, after Campbell.

Nor, again, can we well say of our Lord's *ministry*, by which He was then laying the foundations of his kingdom, that it “came not *with observation*.” Was it not by observation, and very careful observation too, of the evidences which Jesus offered, that men were then to be convinced that he was the Christ? Were they not to search the old prophecies with this view, and compare them with his life, character, doctrine, miracles? Were they not to look into, and so discern the signs of the times? Compare Matt. xi. 3—5, xvi. 3, John v. 39. It was unquestionably *with observation* that its *foundations* were then laid.

3. My persuasion is that the clause we speak of has been hitherto totally misapprehended. It has been taken and commented on, as a *part of Christ's address to the bystanders*. I conceive that it should be connected with the “Lo here! or, Lo there!” as a *part of the exclamation of those men whom Christ speaks of*, thus reporting to one another respecting the conjectured fact of Messiah's advent.

Then the sense will be:—“Neither shall there be anything so partially revealed, or secret, in the ultimate establishment and revelation of God's kingdom, as that there shall be occasion for any doubtful rumours on the point: such as, “Look here! for the King is to be found within *our* city! or, Look there; for the King is within *your* city!”\*—“For, as the lightning that shineth out of the one part under heaven shineth even unto the other, so shall also the Son of Man be in his day!”

It must be remembered that the Jews had their minds full of prophecies that spoke of the Messiah fixing his kingdom within their borders: though in what part of Judea He might first manifest himself, whether in Bethlehem, Jerusalem, or Galilee, they might doubt; each of those districts being mentioned in connexion with it in prophecy. Hence the current but mistaken notion, that when He came to take the kingdom, He might possibly be concealed for a while, and have to be inquired after and sought out.† And as the *king* so the *kingdom*: the one including and being put for the other, as often elsewhere in Hebrew; the *abstract* for the *concrete*.‡

This interpretation seems to me simple, agreeable to the tenor of prophecy, and

\* Compare John i. 26; *μεεις δε ὑμων εσηκεν ον εκ ουδατε αυτος εστιν* said by John Baptist of Jesus Christ.

† As king Josiah was hidden six years in the temple by Jehoiada. 2 Chr. xxii. 12.

‡ So Schleusner. “*Βασιλεια* ponitur pro *βασιλευς*, abstractoposito pro concreto. Mark xi. 10; *ευλογημενη ἡ ερχομενη βασιλεια του πατρος ὑμων Δαβιδ*: coll. Luc. xix. 38, *ευλογημενος ὁ ερχομενος βασιλευς*.”

the archangel and trump of God,<sup>1</sup> the departed saints of either dispensation will rise from their graves to meet Him, —alike patriarchs, and prophets, and apostles, and martyrs, and confessors, —all at once and in the twinkling of an eye: and that then instantly the saints living at the time will be also caught up to meet Him in the air; these latter being separated from out of the ungodly nations, as

altogether in accordance with Christ's subsequent remarks on this occasion; also with the "cometh not with observation," of the verse preceding.

I cannot think with Abdiel,\* that Christ's glorious advent and kingdom may be said to come with observation, because signs of its being near will be observable. The signs of proximity are one thing; the coming or manifestation quite another. Observation is that fixed and attentive regard which we can direct to those objects and events only, that remain a certain length of time before the eyes: and to such objects and events it is then most specially directed, when they have enough of obscurity about them to leave us in a degree of doubt respecting their true character, and enough of interest to excite an anxious eagerness for the development. But so it will not be with the coming and manifestation of the King and Kingdom. It will not come with observation. It will be instantaneous and irresistible in its light of evidence, as the flash of lightning.

The rendering proposed of εντος ὑμων, it will be seen, is within you, in the sense of within your city, or country. This is in strict conformity with the frequent use of the preposition by Greek writers to designate a position within some local division or boundary, and also with their use, in topographical descriptions, of the occupiers of a locality for the locality itself, after prepositions like εν, εκ, δια, &c., or adverbs like εντος, &c.—Thus, for example, Εκ Ματινων ῥει, is said by Herodotus, i. 202, of a river flowing from the country of *Matiene*: Παρ' Αθηναιους, ὡς βεβαιον ον, ανεχωρουν, by Thucydides, i. 2, of *Athens*.—And so, after adverbs, in the examples following. II. Ω. 199; Κεις ἵεναι επι νηας εσω στρατον ευρυν Αχαιων' within the locality of their encampment. Xen. Anab. vi. 5. 7; Ελαμβανον τα επιτηδεια εντος της φαλαγγος: "citra aciem," as Zennius renders the word, behind it. Cyrop. vi. 3. 14; Εντος των σκοπων' of one advancing from the enemies' side within the pickets. Cyrop. viii. 3, 9; 'Ον εντος ουδενι εστιν εισιεναι των μη τετμημενων' within the ranks of guards that lined either side of the road. Anab. i. 10. 3; Παντα οσα εντος αυτων, και χρηματα και ανθρωπους, εσωσαν' said of Greeks in the camp preserving from the invaders all that was locally within their station. † (Zenn. *intra ipsos, in ipsorum castris.*) So too the Latin; "Ea intra se consumunt Arabes:" Plin. ii. 21: i. e. within their own borders.

Hence, to designate a locality, it is perfectly legitimate to use εντος, with a genitive of the inhabitants: e. g. εντος των Γαλιλαιων, for εντος της Γαλιλαιας; εντος ὑμων, for εντος της χωρας ὑμων.

To the whole of the passage, thus interpreted, the 24th of St. Matthew (verses 26, 27) offers so exact a parallel, both as regards the lightning-like coming of Christ, and the incongruity with such a manifestation of surmisings and doubtful rumours on the subject, as both to illustrate and confirm what has been advanced. "If they say to you, Behold He is in the desert; go not forth! Behold He is in the secret chambers; believe it not!" Why? Not because his kingdom was spiritual, within their hearts, and so not to come with observation: but because, "as the lightning cometh out of the east, and shineth even unto the west, so shall the coming of the Son of Man be."

<sup>1</sup> 1 Thess. iv. 16, 1 Cor. xv. 52.

\* Investigator, Vol. i. p. 35.

† This is quoted in Eisleby from Macknight; incorrectly, however, as from the *Cyropædia*.—Nor is Macknight's translation exactly correct. Εντος αυτων is not "things with them in the camp;" but things within them; i. e. within their position.

when a shepherd divides his sheep from the goats,<sup>1</sup> one person snatched from his company or occupation, and another left:<sup>2</sup> and all, both dead and living saints, changed at the moment from corruption to incorruption, from dis-

<sup>1</sup> Matt. xxv. 31; "When the Son of Man shall have come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory: and before him shall be gathered all the nations (τα ἔθνη); and he shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats."

I conceive this to be *primarily* a judgment on the *living* in *Christendom*; the same as that mentioned in Joel iii. 11, "Assemble yourselves, all ye heathen: . . . thither cause thy mighty ones to come down, O Lord: let the heathen be wakened, and come up to the valley of Jehoshaphat: (Heb. *God's judgment*;) for there will I sit to judge all the heathen (ἔθνη) round about. Put ye in the sickle, for the harvest is ripe," &c.\*—For 1st, the term "*all the nations*," here used by our Lord, can scarce be construed naturally otherwise than as Christ used it before in the same discourse, Matt. xxiv. 14, "This gospel shall be preached to *all nations*," or *all the Gentiles*; (πᾶσι τοῖς ἔθνεσι;) Luke xxi. 24, "Jerusalem shall be trodden down by the *Gentiles*, (ὑπο ἔθνων,) till the times of the *Gentiles* (καίροι ἔθνων) be fulfilled," or ended: † i. e. I presume, either the times of the four great Gentile kingdoms; or the parenthesis times of the Jews' exclusion, and committal of the gospel to the Gentiles.—2. The nature of the judicial process implies the fact of the gospel having been made known to all the parties judged, and of Christ's disciples having been among them, and opportunities existed of showing them kindness or unkindness: the which could by no possibility be predicated of the great mass of the dead, or indeed of the living,—I mean of those living or dead in *heathen lands*; but might fitly be predicated (compare Apoc. xviii. 24) of the people of *Christendom*.—3. The judgment here past on the wicked appears, on comparison, to include at least that described Apoc. xix. 20; which says, "The Beast and False Prophet were both cast *alive* into a lake of fire burning with brimstone." For in Apoc. xx. 10 St. John declares, "And the devil was cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, where the Beast and False Prophet are, and shall be tormented day and night for ever;" thereby identifying the lake of fire into which Antichrist and his adherents were cast alive, with that intended for the devil's place of punishment: just as the penal fire adjudged to the wicked of *the nations* is identified with the same in Matt. xxv. 41, "Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels." †

At the same time, though there may be a *primary* reference to the judgment on the *living* at Christ's coming, yet *secondarily* a more extensive judgment on the *dead* too, —on *all* the dead,—may also very possibly be included in the parable. How so will be seen in my next Chapter; pp. 215—218. § A direct *individual* judgment on the parties interested is described, I conceive, in the two preceding parables.

<sup>2</sup> Matt. xxiv. 40, 41.

\* Cited p. 119 *suprà*.

† I take the πληρωθῶσι in its more usual sense when applied to nouns of time; as in Acts vii. 23, 30; ix. 23. So Cyril, (Catech. xv.) ὅταν πληρωθῶσιν οἱ καιροὶ τῆς Ῥωμαίων βασιλείας.

‡ So too Isa. lxvi. 24. See p. 166.

§ Olshausen (on Gosp. Vol. iii. pp. 292—298) considers "the least of these my brethren," in Matt. xxv. 40, to indicate a third party present, viz. *the saints*; who are (not among the judged, but) *assessors with Christ on the throne of judgment*. So πάντα τα ἔθνη corresponds perfectly with the Hebrew כָּל־קַיְיָ, in opposition to the people of Israel. "For the collective body of believers is now viewed as Israel. These do not come into judgment at all, but at the resurrection of the just, enter into the joy of the kingdom of God. . . . The πάντα τ. ε. means all men with the exception of believers; i. e. all unbelievers." In order better to understand Olshausen's views, compare his remarks on the parable of the rich man and Lazarus, Luke xvi. In the intermediate state of departed spirits, he says, "divine grace opens up to such of embryo Christians and unbelievers, as from no fault of their own may be destitute of faith, a possibility of attaining to it."



honour to glory, though with very different degrees of glory;<sup>1</sup> and all alike welcomed (the faithful receiver of a prophet, as well as the prophet himself<sup>2</sup>) to enter on the inheritance and kingdom prepared for them from the foundation of the world; and so, in a new angelic nature,<sup>3</sup> to take part in the judging and ruling of the world.<sup>4</sup>—Meanwhile it would also appear that with a tremendous earthquake accompanying, of violence unknown since the revolutions of primæval chaos,<sup>5</sup> (an earthquake under which the *Roman world*<sup>6</sup> at least is to reel to and fro like a drunken man,<sup>7</sup>) the solid crust of this earth shall be broken, and fountains burst forth from its inner deep, not as once of water, but of liquid fire; of fire now pent up within it as in a treasure-house,<sup>8</sup> and intended as the final

<sup>1</sup> 1 Cor. xv. 41, 42.

<sup>2</sup> Matt. x. 41.

<sup>3</sup> Luke xx. 36, "They are *ισαγγελοι*, . . . being children of the resurrection."

<sup>4</sup> Compare Heb. ii. 5, "He hath not subjected to *angels* the world to come whereof we speak:" (*την οικουμένην την μελλουσαν*) also Matt. xix. 28, Luke xix. 17, Apoc. iii. 21, xx. 4.

<sup>5</sup> The structure of the earth's crust seems clearly to indicate violent previous revolutions: nor, I conceive, is there anything whatsoever in the Mosaic history of creation opposed to this view; as it only takes up our earth's history from its preparation for *man's* habitation. As regards the word *בָּרָא*, *created*, in Gen. i. 1, it will suffice to compare its use in Isa. lxxv. 17, to remove difficulties thence arising.

<sup>6</sup> It is well known that the words *γη* and *οικουμένη* are often used in a limited sense of *Judæa*, or the *Roman earth*, (compare Matt. xxvii. 45, Mark xv. 33, Luke iv. 25, Apoc. xi. 10, Luke ii. 1, &c.,) just as the Romans themselves called their world *the orbis terrarum*. And, after careful consideration of the various prophetic descriptions of the consummation, I incline to think that the meaning of the term, when used in these prophecies of the earth's *primary* convulsions on Christ's second advent, is thus limited, and that it refers to the *Roman world* alone:—with this modification, moreover, that the circumstance of the separation of the Eastern and Western Empire, and political destruction of the former by the Turkish invasion, having caused the phrase to be used in the later Apocalyptic prophecies of Western or Papal Christendom only, it may perhaps be so in those of the consummation also.—The idea of some other and more universal conflagration at the *post-millennial* judgment is not hereby excluded: this latter being the consummation, as it were, of the earlier. On which point I must again refer to my next Chapter.

How the *thrill* in such case, even were there no supernatural interposition, would be felt through the *whole habitable earth*, might be *partially* imagined from the extensive vibration of great earthquakes. E. g. the noise and shock of the great earthquake connected with the eruption of the volcano at Sumbawa, in 1815, is said to have been felt and heard 970 miles off. Of course however the supernatural character of the earthquake at Christ's second advent precludes all comparison with mere natural convulsions.

<sup>7</sup> Isa. xxiv. 20.—In verse 22 of that chapter we read, "They shall be gathered together, as prisoners are gathered in the pit, and shall be shut up in the prison; and after many days shall they be visited." With which compare Apoc. xx. 5.

<sup>8</sup> 2 Peter iii. 7; "The heavens and the earth which now are [i. e. contradictively to those that were overwhelmed by the flood] are by the same word stored with fire [*τεθησαυρισμένοι πυρι*], so I understand the phrase] being kept unto the day of judgment." &c. It is only by this rendering of the *τεθησαυρισμένοι πυρι* that the apostle's evidently intended antithesis can be expressed, between the

habitation of devils:<sup>1</sup> that this, I say, shall then burst forth and engulf the vast territory of the Papal Babylon, and the godless of its inhabitants;<sup>2</sup> thence spreading even to

old world *stored with water*, by which as the instrumentality it at its appointed time perished; and the present world *stored with fire*, by which it, in its time, is also to perish. Besides that, in the received sense, *θησαυρισμενοι* is a word not merely superfluous but inappropriate; "*stored up*" being a phrase used of things laid aside from present use, which certainly our present earth and atmosphere are not.\*—Compare, as to the *water*, Psal. xxxiii. 7; (Sept.) *τιθεις εν θησαυροις αβυσσους*: and, as to the *fire*, Job xxviii. 5; rendered by the Chaldee, "Beneath the earth is *Gehenna*." † Also Isaiah xxx. 33; "Tophet is ordained of old: for the king it is prepared: he hath made it deep and large: the pile thereof is fire and much wood: the breath of the Lord, as a stream of brimstone, doth kindle it."

Similarly Tertullian, Apol. 47; "*Gehennam, que est ignis arcani subterranei ad penam thesaurus.*" In which view of the fiery interior of the earth, other Fathers agreed: as Jerome on Jonah ii.; "*Infernus in medio terre esse perhibetur.*"

As to the suggestion of our earth being *stored with fire*, it seems a fact indubitable.—For, while the earth's form of an oblate spheroid, the crystalline character of its primitive rocks, the evident action of heat on its earliest strata, and absence of organic remains from them, as if at that time from heat uninhabitable, and the proofs, alike in the animal and vegetable fossils of other subsequently formed strata, of a temperature once greatly higher than that of the earth's present surface, but gradually diminishing and approximating to it,—while, I say, geology presents to us in these phenomena a body of evidence irresistible, (if only we suppose the laws of matter the same formerly as now,) for the fact of our earth having been originally fluid from intense heat, and having gradually, in the course of ages, cooled down so as to constitute the outer crust solid and mild in temperature, such as we now experience it,—geology also calls attention to another fact, viz. that this cooling down is only superficial. Of this the gradual increase of heat observed on descending to any depth below the surface, ‡ and the ejection from time to time in all quarters of the globe of boiling streams of lava, and other minerals from below the primitive granite, furnish sufficient indication. And the irresistible violence of these eruptions of the more central earth's boiling and inflammable materials, shows that there is as it were a train laid, that waits but the bidding of the Almighty to break up the earth's solid crust, and wrap this our world, or any fated part thereof, in a universal conflagration.—I may refer to the first Plate in Dr. Buckland's Bridgewater Treatise, as very illustrative of this point. He who has familiarized himself with it can scarcely, I think, help realizing the fact, that the ground he treads on is underwrought with volcanic agencies; ready, the instant the Almighty may please to employ them, to execute the predicted judgment. <sup>1</sup> See the end of Note <sup>1</sup> p. 200.

<sup>2</sup> Apoc. xviii.—To this same catastrophe Walter Brute, A.D. 1391, applied Ezekiel's denunciation, xxviii. 18, against the *Prince of Tyrus*; "I will bring forth a fire from the midst of the whole earth, and will make thee as ashes upon the earth, in the sight of all that behold thee." Foxe iii. 138. The time noted (verses 25, 26,) seems very remarkably to be that of the *final restoration of Israel*.—Compare what was said of *Antichrist's*, or the *King of the North's*, ultimate perishing at that same time, according to Dan. xi. 45, p. 107 *suprà*; and also *the dwellers in the isles*, as foretold by Ezekiel, p. 122. Compare too Dan. vii. 11, and the passages referred to at pp. 47, 48.

\* As *θησαυρισμα* means a *treasure-house*, as well as *treasure*, *θησαυρισμα τιθησανρισμενον πυρι* is in construction like *τειχισμα τετειχισημενον τειχει*, or, *τεθωρακισμενον θωρακι*, 1 Macc. vi. 43. † So A. Clarke in loc. and Gausson's Theopneustie.

‡ "In round numbers we obtain an increase of more than 1° of Fahrenheit's thermometer for every 100 feet of sinking." Edinb. Rev. No. 165, p. 27.—Schlegel, speaking of "the earth's layer of subterraneous fire, with all its volcanic arteries and veins of earthquakes," observes, that from the various phenomena of earthquakes and volcanoes, "naturalists have concluded with reason that the volcanic basin of the earth's surface must be somewhat deeper (perhaps 1½ geographical miles deeper) than the bottom of the sea." Phil. of Hist. i. 22, 23.

Palestine,<sup>1</sup> and everywhere, as in the case of Sodom, making the very elements to melt with fervent heat :<sup>2</sup> and that there perhaps the flame shall consume Antichrist at the head of his confederacy,<sup>3</sup> while the sword also does its work of slaughter ;<sup>4</sup> the risen saints being perhaps (as would seem not improbable from Enoch's,<sup>5</sup> St. Paul's,<sup>6</sup> and the Apocalyptic prophecies)<sup>7</sup> the attendants of the Lord's glory in this destruction of Antichrist, and assessors in his judgment on a guilty world.—And then, immediately, it would seem also that the renovation of this our earth is to take place : its soil being purified by the very action of the fire,<sup>8</sup> in all

<sup>1</sup> Zech. xiv. 4, 5.<sup>2</sup> 2 Pet. iii. 12.<sup>3</sup> Apoc. xix. 20.<sup>4</sup> Apoc. xix. 21 ; also Isa. lxvi. 16, Joel iii. 10—13, &c.<sup>5</sup> Jude 14, "The Lord cometh with ten thousand of his saints."<sup>6</sup> 1 Thess. iii. 13.

<sup>7</sup> It is said, just before the description of the Beast's destruction, Apoc. xix. 11, 14, "And I saw heaven opened ; and behold a white horse, and one that sate on it . . . and the armies in heaven followed him on white horses, clothed in fine linen (*βυσσον*) clean and white." On this the questions arise, What coming of Christ was this, and what hosts these that accompanied him ;—*angelic* hosts, or hosts of the risen saints ? On the first question, Mr. Bickersteth exclaims, "Here can be no mistake : " as if the symbolized coming *must* be *personal*. And though we cannot surely, on the mere evidence of a symbolic picture, conclude on the *παρουσία* being Christ's personal advent, yet it seems not improbable : the heaven now for the first time being said to be opened, as if to permit the passage to earth of some one seated beyond the visible heaven ; according to Acts iii. 21, "Whom the heaven must receive until the times of the restitution of all things."

Connected with this is an argument of Daubuz, drawn from the *dress* of the hosts that followed Christ. He says that the *βυσσος*, or *byssine* linen dress, now ascribed to them, is here mentioned for the first time ; white robes, *στολαι λευκαι*, being the dress specified as given to the souls under the altar previously :—also that this *byss*, woven from a plant in Palestine, (so Pausanias tells us,) made the very finest whitest linen in use among the ancients : and that it is spoken of in Gen. xli. 42 as worn by *Joseph* ; in 1 Chron. xv. 27 as worn by King *David*, on occasion of bringing up the ark to Jerusalem ; and in Exod. xxviii. 39, as appointed for the *priests* under the Jewish law. Thus, from its being the finest linen, and that both of the royal and the pontifical robe, he infers that it signifies the *bridal dress of incorruption and purity*, given to them that are to be *kings and priests* at the resurrection ; and so betokens the hosts of Apoc. xix. 14 to be the risen saints, now associated with Christ in judgment, as afterwards in reigning. (I have just alluded to this, Note<sup>1</sup> p. 52, *suprà*.) \*—Elsewhere *angels* too seem noted as attendant. See Matt. xxv. 31, John i. 51. But I think what is said in Apoc. xix. 19 of the Beast and his allied kings "being gathered to make war with him that sate on the horse, and with his army," better suits the view of Christ's attendant hosts in this Apocalyptic vision being *his saints* : the war of the Beast against Christ and them being, as I suppose, against their cause.

<sup>8</sup> I have already, at p. 135 *suprà*, noted this as one characteristic point in the pre-millennial views of the early Fathers. Let me quote *Methodius*, as a specimen. "Says the great Patriarch Methodius," observes Andreas on Apoc. xx. 11, "It pleases me not what some assert, that the whole universe is to perish together, and heaven and earth and air to be no more. Rather the whole world will through its inundation of fire be burnt so as that its purification and renewal shall be the result. Even

\* On the *βυσσος* compare Trench on the Parables, p. 458. (5th Ed.)



that shall remain of it, for “the nations” of the saved, i. e. the undestroyed Gentiles<sup>1</sup> and restored Israel; (these being perhaps they that are called to the marriage-supper of the Lamb: <sup>2</sup>) and the Spirit too poured out from on high to renew, in a yet better sense, the moral face of nature: and that so the millennial commencement of Christ’s eternal reign with his saints is to begin: <sup>3</sup> the Shekinah, or personal glory of Christ amidst his saints, being manifested chiefly in the Holy Land, and at Jerusalem; <sup>4</sup> but the whole earth partaking of the blessedness: and thus the regeneration of all things, <sup>5</sup> and the world’s redemption from the curse, having their accomplishment, according to his promise, at the manifestation of the sons of God. <sup>6</sup>

Such seems to me to be in brief the appointed order of events, introductory to the Millennium. I pray the reader to believe that it is in no presumptuous or light spirit

as St. Paul speaks Rom. viii. 19.” So too *Origen* *Contrà* *Marcion*. p. 65. (Ed. Basle 1674.)

Very much the same seems to have been the view of the early Reformers of our Church. In King Edward the Sixth’s Catechism, to the question, “By what way, and with what fashion and circumstances,” there is to be brought about the renewing of all things, and introduction of the new heavens and earth of which St. Peter speaks, the following answer is made. “I will tell you as well as I can, according to the witness of the same apostle. The heavens shall pass away like a storm: the elements shall melt away: the earth and all the works therein shall be consumed with fire:—as though he should say, As gold is wont to be fined, so shall the whole world be purified with fire, and brought to his full perfection. The lesser world, which is man, following the same, shall likewise be delivered from corruption and change. And so for man this greater world (which for his sake was first created) shall at length be *renewed*, and be clad with another hue much more pleasant and beautiful.” P. 510. Parker Ed.

The supposed fact of the earth’s purification by fire is another point on which geology offers interesting illustration. For it is a fact, I believe, that volcanic fire will sometimes make the most sterile parts fertile: so that it has been said, for example, of the great African Zabara, or Desert, that nothing more than fire of this kind is needed to turn it into fertility.

<sup>1</sup> As distinguished from the *πληρωμα των εθνων* of Rom. xi. 25, or *fulness of Gentile first-fruits*, gathered into the Church of the redeemed *under the present dispensation*: the which, together with the older *Jewish first-fruits*, is to partake at Christ’s coming of the glories of the first resurrection. This distinction is important, but too often overlooked. <sup>2</sup> See pp. 52, 55, *suprà*.

<sup>3</sup> At p. 135, 136, *suprà* I have already referred to *Justin Martyr*, *Irenæus*, and *Lactantius*, as examples from the early premillennarian Fathers, showing that they did not hold the 1000 years to be any more than the commencement of an eternal reign; therein following Dan. vii. 18, and Apoc. xxii. 5.

<sup>4</sup> It is to be observed that Mr. Faber, and other anti-premillennarians, constrained by the force of Scripture evidence, allow not a little of what has been said in this Chapter: and that a mighty earthquake, a volcanic conflagration, a millennium of blessedness, and even the Shekinah, or visible revelation of Christ’s glory, are to follow on the destruction of Antichrist. S. C. iii. 329, 336. It is only the fact of this being the glory of *Christ’s second advent*, and *the saints’ concomitant resurrection*, that Mr. F. contravenes.

<sup>5</sup> Matt. xix. 28.

<sup>6</sup> Rom. viii. 19.



that I have ventured on these awful and mysterious subjects. I have done so only under a sense of the necessity laid on me as an expositor: and offer what has been said, simply as suggestions of what I infer to be most probable from Scripture; but which, I fully allow, must, in respect of details, be in no inconsiderable measure conjectural and uncertain.

It has long been a disputed question among prophetic expositors, (as my sketch of the chief millennial theories given in the preceding Chapter will have shown already,) where precisely the *New Jerusalem* of the 21st and 22nd chapters of the Apocalypse<sup>1</sup> is to have its position; whether

<sup>1</sup> Apoc. xxi. 1. "And I saw a new heaven and a new earth: for the first heaven and the first earth were passed away; and there was no more sea. 2. And I John saw the holy city, new Jerusalem, coming down from God out of heaven, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband. 3. And I heard a great voice out of heaven saying, Behold the tabernacle of God is with men, and he will dwell with them; and they shall be his people, and God himself shall be with them, and be their God. 4. And God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes; and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain: for the former things are passed away. 5. And he that sat upon the throne said, Behold, I make all things new. And he said [unto me], Write: for these words are true and faithful. 6. And he said unto me, 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. 7. He that overcometh shall inherit all things: and I will be his God, and he shall be my son. 8. But the fearful, and unbelieving, and the abominable, and murderers, and whoremongers, and sorcerers, and idolaters, and all liars, shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone: which is the second death.

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 show thee the bride, the Lamb's wife. 10. And he carried me away in the spirit to a great and high mountain, and showed me that [great] city, the holy Jerusalem, descending out of heaven from God; 11. Having the glory of God: and her light was like unto a stone most precious, even like a jasper stone, clear as crystal; 12. And it had a wall great and high, and had twelve gates, and at the gates twelve angels, and names written thereon, which are the names of the twelve tribes of the children of Israel: 13. On the east three gates; on the north three gates; on the south three gates; and on the west three gates. 14. And the wall of the city had twelve foundations; and in them the names of the twelve apostles of the Lamb. 15. And he that talked with me had a golden reed, to measure the city, and the gates thereof, and the wall thereof. 16. And the city lieth foursquare, and the length is as large as the breadth; and he measured the city with the reed, twelve thousand furlongs. The length and the breadth and the height of it are equal. 17. And he measured the wall thereof, an hundred and forty and four cubits, according to the measure of a man, that is, of the angel. 18. And the building of the wall of it was of jasper; and the city was pure gold, like unto clear glass. 19. And the foundations of the wall of the city were garnished with all manner of precious stones. The first foundation was jasper; the second, sapphire; the third, a chalcedony; the fourth, an emerald; 20. The fifth, sardonyx; the sixth, sardius; the seventh, chrysolite: the eighth, beryl; the ninth,

\* Γεγορε. So Scholz and Heinrichs. Other critical Editions read Γεγοραν.—The clauses within brackets are rejected by the critical Editions.

during, or only after the Millennium: and, if synchronous with it, whether as identical, or not, with the *glorified Jerusalem* prophesied of in the *Old Testament*. Of the older Fathers alike the premillennarian *Tertullian*<sup>1</sup> and the anti-premillennarian *Augustine* explained the glorified Jerusalem of Old Testament prophecy as identical with that of the Apocalypse; the one however as symbolic of the risen saints' *millennial* glory, the other of their *heavenly and everlasting blessedness*.<sup>2</sup> Again, of the moderns, we have seen that *Whitby* and *Vitringa*, while also identifying the two figurations, did yet explain them to signify the *millennial earthly blessedness of the still living Christian Church*:<sup>3</sup> and that *Mr. Faber* would separate the two; and make *Isaiah's Jerusalem* of the latter day, with its new heaven and earth, *alone* millennial, that of the Apocalypse post-millennial.<sup>4</sup> To which I may add, that some expositors, while explaining one or both to prefigure *earthly* glories destined for God's people, make the *restored* and *converted Jews* nationally, not the *Church Catholic* generally, the grand object and chief intended recipients of the coming glory.<sup>5</sup> So does the great question about the *Jews' restoration* intermix itself with that respecting the *New Jerusalem*; and force upon us at this point the more direct

a topaz; the tenth, a chrysolite; the eleventh, a jacinth; the twelfth, an amethyst. 21. And the twelve gates were twelve pearls; every several gate was of one pearl; and the street of the city was pure gold, as it were transparent glass. 22. And I saw no temple therein: for the Lord God Almighty and the Lamb are the temple of it. 23. And the city had no need of the sun, neither of the moon, to shine in it; for the glory of God did lighten it, and the Lamb is the light thereof. 24. And the nations [of them which are saved] shall walk in the light of it: and the kings of the earth do bring their glory and honour into it. 25. And the gates of it shall not be shut at all by day: for there shall be no night there. 26. And they shall bring the glory and honour of the nations into it. 27. And there shall in no wise enter into it anything that defileth, neither whatsoever worketh abomination, or maketh a lie: but they which are written in the Lamb's book of life.

xxii. 1. And he showed me the river of the water of life, clear as crystal, proceeding out of the throne of God and the Lamb. 2. In the midst of the street of it, and on either side of the river, was there the tree of life, which bare twelve manner of fruits, and yielded its fruit every month; and the leaves of the tree were for the healing of the nations. 3. And there shall be no more curse: but the throne of God and of the Lamb shall be in it; and his servants shall serve him; 4. And they shall see his face; and his name shall be on their foreheads. 5. And there shall be no night there; and they need no candle, nor light of the sun; for the Lord God shall give them light: and they shall reign for ever and ever."

<sup>1</sup> Adv. Marc. iii. 25.    <sup>2</sup> See p. 137.    <sup>3</sup> See p. 141. So too Bryce Johnston.

<sup>4</sup> S. C. iii. 340, 298. So too, nearly, Mr. Brown. On what is more peculiar in his view see p. 173 *suprà*.

<sup>5</sup> E. g. Mr. Kelly.

consideration of the *Jewish people's* destiny in the coming future.

And let me just repeat here, what was passingly observed before,<sup>1</sup> with reference to the *literal Israel's* part in the matter, that there has been a very general abandonment by modern commentators, of the decided *anti-Jewish* views of the predicted blessedness held by the ancient Fathers. It was laid down by Origen, Augustine, and others, that though the Jews would be *converted* to Christ before the final judgment, its result would be only their becoming part and parcel of the Church Universal; and being then so merged in it as to lose all national distinctness, and of course to have no *national restoration* to their own land and their ancient city.<sup>2</sup> But, after the Reformation, other views gradually obtained more and more on the subject: and Whitby,<sup>3</sup> in common with others of the same as well as of different prophetic views,<sup>4</sup> declared himself compelled by force of Scripture evidence to admit that, on the times of the Gentiles being fulfilled, the converted Jews will, as a distinct people, re-occupy the Holy Land and Jerusalem. And indeed, *admitting their conversion*, (which who can doubt?) the strength of evidence on this point seems to

<sup>1</sup> p. 172.

<sup>2</sup> Whitby, in his Appendix to the xith Chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, thus describes *Origen's* view. "In his (Origen's) Book against Celsus, he saith not, 'They shall never be converted to the Christian faith,' but that they should never be restored to their own worship or country: . . . 'We confidently affirm (ὅτι οὐδ' ἀποκατασθαισονται) that they shall never again be restored to Jerusalem or the land of promise, which before they were.'" —So too *Augustine* only speaks of their conversion: never, I believe, of their national restoration in Palestine. (See p. 137 Note <sup>4</sup>.) And when *Jerome*, on Habak. iii., speaking of the cursed fig-tree in Matt. xxi. 19 as signifying a curse on the Jews, adds, "Sed cū sæculum istud pertransierit, et intraverit plenitudo gentium, tunc etiam hæc ficus afferet fructus suos, et omnis Israel salvabitur," he means similarly, I believe, only their conversion, not their national restoration. —So too *Tertullian* adv. Marc. iii. 24; *Chrysostom* adv. Jud.; *Jerome* on Is. i.; *Ephrem Syrus* on Dan. ix. 27; &c.

<sup>3</sup> See the citation p. 174, Note. This fact of their restoration to their own land, and rebuilding of Jerusalem "may probably be collected," he says, "from those words of Christ, 'Jerusalem shall be trodden down till the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled;' and *all the prophets* seem to declare that the Jews shall then return to their own land. See Jer. xxxi. 38—40. Yet," he adds, "do I confidently deny that the *temple* of Jerusalem shall be then built again:" &c.

<sup>4</sup> Prideaux, in his Inaug. Orat. vi. 7, notes as agreeing on this point, "inter recentiores, P. Martyr, Beza, Grimæus, Paræus, et in Hexaplâ suâ Willetus." So too Prideaux himself, though a decided anti-premillennarian, the learned Dr. Owen, &c.

So again in the present day Mr. Scott; also Mr. Brown, as cited by me p. 173 *suprà*. Nor does Archbishop Whately deny that there may be a *political* or *national* restoration of the Jews; though strongly denying that there will be any *religious* distinction. See his Millennial Chapter, in the Essays on a Future State.

me irresistible.<sup>1</sup> So that we cannot eliminate this condition out of our problem. We cannot admit into the list of possible hypotheses, so as we might otherwise have done, not without much plausibility, that the *Jerusalem of the latter-day glory* predicted in the Old Testament is to be construed, either with Irenæus as figuring simply and solely the millennial glory of the *Christian Church* on earth, or with Augustine as figuring the eternal glory of the *Church of the resurrection*, in a still higher and heavenly state of blessedness.<sup>2</sup> It must be confessed, I think, that the *literal Israel*, in its *national* character, and its city the *literal Jerusalem*, enter, beyond what these old patristic expositors taught, into Old Testament prophecies of the future blessedness.<sup>3</sup> And the only question for the Apocalyptic exposi-

<sup>1</sup> Deut. xxx. 1—6, seems to me almost by itself decisive on the point. "When all these things have come upon thee, the blessing and the curse, . . . and thou shalt call them to mind among all the nations whither the Lord thy God hath driven thee, and shalt return unto the Lord, thou and thy children, . . . then the Lord thy God will turn thy captivity, and have compassion on thee, and gather thee from all the nations whither the Lord hath scattered thee. If any of thine be driven out unto the utmost parts of heaven, from thence will the Lord thy God gather thee, and from thence will he fetch thee; and will bring thee into the land which thy fathers possess, and thou shalt possess it; and he will do thee good, and multiply thee above thy fathers. And the Lord thy God will circumcise thine heart, and the heart of thy seed, to love the Lord with all thine heart and all thy soul, that thou mayest live."—So that the only ground on which a denial of Israel's *national restoration* to Palestine seems maintainable, is a denial of their *national conversion*. A denial which who can make after St. Paul's declaration, Rom. xi. 25, 26, &c.; not to say that, to the same purport, of nearly all the prophets?

As a late eminent testimony to this effect, I may refer to the late Bishop of London's (Blomfield's) Sermon before the Jews' Society. "That which is here spoken of as a possible contingency;" (viz. the *repossession of their own land*, &c., as predicted in Deut. xxx. 3, &c.,) "is distinctly foretold by later prophets, as an event which will assuredly come to pass. The eighth and three last chapters of Zechariah cannot, we think, without doing violence to all the laws of interpretation, be so explained as not to imply a future restoration of the Jews to their ancient and covenanted inheritance, and the re-establishment of their national polity. This is of necessity connected with a re-instatement of the holy city of Jerusalem in splendour and strength. 'Jerusalem,' says the prophet, 'shall be safely inhabited; it shall be lifted up, and inhabited in her place: and men shall dwell in it; and there shall be no more utter destruction.'" Then, after observing that these words can scarce by possibility be understood in a purely spiritual sense, of the heavenly Jerusalem,—the Bishop adds, that any such spiritual interpretation is positively precluded by Christ's prophecy about Jerusalem being trodden down by the Gentiles till the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled. For, "as the *city* of Jerusalem is to be trodden down, so the *city* of Jerusalem shall be built up."

<sup>2</sup> This last without any yet *future* earthly *Millennium* of righteousness first intervening.—As to Augustine's idea of the Millennium being *past*, its Apocalyptic position after Antichrist's destruction (see p. 143 *suprà*) is a difficulty that the *Protestant* advocates of this view can never overcome.

<sup>3</sup> Some writers indeed still deny this; for example, the Author of the "Rector in Search of a Curate." His theory is that wherever a *national* or *local* restoration of the Jews is predicted, it either means the first restoration from *Babylon*; or a re-



tor is, where to place them in his scheme of unfulfilled prophecy; and how to associate the blessedness of *Israel's national restoration* with, or how dissociate it from, the predicted glories of the Millennium of the Apocalypse and its New Jerusalem.

Now, that we are not to *identify* the restored *Jewish people* with the constituency of the *Apocalyptic New Jerusalem*, or *their* restored earthly and holy city with *that* Holy City, appears to me perfectly clear. For it would be contrary to the whole analogy of Apocalyptic interpretation to attach to these symbols such a meaning; seeing that from the very beginning of *this* prophecy, even throughout, *Jewish emblems* have been proved to be used of the *Christian Church*.—The fitness of this application of them seemed to us evident *à priori*. The natural Israel as a nation having rejected, and so been rejected by God, the Christian visible Church, *primarily Jewish*, and though made up chiefly of a Gentile constituency, yet of Gentiles *engrafted by the apostles on the Abrahamic stock*, became, as it were, God's *substituted visible Israel*:<sup>1</sup> and thus by St. Paul, we saw,<sup>2</sup> as well as other apostles, had had Jewish titles and emblems, both civic and ecclesiastical, as well as the Abrahamic promises, applied to it,<sup>3</sup> long before St. John's exile to Patmos. Then, in the introductory Apocalyptic vision, the representation of Christ, the Christian Church's head, under guise of the Jewish High Priest, and that of the seven Asiatic Christian Churches under the symbol of seven golden lamps, like those of the Jewish temple, was an express recognition of this principle of application; and prepared the Seer for a similar application of Jewish emblems to the Christian Church in the subsequent visions,

restoration *conditionally* promised, and which, from the circumstance of the Jews not fulfilling the conditions, has not been, and will not be, fulfilled. (Of prophecies, such as in Deut. xxx. and Zech. xii., where God promises his Spirit's effusion in order to enable them to fulfil the conditions, he says nothing.) In all other prophecies he applies what is said of the *latter-day glory of Jerusalem* to the *Christian Church*.\* It will, I think, suffice to satisfy the reader on this theory's unsoundness, if he try it simply by those chapters of Zechariah which the Bishop of London refers to.—The British Quarterly Reviewer (p. 168) only escapes from the cogency of these last-mentioned prophecies by the suggestion that they are not Zechariah's, but the writing of an earlier prophet.

<sup>1</sup> So Rom. xi. 17—24.

<sup>2</sup> See my Vol. i. pp. 259, 260.

<sup>3</sup> E. g. Gal. iii. 29, vi. 16, Eph. ii. 12, 19, 1 Peter ii. 9, 10; &c.

\* His admission is observable, that if the Jews' *national restoration to their own land* be a fact predicted, *Christ's personal reign* must be a fact predicted also.

upon a larger scale.<sup>1</sup> And so the *temple-court and service* marked in those visions *its ecclesiastical state and service*:<sup>2</sup> the *twelve tribes of Israel* the constituency of *its* visible professing body, i. e. so soon as it should have attained dominancy and a political form in the Roman world:<sup>3</sup> an *election out of these tribes* (“144,000 out of all the tribes of Israel”), Christ’s *true Church*, on the mass becoming corrupt, and at length heathen-like and apostate:<sup>4</sup> and the *Holy City*, the polity of the same holy seed, the association of the faithful and elect, the true Israel.<sup>5</sup> Which being so, how could the symbol of “the *Holy City*, the *New Jerusalem*, coming down from God out of heaven,” be interpreted with any consistency to signify the converted Jews, and earthly rebuilt Jerusalem? How to signify anything else than the same body of the 144,000, Christ’s spiritual Israel, “the called and chosen and faithful,”—inclusive of course of all their successive generations, agreeably with its mystic form of a *cube* made up of many *squares*:<sup>6</sup>—of these generations, I say, caught up to Christ at his coming, and now in the resurrection-state glorified as “the sons of God:”<sup>7</sup> perfect, according to the Redeemer’s intercessory prayer,<sup>8</sup> in number and unity, as well as glory; the City of God (to use Augustine’s phrase) now at length made complete; the Jerusalem above, (to use St. Paul’s,) long time preparing for the saints its citizens, which is the mother of us all?<sup>9</sup> Indeed Christ’s promise in Apoc. iii. 12 fixes this meaning on it.

As to the very interesting but difficult question of the *chronological place* of the Apocalyptic vision of this New Jerusalem, whether *inclusively millennial* or *wholly post-millennial*, a cursory reader might deem it at once settled by the introductory statement in Apoc. xxi. 1, “And I saw a new heaven and a new earth; (for the first heaven and the first earth were passed away;) and I saw the holy city,

<sup>1</sup> See my Introduction, Vol. i. pp. 71—74.

<sup>2</sup> See Vol. i. pp. 101, 102, Vol. ii. pp. 183—185.

<sup>3</sup> See my Vol. i. pp. 259—266.

<sup>4</sup> Apoc. vii. 4, xi. 2.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* and xiv. 1.

<sup>6</sup> Viz. 144 or 12 × 12 thousand; *one* thousand being the unit.—The *cubic* form of the New Jerusalem seems to me in this sense beautifully apt and significant.

<sup>7</sup> Rom. viii. 19.

<sup>8</sup> John xvii. 21—24.

<sup>9</sup> Gal. iv. 26.

New Jerusalem, coming down from God out of heaven :” compared with that in Apoc. xx. 11, just before, that it was “from the face of him that took seat on the great white throne” that “the [former] earth and heaven fled away, and there was no place found for them.” Surely, it might be thought, this is a *post-millennial* definition of time and order not to be mistaken.—And then too the fact of death and the curse having no existence in the New Jerusalem state will seem to him strong confirmation of that view ; compared with the previously stated fact of its being not till after the judgment of the great white throne, that death and hades were cast into the lake of fire.

On a more enlarged consideration of the question, however, the following strong presumptive evidence will be found to favour the view which supposes the New Jerusalem to have had existence from the commencement, and throughout the progress, of the millennial period.

1. Whereas two things had been mentioned previously, as its subjects of congratulation, in the Church’s joyous song of triumph on Antichrist’s overthrow, Apoc. xix. 6, 7, viz. the *one*, the fact of Christ’s mundane reign beginning, the *other*, that of the Lamb’s marriage having come, and his wife having made herself ready,—and whereas, of these two things, the establishment of the kingdom was immediately afterwards figured to St. John in the emblem of thrones being set, and the risen martyrs and saints taking seat thereon, and judgment being given them,<sup>1</sup>—whereas, I say, the first of these two things was thus duly symbolized, there would on the other hand be no corresponding symbolization whatsoever in the Apocalyptic visions of the Lamb’s synchronical bridal, and bride,<sup>2</sup> unless *this* emblematic vision were supposed to represent it ; and consequently to synchronize in its introduction with the setting of the thrones of judgment, and opening of the Millennium.<sup>3</sup>—

2. The account St. John gives of the manner of his seeing

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

<sup>2</sup> In the Old Testament prophecies of Christ’s bridal, as in Psalm xlv., Isa. lxvii. 4, 5, &c., the *Jews* are supposed to be in a living state on the earth.

<sup>3</sup> So Vitringa argues, p. 1188.—Even Mr. Brown, though viewing the New Jerusalem as a type of the glorified Church in its post-millennial blessedness, yet notes the incongruity of such a more than millennial interval between the bride’s preparing and the bride’s presentation. See his remarks at p. 63.

the New Jerusalem confirms this view of the matter. For while, on the one hand, the fact of his having been a *symbolic man*, or *representative of Christ's earthly Church*,<sup>1</sup> thus far in the prefigurative visions, would lead us in consistency so to regard him still, and consequently in the circumstance of his being carried away in the spirit, through angelic ministrations, to a sight of its *interior* state and glory, to recognize the indication of an earthly Church distinct from, though synchronous with, this New Jerusalem of the resurrection-saints,<sup>2</sup> such as we know will continue through the Millennium,—on the other, what could be the reason of *one of the Angels that had the seven last Vial-plagues* showing it him, unless to mark that the thing he exhibited was to be the speedy consequence or sequel of those Vial-outpourings? Besides which, there is the very singular coincidence of St. John's being said (I presume as a symbolic man) to have fallen down at the feet of the revealing Angel to worship him, *on this exhibition of the Lamb's bride, the New Jerusalem*, just as he was before said to have done on the Angel's primary intimation to him after Antichrist's destruction, *concerning the bride and bridal*, and to have received in either case precisely the same answer and rebuke:—a coincidence scarce explicable, as it seems to me, except on the hypothesis of the fallings down being one and the same act, though twice noted in the Apocalyptic description;<sup>3</sup> indeed as noted

<sup>1</sup> See my Vol. i. pp. 300—302, and Vol. ii. pp. 114, 115. In the description of the angel the words are observable, "the measure of a *man*, i. e. of an angel." Apoc. xxi. 17.

<sup>2</sup> On comparing Apoc. xxi. 2 with Apoc. xxi. 9, and the sequel, it seems the most natural conclusion that what the second passage reports followed immediately after what is reported in the first: St. John first catching sight of the New Jerusalem as it descended; then hearing the voice from heaven about it; then being caught up by the Angel, ere the descent was completed, to have a fuller sight of its celestial glory.

<sup>3</sup> The coincidency of the two passages is very singular; and noted by Vitringa, p. 1226; who inclines to draw much the same conclusion from it as myself.

Apoc. xix. 7—10.

"The marriage of the Lamb is come, and his wife hath made herself ready (*ἡτοίμασεν ἑαυτήν*). And to her was granted that she should be arrayed in fine linen, clean and white. . . . And he saith unto me, Write; Blessed are they which are called to the marriage supper of the Lamb. And he saith unto me,

Apoc. xxii. 8, 9.

"And I John saw these things and heard them: [including the descent of the New Jerusalem prepared, *ἡτοίμασμεν*, as a bride for her husband.] And when I had heard and seen, I fell down to worship before the feet of the angel which showed me these things. Then saith he unto me, See thou do it not: for



probably for the very purpose of marking more significantly the chronological parallelism or identity of the two visions. —3. To the same effect, *thirdly*, is what is said of “the *nations* [of them that are saved] walking in the light of it, and the *kings of the earth* bringing their glory and honour into it; <sup>1</sup> and again, of “the leaves of the tree being for the *healing of the nations.*” <sup>2</sup> For how can we explain this, except on the supposition of men existing on earth, and in the earthly state, such as needed healing, <sup>3</sup> contemporarily with the higher and heavenly glory of the New Jerusalem: the idea of these *men, nations, and kings of the earth* signifying *saints in the resurrection-state*, being an alternative which few probably will be inclined to embrace? No doubt we may suppose men living on the earth, to whom this healing might apply, *after* the Millennium. But would not the healing virtue be needed by men, in order to its being a millennium of happiness, just as much *during* it? And, if so, whence to be derived but from the New Jerusalem?—4. Then comes the important consideration, (one already briefly alluded to in my preceding Chapter,) <sup>4</sup> that in Dan. vii. 18 the saints’ *everlasting reign* being made to date from Antichrist’s fall seems to require that the *everlasting reign* predicated in Apoc. xxii. 5 of the saints of the New Jerusalem should date similarly from Antichrist’s destruction, and so include the Millennium as its commencing

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 the fellow-servant of thyself and of thy brethren, that have the testimony of Jesus. Worship God.”

I am the fellow-servant of thyself and of thy brethren the prophets, and of them which keep the sayings of this book. Worship God.”

<sup>1</sup> Apoc. xxi. 24.

<sup>2</sup> Εἰς θεραπείαν τῶν ἐθνῶν. Apoc. xxii. 2. Mr. Barker has suggested the different translation, “for the *service* of the nations;” so doing away with the idea of any healing agency being applied or needed. But 1st, though *θεραπεία* mean *service*, as well as *healing*, yet I know not any case where it is used, so as Mr. B. would have it here, of service, in the sense of *benefit*, done by a *thing* not *person*: and with a genitive of the persons towards whom the service is performed. *Θεραπεία αὐτοῦ* may mean either the man’s *body of servants*, (the abstract for the concrete,) as in Gen. xlv. 16, Matt. xxiv. 45, Luke xii. 42:—or *attention* and *service* rendered him by *persons*; as *θεραπεία Θεοῦ*, the worship of God, Chrysost. Homil. 8; *θεραπεία τῶν φίλων*, attention to friends, Xen. Cyrop. viii. 2. 13:—or, *healing of him*, as Luke ix. 11.—Further, 2ndly, in the parallel passage, Ezek. xlvi. 12, we read, “the fruit (of the trees) shall be for meat, and the leaf for *medicine*;” so fixing the sense.

<sup>3</sup> So Mr. Close, I see, unguardedly argues, though a strong anti-premillennarian. Sketches of Sermons, p. 22.

<sup>4</sup> See p. 167 supra.

æra. For when the Apocalypse says of the saints, with reference, incipiently, as would seem, to the state and æra of the New Jerusalem, "they shall reign for ever and ever," can we well suppose that its "for ever and ever" means Daniel's "for ever and ever" *minus the first 1000 years?* — Yet once more, 5thly and lastly, comes up for consideration the all-important parallelism of Isaiah's new heaven and earth with the Apocalyptic new heaven and earth of St. John. For surely all fair presumption is in favour of their identity; Isaiah's *main* object of description only being *the new earth*, St. John's *the new heaven*. And if so, then, since Isaiah's commence *from the restoration of the Jews and of their earthly Jerusalem*, at the opening of the Millennium, we seem all but forced to suppose the same of the *Apocalyptic* new heaven and earth; and, by consequence, of their *heavenly* Jerusalem also.

It may indeed be suggested that the epoch of the New Jerusalem's descent from heaven, and manifestation to men, noted in Apoc. xxi. 2, may be an epoch in the history of the Holy City later than that of its first constitution at the saints' rising; the one marking the commencing æra of the Millennium, the other its conclusion. But this seems inconsistent with St. Paul's explicit declaration that it is the *manifestation* of the sons of God, or glorified body of the risen saints, (that is, of the New Jerusalem,) that is to be the occasion of the creation's deliverance from the bondage of corruption, in other words of the first commencement of its millennial blessedness. Besides, if Isaiah's new heaven and earth fix on the Apocalyptic new heaven and earth a millennial commencement, this involves the same commencing date also to the Apocalyptic New Jerusalem, *as first seen by St. John coming down from heaven to earth*; seeing that it was *then* that Christ said "I make all things new." And indeed the phrase "*prepared as a bride*" could scarce be said of it, except at the epoch of the bridal.

It is not to be wondered at, where such strong arguments press antagonistically on either side, that expositors should have been greatly perplexed and divided as to the exact location of the Apocalyptic New Jerusalem vision. After much consideration and re-consideration of the sub-

ject, I have come in fine to a conclusion respecting it partly different from, partly the same with, what was given in the three first Editions. As before, I cannot resist the arguments just stated for the vision being regarded as millennial in its *incipient* chronology. On the other hand I feel even yet more strongly than before, (though certainly never insensible to it,) the difficulty arising out of the apparently un-equivocal sequence of the Apocalyptic new heaven and earth upon the fleeing away of the old heaven and earth from the face of Him who took seat on the great white throne.—But is it then impossible to reconcile the inconsistency? It has occurred to me that it *may* be reconciled, and the chief difficulty of the subject overcome, by a *different view*, from that which has hitherto obtained, of the *chronological place and æra of the great white throne*. The idea first arose in my mind out of the view of the Millennium suggested by Mr. Mede, (after certain of the ancient Fathers,)<sup>1</sup> as itself the day of judgment.<sup>2</sup> This view seemed to me reasonable and scriptural. Wherefore, *à priori*, should we suppose the day of judgment to be one single solar day, any more than the day of salvation to be one single solar day? And, as to *Scriptural evidence*, might not Peter's inspired declaration, “A thousand years are with the Lord as *one day*,” said in direct connexion with the subjects of Christ's judgment-day and the new earth and heaven, suffice of itself to prove its Scripturalness? Besides, if the thrones on which the souls of martyrs took seat were thrones of *judgment* as well as *rule*, and the martyrs' *rule* or *reign* was declaredly prolonged through the 1000 years, the inference seems natural that their office of *judges* too, and so *the judgment itself* also, must be regarded as prolonged through the 1000 years.—But then what of the *Chief Judge*, and *his throne of judgment*? On turning to the parallel vision in Daniel we find *it* implied, as well as *the subordinate thrones* for the saints:—“I beheld till *the thrones* were placed;”<sup>3</sup> and the Ancient

<sup>1</sup> E. g. Tertullian. See his Adv. Marc. iii. 25.

<sup>2</sup> Mede, p. 772. So too Birks' Visions of Daniel, p. 372: to whose beautiful chapters on this subject I have pleasure in referring my readers.

<sup>3</sup> Explained v. 22; “And *judgment* was given to the saints of the Most High.”

of days did sit," i. e. *on his throne of judgment*. Can we then reasonably suppose that in the Apocalyptic visions this, the most august feature in the whole scene of judgment, was wanting? Or, if figured, that it would be altogether past over in silence by the recording Evangelist? Supposing which two suppositions to be negated, we are almost forced on the idea of the *great white throne* of Apoc. xx. 11 being the very throne in question, seeing that none other is mentioned: and so that it was occupied by the Divine Judge at the *opening*, as well as *close*, of the millennial judgment-day.<sup>1</sup>—The specified fact of "the books being opened," before Him who sate on it, just as "the books were opened" before the Ancient of days in Daniel,<sup>2</sup> is a point of agreement so striking as to go far to identify them.—Nor do I see anything in St. John's description to negative the idea. The circumstance of the great white throne being mentioned after the notice of Gog and Magog's post-millennial outrage, is no valid objection at all against it; because retrogression, for the purpose of supplying what needed to be supplied, by way of addition or explanation, is not uncommon in the Apocalyptic prophecy. Nor can it be objected that there would be wanting on this hypothesis a judgment for those who lived not again till after the expiring of the Millennium; seeing that it supposes the judgment of the great white throne, and sitting of the Judge thereon, to be even then unfinished: there being two great acts of judgment by Him who sate thereon; the one great act at the Millennium's commencement, the other at its conclusion.—In further corroboration of the view, I may observe that the correspondence of the vision with the announcement in Apoc. xi. 18 of what was to take place under the 7th Trumpet would be more evident and complete according to it, than on the usual view which postpones the judgment of the great white throne, and connected fact of the dead rising before it to judgment, altogether to a post-millennial epoch. For what was then the announcement? "The time is come of the dead that they should be judged, and that thou shouldest give reward unto

<sup>1</sup> Jerome on Dan. vii., identifies the Ancient of days' throne in Dan. vii. with the great white throne in the Apocalypse.

<sup>2</sup> Dan. vii. 10, Apoc. xx. 12.



thy servants the prophets, and to the saints, and to them that fear thy name, small and great." And whereas, on the *old* hypothesis, none of the dead were expressly specified as raised or rewarded but the anti-Pagan and anti-Papal martyrs, on the *present* the resurrection of the dead "small and great," mentioned in Apoc. xx. 12, would be construed as having beginning at the beginning of the Millennium, as well as completion at its conclusion: with reward to the righteous given in the first instance; and retribution too to the wicked first *privatively*, afterwards *positively*.<sup>1</sup>—As to the parallel prophecies in Isaiah, St. Peter, and Daniel, the harmony of the Apocalyptic with them too would be also then complete and evident. The passing away of the old heaven and earth, and substitution of the new, together with the commencement of the saints' everlasting reign, would in every case begin with the fall of Antichrist, and the Jews' restoration:—there being moreover coincidently, what St. Paul declares coincident, the "manifestation of the sons of God;" that is, of the New Jerusalem.

Yet once more, there may be light thrown on certain other prophetic difficulties by this view of the millennial judgment-day; considered with double reference distinctively to its two great epochs of the commencement and the close. E. g. a more partial *conflagration* might be supposed to mark the commencement of the Millennium, one more complete its close: each included, as if one, in St. Peter's prophecy, though separated in the Apocalypse; as binary stars are resolved into two only on nearer view. Again, as to what is said of the *sea* being no more,<sup>2</sup> (if literally meant,) while what was known as "the sea" of the ancient world, viz. the Mediterranean,<sup>3</sup> might by the convulsions at the opening of the Millennium have its bed elevated, and made dry land, the whole ocean might at the second and final convulsion become physically no more. So too the *triumph over death*, begun strikingly with the saints' first resurrection at its commencement,<sup>4</sup> would be completed

<sup>1</sup> See p. 151 *suprà*.

<sup>2</sup> Apoc. xxi. i.

<sup>3</sup> See Vol. i. p. 366. Some sea there must be in the Millennium, as *the isles* are often mentioned in Old Testament millennial prophecies.

<sup>4</sup> Even in regard to the earth's inhabitants during the millennial period, though death be not as yet extinguished, yet may the dying very possibly be not until the

strikingly by the casting of death and hades into the lake of fire at its close: and much the same of the judgment in Matt. xxv. on the righteous and wicked. In fine, as regards the New Jerusalem, it is quite consistent with our hypothesis to suppose the manifestation of its glory, and its union with the new earth and its inhabitants, though begun at the commencement of the Millennium, to be yet at its close still more complete and perfect.

Such then is the view that I conclude on, as the one most consistent alike with the Apocalypse itself, and with other parallel Scripture prophecies on this great subject.

As regards the earlier and millennial period of the New Jerusalem, it is of course among the Apocalyptic "nations" [of them that are saved], which are said to walk in its light, and "the kings of the earth," which are said to bring their glory and honour into it, that we are to place the restored Jews and Gentile remnant, saved from the primary conflagration, of whom the Old Testament prophecy speaks so much:—the Jews having now a certain pre-eminence and peculiar glory, such as seem constantly predicted of Israel and the earthly Jerusalem, in the earlier prophecies of the latter day. With which view the statement that "in Christ Jesus there is neither Jew nor Greek, circumcision nor uncircumcision," is not, I think, inconsistent:—seeing that that statement had reference to the *premillennial* times of the gathering out of all nations of the Church of the redeemed, the New Jerusalem; wherein equal honours, and an equal reward, were intended for the engrafted as for the natural members of the *true* Israel: but not to the very different times, and different dispensation, of the Millennium. —It seems to me probable that by "*the beloved city*" of Apoc. xx. 9 we are to understand this *earthly* Jerusalem; though it may also perhaps be understood of the *heavenly* or *new* Jerusalem. But in any case there must be supposed, I conceive, a most intimate connexion of the one Jerusalem with the other: the earthly Jerusalem being that upon, or over which, the glory of the New Jerusalem is to rest;

end of the Millennium: as it is said, "As the days of a tree are the days of my people;" "the leaves of the tree being for the healing of the nations:" besides that death may be then without pain, and a mere easy translation to a heavenly state.

like as Jehovah's pillar of fire on the tabernacle in the wilderness, or the more awful glory on the top of Sinai.<sup>1</sup> Here, I say, it would seem that there is to be the meeting-point of earth and heaven; and that same conjunction to be visibly manifested, of which I spoke before in my preceding chapter,<sup>2</sup> of the ultimate blessedness of the *spiritual* and of the *natural* seed of Abraham:—a conjunction and blending together of the two so intimate, that it is often difficult, if not impossible, to discern in prophecy where the one ends and the other begins.

And thus, when we turn to consider the *state of things during the Millennium*, our minds seem irresistibly directed to *Jerusalem*, as the *Mother-Church* of a Christianized universe: (for even though we admitted the literal *Judaic* character of the *Jerusalem* in Ezekiel's last obscure prophecy, it would by no means involve the literal *Judaic* construction of its *temple* and its *sacrifices*;) <sup>3</sup> I say as the *Mother-Church* of a Christian world, and focus and centre of the glories of that latter day. There the shechinah of Messiah's presence is, as it would seem, to shine refulgent; <sup>4</sup> there the King to be seen in his beauty; <sup>5</sup> there too probably the manifestation to be made, more fully than elsewhere, of the perfected company of the redeemed, the general assembly and Church of the firstborn, now entered on their inheritance, <sup>6</sup> the glorified sons of God: <sup>7</sup>—who, intrusted with the *new earth's* government, subordinately to Christ himself, in gracious reward of past service, <sup>8</sup> (perhaps after the example

<sup>1</sup> Compare Isa. iv. 2—5: "In that day shall the branch of the Lord be beautiful and glorious, and the fruit of the earth shall be excellent and comely for them that are escaped of Israel. And it shall come to pass that he that is left in Zion, and he that remaineth in Jerusalem, shall be called holy, even every one that is written among the living in Jerusalem; when the Lord shall have washed away the filth of the daughters of Zion, and shall have purged the blood of Jerusalem from the midst thereof, by the spirit of judgment and by the spirit of burning. And the Lord will create upon every dwelling-place of Mount Zion, and upon her assemblies, a cloud and smoke by day, and the shining of a flaming fire by night; for upon all the glory there shall be a defence."

<sup>2</sup> See p. 163.

<sup>3</sup> So the ancient father Justin Martyr in explaining his millennial view. Οὐ, εν τη παλιη πυρουσια, μη δοξητε λεγειν Ησαιαν, η τους αλλους προφητας, θυσιας αφ' αιματων η σπονδων επι το θυσιαστηριον αναφερεισθαι. αλλα αληθινους και πνευματικους ανους και ευχαριστιας. Dial. cum Tryph. Cited by Mede, p. 899, in proof of no such unscriptural idea being held by the early premillennarian fathers. In fact they were as opposed to it as Whitby himself; quoted Note <sup>2</sup>, p. 207.

<sup>4</sup> Ps. cii. 16, &c.

<sup>5</sup> Isaiah xxxiii. 17.

<sup>6</sup> Heb. xii. 23. Compare Deut. xxi. 17.

<sup>7</sup> Rom. viii. 19.

<sup>8</sup> Luke xix. 17, Heb. ii. 5, &c.

of those angels that, having kept their first estate, have had this *present* earth intrusted to their charge and ministry,) <sup>1</sup> shall be recognized as the constituency of the New Jerusalem, in all their resurrection glories,<sup>2</sup> during the *αιων*, or *age*, of the millennial dispensation.<sup>3</sup>—Meanwhile thither, concomitantly, are to converge the desires and the gatherings of the whole family of man. “The mountain of the Lord’s house having been established on the top of the mountains, all nations shall flow unto it;”<sup>4</sup> and the Lord’s prophecy be fulfilled, “I, if I be lifted up, shall draw all men to me.”<sup>5</sup> The blessedness thence resulting is to be universal. The creature, delivered from the bondage of corruption, is to experience the glorious liberty of the children of God: the river of life from God’s throne diffusing its blessings over the world, and the leaves of the trees beside it being for the healing of the nations. And as “the knowledge of the Lord now covers the earth, like as the waters the sea,”<sup>6</sup> and holiness and peace and joy everywhere blend together, the Lord shall again rejoice in his works; <sup>7</sup> yea shall joy over them with singing, and rest in his love.<sup>8</sup> It shall be the resumption of his *sabbatism*; a sabbatism begun at the jubilee of *man’s* creation, but immediately after all suddenly and rudely interrupted by man’s apostacy:—his resumption of it after the accomplish-

<sup>1</sup> Jude’s expression, “The angels that kept not their first estate,” implies their having been once in a state of *probation*. And *where* then? The researches of the geologists leave no reasonable doubt of our earth’s having been inhabited by *animals*, at least, in a pre-Adamitic age: and why not then by *intelligent* creatures also? Which supposition being admitted as at least possible, does it seem likely that some other distinct planet was the scene of the inhabitation and trial of these earlier probationists, and not our own?—especially considering that the organic pre-Adamitic remains that abound indicate violent death to have prevailed then as now; and by probable consequence *sin*, the cause of violence and death:—considering also that the internal fires of this earthly planet (see pp. 47, 48, and 201, 202 *suprà*) seem not obscurely marked out in prophecy as the scene of the rebel angels’ future punishment; of their punishment, as if previously of their crime?

<sup>2</sup> The Author of the Book of Wisdom compares their bright and fitful appearance with the flashing of *fire-sparks*, (see the Note, p. 168,) or perhaps of the *firefly*. We may rather compare them with Christ’s appearances after his resurrection.—This rule of the glorified saints is not however to the exclusion of *angels*. See John i. 51.

<sup>3</sup> Such in Scripture is often the meaning of *αιων*; e. g. Luke xx. 35.

Irenæus, v. 46, thus reports “the ancients’” idea as to the different degrees of blessedness in this age and state of the new heavens and earth. Οἱ μὲν καταξίωθεντες τῆς ἐν οὐρανῷ διατριβῆς ἐκείσε χωρησοῦσι· οἱ δὲ τῆς τοῦ Παραδείσου τρυφῆς ἀπολαύσουσι· οἱ δὲ τὴν λαμπρότητα τῆς πόλεως καθεξουσιν. Πανταχοῦ γὰρ ὁ Σωτῆρ ὄραθησεται.

<sup>4</sup> Isa. ii. 2.

<sup>6</sup> Isa. xi. 9.

<sup>7</sup> Psalm civ. 31.

<sup>5</sup> John xii. 32.

<sup>8</sup> Zeph. iii. 17.



ment of that work that he has ever since then, conjointly with the Father, been engaged in;<sup>1</sup>—his work, his mightiest work, of *redemption*.

O scenes surpassing fable, and yet true!  
Scenes of accomplished bliss! which who can see  
Though but in distant prospect, and not feel  
His soul refreshed with foretaste of the joy? <sup>2</sup>

I quote from one who is a meet minstrel on such a topic; and subjoin yet another extract from him, depicting the scene and its blessedness.<sup>3</sup> The subject is one too high and holy for my own rude touch. I pass from it.

Meanwhile (so the Apocalypse, as well as other Scripture prophecy, informs us) an awful monument will remain, and be visible, of a once different state of things;—a monument of the guilt and punishment of the age preceding. It has always been God's plan that such memorials should exist,

<sup>1</sup> John v. 17; "My Father worketh hitherto, and I work:"—viz. I conceive, in the work of *redemption*; carried on alike on *sabbaths* and all other days.

For with reference to God's *resting*, which is sometimes spoken of in Scripture, it seems to me that not the mere *cessation* from any particular work of his hands is implied, but also his *complacency* in its beauty and perfection. Thus when God rested, as we are told in Gen. ii. 2, from his work of *creation*, it was after "he had surveyed everything that he had made, and behold it was very good." But the instant that sin entered, and with sin the curse, this work was marred; and consequently, as I conceive, his rest in regard of it at once broken up. So that then, and thereupon, the new and mightier work of *redeeming* this marred world from the curse was to be entered on: that to which Christ, in the above-cited passage in St. John, seems to me to allude; and of the joyous resting from which, *when perfected*, both Zephaniah and St. Paul, (Heb. iii., iv.,) and others too of the prophets delight to speak.

<sup>2</sup> Cowper's Task, 6th Book.

<sup>3</sup> "One song employs all nations, and all cry  
Worthy the Lamb, for He was slain for us!  
The dwellers in the vales and on the rocks  
Shout to each other, and the mountain-tops  
From distant mountains catch the flying joy;  
Till, nation after nation taught the strain,  
Earth rolls the rapturous Hosanna round.  
Behold the measure of the promise filled:  
See Salem built, the labour of a God!  
Bright as a sun the sacred city shines.  
All kingdoms and all princes of the earth  
Flock to that light; the glory of all lands  
Flows into her: unbounded is her joy. . . .  
Praise is in all her gates: upon her walls,  
And in her streets, and in her spacious courts,  
Is heard salvation. Eastern Java there  
Kneels with the native of the farthest West;  
And Ethiopia spreads abroad the hand,  
And worships. Her report has travelled forth  
Into all lands. From every clime they come,  
To see thy beauty, and to share thy joy,  
O Sion! an assembly such as earth  
Saw never; such as heaven stoops down to see."

as a warning against sin, under every dispensation;—under the *patriarchal* that of the *accursed ground*, and then of the *deluge*; under the *Abrahamic* and *Mosaic* that of *Sodom*; under the *Christian* that of *Jerusalem trodden down*, and the *Jewish exiles* dispersed everywhere, with the brand of God's curse upon them. And now there is to be that of the *mystic Babylon*, or *Roman earth* and *Antichrist*, swallowed up in the lake that burneth with fire and brimstone; “the smoke of which goeth up for ever and ever.”<sup>1</sup> This scene the Apocalypse figured to St. John. And with it correspond those most awful and striking words which close Isaiah's prophecy, in reference evidently to the times of the Millennium:—“And they shall go forth, and look upon the carcases of the men that have transgressed against me: for their worm shall not die, neither shall their fire be quenched: and they shall be an abhorring unto all flesh.”<sup>2</sup>

So during the Millennium.—And if, notwithstanding all this, notwithstanding both the warning, the glory, and the blessedness, the Devil do yet succeed afterwards, on his being loosed, in seducing the nations in the four corners of the world, what the wonder; considering the history of the seductions of Adam and Eve in a former paradisiacal state, and when enjoying the intimacy and the vision of God. It will only be a new example how the creature, by himself, when tempted will fall.—Again, the mad attempt of those deceived ones against even “the camp of the saints and the beloved city,” need not surprise *him* who has studied man's corruption and daring, in the history of Israel's rebellion at the foot of the burning mount of Sinai.<sup>3</sup>—As to the speedy, if not instant destruction of the rebels, it needs not that I expatiate on it; or on the subsequent fate of our world. Where revelation is silent, it were vain to conjecture. Suffice it to remark from the Apocalyptic prophecy, respecting the *seduced*, that they are to be destroyed by fire:—respecting the *Devil*, the tempter, that he is forthwith, with all his associated

<sup>1</sup> Apoc. xiv. 10, 11. xix 3.

<sup>2</sup> Isa. lxvi. 24.

<sup>3</sup> Exod. xxxii. 1, &c.

evil angels, to be cast into the same lake, burning with fire and brimstone, where the Beast and False Prophet were cast before:—respecting the *saints*, that, instead of closing their reign with the Millennium, they are in some way still to reign even for ever:<sup>1</sup>—respecting *the rest of men*, that there is to follow after Gog and Magog's destruction their general resurrection; and a judgment before the great white throne, which I conceive to have been first set at the opening of the Millennium,<sup>2</sup> whereby all not written in the Book of Life will be cast into the lake of fire.—In St. Paul's comprehensive summary of the final future, 1 Cor. xv. 24, 28, (a passage already cited in the controversial part of my preceding chapter,) we read thus of this epoch; “Afterward cometh the end, when He shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father; that God may be all in all.” And there is yet one farther glimpse into ages still to come, opened to us by St. Paul; with reference to the influence on other worlds and intelligences of this our planet's history. He tells how the story of its *redemption* is to be through eternity itself a chief lesson to them of the marvels of divine grace:<sup>3</sup>—“that *in the ages to come*<sup>4</sup> He might show the exceeding riches of his grace, in his kindness *toward us* through Christ Jesus.”<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Apoc. xxii. 5.

<sup>2</sup> Eph. ii. 7.

<sup>2</sup> See p. 216.

<sup>4</sup> εν τοις αιωσι τοις επερχομενοις.

<sup>5</sup> I may fitly here subjoin the conclusion of the Apocalypse.—xxii. 6. “And he said unto me, These sayings are faithful and true: and the Lord God of the spirits of the prophets \* hath sent his angel to show unto his servants the things which must shortly come to pass. 7. Behold, I come quickly: blessed is he that keepeth the sayings of the prophecy of this book. 8. And I John saw these things, and heard them. And when I had heard and seen, I fell down to worship before the feet of the angel which showed me these things. 9. Then saith he to me, See thou do it not: for I am the fellow-servant of thee, and of thy brethren the prophets, and of them which keep the sayings of this book: worship God.

10. And he saith unto me, Seal not the sayings of the prophecy of this book: for the time is at hand. 11. He that is unjust, let him be unjust still: and he that is filthy, let him be filthy still: and he that is righteous, let him do righteousness † still: and he that is holy, let him be holy still. 12. Behold, † I come quickly; and my reward is with me, to give every man according as his work shall be. 13. I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, the first and the last. 14. Blessed are they that wash their robes, ‡ that they may have right to the tree of life, and

\* ὁ Θεος των πνευματων των προφητων. So the critical editions generally.

† δικαιωσιν ην ποιησατω. So the critical editions.

‡ πλυνοντες τας εντολας αυτων. So Tregelles, Wordsworth, &c., instead of the received, ποιουντες τας εντολας αυτου, *they that do his commandments*.—The reference to Apoc. vii. 9, 13, 14, hence arising, seems to me very beautiful: beautiful

## CHAPTER V.

## CONCLUSION.

ARRIVED at the concluding Chapter of my Work, it will be well to stop, and consider attentively *our present eventful position* in prophetic chronology, and the evidence which fixes it:—then to direct our regards to *the coming future*; and consider it in the light, and connectedly with the lessons, suggested by the previous parts of the Apocalyptic prophecy. Each of these subjects will furnish ample matter for a separate Section.

§ 1. OUR PRESENT POSITION IN THE PROPHETIC  
CALENDAR.

With regard to *our present position*, we have been led, as the result of our investigations, to fix it at but a short time from the end of the now existing dispensation, and the expected second advent of Christ. This thought, when we seriously attempt to realize it, must be felt to be a very startling as well as solemn one. And for my own part I confess to risings of doubt, and almost of scepticism, as I do so. Can it be that we are come so near to the day

may enter in through the gates into the city. 15. For without are dogs, and sorcerers, and whoremongers, and murderers, and idolaters, and whosoever loveth and maketh a lie. 16. I Jesus have sent mine angel to testify unto you these things in the churches. I am the root and the offspring of David, and the bright and morning star. 17. And the Spirit and the bride say, Come. And let him that heareth say, Come. And let him that is athirst come. And whosoever will, let him take of the water of life freely.—18. I testify unto every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book, If any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book: 19. And if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part from the tree\* of life, and from the holy city, which are written of † in this book. 20. He which testifieth these things saith, Surely I come quickly. Amen! Come, Lord Jesus."

both in itself, and as a connecting link between the there *anticipatively* foreshown state of heavenly bliss; and that which is here symbolized, as actually *realized* and *present*.

\* *Ξυλον*, instead of *βιβλον*. So the critical editions.

† The *και* of the *textus receptus*, after *της πολεις της αγιας*, is wanting in the critical editions.



of the Son of Man, that the generation now alive shall very possibly not have passed away before its fulfilment: yea that perhaps even our own eyes may witness, without the intervention of death, that astonishing event of the consummation? The idea falls on my mind as almost incredible.—The circumstance of anticipations having been so often formed quite erroneously heretofore of the proximity of the consummation,—for example, in the apostolic age, before the destruction of Jerusalem,<sup>1</sup>—then during the persecutions of Pagan Rome,<sup>2</sup> then upon the breaking up of the old Roman Empire,<sup>3</sup>—then at the close of the tenth century,<sup>4</sup>—then at and after the Reformation,<sup>5</sup>—and, still later, even by writers of our own day,—I say the circumstance of all these numerous anticipations having been formed, and zealously promulgated, of the imminence of the second advent, which, notwithstanding, have by the event itself been shown to be unfounded, strongly tends to confirm us in our doubts and incredulity.—Yet to rest in scepticism simply and altogether upon such grounds would be evidently bad philosophy. For these are causes that would operate *always*: and that would make us be saying, *up to the very eve and moment of the advent*, “Where is the promise of his coming?” Besides that, if we throw ourselves back into the times immediately preceding Christ’s *first* advent, it will be easy to see that there would then have been fully as much ground for scepticism with regard to the imminence of that equally momentous event, just before *its* occurrence.<sup>6</sup> Our true wisdom is to test each link of the chain of evidence by which we have been led to our conclusion, and see whether it will bear the testing;—to examine into the causes of previous demonstrated errors on the subject, and see whether we avoid them;—finally, to consider whether the signs of the times now present be in all the sundry points that prophecy points out so peculiar, as altogether to warrant a measure of confidence in our inference such as was never warranted before.

And certainly, on doing this, it does seem to me that

<sup>1</sup> See my Vol. i, p. 54.

<sup>2</sup> So Vol. i, pp. 224, 228—231.

<sup>3</sup> See Vol. i, pp. 387—398.

<sup>4</sup> See *ib.* 470—472.

<sup>5</sup> See Vol. ii, pp. 135—145.

<sup>6</sup> See an elaborate Paper by me on this subject of comparison in the Appendix.

the grounds of our conclusion are stable. For let us look backward over the path we have travelled; and, in rapid retrospective review, call to mind the evidence, step by step, on which our argument has proceeded. A review which now, on revising this Work for its 5th Edition, we can make with all the advantage of those who have had the evidence investigated again and again by antagonistic expositors; its links tested; and every possible flaw sought out.

Can we then well have erred in our explanation of the primary part of the Apocalyptic Prophecy, i. e. its six first Seals?—Let it be remembered, to begin, how, as we first took the Book in hand, the evidence of its apostolic, and so divine authorship, alike internal and external, imprest itself on our minds as clear and irrefragable: and consequently the inference that it ought to be judged of and explained as a divine Book, and after the analogy of other similarly divine and similarly constructed prophecies. Which being the case, and the analogy of Daniel's symbolic and orderly constructed prophecies (by far the nearest parallels in Scripture) enforcing an explanation with reference to the future fortunes of the great worldly empires connected with God's Church, commencing from the date of St. John's receiving the prophetic revelation,—i. e. we saw clearly, from near the end of Domitian's reign, A.D. 95 or 96,—could we well be wrong in supposing presumptively that the fortunes and grand mutations of the Roman empire, then standing in its glory, (the 4th of Daniel's four great prophetic empires,) were likely to be the subjects of the primary Apocalyptic figurations? I say the mutations *thenceforward commencing*, accordantly with the Danicic precedent: especially as the revealing angel's own words, "I will now show thee what is to happen after these things," (the things then present,) taken in their most natural sense, seemed expressly to indicate such a speedily following commencement.—And, if such were the reasonable presumption *à priori*, was the evidence slight, or insufficient, on which we concluded that the figurations of the first six Apocalyptic Seals did answer very exactly to the Roman empire's chief æras of change and progress from Domitian to Constantine?

Let me stop here and particularize a little ; as these Seals were the introduction and key to the whole Commentary.

In regard then of *the four first Seals* it will not be forgotten how the *horse* (the prominent emblem in each) appeared to be a most fit symbol of the martial Roman empire, just analogically with the *ram* in Dan. viii. for Persia, and *he-goat* for Macedon ; especially as, besides being the war-horse, it was an animal sacred to the Romans' reputed father Mars : and how its successive colours of *white*, *red*, *black*, and *livid pale*, considered conjunctively with the associated *riders* of the respective horses, and with the explanatory remarks in each case accompanying, seemed to be just the fittest hues also to depict the chief subsequent successive phases of the empire, such as they might well strike a philosophic eye, marking cause as well as effect, as new principles appeared developed in it, for good or for evil. Thus, 1st, came the *white* prosperous æra under the *bow-bearing* Cretic dynasty of Nerva, Trajan, and the Antonines ; with triumphs the most signal marking its commencement, and triumphs hard-bought but as signal marking its close : (alike the "went forth conquering," and the added "to conquer:") an æra begun on Domitian's death, within a year from the time of St. John's seeing the visions in Patmos ; and continued for some eighty years and more, till a little after the succession of the second Antonine's son Commodus :—then, 2ndly, an æra *red* with the blood of civil strife, under a *sword-bearing* succession of *military usurpers* ; begun with the murder of Commodus, or a little before it, and continued far onward, with other superadded principles of evil soon commingling, the subjects of the two next Seals :—3rdly, the *black* phase of impoverishment by *fiscal oppression*, under the *balance-bearing* administrators of the civil government, the necessary result of prolonged military usurpation and civil wars ; begun from the marked epoch of Caracalla's Edict ; and continued onwards, with ever-increased internal wasting, together with the evil that preceded and caused it :—4thly, the æra of *mortality* under Gallienus, when all the four agencies of destruction particularized in the Apocalypse, *war*, *famine*, *pestilence*, and *wild beasts*, in meet sequel to

the evils of the two preceding Seals, appeared let loose upon the empire, not to be withdrawn till the completed restoration by Diocletian: an æra compared by Niebuhr with that of the *black death* in the European middle age; and when, as Gibbon says, "*the ruined empire seemed to approach the last and fatal moment of its dissolution.*"—It will be remembered, as suggested by this citation and reference, that the æras were marked out, and their picturings ready drawn to our hands, in such singular agreement with the successive Apocalyptic figurations, by the best and most philosophic historians of the Roman empire, Gibbon, Montesquieu, Sismondi, Niebuhr. Nor will my readers forget how many curious antiquarian as well as historical points came into question, in the *Roman* explanation of the symbols of these four Seals;—the *horse, crown, diadem, bow, sword, balance*, notices of *corn, wine, and oil* from the throne, and various *colours* of the horse, all in a fixed chronological *succession and order*. Altogether above *twenty* points for testing: and not one, on testing it, has failed. Could this be mere chance?

And this strikes me much in my present review of the evidence, after all its siftings, that I only did not do justice to my subject originally; and that the evidence for the four Seals, as here expounded, was stronger and more complete than I had primarily represented it. In the 1st Seal the measure of the second Antonine's success was at first not adequately stated: resulting as his wars did in the restoration of the empire to the full measure of its eastward limits as extended by Trajan; but which Hadrian, from motives of policy, had voluntarily for a while contracted. In the 2nd Seal the sword-bearing rider had been explained too exclusively of the Prætorian Prefects: whereas as much the prophetic symbol, as the facts of history, required a reference to the military body and its commanders generally, as the cause of the evils figured under that Seal. In the 3rd it was fairly argued by an opponent that the larger chœnix first taken by me was not the common chœnix, and therefore objectionable. But, on further inquiry, it appeared that the idea which drove me to the larger chœnix of the Apocalyptic price of wheat not suiting the æra



of Alexander Severus, to which my theory referred it, if construed of the smaller and more common chœnix, was a mere mistake on my own part: the value of the denarius having at that æra been so reduced by deterioration of the silver, that the price specified did then suit the lesser and common chœnix, not the uncommon and larger.<sup>1</sup> Once more, in the 4th Seal there was the difficulty arising out of the limitation of the evils of war, famine, pestilence, and wild beasts to the *fourth* part of the earth, according to the received reading of the Greek text: whereas in the historic æra supposed to correspond with the Seal those evils were extended over the whole Roman earth or empire. But, while the fact of *the whole horse* appearing under the livid hue of dissolution, and not its fourth part only, seemed on the very face of the symbol inconsistent with any such limitation as the explanatory words in question attached to it, the reading in Jerome's Vulgate of "*four parts*," instead of "*fourth part*" (a reading verified by myself in the best MS. extant of Jerome, and which in Greek differs from the received by but one letter, and is supported too by other early Versions) was found not only to rectify the internal inconsistency, but to offer a new and striking similarity between the prophecy and the historic æra to which I referred it: seeing that in the Senate's very address to Claudius, the first of the restoring emperors after Gallienus, the empire was spoken of as then separated by military usurpers into three grand divisions of the *West, East, and North*, besides the central division of *Italy and Africa*:<sup>2</sup> a memorable division into *four* which was perpetuated soon after, authoritatively and constitutionally, by Diocletian.

So as to the four first Seals. And then, as the next or 5th Seal figured a most striking scene of Christian martyrs, under persecution as was stated, of the then existing powers of the (Roman) world, so the next page of history exhibited the martyr-scenes of the Diocletianic persecution, an æra called emphatically the *Æra of Martyrs*. And, as the 6th Seal, in its primary figuration, exhibited in differ-

<sup>1</sup> On the several points here mentioned I must beg the reader to refer to my controversial papers in the Appendix, as well as to the body of the Work, in my 1st Volume.

<sup>2</sup> Pollio's Claudius, Ch. 4.—See my Vol. i. pp. 201, 202.

ent but equally striking symbols the passing away of the whole previously established political heaven, and its chief luminaries or powers, not without the accompaniment of rout and terror on their part before the anger of the Lamb, the crucified One,—so the next page of history recorded the extraordinary fact of the dissolution, very soon after, of the whole political system of Roman Paganism, not without defeat after defeat of the imperial champions of Paganism before the standard of the cross; a revolution begun after Diocletian's abdication under Constantine, and completed, some 70 years after, under Theodosius.—To the objection of the Seal's speaking of the great day of Christ's wrath having come, as if fixing the scene to a prefiguration of the final judgment-day, a sufficient answer seemed given in the examples of other and earlier prophecies, descriptive notoriously of temporal revolutions, yet couched in similar phrase and figure: while to any counter-scheme, explaining it of the judgment-day, there stood opposed the impossibility of any literal construction of the Seal's symbols, so as of the judgment-day's physical convulsions, the absence from them of both conflagration and resurrection, and the nature too of the next following figuration in the self-same 6th Seal: one which, though expressly defined as succeeding to the figuration previous, did yet exhibit the sky and the earth and earth's inhabitants as all again visible; and tempests of judgment as preparing against them.—Nor, again, can I help viewing it as a most strong and remarkable confirmation to my theory of the Seals, that that which I may venture to say no other explanation has solved,—I mean the fact of those tempests appearing in vision prepared and suspended, connectedly and synchronically with figurations not only of the sealing of the elect ones out of the tribes of Israel, but of *the palm-bearers to entering on the beatific vision*, though without any change to blessedness correspondently on the earth,—I say that this otherwise inexplicable particular, should have proved on our theory to have the most simple and most complete solution in the doctrinal revelation made to Augustine, (John's genuine descendant in the true Apostolic succession,) respecting both the election of grace out of the professing

Church or Israel,<sup>1</sup> and their final perseverance through grace, even until brought to the beatific vision :—a doctrinal revelation made to him at the very epoch of 'Theodosius' death, just before the bursting of the tempests of Gothic desolation on the Roman empire ; and of which the religious influence was such for ages afterwards, that the highest kind of philosophy of history would have been positively wanting, had this revelation not been then some way depicted. Of which *moral philosophy* of the Apocalypse, however, I shall here say nothing, as it will come up for consideration in a later part of this Chapter. Only, while glancing retrospectively at the *historic* evidence of our exposition of the past, let this concomitant *moral* evidence never be forgotten.

Having dwelt thus at large on the evidence of the six first Seals, as being the introduction and key to the whole Apocalyptic prophecy, it is not my purpose, nor does there seem to me need, to dwell with at all the same particularity on that of my subsequent expositions of the Apocalyptic Book. If we be deemed to have advanced thus far in our exposition satisfactorily, we shall scarcely be judged by any one to have erred in explaining the six first of that Trumpet-septenary of visions which evolves the 7th Seal, as fulfilled in the successive irruptions and woes of the Goths, Saracens, and Turks.—In respect however of the *four first Gothic Trumpets*, let it not be forgotten how notable was the *tripartite* division of the empire, that we thought alluded to in the there figured *third of the earth, sea, rivers, and heavenly luminaries*,—the Western empire's *one-third* : and how, as the last of the four exhibited the eclipse of the governing lights over one-third of the Roman world, so the result of the Gothic and Vandal desolations, by land and sea, was the extinction of the Western Empire.—Then, as regards the *scorpion-locusts* of the 5th Trumpet, interpreted of the *Saracens*, we may remember how striking seemed the evidence in proof of our correctness, alike in the Arabian character of all the various animal symbols, and figured origination of those symbols out of the smoke of the bottomless pit, as if with the accompaniment of some false and cruel

<sup>1</sup> Israel being so construed according to the analogy of the Apocalyptic symbols.

religion emanating from the pit of hell, just such as Mahomedism:—also, in regard of the 6th Trumpet plague of *lion-like horses from the Euphrates*, how we saw proof of its fulfilment in the *Turks*, alike from its apparently implied connexion with the plague of the previous Trumpet, from the symbols of both fire, smoke, and sulphur from the horses' mouths, and heads with injuring power attaching to their tails; also from their declared destiny, after a certain singularly defined period, (a mode of definition which was shown to be used by *Turks*, but of which I have seen no exemplification in the history of any other people,) of slaying the third of men, or Eastern division of Roman Christendom.—After which, and that plain literal statement as to the continued persistence in idolatries, fornications, thefts, murders, sorceries, of those who had not been politically slain by these plagues, viz. the countries as it seemed of Western Christendom,—a characteristic of them to the truth of which the Turkish Sultan's own edict after the capture of Constantinople lent, we saw, its most striking testimony,—there came that graphic prefiguration of the Reformation, with a synchronic sketch of the two sackcloth-robed witnesses' history down to their death and resurrection, given retrospectively by the Angel of the Reformation, which must be fresh in the minds of my readers: and of which the evidence, as I myself look back at it, does appear to me to be the most complete and satisfactory. Truly may I say, after most carefully reviewing it, that I do not think any history of the Reformation can be shown which traces more exactly according to truth the main steps and epochs, external and internal, in the history of that great revolution: from its commencement in Luther's first discovery of Christ as the justification and righteousness of his people, to its establishment, with its now purified Churches, (the *ῥαβδος* of earthly princes, as well as voice from God authorizing them,) in many countries of Christendom: more especially in the tenth kingdom of Papal Christendom, thenceforward Protestant England; and the "seven chiliads," thenceforth the Dutch Protestant United Provinces.—All this under the second half of the 6th Trumpet, or Turkish woe; just according to the Apocalyptic figuration. And then next according



to prophecy, and next according to the history, the second or Turkish woe, we saw, past away: and, as in fulfilment of the 7th Trumpet's sounding, and its earthquake, there occurred that grand event of modern times, *the French Revolution*.

So as to the *primary* series of visions, depicted, I conceive, on the *inner* side of the Apocalyptic scroll. And as an intended parallelism with them was evident (even as if depicted correspondently on the Scroll's *outside*) of the *supplemental and retrogressive series* in Apoc. xii., xiii., concerning the sackcloth-robed Witnesses' slayer, the BEAST FROM THE ABYSS, and his reign for the same 1260 days' period as *their* prophesying in sackcloth,—so too we saw the parallelism of the events of this new series with those of the former, when explained, on the year-day system, of the Popes and Popedom, down to the *primary* end of those 1260 days at the same great epoch of the French Revolution. At the same time that in the particular symbolizations contained in this subsidiary Part of the Prophecy, viz. those of the *ten-horned Beast itself*, its chief minister the *two-horned Beast*, and the *Image of the Beast*,—explained respectively of the *Papal Empire*, *Papal Priesthood*, and *Papal Councils*, together with the symbolized *name and number of the Beast*, construed accordantly with Irenæus' early teaching as *Lateinos*, there were found *tens* and *twenties* of particulars wherein to compare the symbols and the supposed things symbolized; and, I think, a fitting proved between them, one after another, unequivocally. The extraordinary medallie evidence respecting the *diadem* as adopted by *Roman Emperors* just at the time that it was so applied in the prefigurative vision Apoc. xii. 3, and adopted also by the *ten Gothic kings* just at the time that they are in the next following vision of Apoc. xiii. 1, depicted as on the Beast's ten horns, cannot but have greatly struck each candid and intelligent reader.

Thus it was by a continuous double chain of evidence, from St. John's time downward, each with multitudinous links, that we were brought to identify the epoch of the 7th Trumpet's sounding with that of the great French Revolution in 1790. And still the same continued double line of

proof led us onward, yet further, to fix our present position as but just a little before the consummation: <sup>1</sup>—it being in the *one* series, after the outpouring of the previous Vials in the wars of the French Revolution, near upon the close of the 6th Vial, with its drying up of the Turkman Euphratean flood, and the going forth coincidently of three spirits of delusion over the earth, such as are even now recognizable, to gather men to the battle of the great God, or perhaps indeed at the opening of the 7th Vial;—in the *other* series under the second or third of the three flying Angels, with their voices of gospel-preaching and anti-papal warning, such as the world is even now hearing, (the temple or gospel-Church being meanwhile all opened to the world, so as never before,)<sup>2</sup> just before the last judgments of the harvest and the vintage.—Which being so, and when we find the long double line of such various evidence thus combining to fix our position at the advanced point where I have placed it,—and, on considering the evidence retrospectively, not as advocates or partizans, but as simple searchers for truth on the great matter in question, can discern no flaw or chasm therein, to vitiate or render it imperfect,—it seems to me reason's dictate that we should bow to its strength and consistency, and acknowledge that such our advanced position in the prophetic calendar seems indeed, in all probability, to be the very fact.

With regard to the mistaken views as to the nearness of the consummation entertained in other times, and by other expositors of prophecy, the several causes of mistake are for the most part obvious; and also that they are such as cannot, or do not, affect the grounds of our present conclusion. The *patristic expositors*, living early as they did in the Christian æra, had no long continuous chain of historic events before them; such as was essentially needed, in order to the right interpretation of the Apocalypse as a continuous prophecy. If they interpreted it at all, they

<sup>1</sup> Or, rather, as close upon the secondary and complete ending of the 1260 days' prophecy; but with the reserve, as will be presently shown, of the additional 75 days of Dan. xii., following very possibly still after that epoch, and constituting in fact the "time of the end."

<sup>2</sup> Just as prefigured Apoc. xi. 19, xv. 5.

could only generalize, agreeably with their general and vague anticipations of the future: chiefly with reference to the predicted Antichrist; who, they knew, was to come on the dissolution of the Roman Empire, but whose duration (on their *day-day* system) they mistakingly limited to 1260 days.<sup>1</sup> So that they altogether lacked the Apocalyptic land-marks, which would have shown them how much yet remained of the voyage before the harbour could be gained; and made an error of reckoning, which *we* can be in no danger of repeating.—The same causes would have operated, in a measure, to prevent a perception of the truth, through the earlier half of the *dark middle ages*, had there been then enough of intellectual energy and research (which there was not) really to investigate Scripture prophecy: besides which Augustine's error respecting the Millennium,—an error detailed in my 3rd preceding Chapter,<sup>2</sup> and which descended to them from him with almost the authority of inspiration,—engendered that erroneous expectation of the immediate imminence of the judgment-day at *the close of the tenth century*, to which I have more than once made allusion.<sup>3</sup>—After the glorious *Reformation*, though alike by the application of the Apocalyptic emblems of the Beast and Babylon to the Papacy and Papal Rome, by the adoption of the year-day system, and by discoveries in clearer and clearer light of the part that the Gothic Saracenic and Turkish woes had in the prophecy, a vast advance was made in prophetic intelligence, and elements brought into existence for sounder views as to the future,—yet still from the times of Luther, the Magdeburgh Centuriators, and Foxe, down to those successively of Brightman and Mede, Vitringa and Daubuz, and Sir Isaac and Bishop Newton, many chasms remained unsupplied, and important dates uncertified, in Apocalyptic interpretation: more especially because, as Sir I. Newton observed with characteristic sagacity,<sup>4</sup> there remained unfulfilled in history the last predicted revolution, answering to the seventh Trumpet; an event essential to the confirmation of some most import-

<sup>1</sup> See Vol. iii. p. 276.

<sup>2</sup> pp. 136, 143 *suprà*.

<sup>3</sup> Vol. i. p. 470.

<sup>4</sup> "The time is not yet come for understanding these prophecies perfectly, because the main revolution predicted in them is not yet come to pass," Pref. p. 15.

ant points of interpretation, and determination of others. So that what wonder if many mistaken anticipations were still formed and published, antedating the time of the end?—Nor, even after that Trumpet had had (as it is conceived) its marked fulfilment in the *French Revolution*, were those causes of error by any means all removed. It necessarily took some time ere the mind of the investigator could calmly survey and judge of that great event. There was in England, (the only country in which religious truth and inquiry then had favour,) both at the outburst of the French Revolution, and for many years after it, a lamentable deficiency of learning and research; such as was needed to draw out the evidence, and argue accurately from it, on the probabilities of the future. On many important points in the Apocalyptic prophecy there still rested great obscurity: especially, I may say, on *the Seals, the Sealing Vision, the whole Vision of the rainbow-circled Angel of the tenth Chapter, the death and resurrection of the Witnesses, the seventh and eighth Heads of the Beast*, and the very *form and structure of the prophecy itself*. Hence, by necessary consequence, even among them that held to the Protestant and year-day principle of explanation, there was such variety and contrarieties of opinion respecting them, that much, very much, remained evidently wanting, ere a complete and satisfactory explanation of that which related to the *past* could be given: and consequently ere we could be prepared to form a fit judgment from *it*, with any great confidence, as to our own actual place in the prophecy, and the nearness of the great future consummation.—It is the author's hope and belief that, in some considerable measure, this has now been done: and, as before said, a continuous historical exposition given of the Apocalypse, on evidence irrefragable, and without a chasm or lacuna of importance unexplained, up to the present time. Whether this be so, or not, the reader will judge for himself. But, if it be, then it is evident that the most influential cause of former mistakes concerning the coming future must be considered as now done away with; and a vantage ground established for judging correctly respecting it, such as did not exist before.



In the arrangement of the great calendar of prophecy, and the adjustment of our own position on it, whether nearer to the final end or less near, it is evident that the *chronological predictions* (I mean those which involve chronological periods) must needs demand our most particular attention.—First and foremost in importance is the memorable prophecy of the 1260 years of the Beast or Antichrist, six times repeated in the Apocalyptic vision, under one or other variety of formula, and three in Daniel. This measures the Beast's reign, in recognized supremacy over the Roman Empire, during its last divided and apostatized state; or rather the reign of the Beast's last Head, Antichrist. And we have seen that, with the reflected light of that grand illustrative event of our latter day *the French Revolution*, the *primary and imperfect commencement*, and *primary and imperfect end*, of the period may be deemed to have been fixed, on strong probable evidence, to about the years A.D. 531 and 1791 respectively, at just 1260 years' interval: the one the epoch of Justinian's decree and code, which was a virtual imperial recognition of the Pope's supremacy, in his then assumed character of Christ's Vicar, or Antichrist;<sup>1</sup> the other that of the French revolutionary outbreak, and new legal code, which gave to the Pope's antichristian supremacy and power a deadly blow throughout Western Christendom.<sup>2</sup> At the same time that the *full and complete commencement* of the period appeared on strong and peculiar historic evidence (specially that of the then risen ten *diademed* Romano-Gothic Papal horns) to have about synchronized with the epoch of Phocas' decree A.D. 606; and the corresponding epoch of end with the year 1866.<sup>3</sup>—We also saw more lately that in the last of his prophecies Daniel appended to what seemed to be the same period of the 1260 years yet a further addition of 30 and 45, or conjointly of 75 years, as if still to intervene before the times of blessedness.<sup>4</sup> And hence the very important

<sup>1</sup> See Vol. iii. pp. 298—301, with the references.

<sup>2</sup> See Vol. iii. 395—408.

<sup>3</sup> See Vol. iii. pp. 302—304.

<sup>4</sup> See p. 112 *suprà*.—I say *seemed*, because of the peculiar ambiguities and difficulties of that last prophecy. Alike, however, à priori probabilities, and the analogy of the 70 years' predicted Babylonish captivity, (see Vol. iii. 299,) so favour the idea of there being some such definitely extended *time of the end*, that I can myself feel scarce any doubt on the matter.

question whether these additional years are to be measured from the epoch of primary imperfect ending about A.D. 1791; or from that of full and perfect ending in 1866.<sup>1</sup>

Now in favour of the first hypothesis there is, 1st, the obvious and striking fact of 75 years being just the very interval between 1791 and 1866, the epoch of the primary ending and epoch of complete ending of the 1260 years. Again, 2ndly, just as at 30 years there is a break in Daniel's 75 years' period, as if marking an epoch of importance in it, so at 30 years from 1790 there has been found to occur an epoch both prophetically and historically of importance:—the *end* of the long line of 2300 *years* in Dan. viii., calculated from B.C. 480, as the epoch of the emblematic Persian ram's highest acme of conquering power, there precisely falling in, at the year 1820; the which was to mark apparently the destined commencement of the fall of the Perso-succeeding oppressors of Greece and Palestine; and the prophecy's fulfilment being markedly realized, we saw, in the rapid fearful decay of Turkman power from the year 1820.<sup>2—3</sup> Yet again, on the 75 years' period (so calculated) advancing still 45 years further onward, to its ending in 1866, it about falls in with the termination of 6000 years from the Creation, as calculated by a late eminent chronologer, Mr. Fynes Clinton, (*one statement excepted*),<sup>3</sup> from the mundane chronology of the *Hebrew SS.*: in other words, synchronizes at that chronological point, according to the Hebrew chronology, with the opening epoch of *the world's seventh millenary*; and therefore, according to the primitive Church's expectation, not perhaps, as we saw, without apostolic sanction for it,<sup>4</sup> with that of the commencement of the *sabbatism of rest* promised to the saints of God.<sup>5</sup>—On the other hand there is this obvious and strong primary presumption in favour of the measurement of the 75 years of the time of the end from the epoch of *complete*

<sup>1</sup> See Vol. iii. pp. 302—304.

<sup>2</sup> See Vol. iii. pp. 445—447.

<sup>3</sup> “And it came to pass in the *four hundred and eightieth* year after the children of Israel were come out of the land of Egypt, in the fourth year of Solomon's reign over Israel, in the month Zif, which is the second month, that he began to build the house of the Lord.” This will of course be commented on in the Paper on the subject in my Appendix.

<sup>4</sup> See p. 190 *suprà*.

<sup>5</sup> This will be unfolded in a Paper in the Appendix.

ending, in 1866, that it is the most natural. There is no reason why 30 years onward there should not be some important epoch of break in the 75 years' time of the end, thence measured. And again, as regards the Hebrew Mundane Chronology though decided to prefer its authority to that of the Septuagint Greek SS., we must still remember that there are certain breaks and dubious points in it on which an approximation only can be offered: besides a departure from the Hebrew in that famous passage of 1 Kings vi. 1, to which allusion was just made,<sup>1</sup> and by departure from which Mr. F. C. brings the end of the 6000th millenary to an earlier close by near 100 years than it would be otherwise.

A very similar measure of dubiousness, let me add ere passing on, attends the question of the terminating epoch of *Nebuchadnezzar's seven years of bestial degradation*; supposing that transaction (as I cannot but do<sup>2</sup>) to have been symbolic of the heathenish degradation, and aberration from God, of the four great mundane empires of which he was then the representative; the *seven years* having in such case to be construed, on the *year-day* principle, as a period of 2520 years. For, according as it is measured from the cognate Assyrian king's first invasion of the sacred land of Judea, or from the rise of the independent Babylonian empire 100 years later, the terminating epoch will either fall about the time of the French Revolution A.D. 1791, or somewhat later than the close of the present cen-

<sup>1</sup> See Note<sup>3</sup> p. 238.

<sup>2</sup> Dan. iv. If not symbolic, wherefore the so expressly noted *band of iron* and *brass* to the tree's stump: metals these symbolic of Greece and Rome, as we know, in the prefiguration of Dan. ii. ?—The figure is somewhat otherwise applied by Cowper to the wretchedness and ruined hopes of a prisoner;

————— Like the visionary emblem seen  
By him of Babylon, life stands a stump;  
And filleted about with hoops of brass  
Still lives, though all his pleasant boughs are gone.

The close relationship between the Assyrian and Babylonian Empires is notorious. So e. g. *Tacitus*, Hist. v. 8; "Dum *Assyrios* penes, Medosque et Persas, oriens fuit." Again, the Christian expositor *Theodoret* on Dan. ii. says; "The head of gold is not Nebuchadnezzar himself; but the entire kingdom of the *Assyrians* or *Babylonians*."

And so too holy SS. itself. Jer. l. 17; "Israel is a scattered sheep; the lions have driven him away; first the King of Assyria hath devoured him; last this Nebuchadnezzar, King of Babylon, hath broken his bones."


ture. And I must say that the fact of these various prophetic periods thus travelling, as they are alike found to do, to a close within, or nearly within, the century now current, from their several sources more or less remote in the depth of antecedent ages, much impresses my own mind, as confirmatory of the conclusion of our being near the time of the end, which was primarily deduced by me from the evidence simply of the Apocalyptic prophecy. Like as the convergency of many lines of road to a geographical centre indicates that centre to be the place of some important and mighty city, so the convergency of these several chronological lines to an ending within, or nearly within, the present century, now above one-half run out, seems to mark this century as the æra of closing crisis, big with momentous issues as to the destinies of the world.

From which chronological evidence, if we turn to that of the *signs of the times*, we shall find in them the strongest corroborative evidence of our being near the time of the end; yet not so as to decide the comparatively minute point respecting the 75 years of Daniel. Let us dwell a little fully on them. They are signs which have drawn attention, not from prophetic students only, but from the man of the world, the philosopher, the statesman; and made not a few even of the irreligious and unthinking to pause and reflect.—Thus there is, 1st, the drying up, still ever going forward, of the Turkman Mahommedan power, or mystic flood from the Euphrates:—2. the interest felt by Protestant Christians for the conversion and restoration of Israel; an interest unknown for eighteen centuries, but now strong, fervent, prayerful, extending even to royalty itself, and answering precisely to that memorable prediction of the Psalmist, “Thou shalt arise and have mercy upon Zion, for the time to favour her, yea *the set time*, is come; for thy servants think upon her stones, and it pitieth them to see her in the dust:”<sup>1</sup>—3. the universal *preaching of*

<sup>1</sup> Psalm cii. 13, 14.—The general *political* emancipation of the Jews is a sign too very observable. As the Jews in Pagan times had to pay tribute to Rome's *Pagan* worship, so too, subsequently, to Rome's *Papal* idolatrous worship. (See my



Showing the convergent endings of the chief Prophetic Periods.





*the Gospel over the world*, agreeably with Christ's own command; <sup>1</sup> that sign of which Augustine said, that could we but see *it*, we might indeed think the time of the consummation at hand: <sup>2</sup> and of which the result has been such that already, one might almost say, trophies of the enlightening and converting power of the gospel have been gathered out of every nation and kindred and people and tongue, agreeably with the song of the blessed at the consummation, heard anticipatively by St. John in the Apocalyptic vision of the palm-bearers:—4. the marked *political ascendancy* before the whole world, alike Heathen, Mahomedan, and Jewish, of the chief nations of the *old Roman earth*, i. e. *professing Christendom*, and ever-increasing political, scientific, and commercial intercourse, “many running to and fro, and knowledge being increased;” <sup>3</sup> such as to *force* the eyes of all nations on this same *Roman earth*, as (conjointly at least with the mighty offshoot from England of the American United States) the central focus alike of commerce, science, and political power:—5thly, and connectedly, the outgoing thence almost as universally among them of *religious Christian and Antichristian missions*, under the protection and auspices respectively of the chief Roman Catholic and Protestant European powers; the *Romish* and *Antichristian* full of zeal and bitterness; and with conflict already so begun against *Protestant evangelic missions* and *Bible-circulation*, as to have forced the attention of Jews, Heathens, and Mahomedans to the grand subject of the Lord's controversy with Roman Anti-Christendom, and to be preparing them (almost

Vol. i. p. 57, Note<sup>2</sup>.) In 1848 the Marquis Azeglio published an interesting Memoir on the oppression of the Jews at Rome and in Italy. And in that same year the tax was abolished; and the Pope himself attended to see the gate of the Ghetto, or quarter of Jewish insulation, broken down *even in Rome*. Only however for the brief period till the Pope's restoration by French bayonets! <sup>1</sup> Mark xvi. 15.

<sup>2</sup> Epistle to Hesy chius, numbered 197, in the late Paris Benedictine Edition, Tom. ii. col. 1107; “Opportunitas vero illius temporis (sc. finis hujus sæculi et adventus Domini) non erit antequam prædicetur Evangelium in universo orbe in testimonium omnibus gentibus. Apertissima enim de hæc re legitur sententia Salvatoris, Matt. xxiv. 14. . . Unde si jam nobis certissimè nuntiatum fuisset in omnibus gentibus Evangelium prædicari, nec sic possemus dicere *quantum temporis* remaneret usque ad finem; sed *magis magisque propinquare merito diceremus.*”

<sup>3</sup> Dan. xii. 4.—How extraordinary in this respect are the effects, even already, of the late *golden* discoveries in California, Australia, and elsewhere! How extraordinary the late opening of both China and Japan alike to Christian and antichristian preaching!

as by providential voice<sup>1</sup>) for being intelligent spectators of its tremendous issue:—and this the more, 6thly, because of yet other two spirits of religious delusion having also gone forth of late to deceive men, in power and influence quite extraordinary; which, conjunctively with the one before mentioned, answer well, in respect both of character and of time, to the three spirits like frogs from out of the mouths of Dragon Beast and False Prophet, (or spirits of infidelity, popery, and priestcraft,) that, after the drying up had begun of the Euphratean waters, were to gather the powers of the earth together to the war of the great day of God Almighty; <sup>2</sup> all the great hostile *dramatis personæ* of the history of Christendom thus coming on the stage before the drama's consummation:—7. the revolutionary internal heavings of the European nations, alike with infidel and democratic agitation, accordantly with Christ's and the apostles' descriptions of the latter days; and their preparation for deadly conflict, with new and increased powers of destruction, of which the extraordinary outbreaks of 1848 in half the countries of Western Europe may have been but the prelibation.—Such, I say, is the combination of *signs of the times* even now visible; signs predicted more or less clearly in Scripture prophecy, as signs which were to precede the end.

At the same time some signs are still wanting, even as I revise this a 5th time in 1861:—especially the non-gathering as yet of the Jews to Palestine; and predicted troubles consequent:—whence a further presumption in favour of the *later* allocation of Daniel's concluding 75 years. Supposing them at length added, and that the other signs already begun continue manifest as before, and perhaps even yet more strikingly, so as to arrest the attention of the whole world, (including a *completed* exposure of the seven-hilled Harlot, so as in Apoc. xvii.,) they will altogether surely well answer to the symbol of the Angel standing in the sun, announcing the great day of Christ's judgment against his enemies as imminent, even at the doors.

<sup>1</sup> “He shall call to the heavens from above, and to the earth, that he may judge his people. . . . He hath called the earth from the rising of the sun unto the going down thereof.” Psalm l. 1, 4.

<sup>2</sup> See my Part v. Ch. 9.



It is to be understood, in adjusting this alternative allocation of the 75 years to the Apocalyptic prophecy, that if it prove that they are to be measured from the *primary* and *imperfect* ending of the 1260 years in 1791 they will answer to the whole period of the Apocalyptic seven vials : if from the *second* and *complete end* of the 1260 years in 1866, then they will answer simply and alone to the æra of the 7th Vial.

## § 2. THE APPLICATION.

But if it be so, then the solemn question suggests itself, In what spirit and manner may we best prepare to meet this coming future? The thought of the nearness of the consummation is of itself unspeakably awakening and solemn; and the rather when we consider further that there is to be expected antecedently a time of sifting and trial, such as perhaps has never yet been experienced. For our Christian Poet's exquisite language<sup>1</sup> does by no means adequately express the probable severity of the coming crisis. Ere the sabbatism of the saints begins, something much more is to be looked for than the mere gusty closing blasts of a long tempest, or billowy heavings of the sea before a calm, as "it works itself to rest." The final conflict between Christ's true Church and Antichrist, and their respective chiefs and supporters, both visible and invisible, seems set forth in prophecy as most severe. As a *nation*, as a *church*, as *individuals*, how may we best prepare to meet it?

And here it is that the *moral* of the Apocalyptic prophecy, its *moral philosophy of the history of Christendom*, if I may so call it, becomes unspeakably valuable. We have elsewhere had the philosophy of the same history

<sup>1</sup> "The groans of Nature in this nether world,  
Which heaven has heard for ages, have an end.  
Foretold by prophets, and by poets sung,  
The time of rest, *the promised sabbath* comes.  
Six thousand years of sorrow have well nigh  
Fulfilled their tardy and disastrous course  
Over a sinful world; and what remains  
Of this tempestuous state of human things,  
Is merely as the working of a sea  
Before a calm, that rocks itself to rest."

*Winter Walk at Noon.*

traced by *human* pens; and lessons at the same time drawn from it in the way of instruction and direction for the future: as, for example, in a work by the late celebrated *Fredrick Von Schlegel*, professedly on the subject; <sup>1</sup> a writer of no common eloquence, or common reputation. But if we compare the two outlines of historic philosophy together, the *human* and the *divine*, what a contrast will appear; and how true the one, how erroneous and delusive the other!

In his general abstract notions indeed of the philosophy of history, and its objects, Schlegel has much that is admirable. He lays it down that, as the highest object of *philosophy* is the restoration of God's image in man, so the great object of the *philosophy of history* must be to trace historically the progress of this restoration; <sup>2</sup>—that it is God's object and intention, through that *all-ruling Providence* which regulates the whole course of human destiny, <sup>3</sup> ultimately to accomplish it:—that Christianity, his own heaven-sent religion, is the regenerating principle, whence whatever may already have been accomplished has proceeded, and whence alone man's final and perfect regeneration is to arise; <sup>4</sup>—that the hindrances and obstructions in

<sup>1</sup> My reference is, as before, to the English Translation by Schlegel's devoted admirer J. B. Robertson, Esq. The Lectures which make up this Work on the "Philosophy of History" were delivered at Vienna in the year 1828, the year before his death.—I shall freely make extracts in the Notes. It will familiarize the reader with a new point of view in which to consider the Apocalypse.

<sup>2</sup> Preface, ad init.

<sup>3</sup> Lect. xv.; Vol. ii. p. 193. "Without the idea of a Godhead regulating the course of human destiny,"—such is his eloquent language,— "of an all-ruling Providence, and the saving and redeeming power of God, the history of the world would be a labyrinth without an outlet, a confused pile of ages buried upon ages, a mighty tragedy without a right beginning, or a proper ending." And he adds that this is the melancholy impression produced on the mind by several of the great ancient historians; particularly the profoundest of them all, *Tacitus*.

<sup>4</sup> Lect. x.; Vol. ii. 9. Speaking of Christ's divine mission for the redemption of the world, he says; "If we once remove this divine keystone in the arch of universal history, the whole fabric of the world's history falls to ruin; for its only foundation is this new manifestation of God's power in the crisis of time. . . . Without faith in the truth of Christianity, the world's history would be an insoluble enigma;" &c. And again, pp. 4, 5; "From its very origin, and still more in its progress, it entirely renovated the face of the world:"—"It has shone ever brighter with the progress of ages; and has changed and regenerated not only government and science, but the whole system of human life."—This statement however is much modified afterwards as to the past. So p. 38, after saying that at the Constantinian revolution Christianity "*might* have become a real regeneration of the Roman state," he adds that "the old Roman maxims of state-policy," &c., continuing prevalent prevented its completion;—and again, p. 55, "the Romans whose polity and public life Christianity itself was unable totally to regenerate."

the way of its accomplishment have arisen from the fearfully powerful, though most mysterious, influence in the world of the *Spirit of evil*, alike God's enemy and man's, and man's<sup>1</sup> endowment with *free-will*, to choose, as he may please, the guidance of the one Spirit or the other :<sup>2</sup>—further, that it belongs to the province of the philosophy of history to mark God's wrathful judgments on the world, when thus led astray from Him ;<sup>3</sup> and to mark also the interpositions and proceedings of Divine Providence, (especially as illustrated from time to time in the rise and conduct of any remarkable particular nations or individuals,<sup>4</sup>) with a view to the fulfilment of its designs, whether of judgment or of mercy.—Such, I say, is Schlegel's generally just idea of the Philosophy of History;<sup>5</sup> and the reader needs but to recall what has gone before in this Commentary, or to glance at the illustrative Chart prefixed to it, in order to be convinced how eminently, on such an idea of it, there attaches the highest kind of *philosophic* character to the historic prefigurations of the Apocalypse.<sup>6</sup> It is in the *application of the principle* that the marked contrast appears between these and Schlegel's sketches. Nor, I think, can I better place the moral lessons of this holy book in relief and distinctness before the reader, than by setting forth *its*

<sup>1</sup> Schlegel is very strong in his statements on this point. So Lect. xv. p. 199 ; “That man only who recognizes the whole magnitude of the power permitted to the wicked principle, according to the inscrutable decrees of God, from the curse of Cain, and the sign of that curse in its unimpeded transmission through all the . . . false religions of heathenism,—all the ages of extreme moral corruption, and eternally repeated and ever increasing crime, . . . is alone capable of understanding the great phenomena of universal history, in their often strange and dark complexity.”

<sup>2</sup> This is Schlegel's *third* principle, (the other two being *God's all-ruling and redeeming providence*, and the *Evil Spirit's power of tempting to evil*), of which the recognition is essential to the philosophy of history. ii. 300. He says, p. 197 ; “Without this freedom of choice in man, . . . this faculty of determining between the divine impulse and the suggestions of the Spirit of Evil, there would be *no history* ; and without a faith in such principle there could be *no philosophy of history*.”

At p. 247, Vol. i., after noticing Condorcet's theory of the endless perfectibility of man, as the *liberalism* of historic philosophy, he well adds, “But man's *corruptibility* is as great as his *perfectibility*.”

<sup>3</sup> “This idea of divine justice, and of God's judgments on the world, exemplified in history, belongs undoubtedly to the province of historical philosophy.” Lect. x. Vol. ii. p. 7.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* p. 5.

<sup>5</sup> See p. 255 on the grand point of failure.

<sup>6</sup> In order to a right view on these points, there is needed of course, and consequently required by the philosophy of history, a distinct setting forth of what Schlegel calls (ii. 194) “*the critical points in the progress of human society*.” Very much the same with what I have stated in my Introduction, Vol. i. p. 112, as what might be expected in a divine prophecy of the future, and what would be found in the Apocalypse. Compare my review of evidence, pp. 226—234 *suprà*.

moral philosophy of history, somewhat fully, *in direct contrast with the other.*

The *German philosopher* then, agreeably with his religious creed,<sup>1</sup> directs himself by the *Romish* standard in his judgment of things that concern religion and the Church. After the first four centuries, notable for the diffusion and final triumph of Christianity over Paganism in the Roman Empire, he traces the *Church visible and established* (already in the West, in respect of its acknowledged *head*, a *Romish Church*) through the *four* centuries next following, of “a chaotic intermediate state” between ancient and modern history,<sup>2</sup> as if still *Christ’s true Church*, the upholder and preserver of the Christian religion, as well as civilizer of the barbarous invading Germanic nations:—then the next *three* centuries, after that the tempests had subsided, the wild waters of barbarian inundation begun to flow off, and “the pure firmament of Christian faith” shone forth unclouded,<sup>3</sup> from Charlemagne to Gregory VII and the first half of the 12th century inclusive, (a period constituting the earlier half of the middle age,) as “the happiest era and golden age of Christendom:”<sup>4</sup> when “the influence of religion on public life was paramount;” when “in Charles’s project of a universal empire to embrace all civilized nations, the foundation-stone of the noble fabric of modern Christendom was laid, and all the elements of a truly Christian government and policy offered to mankind;”<sup>5</sup> when “the principles which animated society were the best and noblest and soundest;”<sup>6</sup> when the Church, “like the all-embracing

<sup>1</sup> Schlegel was by birth a Protestant. But in his thirty-third year, A.D. 1805, he renounced Protestantism, and embraced the Romish faith. “It was in the venerable minster at Cologne,” says his translator, “that there was solemnized in the person of this illustrious man the alliance between the ancient faith and modern science of Germany.” *Memoir*, p. xvi.—It is to be remembered that German *Protestantism* was then scarce anything but German *Neology*. <sup>2</sup> ii. 117.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*—So does Schlegel in one sentence adopt the three Apocalyptic images of a *tempest* and an *inundation*, whereby to symbolize the great Germanic irruption, and a *new Christian firmament*, in place of the *old Pagan political firmament*. See Apoc. vi. 14, vii. 1, 2, xii. 15: also my Vol. i. p. 253, and Vol. iii. Note <sup>1</sup>, p. 62.

<sup>4</sup> *Lect.* xiii. p. 127—129. He particularizes the reigns of Charlemagne, Alfred, and the first Saxon kings and emperors of Germany, “as exhibiting the paramount influence of religion on public life, and constituting the happiest era, the truly golden period of our annals:” and he exemplifies, among other things, in the earlier “spiritual chivalry of the Templars and Knights of St. John, consecrated to warfare in the cause of God,” and the chivalry of the first crusades. At p. 176, he calls the early middle age “thoroughly Christian.” Gregory the Seventh too (p. 146) is the special subject of his eulogy. <sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* 124, 125. <sup>6</sup> *Ibid.* 153.



vault of heaven,"<sup>1</sup> with its pure faith sheltered and shed kindly influence on all; and the Papal power, founded on and adapted for unity, after having grown up towards the end of this æra to unprecedented greatness, used this great power only so as to preserve Christianity from being lost in a multitude of sects:<sup>2</sup> in all which he thinks to mark the presence and operation of *God's animating Spirit*, as well as *kindly providence*.<sup>3</sup>—On the other hand he traces the contemporary operation of the *Evil Spirit*, (the "*Spirit of time*," as he calls it,) from after the æra of the overthrow of the Pagan Empire that it had previously ruled in and animated,<sup>4</sup>—I say, he traces the Evil Spirit's operation through the same period in a beguiling sectarian spirit, and the religious schisms of Christendom; including not alone the Arian schism, and the Mahommedan schism, (for he places Mahommedanism in the same category,<sup>5</sup>) but also the iconoclastic proceedings of certain of the Greek emperors, (proceedings which he lauds Gregory the Second for resisting,)<sup>6</sup> and the consequent schism between the Eastern and Western Churches.—In his sketch of the *later half* of the middle age, reaching from the 12th century to the Reformation, he admits the general religious deterioration of Western Christendom; particularizing the essentially false scholastic philosophy then in vogue, and the internal feuds, and contests between Church and State:<sup>7</sup> and traces the kindly operation of the Divine Spirit, ("the Paraclete promised to the Church by its divine Founder,")<sup>8</sup> whereby Christianity was preserved, in the rise and insti-

<sup>1</sup> Ibid. 115, 116.<sup>2</sup> Lect. xiv. p. 183.<sup>3</sup> Ibid. 184.

<sup>4</sup> "Christianity is the emancipation of the human race from the bondage of that inimical Spirit, who denies God; and, as far as in him lies, leads all created intelligences astray. Hence the Scripture styles him 'the Prince of this world;' and so he was in fact, but in *ancient history only*; when among all the nations of the earth, amid the pomp of martial glory, and splendour of Pagan life, he had established the throne of his domination. Since this divine æra in the history of man, . . . he can no longer be called the Prince of this world; but the *Spirit of time*:" i. e. as regarding "*temporal interests*," above "the thoughts and faith of eternity." Lect. xviii. ad fin. ii. 333.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid. p. 333.

<sup>6</sup> "The rigid prohibition of the religious use of images was proper in those cases only where the use of them was not confined to a mere devotional respect, but was likely to degenerate into a real adoration and idolatry; and where a strict separation from Pagan nations, and their rites, was a matter of primary importance. . . . But now that the Mahommedan proscription of all holy emblems and images of devotion arose from a decidedly antichristian spirit, . . . this Byzantine furions war against images, and all symbols of piety, can be regarded only as a mad contagion of the moral disease of the age." Ibid. 106.

<sup>7</sup> Ibid. 173, 176, 333.<sup>8</sup> Ibid. 184.

tution of the ecclesiastical mendicant orders, as men of the most perfect evangelical humility, poverty, and self-denial:<sup>1</sup> at the same time reprobating the doctrines of the then popular opposers of the Church, viz. the Waldenses, Albigenses, and also Wickliffe and Huss after them, as fraught with the germs of heresy.<sup>2</sup>—So arrived at *the Reformation*, he speaks of it as manifested to be a *human*, not *divine* reformation,—by its claim of full freedom of faith,<sup>3</sup> its rejection of the traditions of the past,<sup>4</sup> its destruction of the dignity of the priesthood, and endangering of the very foundations of religion, through a denial of the holy sacramental mysteries,<sup>5</sup> its adoption finally of a faith of mere negation, (so he designates it,) and severing of its Protestant constituents from the sacred centre of faith and religion, i. e. from Rome.<sup>6</sup>

Such is Schlegel's philosophic view of the history of Christendom down to the Reformation. After which he notices the *religious indifferentism* of spirit, and false *illuminationism* of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries,—ascribing them very much to the influence of the Protestant principle,<sup>7</sup>—until the tremendous political outbreak of this

<sup>1</sup> Lect. xiv. pp. 184, 186.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. 187.

<sup>3</sup> Lect. xviii. p. 334.

<sup>4</sup> "The total rejection of the traditions of the past (here was the capital vice and error of this revolution) rendered this evil [the unhappy existing confusion of doctrines] incurable; and even for biblical learning, the true key of interpretation, which sacred tradition alone can furnish, was irremediably lost." Lect. xv. p. 215.—So also at p. 228, in a passage quoted Note <sup>6</sup> below.

<sup>5</sup> "The hostility of the German Reformers to the Church was of a spiritual nature. It was the religious dignity of the priesthood which was more particularly the object of their destructive efforts. The priesthood stands or falls with faith in the sacred mysteries:" and (these having been by the Protestant body generally rejected) "it was not difficult to foresee that, together with faith in them, respect for the clergy must sooner or later be destroyed." Moreover "that great mystery of religion on which the whole dignity of the Christian priesthood depends, forms the simple but very deep internal key-stone of all Christian doctrine: and thus the rejection or even infringement of this dogma shakes the foundations of religion, and leads to its total overthrow." Ibid. p. 218.

<sup>6</sup> "Had it been," he says, p. 228, a "*divine* reformation, it would at no time, and under no condition, have severed itself from the sacred centre and venerable basis of Christian tradition; in order, reckless of all legitimate decisions, preceding as well as actual, to perpetuate discord, and seek in negation itself a new and peculiar basis for the edifice of schismatic opinion."

He speaks with high approval, p. 222, of the institution of the *Jesuits*; as a religious order wholly dependent on the Church; and so, and from their opposition to Protestantism, as answering to *the great want of the age*.

<sup>7</sup> "Those negative and destructive principles,—those maxims of liberalism and irreligion, which were almost exclusively prevalent in European literature during the eighteenth century;—in a word, *Protestantism*, in the comprehensive signification of that term." Lect. xviii. p. 284, 285.—So too p. 295; though he there allows that

infidel illuminism in the French Revolution. Then, after a notice of the Revolution and its twenty-five years' war "of irreligion,"—"a convulsive crisis of the world which has created a mighty chasm, and thrown up a wall of separation between the present age and the eighteenth century,"<sup>1</sup>—he speaks of the late progressing revival of *Roman Catholicism*, as a revival of *religion*, more especially in the countries of France and Germany. And he finally expresses his hope of a true and complete regeneration of the age, at no great distance of time, (though not till after a total temporary triumph of some antichristian spirit of evil,<sup>2</sup>) as the fit conclusion to the philosophy of history:<sup>3</sup>—its *essence* to consist in a thorough Christianization alike of the state and of science; <sup>4</sup>—its *form* to be somewhat like the perfecting of the noble but imperfect Christian Empire of Charlemagne; <sup>5</sup>—its *introduction* to be preceded by a display of fearful divine judgments,<sup>6</sup> and indeed attended by Christ's own coming and intervention: <sup>7</sup>—and, with this *divine* reformation, and its accompanying complete victory of truth, "that *human* reformation, which till now hath existed, to sink to the ground, and disappear from the world."<sup>8</sup>

the English Protestantism of philosophy is to be distinguished from the French revolutionary atheism. For that "though, by its opposition to all spiritual ideas, it is of a negative character, yet most of its partizans contrive to make some sort of capitulation with divine faith, and to preserve a kind of belief in moral feeling." So too p. 334.

<sup>2</sup> Lect. xv. Vol. ii, p. 199.

<sup>3</sup> Lect. xviii. p. 323.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid. 320, 322, 336.

<sup>5</sup> This is spoken of at p. 320 as a magnificent ground-work for a truly Christian structure of government, which then indeed remained unfinished, but is to be the object of our hope for the future. See the next Note.

<sup>6</sup> "This exalted religious hope, — this high historical expectation, — must be coupled with great apprehension, as to the full display of *divine justice* in the world. For how is such a religious regeneration possible, until every species, form, and denomination of political idolatry be . . . entirely extirpated from the earth." pp. 318, 319.

<sup>7</sup> "As every human soul is conducted to the realms above by the gentle hand of its divine guardian, so the Saviour himself has announced to all mankind, in many prophetic passages, that when the period of the dissolution of the world shall approach, he himself will return to the earth, will renovate the face of all things, and bring them to a close." So ii. 20.—Prophecy shows, he adds, that mankind had "to traverse many centuries, before the promise was to be fulfilled, the final and universal triumph of Christianity throughout the earth to be accomplished, and all mankind gathered into one fold and under one shepherd:" so showing that it is the *earthly* renovation of all things, and triumph of Christianity on this earthly scene, that Schlegel expected Christ's second advent to introduce.

To the same effect is the heading of his last Lecture (p. 300, on the "Universal Regeneration of Society,") with the accommodated text, "I come soon, and will renew all things." Schlegel was, in his way, a *Premillennarian*. <sup>8</sup> Ibid. p. 318.

Now turn we to the philosophy of the same history of Christendom, as traced out to the evangelist *St. John* in the divinely pictured visions of the *Apocalypse*; and oh! how different is its purport!—a difference based in fact on a fundamentally different view from Schlegel's, alike as to *Christ's true religion*, and as to *Christ's true Church!* After a rapid prefiguration in its six first picturings of the chief æras and vicissitudes of the Roman Pagan empire, thenceforward successively to occur, (not without distinct notice of *its* persecuting cruelty, and the Christian martyrs' faith and constancy,) even until its total overthrow and dissolution before the power of Christianity,—there was then next presented in the sealing vision a primary graphic sketch of the Christian body, such as it would present itself to the all-seeing eye of God's Spirit, and to the eye too of him who was taught of the Spirit, after the great revolution should have been completed, and a new and favouring political heaven overshadow it. And what the nature and purport of the sketch? That of tempests of judgment impending: as if the Christian body so delivered, so exalted, and so extended, was verging to apostasy, such as to call down those judgments: and, connectedly, that of an election and sealing by Christ of so small a number out of the professing Church, or mystic Israel, as to confirm the impression that apostasy was seen to be beginning in Christendom:—at the same time that the very significant figurations of the prophetic sketch with reference to the sealed Israel, distinctively, compared with the parallel facts of after history corresponding, seemed in no obscure manner to hint at that self-same Judaic and unscriptural view of the Church sacraments and Church ministry, which Schlegel would identify with the essence of religion, as characteristic of the then unsealed Israel, and in no little measure the originating cause of the apostasy. And so thenceforward the prophecy traced onward the fortunes and histories of Christendom and the Church distinctly in two different lines of succession:—the *one* the visible professing and more and more antichristian Church:—the *other* no visible corporate Christian body, (the once visible faithful Catholic Church being now hid from men



as in a wilderness,) but the *κυριακη εκκλησια*,<sup>1</sup> Christ's own *real* Church, the outgathering and election of grace, individually chosen, enlightened, quickened, and sealed by Him with the Holy Spirit of adoption; a body notable as "God's servants" for holy obedience; and though few in number, compared with the apostate professors of Christianity, yet in God's eye numerally perfect and complete.<sup>2</sup> Thenceforward, I say, the prophecy traced them in their two distinct lines of succession, through their respective fortunes and histories, not without figuration of the respective invisible heads and inspirers of their respective polities and actions, whether the *Evil Spirit* or the *Good Spirit*, down even to the consummation. On the one hand there was depicted the body of *false professors*, multiplied so as to form the main and dominant constituency of apostate Christendom, as developing more and more a religion not Christian but antichristian, it being based on human traditions, (the same that figure so high in Schlegel's estimate,) not on God's word:<sup>3</sup> and, after falling away to the worship of departed saints and martyrs as mediators, in place of Christ,<sup>4</sup> as alike in its *western* and its *eastern* division judicially visited and desolated by the divine avenging judgments of emblematic tempests, scorpion-locusts, and horsemen from the Eu-

<sup>1</sup> These two words have both somewhat remarkably been preserved, in the signification of *church*, in our modern European languages:—the one, *εκκλησια*, in the *église*, *chiesa*, *iglesia*, of the French, Italian, Spanish, &c.; the other, *κυριακη*, in the *kirche*, *kirk*, *church*, of the German, Scotch, English, Dutch, Swedish, and other northern tongues.

Archbishop Whately has indeed in his work on the Kingdom of Christ, p. 76, suggested a very different origin to the latter appellative. "The word *church*, or its equivalent *kirk*, is probably no other than *circle*, i. e. an assembly, *ecclesia*." But what his authority for the statement I know not; and its truth seems more than problematical. In Suicer's Thesaurus it will be found that both *κυριακη*, and much more generally *κυριακον*, had come in the 4th century to be words used in the sense of *church* in Greek Christendom. "*Κυριακον* usitatissimè notat *templum*." Sic Can. 5. Neo-Cæs. *Κατηχομενος, εαν εισερχομενος εις το κυριακον, εν τη των κατηχομενων ταξει στηκη* Can. 28, Laod. *Οτι ου δει εν τοις κυριακοις, η εν ταις εκκλησιαις, τας λεγομενας αγαπας ποιειν* Eusebius H. E. ix. 10; *Και τα κυριακα οπως κατασκευαζοιεν συγχωρειται*. He refers too to Can. 74 in Trullo; also to Athanasius and Zonaras.—I may add that Cyprian and others of the Western fathers use similarly the corresponding Latin word *Dominicum*.

From the language of Greek Christendom the word was transferred, I presume, by Ulphilas, at the close of the fourth century into the Gothic language; and so into the Saxon and other cognate tongues. Thus Johnson in his Dictionary; "Church (eyrce Saxon, *κυριακη* Greek)."

<sup>2</sup> Apoc. vii. 4.

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

<sup>4</sup> Apoc. viii. 3. See Vol. i. pp. 330—341.

phrases; in other words, of the Goths, Saracens, and Turks :<sup>1</sup>—then as, in its *western* division, rising up again from the primary desolating judgments of Gothic invasion, in the new form of an *ecclesiastical empire*, (the same that Schlegel eulogizes as Christ's true Church,) *enthroned on the seven hills of ancient Rome*: its secret contriver being the very Dragon, or Satanic Spirit, that had ruled openly before in the Pagan Empire; its ruling head proud, persecuting, blasphemous, and self-exalting against God, even beyond his Pagan precursors;<sup>2</sup> its constituency and priesthood, throughout Schlegel's boasted middle ages, characterized by "unrepented idolatries,) such is God's representation of the Romish image-worship so strangely patronized by the German philosopher,<sup>3</sup>) and fornications too, thefts, murders, and sorceries:"<sup>4</sup> in fine as continuing unchanged, unchangeable in its apostasy, notwithstanding the repeated checks of woes and judgments from heaven, even until the end; and therefore then at length in its impenitency to be utterly abandoned to judgment, and, like another Sodom, made an example of the vengeance of everlasting fire:<sup>5</sup>—*this being in fact the grand essential preliminary to the world's intended and blessed regeneration.*

On the other hand, with regard to *Christ's true Church*, the *election of grace*, consisting of such as should hold to Christ as their head, and keep the word of God and testimony of Jesus, the Apocalyptic prophecy represented them as almost at once entering on a great and long tribulation; yet though in number few and fewer, and reduced soon to a state spiritually destitute and desolate, like that of the wilderness, so as to constitute them a church invisible rather than visible, as still secretly preserved by their Lord:<sup>6</sup> a revelation of God's *doctrines of grace*, (doctrines directly antagonistic to those of the incipient apostasy,) being it

<sup>1</sup> Apoc. viii., ix.

<sup>2</sup> Apoc. xii., xiii.

<sup>3</sup> See the quotation from Schlegel about the iconoclastic Greek emperors in Note<sup>6</sup>, p. 247, *supra*.

Mr. Sibthorp, it is said by Mr. Faber, went over to the Church of Rome under the belief that it did not require idolatrous worship of the Virgin Mary; and that he has left it, and rejoined the English Church, on finding that this was in very truth required of him. But did it need that he should enter the Romish Church for evidence on such a point?

<sup>4</sup> Apoc. ix. 20, 21. See my chapter on it, Part iii. ch. i.

<sup>5</sup> Apoc. xviii.

<sup>6</sup> Apoc. xii. See my Vol. iii. pp. 64—69.

seemed vouchsafed, the result of a direct *primary* intervention from heaven at this crisis of time, with a view to their spiritual preservation and life : which revelation, singularly acted out before St. John in the light-bearing visions of the sealing and the palm-bearers, just before the burst of the emblematic tempests, was in Augustine's history and teaching, teaching never altogether forgotten afterwards, perfectly realized and illustrated.<sup>1</sup> It then depicted the actual *witnesses for Christ's cause and truth*, from out of this little body, and protestors against the reigning apostasy, (witnesses verified historically afterwards in the history of those whom Schlegel would make *heretics*, the Waldenses more especially, and Wickliffe, and Huss, and their followers,)<sup>2</sup> as made war on by Rome's revived empire, soon after the completion of their testimony against the several chief doctrines of its apostasy, and the Pope's full establishment of his power, like as by a Beast from the abyss of hell ; and so being at length conquered and apparently exterminated :—with the added figuration however of their sudden and most extraordinary revival and exaltation almost instantly after, in the presence of their enemies ;<sup>3</sup> a revelation from heaven introducing and accompanying it yet more glorious than the former one, even of Christ as the Sun of Righteousness :<sup>4</sup> and a great political revolution attending, or following, under which the tenth part of the ten-kingdomed ecclesiastical empire would fall. All this the prophecy figured as the result of God's *second* great intervention for his Church ; and all this we saw, on irrefragable evidence, to have been fulfilled in the great *Reformation* of the xvth century : the discovery introducing it of the doctrine of justification simply by faith in Christ Jesus ; and the downfall following it of the tenth part of the Popedom in Papal England. Thus was this Protestant Reformation distinctly figured in the Apocalypse as a glorious *divine* act, not *human*, so as Schlegel would have it :—its excommunication of the Roman Papal Church, with all its false rites and traditions, (by Schlegel so fondly cherished,) and its national establishment too in Northern Germany, England,

<sup>1</sup> See the 4th Section of my Chapter on the Sealing Vision ; Vol. i. pp. 296—318.

<sup>2</sup> See my Part iii. Chap. vii.

<sup>3</sup> Apoc. xi. 7—11, Part iii. Chap. viii.

<sup>4</sup> Apoc. x. 1, Vol. ii. pp. 40—45, and 91—97.

and elsewhere, being further depicted as acts directed from heaven; <sup>1</sup> and its faith, instead of being (so as *he* would call it) a mere negation, represented to have its very origin in the positive recognition of Christ as the Sun of Righteousness, and only source of man's justification, light, and life. —As to the subsequent "*indifferentism in religion*," as Schlegel truly designates it, which followed afterwards in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, even in the states and churches of Protestantism, it was not unforeshown in the further developments of the Apocalypse. But what the cause assigned? Because, amidst all the rejoicings of states and churches on the establishment of a purer religion, it would still be but the 144,000, the election of grace, *a church within a church*, that would really understand and appreciate the essential principle of that "new song" of the Reformation; still that alone which would be really the *κυριακη εκκλησια*, the Lord's Church.<sup>2</sup> Yet it seemed also preintimated how (as if from some gracious revival of religion in God's still favoured Protestantism) there would afterwards speed forth in the latter times three missionary Angels, flying through mid-heaven, with voices of faithful gospel-preaching throughout the length and breadth of the world, of warning against Papal Rome, and denunciation of its quickly-coming judgment: <sup>3</sup> (a contemporary energetic revival and going forth of the spirit of *Poper*,<sup>4</sup> conjunctively with other kindred and allied spirits of *Pagan-like infidelity* and *pseudo-Christian priestcraft*, being but the last putting forth of its bravery, to hasten the final crisis, and constitute the precursive and justification of its fall :) acts these that would be nearly the last public ones promoted, or mingled in, by the little body of Christ's faithful ones on earth. For it was foreshown how that Christ's advent would speedily follow; and contemporarily therewith, and with the mystic Babylon's destruction by fire, his witnessing saints and all that fear him, small and great,<sup>5</sup> have the reward given them of an entrance into the ever-

<sup>1</sup> Apoc. xi. 2. See Vol. ii. pp. 183—199.

<sup>2</sup> Apoc. xiv. 1. See Part iv. Chap. x.; Vol. iii. p. 316, &c.

<sup>3</sup> Apoc. xiv. 6, &c. See Vol. iii. pp. 460—463, &c.

<sup>4</sup> The same that Schlegel boasts of as the glorious characteristic of these our own days.

<sup>5</sup> Apoc. xi. 18.



asting kingdom of their Lord; and that so, and then, (not before, or otherwise,) the promised regeneration of all things (the Christian's great object of hope<sup>1</sup>) should have its accomplishment, in Christ's own reign with his saints; and therewith, at length, the true and only complete evangelization of the world.

Such is the Apocalyptic *moral* philosophy of the history of Christendom; such its contrast with Schlegel's:<sup>2</sup>—its *rule of faith* not *tradition*, but *the Bible*; its *Church of the promises* that alone of *true believers in Jesus*; and *God's glory in Christ* the grand and final *object* ever set forth in it.—The review will well prepare us for applying to ourselves, in conclusion, the moral lessons of the whole; as we look to the probabilities—the awful and the hopeful probabilities—of the fast-coming future.

As a *nation* then does it not, while pointing out how and wherefore England has been raised to its present greatness,—viz. in order to its being the great bulwark and promulgator throughout the world of a Protestant evangelic faith,<sup>3</sup>—solemnly warn us also against being seduced by any spirit of mistaken expediency, false liberalism, religious indifferntism,<sup>4</sup> or, I may add, party faction, to seek nationally to identify ourselves with the Papal antichristian religion, or any further to foster its power, either at home or in the colonies? Surely of toleration and civil privilege the utmost has been granted to our Roman Catholic fellow-subjects, consistent (to say the least) with our character as

<sup>1</sup> On this point Schlegel, in his 5th Lecture, beautifully contrasts the religion of the ancient Jews (to which Christianity has succeeded) with that of all the other Asiatic nations. In the traditions of these latter, he observes, *regret* was the prominent feeling expressed for what man had *lost*; in the Hebrew religion *hope* for the future. "The whole existence of this people turned on the pivot of *hope*; and the keystone of its moral life projected its shadows far into futurity." i. 183.

<sup>2</sup> To its philosophy in the figurations of *historic fact* the reader's attention was directed in the introductory chapter of my Work, Vol. i. pp. 112—114, as also in the 1st Section of my present chapter.

<sup>3</sup> See Vol. ii. pp. 472—474, 485, 486; and Vol. iii. Part v. Ch. viii.

<sup>4</sup> A year or two before the Act of Roman Catholic Emancipation, Mr. Gally Knight, in an influential and able Pamphlet, pointed to the ease of the then Dutch and Belgian kingdom, in proof of the possible thorough union of Protestants and Catholics under a Protestant Government. The very next year the Protestant Government there was overthrown by a united Romish and democratic insurrection.

As to the Irish Roman Catholic Emancipation Act, who, even of its most sanguine advocates, has not confessed to disappointment in the results?

a Protestant state. Let us beware lest, in the vain hope of thoroughly conciliating the Romish priesthood in our land,—a thing which history and reason, as well as prophecy, have shown to be impossible,—we abandon our distinctive Protestant character;<sup>1</sup> and therewith, in the great coming crisis, forfeit the high protectorate, hitherto granted us, of heaven.<sup>2</sup>—Nor, let me add, if in that crisis (as prophecy seems to intimate) the evangelization of the heathen, or evangelization and restoration of the Jews, prove in the issue to be the occasion of the great Romish (and perhaps too Mahommedan) powers uniting together in some hostile and opposing confederacy, let it be forgotten which is the Lord's side:<sup>3</sup> lest here too we act as an ally, if not constituent, of Babylon; and become nationally a partaker of her sins, and nationally, in God's coming judgment on the nations, a partaker also of her tremendous punishment.

Further, has it not a voice to us as a *Church*? I speak of the Church established by God's gracious Providence in this kingdom. May we not, from that holy prophecy that we have been considering, infer it to be its paramount duty, wisdom, and even safety, to hold fast the pure and scriptural doctrine on which it was founded at the Reformation: and to eschew and repudiate, not the principles of direct Popery only, or even of the modern Tractarian-semi-Popery; which is but in truth that earlier form of the great apostasy revived, to which in due time, as we have seen, and through Satanic arifice, Rome did but furnish the fitting headship;<sup>4</sup>) but also of every modification of the same, which may seek to make religion a thing *ecclesiastical*, rather than a thing *personal* and *spiritual*; and to interpose the Church, with its priesthood and services and sacraments, *between* the soul and Christ, instead of asserting it as their one grand prerogative and office to direct the soul *to* Christ?—Surely it is a strange misnomer to call this system, as with laudatory title, *High Church*, and decry the opposite system by

<sup>1</sup> For example by "the great measure," as some have called it, of paying the Irish Roman Catholic Priesthood from the national funds.

Since the publication of my First Edition, we have to regret that our national Protestant character should have been further compromised by the Maynooth endowment;—however patriotic the motives of the ministry that originated it.

<sup>2</sup> Let me refer on this head to the illustrative historic sketch prefixed by Dr. Croly to his Treatise on the Apocalypse. <sup>3</sup> See pp. 128, 129. <sup>4</sup> Apoc. xiii. 2.

the vituperatively-intended title of *Low Church*. The *true low churchmen* seem to me they who fashion their *beau ideal* of an ecclesiastical system, simply or chiefly, with reference to an *earthly church*, and its *human* administration and administrators. The *true high churchmen* seem to be they the Church of whose chief affections and thoughts is the *Jerusalem above*:—that which has for its head, Christ; its home, heaven; and this our earth as but the scene of its preparatory formation and trial: a scene whereon its members, scattered everywhere through the visible Church, and known to God, though often unknown to men, are by the common principle of union with Christ their invisible head, united verily and in truth with each other, and united with those too of the same body that may have already passed into Paradise.<sup>1</sup> It is this Church which St. Paul's glowing eloquence set forth to the Ephesian Christians as the Church the Bride, which Christ loved, and purchased, and purposes "to present to himself glorious, without spot or wrinkle;"<sup>2</sup> to the Galatians as "the Jerusalem that is above, which is the mother of us all;"<sup>3</sup> and to the Hebrews, as "the church of the first-born<sup>4</sup> whose names are written in heaven:" this that of which, in the Apocalyptic visions, St. John beheld the fortunes figured, throughout all its successive generations militant on earth; even until the time of their perfected union, number, and blessedness, as the Lamb's bride, New Jerusalem.<sup>5</sup> And so, accordingly, the earlier confessors, that witnessed for Christ under Pagan Rome, recognized her as *the Church*, the *Mother Church*, and rejoiced in her as children.<sup>6</sup> And when stealthily afterwards *the*

<sup>1</sup> Compare Eph. iii. 15,—“our Lord Jesus Christ, from whom the whole family in heaven and on earth is named.”

<sup>2</sup> Eph. v. 25—27.

<sup>3</sup> Gal. iv. 26.

<sup>4</sup> ἐκκλησία πρωτοτοκῶν Heb. xii. 23.

<sup>5</sup> Apoc. vii. 3, 4, &c. xiv. 1, &c. xvii. 14, xx. 4, xxi. 2, 10—12, xxii. 3, 4, &c.

<sup>6</sup> Let me exemplify, as I have not directly done so before.

1. *Ignatius*, in the heading of his Letter to *the Church* at Ephesus, (a very striking and illustrative document, of chronology immediately following the Apostolic time,) speaks of it as *predestinated by God before the world to glory*: thereby distinctly defining the *true spiritual church* at Ephesus as the object of his address, though *in charity* supposing all to belong to it of the members of the *professing church* there constituted: professing as they did under circumstances of trial and persecution, so calculated to prevent the adhesion of any but true disciples. Ἰγνατιος, ὁ και Θεοφορος, τη ευλογημενη εν μεγαθει Θεου Πατρος και πληρωματι, τη προορισμενη προ αιωνων ειναι εια παντος εις δοξαν παραμονον, ατρεπτον,

*earthly mixed corporate body, so called*, came to be more and more substituted for it in fact, when more and more alienated from it in spirit, and to usurp to itself the other's dignity, titles, privileges, and claims,—man's earthly church those of God's heavenly Church, the thing ecclesiastical those of the thing spiritual,<sup>1</sup>—then, we saw, (let me be excused if I repeat on a point so momentous,) Augustine seemed raised up for the special purpose of setting it forth

ἠγνωμενην, και εκλελεγμενην, εν παθει αληθινω, εν θεληματι του Πατρος και Ιησου Χριστου του Θεου ἡμων, τη εκκλησια, τη αξιομακαριστω τη ουση εν Εφεσω.

2. The Epistle which contains the *Acts of Polycarp's Martyrdom* is addressed by "the Church of God which sojourns at Smyrna, to that which sojourns at Philomelium, and to all sojourning bodies of the Holy Catholic Church throughout the world:" thereby indicating necessarily, I think, that *spiritual and true Church*, of which the members feel and live as pilgrims here, and with their home in heaven.

3. *Justin Martyr*, Dial. cum Tryph. p. 287, speaks of the Church as *Christ's Bride* prophesied of in Psalm xlv. : which Church we know from other Scriptures to be that symbolized as the *heavenly Jerusalem* ; made up only of the true and the saved.

4. Similarly *Tertullian*, de Baptismo, c. 15, says ; "Et una ecclesia in cœlis : " \* and in his De Cor. Mil. c. 13 ; " Sed tu peregrinus es mundi hujus, civis supernæ Hierusalem : noster, inquit, municipatus in cœlis."

5. And so again the Author of the beautiful *Epistle to Diognetus*, quoted before by me Vol. i. p. 102. "Christians (i. e. the constituency of the Church) display the wonderful nature of their peculiar polity. They dwell in their own country but as sojourners : they abide on earth, but are citizens of heaven."

<sup>1</sup> Of all the early Fathers none, I believe, contributed to this more than the excellent Cyprian ; especially by his well-meant, and in many respects valuable Treatise, *De Unitate Ecclesie*. For the error attaches to it of arguing from such passages as, "Thou art Peter, &c., and on this rock will I build my Church," and that, "What thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven," and again, "As my Father hath sent me, so send I you," with reference almost wholly to the apostolic commission transmitted officially downwards to the episcopal rulers of the Church ; instead of urging the essentiality, as other Fathers did, † in order to the enjoyment of these promises and prerogatives, of adherence to the apostolic faith : and the error also of identifying the earthly Church visible, governed by these rulers, with that against which the gates of hell should not prevail, viz. Christ's spiritual Church, the Bride. "Super unum (sc. Petrum) ædificat ecclesiam suam . . . Exordium ab unitate proficiscitur, ut ecclesia una monstretur : quam unam ecclesiam etiam in Canticis Canticorum Spiritus Sanctus ex personâ Domini designat, et dicit, 'Una est columba mea, perfecta mea.'" But we must always recollect that in Cyprian's time the professing Church was essentially faithful ; and indeed tested and purified by persecution.

\* On which observes his Romish Editor Pamelius ; "et in terris videtur desiderari. Etsi autem ad Eph. iv. id aperte non habeatur, subindicatur tamen his verbis, Unum corpus et unus spiritus : quemadmodum S. Cyprianus pulchrè explicat, Libro De Unitate Ecclesie."

† So *Cyril Alex.* De Trin. iv. 1 : Πετραν οιμαι παρωνημως ἑτερον ουδεν η την ακατασιστον και ἕδραιοτατην του μαθητου πιστιν αποκαλων, εφ' η̄ και ἀδιαπτωτως ερηρυσται και διαπεπηγεν η̄ εκκλησια του Χριστου, και αυταις αναλωτος ταις ἄδου πυλαις εις αει διαμενονσα. And *Origen* : Πετρα γαρ πας ὁ Χριστου μαθητης, ἀφ' οὐ ἐπινον οἱ ἐκ πνευματικῆς ἀκολουθουσης πετρας : και ἐπι πασαν την τοιαυτην πετραν οικοδομεται ὁ ἐκκλησιαστικος πικς λογος, και ἡ κατ' αυτου πολιτεια : εν εκαστω γαρ των τελειων, συμπληρουντων την μακαριοτητα λογων και εργων και νοηματων, εστιν ἡ ὑπο του Θεου οικοδομουμενη εκκλησια. In Matt. xvi. 18. (Ed. Huet, i. 75).—So too *Augustine*.



again before men as the only true Church of heavenly promise.<sup>1</sup> Taught by whom, or at least accordantly with whom, when ages succeeded afterwards of darkness deeper and deeper,<sup>2</sup> (very much through this self-same error,) the confessors of the middle age, living under that perfected form of the apostatized ecclesiastical and earthly thing, *Rome Papal*, "*Mother and Mistress*," were mainly saved from her sorceries by recognizing the distinction, and choosing and appropriating the heavenly Church as their own.<sup>3</sup> And so too, still later, the Churches of the Reformation, our own especially inclusive: which, while *in charity*, like the Apostles and early Christians, regarding and speaking of all members of the Church Visible, not openly inconsistent, as belonging to it,<sup>4</sup> did still prominently set forth, distinct-

<sup>1</sup> More often Augustine speaks of Christ's true Church under its character of a *polity*, the *Civitas Dei*. But at times he conjoins the two phrases. So C. D. xvii. 4. 3; "Ecclesia Christi, civitas Regis Magni;" also xvii. 16. 2, &c.

<sup>2</sup> See my Vol. i. 306—308.

<sup>3</sup> See my historical application of the Vision of the 144,000 seen by St. John with Christ on Mount Zion, in contrast and opposition to the Beast Antichrist's multitudinous worshippers in Babylon, Vol. iii. p. 308.

"In common with the soundest divines," says Professor Le Bas, "Wicliff allows the distinction between the *Church visible* and the *Church invisible*. The latter he calls the *very body of Christ*, the former his *medlied* (or mixed) body; which includes men ordained to bliss, and hypocrites doomed to perdition." p. 338. Mark, too, the prominence of this point in the examinations of *Lord Cobham* and others of the latter *Wicliffites*, before the Romish tribunals; and the "Credo unam esse sanctam catholicam Ecclesiam," perpetuated as *Huss's* motto on his medal, given at Vol. ii. p. 460: also *Luther's* public recognition of this doctrine of Huss, quoted Vol. iii. p. 311, Note <sup>1</sup>; and the same in the examination of *Philpot* and other Anglican reformers of the xvth century.

<sup>4</sup> I beg to call the reader's careful attention to this point, as one that seems to me most important. There are two principles on which an interpreter may attempt the explanation of the various enlogistic phrases, such as *the elect*, *the faithful*, &c., addressed by the apostles to the churches they write to. The *one* is that which explains them of mere *ecclesiastical election*, and *profest faith*; and consequently applies them to all the members of the professing church indiscriminately, the true alike and the false. The *other* is that which regards the phrases as properly belonging only to the *true members*, i. e. the constituency of the *spiritual church*: and consequently applies the terms *generally* only in the spirit of *charity*; hoping, where there exists no plain evidence to the contrary, in the sincerity of men's profession.—I feel deeply persuaded that the *latter* is the only one that can be consistently and satisfactorily carried out.

So *Leighton*, on 1 Pet. i. 2. "The Apostle denominates all the Christians to whom he writes by the condition of *true believers*; calling them *elect* and *sanctified*, &c.: and St. Paul writes in the same style in his Epistles to the churches. . . Not that all in these churches were such indeed; but because they professed to be such, and by that their profession and calling as Christians were obliged to be such, and as many of them as were in any measure true to their calling and profession were really such. Besides, . . . in all probability, there would be then fewer false Christians, and the number of true believers usually greater, than now in the best reformed Churches." Compare the extracts from Clement of Rome and Justin Martyr, given in my Vol. i. p. 267, Note <sup>3</sup>.

ively from the *Church Visible*,<sup>1</sup> “the blessed company of all faithful people,” “the members incorporate of the mystical body of Christ:”<sup>2</sup>—that *spiritual Church* the gather-

<sup>1</sup> In its xviith Article our Church sketches the history, formation, and character of the blessed company that constitutes Christ's *true invisible Church*; in its xixth, a *true visible Church*, (such as may be fitted to gather in and nourish *the invisible*,) as being “one in which the pure word of God is preached, and sacraments duly ministered.” Its Burial Service alludes to the *invisible* or *spiritual Church* under the appellation of *the number of the elect*: “That thou wouldest shortly accomplish the number of thine elect, and hasten thy kingdom.”

So too in the Prayer for the Ember Weeks: “Almighty God, who hast purchased to thyself an *Universal Church*, by the precious blood of thy dear Son.”

<sup>2</sup> So the Anglican Communion Service.—Similarly says the Homily on Whitsunday, though speaking of this Church's earthly state; “The true Church is an universal congregation or fellowship of God's faithful and elect people, built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets.”

Let me add the following from King Edward the Vith's Short Catechism.

*M.* Now remaineth that thou speak of the *Holy Church*.—*S.* Afore that the Lord God had made the heaven and earth, he determined to have for himself a most beautiful kingdom and holy commonwealth. The Apostles and ancient Fathers that wrote in Greek called it *εκκλησια*; in English a *congregation* or *assembly*: into the which He hath admitted an infinite number of men, that should all be subjects to one king as their sovereign, and only one head: Him we call *Christ*, which is to say *Anointed*. . . To the furnishing of this commonwealth belong all they as many as do truly fear, honour, and call upon God, wholly applying their mind to holy and godly living; and all those that putting all their hope and trust in him, do assuredly look for the bliss of everlasting life. But as many as are in this faith stedfast, were fore-chosen, predestinate, and appointed out to everlasting life, before the world was made. Witness thereof they have within their hearts, the Spirit of Christ; the author, earnest, and unfailable pledge of their faith. Which faith only is able to perceive the mysteries of God, only bringeth peace into the heart, only taketh hold on the righteousness that is in Christ Jesus.

Then in answer to the question, “Canst thou yet further *depaint me out* that congregation which thou callest a kingdom or commonweal of Christians,” (evidently the same Christian congregation, kingdom, commonwealth, or Church, of which a description had been given in the preceding extract from the Catechism,) “and so set it out before mine eyes that it may be known asunder from each other fellowship of men,” “some certain congregations that may be seen,”—the Scholar defines it as consisting of those who not only “profess the pure and upright learning of Christ, as it is faithfully set forth in the Holy Testament,” and “use his Sacraments with pureness and simplicity,” but also “in all points are governed and ruled by the laws and statutes of their king and high bishop Christ, in the bond of charity,” and “banish out of the Church such as will not amend their lives.” And he concludes respecting it thus: “This is that same Church which Paul calleth the pillar and upholding stay of truth. To this Church belong the keys wherewith heaven is locked and unlocked: for that is done by the ministration of the word; whereunto properly belongeth the power to bind and loose, to hold for guilty and forgive sins.” After which the Catechism proceeds thus:

“*M.* This would I hear of thee, why it immediately followeth [i. e. after mention in the Creed of the *Holy Ghost*] that we believe the *holy Universal Church* and the *Communion of Saints*?—*S.* These two things I have always thought to be most fitly coupled together, because the fellowships and incorporations of other men proceed, and be governed by, other means and policies; but the Church, which is an assembly of men called to everlasting salvation, is both gathered together and governed by the Holy Ghost. Which thing, sith it cannot be perceived by bodily sense or light of nature, is by right and for good reason here reckoned among things that are known by belief [i. e. placed in the *Creed*]. And therefore this calling together of the faithful is called *universal*, because it is bound to no one special place. For God

ing of whose members out of "this naughty world,"<sup>1</sup> and their nourishing, strengthening, and edification,<sup>2</sup> is the great object of all earthly and visible orthodox churches, with all their admirable and divinely-appointed instrumentalities and means of grace: an object on the completion of which such scaffoldings will be set aside; as things that have answered their purpose, and are needed no more.<sup>3</sup>—Is it not very mainly from confusion of those two very different things, the *Church of true-hearted spiritual believers*, simply and alone, (a corporation to human eye *invisible*),<sup>4</sup>

throughout all coasts of the world hath them that worship Him: which, though they be far scattered asunder by divers distance of countries and dominions, yet are they members most nearly joined of that same body whereof Christ is the head; and have one spirit, faith, sacraments, prayers, forgiveness of sins, and heavenly bliss, common among them all."—Liturgies of King Edward VI. pp. 511—514. Parker Edition.

<sup>1</sup> So our Ordination Service. "Ye are called to teach, feed, and provide for the Lord's family: and to seek for Christ's sheep that are dispersed abroad, and for his children who are in the midst of this naughty world (i. e. professing Christendom); that they may be saved through Christ for ever."

<sup>2</sup> Compare Eph. iv. 12; "He gave some apostles, some evangelists, some pastors and teachers, for the perfecting of the saints, for the edifying of the *body of Christ*:"—i. e. of the *Church of the redeemed*, "which is his body." Ibid. i. 23.

<sup>3</sup> So Leighton (the truest as well as sweetest exponent of Anglican Church doctrine) on 1 Pet. ii. 5. "Ye are built up a spiritual house." This building is the *whole invisible Church of God*, and each good man is a stone of this building.—For this purpose chiefly did God make the world, the heaven and earth, that in it He might raise this spiritual building to himself, to dwell in for ever. . . . The continuance of this present world, as it now is, is but for the service of this work, like the scaffolding about it; and therefore, when this spiritual building shall be fully completed, all the present frame of things in the world, *and in the Church itself*, shall be taken away, and appear no more."

<sup>4</sup> Of course in their individual character the members of Christ's true Church will be visible as "lights in the world," in proportion as their walk and conversation are consistent. Moreover it is *possible* for a *community* of true-hearted Christians, unmixt with false, to be visibly associated together in social fellowship and religious worship. Such, for example, was the earliest primitive Church constituted on the great day of Pentecost at Jerusalem: such the primitive Churches, as first constituted at Philippi and Thessalonica: which beautiful models the Catechist of King Edward seems to have had in his eye in the extract just given from the Catechism. But, since that morning-day of the Christian Church they have been but the unrealized *ideal* model of a Church visible. For in every case tares began almost immediately to mix with the wheat in the early Churches, as the Apostolic Epistles themselves show, agreeably with our Lord's prophetic parable. And so a visible Church of the true-hearted, distinctively and alone, was no more to be found. Nor this alone. But as corruption became more and more prevalent, and tainted not only the individual character of the professing Church's members, but also its doctrinal teaching, profest faith, and public worship, then even what might be called a true visible professing Church existed not: and the Apocalyptic symbol at length had fulfilment of the *true Catholic Church*, once visible, being driven into a state of invisibility and barrenness, like as of a wilderness. Nor even in that comparatively small portion of ancient Roman Christendom, in which orthodox doctrine and pure forms of worship were restored at the Reformation, has the mass of any visible Church community answered in spirit and character to its profession. Compare Apoc. xiv. 3; a passage already before referred to.



and the *Church professing and visible*,<sup>1</sup> together with a mistaken *Judaic* view of the Christian ministry or priesthood,<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> I cannot better illustrate this than from Mr. Gresley's "*True Churchman*." He observes (p. 35, 6th Ed.); "It is the right or the wrong belief in the doctrine of the one *Catholic and Apostolic Church*, which makes all the difference, rendering men sound orthodox Churchmen, or wavering Schismatics. Some not very spiritual persons have adopted a mode of speaking of *the Church as the body of true believers in all the world*. It is manifestly a mere political manœuvre.\* Let us turn to the Bible. The word *Church* occurs in a good many places in Scripture; in the large majority of which it is applied to a *religious community existing visibly upon earth*, which was liable to persecution, vexation, extension, could receive complaints, admit or reject members, deliberate, decide controversies, send messengers, be edified, take care of, salute, and be saluted, in short could exercise all the functions of a visible human society." Then he adds: "There are a few, very few, exceptions; as in the Epistle to the Ephesians, where it is said that Christ gave himself for it, that he might present it to himself a glorious Church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing. Here evidently the Apostle alludes to some *prospective* condition of *the Church*; because not even one individual member of the Church on earth is on this side of the grave perfectly sinless. This perfect holiness therefore can be ascribed only to the Church triumphant: as in the Hebrews, where the heavenly Jerusalem is spoken of as the general assembly and Church of the first-born which are written in heaven, the spirits of just men made perfect."

Let me ask, is there not some confusion of ideas, or of language, in this passage? In the first part Mr. G. speaks of *the Church* (the one *Catholic and Apostolic Church*) as a *religious community existing visibly on earth*, including (as appears from the context) all its professing members, and governed by bishops of the official apostolic succession: then he quotes a certain few passages from Scripture, which allude, he says, to a *prospective and triumphant* condition of *the Church*. Now, in thus speaking, either Mr. G. means by *the Church* the same community that he before designated under that name, though in a different stage and state of existence; which is the natural and only proper meaning of his words; in which case he makes *all professing unexcommunicated members* of the earthly episcopal Churches to be members at last of the Church triumphant in heaven; an error surely as fearful as palpable!—Or else he means by *the Church* in one sentence one thing; in the next quite another: viz. in the first, *the Christian visible community*, including both true and false, the tares and the wheat; in the other the *wheat*, or *true Church* only. On which latter hypothesis he virtually admits the distinction that he is so bent on denying, between the *Church visible* and *Church invisible*; while violating at the same time that distinctness which is a primary rule of good writing. What if, in Algebra, the equation  $A = a + \dot{a}$  being proposed, (as the *Church visible* includes both the *true* and the *false* members of it,) some one in working out the problem were without notice to use  $a$ , after a step or two, as by itself alone the equivalent of  $A$ ?

As to the difference between Mr. G. and his own Church on the general view, the Notes preceding will, I think, show it clearly.

I am not unaware that certain eminent opponents of the ecclesiastical system advocated by Mr. Gresley, do yet agree with him in speaking of the appellative *sons of God* as one applied by St. Paul to all the members of *the Church visible*, "whether they walk worthy of their high calling or not." So Archbishop Whately in his Kingdom of God, p. 8: who also, at p. 52, notes all these as constituting the *communion of saints*. But would *St. Paul* have counted in that communion such false professors as he alludes to Acts xx. 30; Phil. iii. 19; 2 Cor. xi. 13, 15; Jude 12; &c.?

<sup>2</sup> See my general argument on this subject on the Sealing Vision, Part i. ch. vii. § 3, concluded Vol. i. pp. 292—296.

It was through this erroneous view, primarily, that Mr. Sibthorp was led to join Rome. So he himself tells us, in his very illustrative Letter of justification.—And, I fear it still partially affects some, who would yet shrink back from Oxford Tractari-

\* Was it so with Archbishop Leighton? or with the founders of the Church to which Mr. G. belongs, whose views to this effect I have noted above?



that most of those Oxford anti-Anglican errors have sprung, whose legitimate end and perfecting is in the Romish doctrine and Church?<sup>1</sup>—especially as conjoined with misunderstanding or forgetfulness as to the great predicted *ecclesiastical apostasy*, which, according to prophecy, was to run on even from St. Paul's time within the professing Church, in chronological parallelism with the constituency and doctrine of Christ's true Church, and at length all but to stifle the latter?<sup>2</sup>—So, as to the Apocalyptic Book's view of Christ's *Church of the promises*. Add to which the lesson from its definition of Christ's witnesses as those who "keep the commandments of God and the testimony of Jesus,"—*God's* commandments, evidently, in contradistinction to *man's*: a definition which implies the duty of making God's own book the one only rule of faith and practice, contradistinctively to all mere human tradition.—Whether at home or abroad, let but this its own originally<sup>3</sup> scriptural and evangelic spirit still characterize our Anglican mother Church; and we may surely the rather hope for the divine blessing upon her. By the joint application of her Apocalyptic *Augustinian* doctrine respecting *the true Church*, as one made up of Christ's individual *election of grace*, chosen from out of visible professing Churches through grace unto salvation, and her Apocalyptic *Lutheran* doctrine of *justification simply by faith in Christ our Righteousness*, (doctrines alike prominently set forth in the Apocalypse, as re-imprest on men by express revelation,<sup>4</sup>) together with implicit and constant reference to the written Scripture as the rule of faith, we may expect that she will detect and expel from within her pale, as with touch of the spear of

anism. I might exemplify in a late Ordination Sermon by one much to be esteemed on 2 Cor. viii. 23, based very much on this official, ecclesiastical, Levitical view of the Episcopacy, Church, and Priesthood:—as if from his mere *office* a bishop or presbyter can be the *glory of Christ*, unless he hold, preach, and live the doctrine of Christ; or as if men baptized can be *really* brethren to Christ's saints, unless they be *really* and in *heart* members incorporate with Christ the head.

<sup>1</sup> What an illustration of this has been given, since my first Edition was published, in the apostasy to Rome of the chief Oxford Tractarians, Messrs. Newman, Ward, Oakley, Faber, Maskell, &c.!

<sup>2</sup> See in Vol. iii. pp. 94, 95, my reference to Archdeacon Manning's argument on this point.

<sup>3</sup> I say *original*, with reference to the Crammers, Riddleys, Jewels, &c., the actual founders of the English Church; not to the Lauds or Bulls, whom some would refer to as its fathers, of a later and very different generation.

<sup>4</sup> See my Vol. i. Part i. Ch. vii. § 4, and Vol. ii. pp. 40—45.

Ithuriel, every the most specious heresy: and that so, at the last great day of Christ's collecting together his jewels, the eulogy of God's own Zion may prove to have continued hers to the end, that "many were born in her, and that the Most High did establish her."<sup>1</sup>

And might not a word be fitly added also of solemn practical application of the lessons of this prophecy to *other churches*, orthodox and unorthodox, among us?—In the anticipation of some fearful approaching conflict, (if such anticipation seem warranted by the prophecy,) and yet more in the view of this war of principle, and of the nations, as but a prelude to the fiery judgments that are to accompany the Lord's own coming, do we not see motives pre-eminently cogent for union among all that love the Lord Jesus in sincerity? And does it not appear lamentable that, whether from political or ecclesiastical differences of opinion, there should be cherished by any such in *the Protestant dissenting bodies* a feeling of bitterness against our Anglican Church; a Church which they yet allow to be in its *doctrines* and *profession of faith* eminently scriptural and evangelic: especially considering that their supposition of Christ's declaration, "My kingdom is not of this world," militating against a national established Church, depends on an inference from that text very questionable; <sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Psalm lxxxvii. 5.

<sup>2</sup> What has past in our own Church since the publication of my first Edition, renders the right view of this famous text, John xviii. 36, "My kingdom is not of this world," (*ἡ βασιλεια ἡ ἐμὴ οὐκ ἐστὶν ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου τούτου*;) more important than ever. Hence a brief discussion of it may be not inappropriate; especially as one connected with, and supplemental to, my notice of Christ's kingdom, p. 188, in the Chapter on the Millennium.

And, with a view to this, it seems essential that we consider it in the light not only of its immediate context, but also of that larger context of Scripture, (alike of the Old and New Testament,) in which *Messiah's kingdom*, called also *the kingdom of God*, or *kingdom of heaven*,\* is a perpetually recurring topic.

Now the Old Testament prophecies, alike those of David, † Isaiah, ‡ Daniel, and others, foreshadowed this kingdom as one that would appear under two distinct phases; a *primary* one of imperfection and opposition; a *final* one of triumphant and universal establishment over all error and all opposition. More especially, for example, in Daniel's famous first prophecy there were figured distinctively the *regnum lapidis* and the *regnum montis*; §—the *primary* humbler state of Messiah's kingdom, as a stone cut out without hands; (the divine temple's destined corner-stone; ||) and its

\* In St. Matthew we find it generally called *the kingdom of heaven*, in St. Mark and St. Luke *the kingdom of God*. † E. g. Ps. ii., xxii. ‡ E. g. Isa. liii.

§ Dan. ii. 34, 35. I use Mede's well-known Latin designatives.

|| Matt. xxi. 42; Luke xx. 17. In what our Lord adds, as recorded both by St.

and indeed, unless my solution of the vision of Apoc. x. xi. can be refuted, that the establishment of the Anglican,

*ultimate* triumphant state, after shivering the world's great image to pieces, and as a mountain (the mountain of the Lord's house, \* I suppose,) filling with its glory the whole earth.—So too this twofold state and phase of Jesus Christ's kingdom was prominently set forth by Christ himself and his apostles in the New Testament. The *first* was set forth as having commencement from after the King's presentation of himself in human form on earth, rejection by the master-builders in Israel, and consequent judicial suffering, though only as man's redemption-price from out of the kingdom of darkness, with free and open entrance thenceforth into his own kingdom of light and holiness; † then absenting himself from earth for a while, with a view to receive from his Father investiture of the kingdom; ‡ and to prepare his people for it, as well as it for his people. § Which *preparatory* state of the kingdom is described as including its proclamation over the world; appointed heralds || being charged with invitation from the King to all to enter it: (with the foreseen result however of a promiscuous gathering of bad and good, false as well as true, as in the seed-scattering and net-throwing of the Parable: ) ¶ and as including also among its characteristics a provision for the meet spiritual education, support, and nourishment of all its true members; while still sojourners, far away from the King and kingdom of their hearts, in a world under the dominion of their King's and their own great enemy, the Evil One. \*\*—The *second* state and phase described is that of its manifestation in heavenly power and majesty, so as prefigured at the transfiguration; †† and establishment on the ruins of Antichrist's kingdom, ‡‡ and of each other dominion allied with the Prince of darkness. It is this latter for which Christ bids us pray incessantly, "Thy kingdom come!" And it is to be ushered in by the King's own visible return in glory; the retinue of all his faithful saints and subjects of every age rising to attend him, in reflected lustre like as of the sun, and to the exclusion of each and every one of the insincere and false. §§ Not however in their prior mortal state; the kingdom being that which even the saints themselves in flesh and blood cannot inherit: ||| but, with a view to their entrance on which, the new robing of incorruption is provided for them, and the world itself to be made a new world wherein dwelleth righteousness. ¶¶

Conformably with all this the text under discussion, "My kingdom is not of this world," is, I conceive, to be explained as spoken by Christ to Pilate,—1st, with reference to the *principle of its constitution*; as neither having for its object the grandeur, dignities, or secular supremacy of the kingdoms of this world, nor involving

Matthew and St. Luke, "On whomsoever it shall fall *λικμησει αυτον*," we have, I think, a very interesting connecting link between *David's* prophecy about the cornerstone (Ps. cxviii. 22, "The stone which the builders rejected, &c.") here quoted by Christ, and *Daniel's* about the image-smiting stone. For *λικμησει* is not exactly rendered in our translation "it shall *grind him to powder*." It should rather be, "it shall reduce him to dust, like as winnowed chaff from the threshing-floor." The similarity of which to Dan. ii. 35 is so evident and striking that I cannot think it unintended:—"The stone smote the image upon his feet of iron and clay; and then was the iron, the clay, the brass, the silver, and the gold broken to pieces together, and became like the chaff of the summer threshing-floor; and the wind carried them away." The Greek word is the self-same that is used in Dan. ii. in the Septuagint: *λικμησει και λεπτυνει πασας τας βασιλειας*.

\* Isa. ii. 2; Mic. iv. 1. Compare Apoc. xxi. 10.

† Col. i. 13, 14.

‡ Luke xix. 12.

§ 1 John xiv. 2.

|| Matt. iv. 23; Acts xxviii. 31, &c. I need hardly observe that *κηρυσσειν*, usually rendered to *preach*, is literally to *proclaim as a herald*.

¶ Matt. xiii. 24, 47. See p. 188.

\*\* 1 John v. 19.

†† Mark ix. 1; "There be some standing here which shall not taste of death till they see the kingdom of God come with power. And after six days Jesus taketh Peter and James and John . . . up into an high mountain apart, and was transfigured before them; &c." Compare 2 Pet. i. 16—18.

‡‡ Dan. ii. 44; vii. 26, 27.

§§ 1 Thess. iv. 16, 17; Matt. xxv. 31, 34; xiii. 41—43.

||| 1 Cor. xv. 50.

¶¶ 2 Pet. iii. 13.

as well as of the German and other reformed Churches of the 16th century, seems expressly noted in the Apocalyptic figurations as the Lord's own doing.<sup>1</sup>—The same as to the Scotch *Free Church*, in its relation to the *National Church* of Scotland. For, if the perfect healing of the breach be hopeless, that has been caused by the lamented secession from the latter of so large and influential a body of its members, inclusive of many of its most eminent and excellent ministers, it should surely be remembered how small the grounds of separation of *heart*, in comparison with those of union:—considering that it is not on questions involving the essentials of Christian faith that the disruption has arisen, but on questions of *ecclesiastical constitution and government*, never perfectly to be resolved in a world where all is imperfect,<sup>2</sup> and on which sincere Christians may reasonably

disobedience or violation of allegiance in secular matters to the earthly sovereign,\* but only vindicating to itself the empire of the heart:—2ndly, in respect of *its constituency*, as including those only who in heart “are of the truth,” in contrast with a world of which he had the night before said, that “the Spirit of truth was what the world could not receive;” † its members being thus “not of the world, even as Christ was not of the world:”—3rdly, in respect of *the mode of its propagation and advancement*, as not by force or the sword, like this world's kingdoms; “else would my servants fight:”—4thly, in respect of *the time of its proper manifestation and establishment*; as not during the existence of the world that now is, but of the world to come, ‡ at the end of the present age; § in other words on the regeneration, or new creation, when the Son of Man shall sit on the throne of his glory, and there shall be the new heaven and new earth, spoken of by Isaiah and St. Peter. ¶

Supposing which explanation of the text correct, it seems, although what might be called a decidedly *spiritual* explanation, yet to involve no precept or argument against a national establishment of the orthodox faith. For the rich and nobles and kings are no more excluded from the offer of a part in Christ's kingdom than the ignoble and the poor. And, in case of their accepting the offer, and becoming members of it, they are surely as much bound as any others to promote the interests of the kingdom, by such legitimate means as God may have put within their power: including especially, on the part of Christian kings, the provision of a gospel-ministry and an evangelic worship, throughout the countries ruled by them, after the examples of the ancient Jewish princes Hezekiah and Josiah. For example, can the Queen of the Sandwich Islands have violated any principle of duty involved in Christ's declaration to Pilate, in making provision for them in her distant territory? Or our pious King Edward, in so acting at the Reformation in England? Or in quite another way Constantine, in judging on the Donatistic controversy submitted to him?

<sup>1</sup> See my Vol. ii. pp. 188—195, on the *ῥαβδος*, or *rod of authority*, given by the Angel to St. John, for measuring and re-forming the symbolic temple.\* \*

<sup>2</sup> I mean in regard of the chief disputed points on which the disruption arose:—

\* Compare Rom. xiii. 1; 1 Pet. ii. 13, 17.

† John xiv. 17.

‡ Ἡ οἰκουμένη ἡ μέλλουσα, Heb. ii. 5.

§ Matt. xiii. 39.

¶ Matt. xix. 28.

¶ See my notices of the new heaven and earth in the two preceding Chapters, Compare Justin Martyr, Apol. ii.; Ὑμεῖς ακουσαντες βασιλειαν προσδοκωντας ἡμας ακριτως ανθρωπινον λεγειν ἡμας ὑπειληφατε, ἡμων την μετα Θεου λεγοντων.

\*\* This my view of the *ῥαβδος* has been the subject of some controversy, especially with Dr. Candlish. But, as now in my 3rd and 4th Editions more fully and carefully explained, it is that to which I believe Dr. C. would not object.



hold different opinions;—considering further that the objected *Erastianism* of the Established Church<sup>1</sup> can scarce be viewed, even by the seceders, as any subject of Divine disapprobation; and indeed, in so far as it attached to the primary constitutions of the German or British Churches of the Reformation, (supposing my explanation correct of the symbol of St. John's measuring the temple,) would seem to have had Apocalyptic testimony to its being that which had the Covenant Angel's own approving regard and direction;<sup>2</sup>—considering too that as regards *Christ's headship* and

especially those of *patronage*, as distinguished from the *popular call* or *nomination*, as a prerequisite to ordination to a benefice; and that of the *supremacy of the highest civil* over the *highest ecclesiastical* court, in questions involving conjointly both civil and ecclesiastical rights. As regards the *former*, is not the doubt both permissible and reasonable whether popular call may not be to the full as liable to abuse as lay patronage? As regards the *latter*, has not the supremacy of the civil court in England been on more than one important occasion within the last century a defence, not only of the beneficed clergy personally, but even of the truth itself, against the abuse of the episcopal authority?

<sup>1</sup> *Erastus* was a German divine of the xvth century. Neal, in his History of the Puritans, Vol. ii. Pref. p. ix,—after observing that the Members of Parliament, during the civil war, were almost all of the principles of *Erastus*, who maintained that Christ and his apostles had prescribed no particular form of discipline for his Church, but had left it in the hands of the civil magistrate to appoint such particular forms of church government as might most subserve the welfare of the Commonwealth,—adds, “These were the sentiments of the Reformers, from Cranmer down to Baneroff.” This last statement, however, needs the important modification of the magistrate being supposed to do nothing contrary to the Bible.

With regard to *Erastus' doctrine*, it may be useful further to give Archbishop Whately's explanation of *Erastianism*. “Erastianism has always been considered as consisting in making the State *as such*,—the civil magistrate *by virtue of his office*,—prescribe to the people *what they shall believe*, and how worship God.” (Kingdom of Christ, p. 266.) Supposing which to be correct, then all charge of *Erastianism* against the Scotch Established Church will be evidently incorrect; seeing that the State has not attempted to impose new *Articles of belief* on the Church. Nor indeed did the seceders, in consequence of such Erastian pretensions, leave the Establishment.\* Dr. Candlish, however, asserts, (Letters on Hore, p. 120,) that “neither *articles of belief*, nor *manner of worship*, came into question at all in the Erastian Controversy, properly so called: and “that it was on the lawfulness, according to Scripture and right reason, of the civil magistrate's jurisdiction in the exercise of *Church discipline*, particularly in the acts of *excommunication*, and of *admitting to membership and office in the Church*, that the dispute about which Erastus was concerned really turned.”

At any rate it must be allowed that *Erastianism* is a just cause of reproach, in so far only as it can be proved to be *anti-scriptural*. And in such a case as the famous Marnoch and Strathbogie one, where the two jurisdictions met and conflicted, was God's revealed will so clear as that a Christian man, wishing to judge by that rule, might not honestly differ from the opinion of the majority in the General Assembly, who subsequently seceded from the Established Church?

<sup>2</sup> See Note<sup>1</sup> p. 266 *suprà*.—I have said above, “in so far as the objected Erastian-

\* Let me contrast the case of the Ministres demissionaires, now Ministers of the Free Church in the Canton de Vaud. Here the first grand step of the Secular Government towards the oppression of the Vaudois Church was the abolition by it in 1839, at one fell swoop, and altogether by its own authority, of the *Helvetic Confession of Faith*.

*kingship* over his Church, the doctrine, in the highest and most scriptural sense of those phrases,<sup>1</sup> nay and even in a

ism attached also to the *primary* constitutions of the German or other Churches of the Reformation," because it is to these that the Apocalyptic symbol (if I am correct) relates; not to such changes in their ecclesiastical constitutions as may have been made at any later epoch.—Of course too my argument from the Apocalyptic symbol has reference only to main points in the constitution of the Reformed Churches, not to details.

<sup>1</sup> As the point is of importance, it may be well to subjoin, with a view to a right judgment on the *scriptural* sense of this phrase, *all* the passages in the New Testament which speak of *Christ's headship over the Church*:—and all, I believe, in regard to the Church in its most spiritual sense.

First then we have Christ figured to us as *the head corner-stone* of his temple, the Church. So in Matt. xxi. 42, and the parallel passages in Mark and Luke. But of what temple or Church? The visible earthly Society so called, including both false and true members; or that constituted of the true only? St. Peter (1 Pet. ii. 4—6) defines it distinctly as the latter. "To whom coming, as unto a living stone, disallowed of men, but chosen of God and precious, ye also as *living stones* are built up a spiritual house," &c.: as it is said in the Scripture, "I lay in Zion a chief corner-stone . . . and, The stone which the builders disallowed, the same is made the head of the corner."

Then, passing over 1 Cor. xi. 3, where it is said of *individual* Christians that "the head of the woman is the man, and the head of the man is Christ," a passage therefore not directly bearing on the point now in question, we come to the following five apposite and famous passages in St. Paul's Epistles to the Ephesians and Colossians. 1. Eph. i. 22; "And God gave him to be the *head* over all things *to the Church*; which is his body, the fulness of him that filleth all in all." 2. Eph. iv. 11—15; "And he gave some apostles, and some prophets, and some evangelists, and some pastors and teachers, for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ; till we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ; that, . . . speaking the truth in love, we may grow up into him in all things, which is *the head*, even Christ: from whom the whole body fitly joined together . . . maketh increase of the body unto the edifying of itself in love." 3. Eph. v. 23, &c.; "The husband is the head of the wife, as Christ is *the head of the Church*. . . And he loved the Church, and gave himself for it, that he might present it to himself a glorious Church, not having spot or wrinkle or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish." 4. Col. i. 18; "And he is the head of his body the Church." 5. Col. ii. 18, 19; "Let no man beguile you of your reward, by a voluntary humility and worshipping of angels, intruding into those things which he hath not seen, . . . and *not holding the head*; from which all the body, by joints and bands having nourishment ministered, and knit together, increaseth with the increase of God."

In all which passages, especially as compared together and mutually illustrated by each other, it seems to me clear that *the true Church* is meant always and distinctively, as that of which *Christ is head*. I am surprised that Dr. Candlish, (Letters, pp. 26, 27, 123), while fully admitting, nay contending, that "holding the head" is said in Col. ii. 19 distinctively of *true* believers, should yet contend also that *most* of the passages quoted belong both to the true Church, and also to visible Churches, "outstanding societies," (including of course both good and bad,) formed in Christ's name, and especially that Eph. iv. 11, &c., has reference to these latter; "If there be meaning in words, it must apply to a visible organized society." But why? Because, says he, the provision specified of outward means and ministers of grace (apostles, prophets, evangelists, &c.) necessarily belongs to a visible organized Society. But whose edifying is accomplished by them? Surely not that of mere professors in the Church Society, but of the true members only. Which last therefore can alone in the scriptural sense be deemed Christ's body; \* (just as in Col. ii. 19, where Dr.

\* So Augustine, De Doctr. Christ. iii. 45: where, speaking of Tichonius' second

lower and less purely scriptural sense of them, may be considered, I presume, to be held by the members of the Scotch Established Church as truly as of the Free ;<sup>1</sup>—in fine, that,

C., as I observed, allows it;) and which last alone consequently have Christ as a head ; and grow up into him in all things ; &c.\*

As to the Scriptural view of *Christ's kingship* in the Church, and of those to whom the privilege attaches of having him for their king, the most illustrative passage that I know is John xviii. 37, "Every one *that is of the truth* heareth my voice : " following as it does on Christ's saying that he was born to be a king, though over a kingdom not of this world ; † and being in fact his explanation of the subjects that would belong to it. Does not St. John teach us (1 John iii. 19, &c.) that none but real heart-believers are *of the truth* ? Does not Christ state it (John x. 27) as the distinctive of his own true sheep, that they *hear his voice* ?

<sup>1</sup> The Free Church holds Christ's headship over the *visible Church* ; and this as an important principle in the right ecclesiastical constitution of Christian communities. So the Address by the Convocation to the People of Scotland, as also Dr. Candlish's, Mr. Grey's, and Mr. Hamilton's Pamphlets, &c. "Christ is not only inwardly a spiritual head to his mystical Church, but externally a spiritual head to the *politie body of the visible Church of professors, and their only lawgiver* : "—a principle which the *Reply by the General Assembly's Special Commission to Sir J. Graham* applies, by declaring that an acknowledgment of the right of a Secular Court to act as it has, is a repudiation of the doctrine contained in the Scotch Confession of Faith, that the *Lord Jesus is the only head of the Church*.

But since the Church *visible* in any professedly Christian country must be held to embrace the whole community and *πολιτεια*, people as well as pastors, prince as well as people, all in allegiance to Him whom they in common profess to regard as their King, ought not the Prince's subordinate officers, *the Judges of the law inclusive*, to be considered as acting under the heavenly King, while conscientiously fulfilling their several appointed functions ; as truly as Church officers so called, (in a narrower sense of the word Church,) while fulfilling theirs ? Was Sir Matthew Hale in his *secular* court less a servant and minister of the Church's Head and King Christ Jesus, than Archbishop Laud in his *spiritual* or rather *ecclesiastical* court ? So that the difference on this point between the Free Church and both the English and Scotch Established Churches seems to be still more narrowed.—It strikes me that this large view of the visible Church's constituent body, and its various functionaries, has been practically too much overlooked, on one side at least, in the controversy ; the Church

---

interpretative principle, *De Domini corpore bipartito*, as including both the true members of Christ's body and the false, Augustine says that the phrase is wrongly exprest ; because hypocrites and false professors do not really belong to Christ's body at all. "Non revera Domini corpus est quod cum illo non erit in æternum."

\* How strongly Christ is set forth as *the Church's head*, in this Scriptural sense of the phrase, by the founders of the Anglican Church, (which yet has been spoken against as Erastian,) will have been seen in the extract from King Edward's Catechism given a little earlier.

† See my discussion on the text, "My kingdom is not of this world," in the Note<sup>2</sup> p. 264, just before.

Archbishop Whately, in his well-known Work on the *Kingdom of Christ* already more than once referred to, appears to me to have greatly impoverished and understated Christ's meaning in this declaration ; by explaining it (p. 29), wholly or chiefly, as "*the renunciation of all secular coercion in behalf of his religion*." This view of the words in the text's latter clause arises from his viewing *Christ's kingdom* in the former clause as meaning only *the earthly visible society*, called *the Church* in its earthly present mixt state : for he says scarce a word in his Treatise of *this earthly state* being one in which many would profess to attach to Christ's kingdom that really do not, the tares as well as the wheat ; or of the *future state* as that in which alone the *true constituency* of the kingdom will be separated from the *untrue*, and in perfect union and glory shine forth for ever.—The different views from this of Wicliff and of the Anglican Church have been shown before.



instead of that established Church being an "Egypt" that God's Israel had to come out of,<sup>1</sup> it was and is by that evangelic *Confession of Faith* which it holds for its standard, as well as the Free Church, a joint witness and bulwark with it against the only figurative Egypt of New Testament prophecy, I mean Papal Rome.<sup>2</sup> To the noble devotedness of the Free Church, since the disruption, and its zeal, energy, and self-denial in carrying out its many high objects, the world itself bears testimony. But has not one thing been wanting? And would her labours be less holy or less blest, if acrimony towards the Church she has seceded from were altogether banished; and if, instead of it, there was exhibited by her in clearer daylight the holding of the fellowship of the Spirit in the bond of peace?<sup>3</sup>

and the State, Church Courts and Secular Courts, being spoken and written about as if antagonistic, and the former only as under Christ, the Church's Head and King.\*

And let me suggest whether another misapplication of language (such it seems to me) may not have further confused the question, needlessly widened the difference, and even opened what might be a door to serious error; I mean the use of *spiritual* for *ecclesiastical*, in speaking of the members of Church Courts in contra-distinction to those of Secular Courts. Says Mr. Hamilton, in his "Harp on the Willows," p. 20; (and he is only one among many that have used the same language);—"They hold that the Lord Jesus is the only Head of the Church. In their *ecclesiastical procedure* they desire to follow his will, as that will is revealed in his word. They believe that the Spirit of God, *speaking through spiritual men*, is the sole interpreter of that word. And they cannot allow the *commandments of men*, the *verdicts of secular courts*, to interpose between them and their heavenly King." It seems to me that the *spiritual men*, here meant, must be the members of the Scotch *ecclesiastical* Courts, as opposed on the questions that finally caused the disruption to the Judges of the *secular* Courts: and that it is the decisions of the former which are characterized as the *voice of the Spirit*, in opposition to the verdicts of the latter, which are styled the *commandments of men*. Now is not the similarity of this to Papal language about Councils, held under Papal presidency, ominous and a warning? "*Spiritus Sancti testatur præsentiam congregatio sacerdotum*," said Pope Celestine of the Ephesian Council held A.D. 468: and it was deemed fitting that the Seal of the Council of Trent should have a *dove* engraved on it, in token of the same presence of, and inspiration of the Council by, the Divine Spirit. (See my Vol. iii. p. 234.) *Ecclesiastical men*, congregated on ecclesiastical matters, were deemed by Rome *spiritual men*, inspired in their decisions by God's Spirit. On the other hand I believe that in the New Testament the word *πνευματικός*, *spiritual*, when said of persons, is only used of true Christians. So 1 Cor. ii. 14, 15; iii. 1; xiv. 37; Gal. vi. 1; 1 Pet. ii. 5. See especially the first passage on the list, 1 Cor. ii. 15; "The *natural* man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, for they are foolishness to him: . . . but the *spiritual man* judgeth (or discerneth) all things."

<sup>1</sup> So the title of Mr. Hamilton's Sermon, "Farewell to *Egypt*; or the departure of the Free Church out of the Erastian Establishment." And other writers of the Free Church have used the same figure.

<sup>2</sup> See my Vol. ii. pp. 437—444.

<sup>3</sup> I rejoice to think that since this was written there has been much less of acri-

---

\* On this point let me beg the reader's special attention to the case of Constantine judging in the Donatistic controversy, alluded to p. 266 supra. And see on it Mosheim iv. 2. 5. 4, with Notes.



And can I omit altogether a word of affectionate address and warning to members of the *Romish Church*; should there in God's providence be any such among the readers of this Commentary? If what has been here written appear indeed to bear the stamp of God's own truth, (and I am well persuaded that not all the learning or ingenuity of Rome can in its main points confute it,) then may the Divine Spirit carry home conviction to them; and make the view of God's own judgment, here fully drawn out on the great questions at issue between Romanism and Protestantism, and the view too, which the prophecy gives us, of the probable nearness of the great day of his publicly pronouncing and acting out that judgment, to be like the warning-cry in their ears, "If any man worship the Beast and his image, and receive his mark in his forehead or in his hand, the same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God, and shall be tormented with fire and brimstone in the presence of the holy angels, and of the Lamb, and the smoke of their torment ascendeth up for ever:"<sup>2</sup> or, rather, like that other kindlier voice from heaven, "Come out of her, my people," (for many, I doubt not, of this character through some delusion or ignorance are still, in respect of outward communion, *in* the Romish Church, although in spirit not *of* it,) "Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues; for her sins have reached unto heaven."<sup>3</sup>

Once more, let not the last Apocalyptically predicted danger to the professing Church be forgotten, of some strong assault by the spirit of heathen-like infidelity. Alas! how strikingly has the fulfilment of the prediction been

mony, and much more of Christian kindness, between these two branches of Christ's Church! \* Moreover, in proof of larger and I think more correct views having been embraced at length by many valued members of the Scotch Free Church, I have pleasure in referring to Dr. Hanna's sermon, noticed in my Vol. ii. p. 196.

<sup>2</sup> Apoc. xiv. 9—11.

<sup>3</sup> Apoc. xviii. 4, 5.

\* In regard to the passage on the Free Church here concluded, and what may seem to many its too extended and elaborated Notes, let me be permitted to observe that this has partly been occasioned by a not unfriendly controversy with Dr. Candlish, arising out of observations on the Free Church, less carefully made in my 1st and 2nd Editions, and expressed with less of kindness towards the Free Church than they ought to have been. As bearing directly moreover on the great questions respecting the *true* and the *visible* Church of Christ, they may be regarded as having a real Apocalyptic interest. For a fuller discussion of the subject I beg to refer the reader to Dr. Candlish's Pamphlet and my Reply.

manifested, as I revise this book for the 5th time, even in our own Church of England!

But it is *individually* that the application of the subject is most important. And when thus personally applied, need I say how unspeakably deep and solemn its interest! It is not enough that we belong to the most orthodox Church, profess the most Scriptural faith, and be even zealous for it against the many errors and heresies of the day. The question is, Are we of Christ's *true disciples*, his "*little flock*," to which alone the Father has given promise of the kingdom?<sup>1</sup> Have we then the evidence of belonging to it? Have we received the Apocalyptically-noted mark and seal of God's Holy Spirit; and the inward light, life, and spirit of holiness and adoption, which He alone can give?<sup>2</sup> Is our faith fixed on Christ as the Sun of righteousness?<sup>3</sup> Do we hold to the written word in life, as well as in doctrine?<sup>4</sup> Do we witness for Christ in an apostate world: as *in* the world, but not *of* the world? Do we seek to follow the Lamb whithersoever he goeth,<sup>5</sup> in holiness, spiritual-mindedness, benevolence, self-denial, and patient perseverance in well-doing, through evil report, as well as good report? Do we seek to improve our several talents for him, as those that must soon give account?<sup>6</sup> Does our charity abound to Christ's flock and people?<sup>7</sup> Is the lamp of faith trimmed, and its light kept burning within us, as by men that watch for their Lord?<sup>8</sup> Is the thought of his coming precious to us? Do we look for and love the thought of his appearing?<sup>9</sup>—Doubtless there are many who can answer these questions in the affirmative. And happy are they. But there are many more, it is to be feared, with whom misgivings will arise in the conscience, as they reflect upon them. Alas! who can doubt the prevalence, in what has been not inaptly called "the religious world," of much of false profession; much of the Laodicean spirit of lukewarmness, self-conceit, religious pride, earthly-mindedness; much of the characteristic deadness of

<sup>1</sup> Luke xii. 32.

<sup>2</sup> Apoc. vii. See my Chapter on this Sealing Vision.

<sup>3</sup> Apoc. x. 1.

<sup>4</sup> Apoc. xii. 17, &c.

<sup>5</sup> Apoc. xiv. 4.

<sup>6</sup> Matt. xxv. 14, &c. 1 Cor. iv. 2.

<sup>7</sup> Matt. xxv. 35, &c.

<sup>8</sup> Matt. xxv. 7. Luke xii. 35.

<sup>9</sup> 2 Peter iii. 12; 2 Tim. iv. 8.

the Church of Sardis, "having a name to live, but being dead?"<sup>1</sup> With all such what cause is there, in contemplation of the coming future, for humiliation, holy fear, repentance! Blessed be God, though the acceptable time remaining be short, it is not ended. Though the Master seems to be on the point of rising, he has not as yet actually risen, and shut to the door.<sup>2</sup> Not only is the probationary period of permitted evil as well as good prolonged, as it is written, "He that is unjust let him be unjust still, and he that is holy let him be holy still,"<sup>3</sup> but the voice of mercy and love is also yet to be heard, inviting sinners to salvation:—"The Spirit and the Bride say, Come; and let him that is athirst come; and whosoever will, let him take of the water of life freely."<sup>4</sup>

For himself (if such personal allusion be permitted him) the Author cannot but recollect that awful declaration by Christ, "Many shall say to me in that day, Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name, and I will say unto them, I never knew you,"<sup>5</sup> as one that ought to suggest to him very solemn matter for self-examination and fear. It is one thing intellectually and historically to search out Scripture truth; another, and very different, experimentally to know and feel it. The *former* he has done, according to his ability, without grudging of time or trouble: but to himself of what avail, if the *latter* be wanting? Under this feeling he will venture to address to every Christian reader this one parting request;—that if, from the explanation of the Apocalyptic Book in the present Commentary, they may have received any spiritual light, comfort, or edification, then they will not refuse to make requital by prayer earnest and personal for him, that he may not fall under the condemnation just spoken of; nor, having preached to others, be found in that day of trial himself a cast-away.—At this present closing crisis of the world, alike in the evidence of prophecy, in the signs of the times, in the

<sup>1</sup> I know not any more searching passages in Holy Scripture, for self-application on this great question, than those suggested by Christ's Epistles to the Seven Churches of Asia.

<sup>2</sup> Luke xiii. 25.

<sup>3</sup> Apoc. xxii. 11. Such I conceive with Vitringa to be the meaning of this converted text.

<sup>4</sup> Apoc. xxii. 17.

<sup>5</sup> Matt. vii. 22.

general agitation of Christendom, and in the increased and increasing expectancy of Him by his people, the Saviour's voice seems to be heard, distinct and clear as perhaps never before, "Surely, I come quickly." God grant that it may be the privilege of both reader and writer, whether summoned to meet Him by death, or by the brightness of his own personal advent, to be enabled each one to answer the summons with the inmost soul's welcome, "Amen! even so! come, Lord Jesus!"



## APPENDIX TO VOL. IV.

---

### PART I.

#### A SKETCH OF THE HISTORY OF APOCALYPTIC INTERPRETATION.

It will, I think, conduce to clearness, if we classify the Apocalyptic expositors whom we shall have to notice under the chronological divisions following:—1. those between St. John's publication of the Apocalypse, and Constantine's establishment of Christianity in the Roman Empire;—2. those from Constantine to Imperial Rome's completed fall, and the rise of the Romano-Gothic kingdoms in Western Europe, ere the close of the 5th century;—3. those between the epoch last-mentioned and the end of the 11th century;—4. those from the 11th or 12th century to the Reformation;—5. those of the æra and century of the Reformation;—6. those from A.D. 1600 to the French Revolution;—7. those from the outbreak of the French Revolution, A.D. 1790, to the present time.<sup>1</sup>

#### PERIOD 1.—FROM ST. JOHN TO CONSTANTINE.

The earliest profest Apocalyptic Commentary extant is that by *Victorinus*, Bishop of Pettau in Pannonia; who was martyred in the Diocletianic persecution, just at the very ending of the period now

<sup>1</sup> Some time after the publication of the 3rd Edition of the *Horæ*, with its Historic Sketch of Apocalyptic Interpretation, Mr. C. Maitland published his Book entitled "The Apostolic School of Prophetic Interpretation," which consists very mainly of an historic sketch on the same subject. Mr. C. M. had my Sketch before him while writing this; as appears from his reference to my 4th Volume containing it, at his p. 53, and various notices apparently borrowed from it throughout.—In revising this Part of my Work I have, in my turn, had the advantage of keeping his Treatise before me; and found it useful both otherwise, and especially as a check to my own notices of the same expositors: the more so because his views of the Apocalyptic prophecy are essentially different from my own, being mainly those of the *futurist* school. His Treatise is indeed almost professedly drawn up with the object of inculcating that particular view of prophetic interpretation. Which circumstance imposes on me the duty of checking, and when incorrect (which he too frequently is) correcting his statements; especially with reference to the 1st and 2nd Periods of my Sketch.

under review. Before that time, however, various brief hermeneutic notices of certain parts of the Apocalypse had been given to the Christian world by some of the earlier fathers, *Justin Martyr*, *Irenæus*, *Tertullian*, *Hippolytus*, and also by the Christian *Pseudo-Sibyl*: notices ranging in date from about the middle of the 2nd to the middle of the 3rd century; and which are too interesting to be past over in an inquiry into the history of Apocalyptic interpretation. I have indeed already partially noticed them, in my sketches of the æras or of the topics that they relate to, in the foregoing Commentary. But I think it will be well here to present them again connectedly in one point of view, and somewhat more in full, as the fittest introduction to our whole subject.<sup>1</sup>

1. As regards the *Pseudo-Sibylline oracles*,—poems which were written and circulated under that title, through the pious fraud of certain Christians, about the middle of the 2nd century,—my readers will already have learnt from previous citations given from them in

<sup>1</sup> I do not specify the *pseudo-Barnabas*, who wrote probably early in the 2nd century, because we find nothing distinctively *Apocalyptic* in his Epistle:—except indeed in regard of that passage about the six days of creation and following sabbath, viewed as types of the world's six millenniums of duration, and seventh millennium of rest consequent on them, which will be found cited in the Chapter in my Appendix on the present æra in the world's chronology.

I call this writer the *pseudo-Barnabas*, because of having no doubt in my own mind as to his not being the *apostle* Barnabas. The Jewish temple had evidently been destroyed when the Epistle was written; and Barnabas probably died before that event. The author writes as if a Gentile, whereas Barnabas was a Jew: and moreover with such strange mistakes of fact about certain of the Levitical rites and ceremonies as, it seems to me, impossible a Jewish Levite like Barnabas could have made: and fancies too as to typical meanings in them, such as ill consist with the idea of that apostolic companion of the apostles having been their inditer.

For the same reason in part I omit noticing the so-called *Hermas'* writings, not doubting that the writer's assumption of that apostolic name is a fraud; as nearly all critics, following Tertullian's indignant rejection of its apostolicity, (*De Pudicit.* 10, 20,) admit: also because of there appearing nothing in them of distinct and particular Apocalyptic interpretation. As a general witness to the genuineness of the Apocalypse he is cited by me in the Preliminary Essay to my Book, Vol. i. pp. 9—11.

Further I omit all notice of the *2nd Book of Esdras*; as I incline with Dr. Lawrence to deem it the work of a Jew, written just before Jesus Christ's birth. The famous passage, Ch. vii. 28, which speaks of *Jesus* by name, is wanting in the Ethiopic version; where we read simply, "My *Messiah* shall be revealed," not "My son *Jesus*." Hence Dr. Lawrence deems the passage in the Latin Arabic to be an interpolation, or marginal gloss, by some Christian hand. Further the two first Chapters, in which there might seem to be allusions to certain New Testament Scriptures, (especially Ch. ii. 42—46,) are wanting in both the Arabic and Ethiopic versions.

Mr C. Maitland, on the contrary, pp. 111—119, opens his Sketch of Christian Prophetic Interpretation by notices of the soi-disant *Barnabas*, as really the apostle of

this Book,<sup>1</sup> that *the destruction of Rome*, the *Apocalyptic Babylon*,<sup>2</sup> was one prominent subject in them ; and with ideas about it evidently borrowed from the Apocalypse. In Book viii., more especially, it is the burden of the song. And this will be found to be the idea of the writer, or writers, as to events connected with it:—that the destroyer Antichrist, himself of Latin extraction,<sup>3</sup> would be the first author of its ruin ; this Antichrist equalling himself with God, and being (as is hinted<sup>4</sup>) *the Emperor Nero* restored to life again, and now coming back from Asia in alliance with the Jews ; but that the grand and final destruction would be by direct judgment from heaven. “Descending from on high thou shalt dwell underneath the earth ; with naphtha and asphalt, and sulphur and much fire, thou shalt disappear, and become as burning ashes for ever.<sup>5</sup> And every one who looks on thee shall hear the deep sound of thy wailing from hell, and thy gnashing<sup>7</sup> of teeth.”—Then, on Rome’s end, there would follow speedily, according to our Sibyl, the world’s end:<sup>6</sup> and then, on the opening of the first octad,<sup>7</sup> another and better world.

that name ; *Hermas*, with “his gushes of penitence, &c.,” as the *Hermas* of Rom. xvi. 14 ; and of the *2nd Book of Esdras*, as really the writing of a Christian.

<sup>1</sup> See my Vol. i. pp. 230, 231.

<sup>2</sup> The name given by the Poet in various places to Rome ; e. g. Book v. p. 312 ; (Ed. Paris 1599.)

Και φλεξει ποντον βαθυν, αυτην τε Βαβυλωνα,  
Ιταλιης γαιων θ’.

<sup>3</sup> So p. 368 ;

Ω βασιλευ μεγαλαυχε, Λατινιδος εκγονε Ῥωμης.

This *Latin* appellation of Rome appears often elsewhere in the Book : so that I cannot but incline to think that it had reference to *Λατινιος*, as the name and number of the Beast ; the same that was soon afterwards specified by Irenæus.

<sup>4</sup> Sometimes designated as the *mother-murderer* ; sometimes by the number 50, as the numeral value of ν’, the first letter of his name.

The former designative occurs, for example, in Book viii.

ὅταν γ’ επανελθῃ

Εκ περατων γαιης ὁ φυγας μητροκτονος ελθων, . . .

Και τότε πευθησεις.

The latter occurs in Book v. p. 303 ;

Πεντηκοντα, δ’ οστις κροειην λαχε κοιρανος εσται,

Δεινος οφισ, φυσσων πολεμον’ . . .

Αλλ’ εσται και αϊστος ὁ λογιος· ειτ’ ανακαμψει,

Ισαζων Θεω αυτον· ελεγξει δ’ ου μιν εοντα.

<sup>5</sup> Elsewhere the writer notes in contrast the then flourishing state not only of Rome but its *Campagna* ; το πεδον Ῥωμης εριθελον’ a statement very illustrative of what I have said at p. 38 *suprà*.

<sup>6</sup> B. viii. p. 368.—This was to be when Rome had fulfilled the number of the years destined her in her name Ῥωμη, viz. 100 + 800 + 40 + 8 = 948.

Τρις δε τριηκοσιους και τεσσαυρακοντα και οκτω

Πληρωσεις λυκαβαντας’ . . τεον ονομα πληρωσασα.

<sup>7</sup> B. vii. p. 359 ;

2. In *Justin Martyr* the chief direct reference to the Apocalypse is on the *millennium* announced by it; which, as we have seen,<sup>1</sup> he interpreted literally:—how St. John prophesied that believers in Christ would reign 1000 years with Him in Jerusalem, Jerusalem having been restored, enlarged, and beautified, agreeably with the Old Testament prophecies of the latter day; after which would follow the general resurrection and judgment. Further, in regard to *Antichrist*, though referring for authority more directly to Daniel,<sup>2</sup> yet it is evident that he considered the Apocalyptic ten-horned Beast, or rather its ruling head, to be identical with Daniel's little horn of the fourth wild Beast;<sup>3</sup> and each and either identical with St. Paul's Man of Sin, and St. John's Antichrist: also that he regarded this Antichrist as still future, though at the very doors; as destined to reign literally  $3\frac{1}{2}$  years; and as to be destroyed by Christ's glorious advent.<sup>4</sup>

3. In *Irenæus* again these are the two chief Apocalyptic subjects commented on; and with just the same opinions respecting them as Justin Martyr's. But his comments are fuller.

With reference more especially to the great subject of the Apocalyptic Beast, *Antichrist*, he directed his readers, as we saw long since,<sup>5</sup> to look out for the division of the Roman empire into ten kingdoms, as that which was immediately to precede, and be followed by, Antichrist's manifestation. We saw too his jealousy that the true number of Antichrist's name, 666, as in the most genuine manuscripts, not 616, as in certain falsified copies, should be well understood: also how he thought that, as being in some way of *Roman* polity or connection, (even though by birth a *Jew*,) Antichrist's characteristic title, in fulfilment of the Apocalyptic enigma, might very

Εν δε τριτω κληρω περιτελλομενων ενιαντων,  
Ογδοατης πρωτης αλλος παλι κοσμος οραται.

Is this *Barnabas'* octad?—Compare the anti-premillennarian Jerome's notice of the Christian sabbath as the 8th day.

<sup>1</sup> See the Note p. 134 supra.

<sup>2</sup> See the Note Vol. i. p. 229.

<sup>3</sup> Because the millennium of the risen saints' reign with Christ, which in the Apocalypse is made to follow immediately after the destruction of the Apocalyptic Beast, by some interposition of Christ from heaven, is by Justin stated to follow immediately after the destruction of Daniel's Little Horn, or Antichrist.

<sup>4</sup> See Vol. i. p. 230, Note 2.—He intimates further his expectation of *Elias* coming literally and personally before Christ's second advent. But he says this without any reference to the two witnesses of the Apocalyptic prophecy, such as Mr. C. Maitland ascribes to him, p. 140.

<sup>5</sup> See the quotations in my Note Vol. i. p. 229



probably be *Λατρεῖνος*, the *Latin Man*, seeing that they who then held the world's empire were *Latins*; a name numerally equivalent to 666.<sup>1</sup>—The *second lamb-like Beast* Irenæus calls the first Beast's armour-bearer; and also "the False Prophet," as in Apoc. xix.<sup>2</sup> Under a notion of the Antichrist being a false Christ of *Jewish* origin, he fancifully suggests that the omission of *Dan* from those tribes of Israel out of whom an election was sealed, in Apoc. vii., might be an intimation of that being Antichrist's tribe.<sup>3</sup> His idea of Antichrist sitting in *the rebuilt temple of Jerusalem*, and *there* showing himself as God, "setting aside all idols," in order to concentrate men's worship on himself, belongs to St. Paul's prophecy of Antichrist, not St. John's; and his idea of Antichrist's  $3\frac{1}{2}$  years being the half of the last of Daniel's 70 hebdomads, not to St. John, but Daniel.<sup>4</sup> Again that of "Antichrist's fulfilling the part of the unjust judge in St. Luke, by avenging the Jews of their adversaries the Romans, and transferring the empire to Jerusalem," is altogether extra-Apocalyptic; and I must add very fanciful. Yet on this he mainly grounds his as yet peculiar opinion that Antichrist would transfer the seat of empire to Jerusalem, and there sit in the temple of God as if he were the Christ and God.<sup>5</sup>

There is yet another direct point of Apocalyptic explanation to be

<sup>1</sup> On the whole however, we saw, he preferred the name *Teitan*.

<sup>2</sup> v. 28.

<sup>3</sup> In support of this idea Irenæus (v. 30) strangely refers to Jer viii. 16, "The snorting of his horses was heard from *Dan*," as if said of Antichrist's emerging from out of that tribe. And Mr. C. M. as strangely, pp. 157—159, seems to approve and endorse the interpretation. The reader need only refer to Jeremiah in order to see that it is said, as Lowth explains it, "of the *Chaldean* army marching into Judæa through the tribe of *Dan*:" that being the northernmost district of the territory of Israel.

<sup>4</sup> It may be well to observe here that Irenæus says nothing of any of Daniel's hebdomads except the last. Whether with his contemporary Judas (see Euseb. H. E. vi. 6) he supposed the 70 hebdomads to reach continuously to the consummation, through some different view from that which is commonly received of their commencing date, —or whether with Hippolytus he supposed the last hebdomad to be separated from the rest in the prophet's intention by a chronological break,—does not appear.—See my notice of this subject at the end of the Section.

<sup>5</sup> I say very mainly; because he also refers to one and another passage in Daniel about the sanctuary being desolate, and the abomination of desolation resting in it, as if meaning the Jerusalem (rebuilt) temple; viz. Dan. viii. 13, and Dan. ix. 27. But it is in nearest connexion with the parable in St. Luke. "Ipse est iniquus iudex . . . ad quem fugit vidua oblita Dei, id est terrena Hierusalem ad ulciscendum de inimico. Quod et faciet in tempore regni sui. *Transferet regnum in eam*; et in templo Dei sedebit seducens eos qui adorant eum quasi ipse sit Christus," v. 26. So Irenæus would make Antichrist's empire a *fifth* mundane great empire, with new and different capital from Rome, in direct contradiction to Dan. ii., vii., which alike state that there would be but *four* previous to the reign of Messiah.

noted in Irenæus. We find in his 4th Book a passing notice of the *white horse and rider* of the first Apocalyptic Seal; and explanation of it as signifying Christ born to victory, and going forth conquering and to conquer.<sup>1</sup> This is quite a detached comment; without any reference to the contrasted symbols of the Seals following.—I may add too that he makes the Apocalyptic *altar* to be that on which Christians' prayers and praises are offered *in heaven*, not that of the earthly Jerusalem.<sup>2</sup> And so again of the Apocalyptic *temple*.

#### 4. Next turn we to *Tertullian*.

And on the subject of *Antichrist*, while agreeing with Irenæus in expecting his development chronologically after the breaking up of the Roman State into ten kings, or kingdoms, all in strict accordance with the Apocalypse, I see in Tertullian no intimation of his entertaining any such idea as Irenæus' as to this Antichrist being a Jew of the tribe of Dan; or of his fixing an abomination of desolation, in the sense of his own worship, in any rebuilt temple at Jerusalem.<sup>3</sup> Nor again does he, like Irenæus, refer to the last of Daniel's 70 prophetic weeks, as furnishing out the time of  $3\frac{1}{2}$  years to the two witnesses, and  $3\frac{1}{2}$  to Antichrist. On the contrary he in one place elaborately draws out a sketch of the chronology, from the first year of Darius to that of Jerusalem's destruction by the Romans under Titus, to show that the whole 70 weeks were then fully completed, and the whole prophecy then accomplished.<sup>4</sup> And indeed it is evident that he regarded the  $3\frac{1}{2}$  years of the witnesses and  $3\frac{1}{2}$  years of Antichrist as one and the same; for in his view the death of the *former* was to be the death of the *latter*.<sup>5</sup> Moreover again and again

<sup>1</sup> "Ad hoc enim nascebatur Dominus;" (viz. to overthrow his adversary, like his anti-type Jacob;) "de quo et Joannes in Apocalypsi ait, *Exivit vincens ut vinceret.*" iv. 38.

<sup>2</sup> "Est ergo *altare* in cœlis. Illuc enim preces nostræ et oblationes diriguntur; et ad *templum*; quemadmodum Joannes in Apocalypsi ait, *Et apertum est templum Dei.*" iv. 34, ad fin. Irenæus' reference here is to Apoc. xi. 19, or xv. 5. But it is quite evident from the passage that he would have expounded the temple scene in Apoc. viii. 3, where incense was given to the Angel, of Christian worship also.

<sup>3</sup> More than once he expounds what St. Paul says about *Antichrist's sitting in the temple of God, &c.*, of pseudo-Christian heretics like the Marcionites sitting in the professing Christian Church.

<sup>4</sup> "Ita in diem expugnationis suæ Judæi impleverunt hebdomadas LXX prædictas à Daniele. Igitur, expletis his quoque temporibus, et debellatis Judæis, postea cessaverunt illic libamina et sacrificia, &c." Adv. Jud. 8.

See my notice on Daniel's hebdomads at the end of this Section.

<sup>5</sup> See p. 282 Note <sup>2</sup> infra.



Apocalyptic prefigurative drama.<sup>1</sup> The palm-bearers of the *latter* vision, that had to come out of the great tribulation, he identifies as that same second set of martyrs that had been predicted to the souls under the altar;—those that were to make up the martyr-complement by suffering under *Antichrist*, and so suffering to become triumphant, and attain Paradise. And hence chiefly he formed to himself an *Apocalyptic plan*, and “*ordo temporum*” in the prophecy:—how that before the judgment and vindication promised to the souls under the altar, the imperial harlot-city Rome was to be destroyed by the ten kings, (mark, not the ten kings *and Antichrist*), after the vial-plagues had first been poured out on its empire: then the Beast Antichrist to rise, make war conjunctively with his False Prophet on the Church, and add an innumerable multitude of sufferers, during the tribulation of his tyranny, to the martyrs previously slain under Pagan Rome, Christ’s two Witnesses, Enoch and Elijah, specially inclusive:<sup>2</sup> then, Antichrist having been thereupon destroyed from heaven, and the Devil shut up in the abyss, the privilege of the first resurrection, and millennial reign with Christ, to be allotted to its chosen participants; and afterwards the conflagration to follow, in which fire the seven-hilled Babylon, with its persecuting princes and provincial governors, would meet their ultimate destruction and torment;<sup>3</sup> and the general resurrection and judgment.

As to the *Apocalyptic millennium*, Tertullian’s view will have been seen by the citations in my Millennial Chapter to be precisely similar to that of the two preceding Fathers.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Mr. C. Maitland says, p. 164; “This passage contains the earliest identification of the 5th Seal martyrs with those who suffer under Antichrist.” It will be seen I believe that, instead of this, Tertullian expressly distinguishes the 5th Seal martyrs, as the *first* set of martyrs, from the *second* set that were to follow under Antichrist.—The white robes of the palm-bearers in Apoc. vii., robes washed white by them in the blood of the Lamb *before death*, are also unadvisedly identified by Mr. C. M. with the white robes of the martyrs in Apoc. vi. 11;—white robes given them in vision *after death*.

<sup>2</sup> “Translatus est Enoch et Elias, nec mors eorum reperta est, dilata scilicet. Cæterum morituri reservantur, ut Antichristum sanguine suo extinguant.” De Anim. 50.

In another place, Adv. Marc. iv. 22, he explains *Zachariah’s* two olive-trees as *Moses* and *Elias*.

<sup>3</sup> “How shall I admire, how exult, when I behold so many proud monarchs, reported to have been received into heaven, groaning in the lowest abyss of darkness; so many provincial governors who persecuted the name of the Lord liquifying in fiercer fire than they ever kindled against the Christians!” De Spectac. c. 30. Cited already by me under my 5th Seal, Vol. i. p. 224.

<sup>4</sup> See on his millenary view the abbreviated extract given in the Note p. 134



Altogether Tertullian's is an eminently common-sense view of the prophecy; viz. as a prefigurative drama, in orderly succession, of the chief eras and events in the history of the Church and of the world, from Christ's first coming, or near it, to his second.<sup>1</sup> Excepting his view of Enoch and Elijah as the witnesses, there seems to me little on which we might not even now join hands in concord with the venerable and sagacious expositor.

5. Next comes into review on this head *Hippolytus*, Bishop of Portus Romanus, now well ascertained to be the modern Ostia:<sup>2</sup>—one who was an immediate successor of Irenæus and Tertullian, indeed it is said Irenæus' disciple;<sup>3</sup> and who suffered martyrdom, probably about A.D. 235, or 250, under the Emperor Maximin, or the Emperor Decius.<sup>4</sup> Jerome reports that he wrote a Treatise specifically on the Apocalypse, as well as one on Antichrist.<sup>5</sup> If so, the former has perished. But there is still extant a short Treatise purporting to be that by him on *Christ and Antichrist*, and with every mark of genuineness.<sup>6</sup> This includes in it sundry Apocalyptic notices of much interest; and I therefore give the following brief abstract.

suprà. But it will be quite worth the reader's while to read the whole passage from which this extract is taken; which passage, I see, is given by Bishop Kaye in his Tertullian, p. 362.

Respecting the New Jerusalem, as will be there seen, his idea was that it was to be of *heavenly fabric*; and would descend *from heaven* to be the abode of the resurrection saints during the Millennium. That he did not expect the converted Jews, still in a mortal state, to be restored to, and to occupy their own land of Judah, appears from the general anti-Judaic tone of his remarks. (See for example my extract from him p. 280, in the Note 4.) In one place however he tells of a glorious city which had been seen shortly before *in Judæa* for forty successive days, suspended in the air at break of morning; the image, it was supposed, and he believed it, of the New Jerusalem. And perhaps he may hence be supposed to have had an idea of Judæa, as the chief local point of the manifestation of the glories of the heavenly Jerusalem, during the millennium. But nothing more.

<sup>1</sup> So too as to Christ's prophecy of Jerusalem's destruction, Tertullian, with the same common-sense eye, regards it as an *orderly* prophecy, from a commencing date of the time when it was spoken: "Interrogatus à discipulis quando eventura essent quæ interim de templi exitu cruerant, ordinem temporum primo Judaicorum, usque ad excidium Jerusalem, dehinc communium, usque ad conclusionem seculi, dirigit." De Res. Carn. 22.

<sup>2</sup> See my notice on this point, Vol. i. p. 26, Note 2.

<sup>3</sup> So Photius, apparently on the authority of Hippolytus himself; Μαθητης Ειρημαιου ο' Ιππολυτος. . . Ταυτας δε φησιν ελεγχοις υποβληθηναι ομιλουντος Ειρημαιου. Quoted by Lardner, Vol. ii. p. 424.

<sup>4</sup> Lardner, p. 428.

<sup>5</sup> Ib. 422.

<sup>6</sup> I may specify particularly the clause following; which shows the Treatise to have been written in the times of Pagan persecution, and so before Constantine's establish-

After observing on God's will that the mysteries of the future, foreshown by the ancient Prophets, or *seers*, should be concealed from none of his servants, he opens his subject by laying down strongly respecting the coming Antichrist, even as if his grand characteristic, (a view derived evidently in part at least from the Apocalypse,<sup>1</sup>) that he would in everything affect resemblance to Christ. "The seducer will seek to appear in all things like the Son of God. As Christ a Lion, so he a lion; as Christ a King, so he a king; as Christ a Lamb, so he as a lamb, though inwardly a wolf; as Christ sent out apostles to all nations, so will he similarly send out false apostles:"<sup>2</sup> it being added that he would have also a similar connexion with the Jewish people.<sup>3</sup> Then, after extracts from other Scriptures, and especially from Daniel's two great symbolic prophecies of the quadripartite Image and the four wild Beasts, which he explains, just like the other Fathers, of the Babylonish, Persian, Macedonian, and Roman empires, and the little horn of the fourth Beast as Antichrist, he thus turns to the Apocalypse for information as to the fated end of both Antichrist himself, and his city Rome:—"Tell me, blessed John, thou apostle and disciple of the Lord, what hast thou heard and seen respecting Babylon: wake up, and speak; for it was she that exiled thee to Patmos."<sup>4</sup> And then he gives in full the two Chapters, Apoc. xvii. and xviii., containing the Angel's explanation of the beast-riding Harlot, and the consequent vision of her destruction. And, adding and interweaving other explanatory notices both from the Apocalypse and Daniel, he expounds the whole subject to the effect following:—that the *last* of Daniel's 70 weeks, (for he insulates this

ment of Christianity. Αλλ' ἢ μεις οἵτινες ἐλπίζουτες εἰς τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ διώκωμεθα ὑπ' αὐτῶν τῶν ἀπιστῶν. Ch. 59. Moreover every such notice of monasticism, and of the Virgo Deipara, as are found in the spurious Treatise *De Consummatione Mundi ac de Antichristo*, bearing Hippolytus' name, and with much of his real Treatise incorporated, are here wanting;—notices which savour of the latter half of the 4th century, or a period yet later.

<sup>1</sup> Antichrist's affected likeness to a *lamb*, which is one of the points here specified, is in a later part of the Treatise expressly inferred by Hippolytus from the Apocalyptic figuration of Antichrist and his False Prophet as a *two-horned lamb-like Beast*: τὸ δε εἰπεῖν τὰ κέρατα αὐτῆ ὁμοία ἀρνίῳ, ὅτι ἐξομοισθαι μέλλει τῷ υἱῷ τῆ Θεῶν. ch. 49.—Compare Tertullian's explanation of the symbol, p. 281 Note <sup>2</sup> *supra*.—In Mr. C. M.'s sketch of Hippolytus' prophetic views this important passage is not referred to.

<sup>2</sup> Ch. 6; referred to already, Vol. ii. p. 85, Note <sup>5</sup>.

<sup>3</sup> ἐν περιτομῇ ὁ Σωτὴρ ἦλθεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον, καὶ αὐτός (ὁ Ἀντιχριστός) ὁμοίως ἐλευσεται.

<sup>4</sup> Ch. 36.

last from the rest, in the manner stated below,)<sup>1</sup> that in which the Lord would confirm the covenant with many, and in the half of which would occur the taking away of the daily sacrifice and oblation, would fall at the end of the world:—that in the former half of it, or first  $3\frac{1}{2}$  years, Enoch and Elias would preach as Christ's two sackcloth-robed witnesses, the precursors of Christ's second advent, as John the Baptist was of the first; <sup>2</sup> and its latter half, or next  $3\frac{1}{2}$  years, include the rise and reign of Antichrist, his slaying of the Witnesses marking its commencement:—that of the two Apocalyptic Beasts the former, or *seven-headed ten-horned Beast*,<sup>3</sup> meant the heathen Roman empire, wounded to death by a sword; the other, or *two-horned lamb-like Beast*, Antichrist, inclusive of his False Prophet; who would revive as it were the *image* or *ghost* of the old empire, (such is his singular and ingenious interpretation of *the giving life to the image of the Beast*, and *making it speak*,) just as Augustus once did to it by his new laws and constitution;<sup>4</sup> and might thence very probably have *Λατεινος*,

<sup>1</sup> Ib. p. 5.—Hippolytus was, I believe, the first author of the chronological separation of the last week of Daniel from its fellows. Jerome on Dan. ix. states Hippolytus' view to the effect following:—that 7 hebdomads of the 70 were to elapse before the Jews' return from Babylon, 62 after these to Christ's birth; (a clear mistake, says Jerome, since from Cyrus to Christ there would be 560 years;) then the last hebdomad, quite separate from the rest, to occur at the end of the world, and be divided between Elias and Antichrist, as stated in the text.

<sup>2</sup> Christ's precursor, says Hippolytus, in preaching the gospel to the souls in Hades. ch. 46, p. 6.

<sup>3</sup> With regard to this seven-headed ten-horned Beast, it appears from Andreas's Comment on Apoc. xvii. 10 that Hippolytus explained his seven heads of the seven ages or millenniums of the world; five of which had past (according to the Septuagint chronology) when St. John received the revelation in Patmos, the sixth was then current, and the seventh when it came must continue, he thought, but a little space. How so, he does not explain.—I presume this is taken by Andreas from Hippolytus' Treatise on the Apocalypse; as I have not found it either in the true or the spurious Treatise of Hippolytus on Antichrist.

<sup>4</sup> Το μεν ουν θηριον αναβαινον εκ της γης την βασιλειαν την του Αντιχριστου εσομενην λεγει . . . το δε και την εξουσιαν του πρωτου θηριου εποκει, και ποιει την γην και τους εν αυτη κατοικουντας ινα προσκυνησωσι το θηριον το πρωτον, ου εθεραπευθη η πληγη του θανατου αυτου,—τουτο σημαινει οτι κατα τον Αυγουστου νομον, αφ' ου και η βασιλεια 'Ρωμαιων συνεστη, ουτω και αυτος κελουσει και διαταξει απαντα επικυριων, δια τουτου δοξαν ευουτου πλειονα περιποιουημενος. Τουτο γαρ εστι το θηριον το τεταρτον ου επληγη η κεφαλη, και παλιν εθεραπευθη, δια το καταλοθηναι αυτην, η και ατιμασθηναι, και εις δεκα διαδηματα αναλυθηναι. 'Ος τοτε πανουργος αν ωσπερ θεραπευσει αυτην και ανανεωσει. Τουτο γαρ εστι το ειρημενον υπο του προφητου, οτι δωσει πνευμα τη εικονι, και λαλησει η εικων του θηριου ενεργησει γαρ και ισχυσει παλιν δια του υπ' αυτου οριζομενου νομον. Ch. 49. So, according to Hippolytus, Antichrist's empire would be the old imperial Roman empire revived: not, as Irenæus and Mr. C. M., a 5th empire, which Daniel expressly excludes.

This most important passage in Hippolytus' prophetic views is silently past over by Mr. C. Maitland.

the *Latin Man*, as his designative title, a name containing the fated number 666: <sup>1</sup> (the whole passage is every way most observable:) that meanwhile the Church, figured in Apoc. xii. as a travelling woman, because of daily bringing forth Christ (or Christ's members) by her preaching in the world,<sup>2</sup> and clothed with the *Divine Word*, as the sun, and the starry crown of the twelve apostles, would, while the Antichrist established his abomination in the holy place,<sup>3</sup> flee to the mountains, pursued from city to city by him, and sustained only by faith in Christ crucified; his arms, extended on the cross, being like the sustaining wings of the great eagle in the Apocalyptic vision:— and that then, and thereupon, Christ's coming would take place; Antichrist be destroyed by its brightness; the first resurrection of the saints follow; the just, welcomed by Christ, take the kingdom prepared for them (Matt. xxv.) from the world's beginning, and, as Daniel says, shine forth in it as the sun and the stars; the judgment of the conflagration being meanwhile executed on unbelievers; and so Isaiah's word fulfilled, "They shall go forth and look on the carcasses of the men that have sinned against me: for their worm dieth not, nor is their fire quenched; and they shall be for a spectacle to all flesh."<sup>4</sup>

6. Next the name occurs of the famous *Origen*, Hippolytus' con-

<sup>1</sup> After mentioning 666 as the Beast's number, and Teitan and Euanthas as answering to the numeral, he goes on thus. ΑΛΛ' επειδη προεφθημεν λεγοντες οτι εθεραπευθη η πληγη του θηριου του πρωτου, και ποιησει λαλειν την εικονα, τουτ' εστιν ισχυσαι, φανερον δ' ετι πασιν οτι οι κρατουντες επι νυν εισι Λατινοι, εις ενος ουν ανθρωπου ονομα μεταγομενον γινεται Λατεινος. c. 50. A passage already cited by me Vol. iii. p. 248.

Mr. C. M. writes thus, p. 168; "Like Irenæus, our bishop knows many names that make the number of the Beast. He prefers the word (*αρνουμαι*) *I deny*, doubtless from the predicted denial of Christ's being come in the flesh." I regret that Mr. C. Maitland should have so written. He had the two Treatises before him, the *genuine* and the *spurious*. He cites the above, which is only in the spurious one, as Hippolytus' solution; and leaves the genuine Treatise, and its preferred solution of the name, Λατεινος, unnoticed!

<sup>2</sup> Και εν γατρι εχουσα κραζει ωδινουσα, και βασανιζομενη τεκειν, οτι ου πανσεται η εκκλησια γεννωσα εκ καρδιας του λογου, τον εν κοσμω υπο απιστων διωκομενον . . . τον αρρενα και τελειον Χριτον, παιδα Θεου, Θεου και ανθρωπου καταγγελλομενου αι τικτουσα η εκκλησια διδασκει παντα τα εθνη. Again, ου the words "caught up to God;" ηρπαγη το τεκνον αυτης προς τον Θεον και τον θρονον αυτου, οτι επορευανιος εστι βασιλευς, και ουκ επιγειος ο δι' αυτης αι γεννωμενος.

<sup>3</sup> Hippolytus does not expressly define the locality as *Jerusalem*. I should rather suppose however that he means it: though how to reconcile this with the Antichrist's complete restoration of Rome's empire, as by a second Augustus, may seem difficult.

<sup>4</sup> Ad fin. ch. 65.



temporary; who has however left but little in his commentaries on Apocalyptic interpretation.<sup>1</sup> It may be well however to mark the three notices following.

1. Of the Apocalyptic book (Apoc. v.), “written *within* and *without*,” he explains the writing *without* as the obvious *literal* meaning; the writing *within* as its spiritual meaning.

2. The 144,000, both in Apoc. vii. and xiv., he explains as true Christians.<sup>2</sup>

3. Regarding the *Antichrist* whom he evidently identifies with the Apocalyptic Beast warred against by him that sate on the white horse in Apoc. xix., “the Word of God,” he strongly expresses his opinion, just like Hippolytus, as to the hypocrisy with which he would usurpingly ascribe to himself the titles, character, and functions of the true Christ.<sup>3</sup>

In passing on, the names of *Dionysius* and *Nepos* occur about A.D. 250, known in connexion with the Millennarian controversy, and so with the *Apocalypse* and its genuineness; on which points, however, I have before spoken at the beginning of the Work.<sup>4</sup> Of these there is no need to speak more now.—I proceed therefore,

7thly, to *Victorinus*; the author, as before observed, of the earliest profest and continuous Apocalyptic Commentary now extant; and who died by martyrdom under the persecution of Diocletian. His Commentary is noticed by Jerome, who speaks of it as one of millenarian views.<sup>5</sup> And hence has arisen a doubt as to the genuineness of the Treatise still extant, that goes under the name of Victorinus’

<sup>1</sup> So in his Commentary on John, Vol. ii. p. 90. [Ed. Huët.]      <sup>2</sup> Ibid. pp. 1, 2.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid. pp. 52—54. The passage is so remarkable that I must transcribe it in part. After speaking of Christ in the language of Apoc. xix. as Ὁ Λογος τῆ Θεοῦ, ὁ πιστος καλημενος, και αληθινος, και εν δικαιοσυνη κρινει και πολεμει, he thus turns to his conflict with the great usurper Antichrist. Επαν δε αυτος μεν πρεσβευη περι αληθειας, ὁ δ’ ὑποκρινομενος ειναι Λογος, η Λογος ων, και ἡ ἑαυτην την αυγορευουσα αληθειαν, εκ αληθεια τυγκανησα, αλλα ψευδος, φασκη ειναι ἑαυτην την αληθειαν, τοτε καθοπλισαμενος ὁ Λογος κατα τῆ ψευδὸς αναλοι αυτο τῶ πνευματι τῆ σοματος, και καταργει τη επιφανεια της παρεσιας αυτη. (2 Thess. ii.)

He then dwells on the distinctives of Christ as enumerated by St. John in his description of the sinner on the white horse in Apoc. xix. in such a manner as to imply pretty plainly that he did not so view the rider on the white horse in Apoc. vi., where all these characteristics are wanting.

<sup>4</sup> See my Vol. i. pp. 3—7, 26.

<sup>5</sup> “Et Papias Hierapolites Episcopus, et Nepos in Ægypti partibus Episcopus, de mille annorum regno ita ut Victorinus senserunt.” Cited B. P. M. iii. 414.

Treatise on the Apocalypse ; containing as it does, at its conclusion, a distinct anti-millennarian declaration.<sup>1</sup> But the objection vanishes on examination ; for various indubitable millennarian intimations occur in the body of the Commentary :<sup>2</sup> and the anti-millennarian passage is an evident interpolation by another hand, probably Jerome's own ;<sup>3</sup> as well as one or two shorter passages elsewhere.<sup>4</sup> Moreover in Ambrose Ansbert I have observed a reference to the true Victorinus' statement on a rather singular point ; which precise statement we find in the extant Commentary.<sup>5</sup>—In the edition given in the Bibliotheca Patrum Maxima, now before me, there is the farther disadvantage of transposition of various parts of the Comment from their right places. But the Apocalypse itself makes the rectification of this easy, as Victorinus' is evidently an orderly Comment on it.—I have only further to premise, that the work is very short, occupying but seven folio pages, or fourteen columns in the Bibliotheca, Vol. iii. pp. 414—421. Of these fourteen columns, three and a half

<sup>1</sup> "Audiendi non sunt qui mille annorum regnum terrenum esse confirmant ; qui cum Cherintho hæretico sentiunt." Ad fu. B. P. M. iii. 421.

<sup>2</sup> 1. On the Epistle to the Church of Thyatira, "I will give him the *morning star*," the explanation is given, "Primam resurrectionem scilicet promisit : " and again, on "I will give him power over nations," "id est, iudicem illum constituet inter cæteros sanctos." p. 416.

2. Speaking of the nations to be destroyed at Christ's coming, ("gentibus perituris in adventu Domini,") as signified by various figurations, such as the harvest and the vintage, the writer adds, "Sed semel in adventu Domini, et consummationis, et regni Christi, et apertione regni sanctorum futurum est." p. 420.

3. "In Judæâ ubi omnes sancti conventuri sunt, et Dominum suum adoraturi."—p. 415.

Strange that Bellarmine should have overlooked all this ; and in his *De Scriptor. Eccl.* spoken of the extant Treatise as decidedly anti-millennarian !

<sup>3</sup> For Jerome, in returning the copy of Victorinus sent him, says that he had not only corrected the transcribers' errors, but himself made additions :—"Quia me literis obtestatus es . . . majorum statim libros revolve ; et quod in eorum commentariis reperi Victorini opusculis sociavi. Ab iotâ inde quæ ipse secundum literam senserit, à principio libri ad signum crucis quæ ab imperitis erant vitiata scriptoribus, correximus ; exinde usque ad finem voluminis addita esse cognosce." (ibid. 414.)—The anti-millennarian addition, of which I gave in Note <sup>1</sup> the concluding sentence, occupies near a column at the end of the Treatise as now printed. It gives Jerome's view of the first resurrection, to much the same effect as Augustine's ; but only, in true Hieronymic style of sentiment, with special notice of the *keeping of virginity*, as characterizing those millennarian priests and kings unto God, in regard of whom the Devil is bound.

<sup>4</sup> Especially at p. 417 ; where, Victorinus having mentioned twenty-four Books of the Old Testament, the gloss occurs ; "Sunt autem libri veteris Testamenti qui accipiuntur viginti quatuor, quos in Epitomis Theodori invenies : " in which the reference is to Theodorus, a writer of the sixth century.

<sup>5</sup> See the Note at p. 294 *infra*.

are devoted to the Apocalyptic introductory Vision and Epistles to the Seven Churches; three more to the Apocalyptic scenery; four to the Seals, Trumpets, and Witnesses; two to the Vision of the Dragon and the two Beasts; and one only to all the rest: herein well agreeing with what Cassiodorus says of it, that it only explained the more difficult passages.<sup>1</sup>—I now proceed to give an abstract of it: and this somewhat at large, as due to its chronological interest.

At its opening Victorinus dwells on the particulars of Christ's first appearance to St. John:—*his head and hair white* marking the antiquity of the Ancient of Days, for the head of Christ is God; and perhaps with reference, in the *wool* that it is compared with, to the sheep his members, in the *snow* to the multitude of baptismal candidates, white as snow-flakes from heaven: *his face as the sun* serving not only to express his glory, but the fact of his having risen, and set, and risen again in life on this world; *his long priestly robe* marking his priesthood; *his zone* the golden choir of the saints; *his breasts* the two Testaments, whence his people's nourishment; and the *sword from his mouth* his preached word, by which men shall be judged and Antichrist slain: *his voice* being likened to *many waters* with reference not only to its power, as that of many people, but perhaps too to the baptismal waters of salvation issuing from him; and *his feet to brass glowing from the furnace*, in reference to the apostles purified in the furnace of affliction, by whom he walks as it were in his preached gospel through the world.—Then, after a short notice of the Epistles to the Seven Churches, (which seven he explains as representatives of the Church Universal,<sup>2</sup>) he proceeds to the second series of visions, on the door being opened in heaven, and John called up thither: the heaven once shut having by Christ's satisfaction been opened; and in St. John's person, originally of the circumcision, but now a preacher of the New Testament, it being apparent that alike the faithful of either dispensation were now invited.<sup>3</sup> In the heavenly scene presented to John's view, the *throne* was that of Divine royalty and judgment; its *jasper* colour, as of

<sup>1</sup> So Professor M. Stuart, in his Apocalyptic Comment, i. 454.

<sup>2</sup> Like Paul, he adds; who first taught that seven Churches represented the Church Catholic, by addressing epistles to just seven Churches. For Victorinus' appended List seems not to have included that to the *Hebrews* among St. Paul's Epistles.

<sup>3</sup> Such seems to me his meaning; but it is obscure.—Thus early is St. John's *representative character* on the Apocalyptic scene hinted.

water, signifying God's earlier judgment by the waters of the deluge; its fiery *sardine* colour that to come by fire; and the *sea* before the throne the gift of baptism, and offer of salvation through it, previous to judgment. The *twenty-four elders* he explains as the twelve patriarchs and twelve apostles, seated on thrones of judgment: agreeably to the patriarchal privilege, "Dan shall judge his people," and the apostolic, "Ye shall sit on twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel:"—while the *four living creatures* typified the four evangelists, and their preaching of the gospel: the eyes within signifying the insight of that preaching into man's heart; and the six wings of each (twenty-four in all) having reference to the twenty-four books of the Old Testament, because it is only by help of the previous testimonies of those books that the Gospel can fly abroad.—The voices and thunderings from the throne meant God's preachings, and threats, and notices of Christ's coming to judgment; the seven torches of fire the Spirit, granted to men in virtue of Christ's crucifixion.—As to the *seven-sealed book*, it was the book of the Old Testament; a book, with its prophecies of things to occur in the last times,<sup>1</sup> opened by none but Christ: who alone, as the *lamb* that was slain, could fulfil its types and prophecies; alone as a *lion*, and through death, conquer death for man. Also the saints' new song of thanksgiving had reference to the new salvation and new blessings, now imparted to believers, especially of the glorious promised kingdom. Even if the opening of the Seals were simultaneous,(?) yet did the arrangement of them indicate order; the first Seal indicating what took place first,<sup>2</sup> the foreshowing of things that were to be in the last times.

Arrived thus at the opening of the *Seals*, Victorinus explains the *four horses and riders* of the first four Seals as indicating respectively the triumphant *progress of the Gospel*, begun from after Christ's ascension,<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> So I suppose we are to understand him. "Resignatio sigillorum, ut diximus, apertio est Veteris Testamenti, et prædicatorum prænunciatio in novissimo tempore futurorum." p. 417.

<sup>2</sup> "Quæ licet Scriptura prophetica per singula dicit, omnibus [tamen] simul apertis sigillis, ordinem tamen suum habet prædicatio. Nam, aperto primo sigillo, dicit se vidisse equum album et equitem coronatum, habentem arcum; hoc enim primo factum est." *ibid.*

<sup>3</sup> "Postquam enim ascendit in cælos Dominus, et aperuit universa, misit Spiritum suum; ejus verba prædicationis, tanquam sagittæ ad corda hominum pergentes, [ut] vincerent incredulitatem." *ib.* Thus, though he refers in the preceding context (cited



and the *wars, famines,*<sup>1</sup> and *pestilences,*<sup>2</sup> which Christ said would precede his second coming: also the fifth Seal's *souls under the altar*, as marking the continuous persecutions and martyrdoms of Christ's saints; for whose consolation, till the last great day of retribution, *white robes*, or joys of the Holy Spirit, are given: the region under the *brazen altar* of vision figuring the place under-ground where the separate spirits rest;<sup>3</sup> while the place of the *golden altar* (as being that to which our offerings of prayer and praise are brought)<sup>4</sup> typified heaven. Further, the *earthquake* of the sixth Seal he makes to be the last persecution:<sup>5</sup> that wherein the darkening of the true doctrine to the unfaithful would answer to the eclipsed sun in the vision, and the bloodshed of martyr-saints to the moon like blood: the falling away of vain professors from the Church, under force of persecution, fulfilling the symbol of the falling stars from heaven; and the removal of the Church itself from public sight that of the rolling away of the figured firmament.<sup>6</sup>—In the sealing vision, Apoc. vii., next following, the *four angels of the winds* (the same as the *four winds* of Apoc. ix. 14, *bound in the Euphrates*<sup>7</sup>) signified four nations, (nations being ruled over by angels,) who were not to transgress their limits till they should come in the last æra with the Antichrist; the *Angel from the East* meaning Elias; who would anticipate the times of Antichrist, turn the hearts of the fathers to the children, (i. e. of the Jews to the Gentile believers,) and convert to the faith

p. 288) to the *last times*, yet the vision is explained by Victorinus as having the *beginning* of its fulfilment from the time of Christ's ascension.

<sup>1</sup> "Hurt not the wine and oil" he explains, "Spirituallem hominem ne plagis percuresseris:" the *balance*; "Statera in manu libra examinis, in qua singulorum merita ostenderet." p. 418.

<sup>2</sup> He makes no mention of the limiting "*fourth part of the earth*," handed down to us in the present Greek text.

<sup>3</sup> "Sub arâ, id est sub terrâ. . . Ara ærea terra intelligitur; sub quâ est infernus, remota pœnis et ignibus regio, [an opinion like that of Tertullian and Jerome, cited p. 202 supra,] et requies sanctorum."—On the idea of the separate spirits of the saints (saints in the *Romish* sense) not having the beatific vision of God, the Editor appends a Note, *Cautè lege!* *ibid.*

<sup>4</sup> Matt. v. 23.

<sup>5</sup> He does not say the persecution by Antichrist: and one might almost suppose he meant one before his coming: as Elias' coming is next notified, who (according to Victorinus) was to precede Antichrist.

<sup>6</sup> Here, at p. 418, occurs the first marked disorder in the printed copy in the Bibliotheca: the comment there going on to Apoc. xi. 1; and the proper sequel, on Apoc. vii., not occurring till p. 419.

<sup>7</sup> So Victorinus; agreeably with the Gloss in Griesbach, which on Apoc. ix. 14 reads *τεσσαρας ανεμους*, for *τεσσαρας αγγελους*.

both many of Israel,<sup>1</sup> and a great multitude of Gentiles: of all whom, now united in one as God's elect, the white robes signified their washing in the blood of the Lamb by baptism, and subsequent preservation of the grace then given.<sup>2</sup>—In Apoc. viii. the *half-hour's silence* figured the beginning of eternal rest; one half-hour only being mentioned, to signify the subject's then breaking off. For chronological order is not followed in the Apocalypse:<sup>3</sup> but the Holy Spirit, when he has come to the chronological end, returns often, and repeats, by way of supplement.

Next comes the vision of the *incense-offering Angel*. Victorinus supposes this incense-offering to depict the prayers of saints: (specially, on Antichrist's reign approaching, the prayer that they may not enter into temptation:) the Angel being figured, because Angels offer the prayers of the Church, as well as pour out wrath on Antichrist's kingdom; which wrath was signified alike in the seven trumpets and seven vials, the one set of symbolizations supplying what was omitted in the other.<sup>4</sup>—As to the particular subjects of these Trumpets and Vials, he does not unfold it in detail. He only generally says of them, that they depict "either the ravages of plagues sent on the world, or the madness of Antichrist, or a diminishing of the peoples, or the variety and difference of the plagues,<sup>5</sup> or the hope of the saints' kingdom, or the ruin of states, or the destruction of the great city, Babylon,—i. e. *the Roman*." And just expounding, as he passes, the warning cry of the eagle flying in mid-heaven, after the fourth trumpet-woe, to mean the Holy Spirit's warning voice to men by the mouth of *the two prophets*, against the wrath to come in the impending plagues, he so proceeds to the Angel vision of Apoc. x.

<sup>1</sup> Elsewhere Victorinus explains the 144,000 as the elect *out of the Catholic Church*, converted in the last days by Elias. See p. 295 Note 4, *infra*.

<sup>2</sup> "Electorum numerum, qui per sanguinem agni baptismo purgati, suas stolas fecerunt candidas, servantes gratiam quam acceperunt," p. 419.—The white robes given in the *fifth* seal Victorinus had explained, we saw, as the gift of the Holy Spirit.

<sup>3</sup> "Semihora initium est quietis æternæ. Sed partem intellexit quia interruptio. Eadem per ordinem repetit." p. 419. He here, and elsewhere, strongly insists on the *retrogressive* character of certain of the visions. "... licet repetat per phialas; non quasi bis factum dicit; sed, quoniam semel futurum est quod est decretum à Deo ut fiat, ideo bis dicitur. Quidquid igitur in tubis minus dixit hinc in phialis est. Nec aspiciendus est ordo dictorum: quoniam sæpe Spiritus sanctus, ubi ad novissimi temporis finem percurrerit, rursus ad eadem tempora redit, et supplet ea quæ minus dixit. Nec requirendus est ordo in Apocalypsi, sed intellectus." *ibid.* <sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>5</sup> "*Differentia* plagarum." Or perhaps, *delaying*; with allusion to such passages as Apoc. ix. 12, x. 7, xi. 14. *ibid.*

The first part of which vision he makes refer, as a parenthesis, to St. John *personally*. The *Angel* is explained to be *Christ*; the *open book* in his hand the Apocalypse revealed to John; his *lion-like* voice, that declaring that now only is the time of repentance and hope; the *seven thunders* the mysteries of the future spoken through the prophets by the divine septiform Spirit; which voices John was not to write, because, as an apostle, of higher functions than that of *interpreting* Scripture mysteries; an office this latter belonging rather to Church subordinate functionaries afterwards.<sup>1</sup> Further, the charge to *eat the book*, and *preach again* to peoples and tongues, Victorinus explains of St. John's returning personally on Domitian's death to Ephesus, and publishing the Apocalypse;<sup>2</sup> also his *taking the measuring reed* with which to measure the Apocalyptic temple and altar, of St. John's further publishing his Gospel:<sup>3</sup> whereby, and by the creed laid down in it,<sup>4</sup> the orthodox and faithful were marked out and defined as true Church-worshippers; and heretics, like Valentinus, Ebion, and Cerinthus, as to be excluded from the Church.

On the *two Apocalyptic Witnesses* Victorinus supposes a passing, in the resumed figurations of the future, into the last hebdomad of the last times;<sup>5</sup> during the *former*  $3\frac{1}{2}$  years of which Christ's two witnesses, Elijah and Jeremiah,<sup>6</sup> would prophesy:—these witnesses to

<sup>1</sup> "*Apostoli* virtutibus, signis, portentis, magnalibus factis, vicerunt incredulitatem: post illos . . . *ecclesiis* datum est solatium prophetarum scripturarum interpretandum." p. 419.

<sup>2</sup> I have quoted this, Vol. i. p. 35.

<sup>3</sup> Victorinus' testimony to the fact of the publication of St. John's Gospel subsequently to his return from Patmos, and apparently too after the Apocalypse, should be noted. "Nam et evangelium postea scripsit;" his writing it being, it is said, at the request of the assembled Christians of the whole neighbourhood of Ephesus, in consequence of the Gnostic heresies referred to.

<sup>4</sup> This is a curious early specimen of something like a creed; and one, not, I think, as yet noted by those who have written on creeds. "Mensura autem Filii Dei, mandatum Domini, (1.) Patrem confiteri omnipotentem. (2.) Dicimus et hujus filium Christum, ante originem seculi spiritualem apud Patrem genitum, hominem factum; et, morte devictâ, in caelos cum corpore à Patre receptum, effudisse Spiritum sanctum, donum et pignus immortalitatis:—hunc per Prophetas prædicatum, hunc per legem conscriptum, hunc esse mandatum Dei, et Verbum Patris, et conditorem orbis. Hæc est arundo et mensura fidei. Et nemo adorat [ad] aram sanctam, nisi qui hanc fidem confitetur."—p. 418.

Victorinus' application of this figure of the *temple* and the *altar* to the *Christian Church*, and *Church worshippers*, not any *Jewish* temple and altar, should be well marked.

<sup>5</sup> Without any express reference however to Daniel's hebdomads.

<sup>6</sup> For, says Victorinus, Jeremiah had the original commission, "Before that I formed thee in the womb I knew thee; and sanctified thee to be a prophet among the nations." Now, argues Victorinus, during his recorded life Jeremiah was not a pro-

be killed in Jerusalem (called Sodom and Egypt) by the Beast from the abyss, Antichrist, at the commencement of his  $3\frac{1}{2}$  years' reign next succeeding, after many plagues inflicted on the world, answering to the *fire out of their mouths* in the symbol: but to rise again on the fourth day after; the fourth, not the third, so as not to equal Christ.

So he comes to the vision of the *Dragon and Woman*, Apoc. xii.; or rather to the concluding verse of Apoc. xi., about the temple appearing opened, and the ark appearing, which he connects with it: to the chronological retrogression in which, from the last times previously depicted, he calls especial notice.<sup>1</sup> For he construes the Woman to signify the Judæo-Christian Church of the Patriarchs, Prophets, and Apostles,<sup>2</sup> (like the *sun* glorious in hope of the resurrection, like the *moon* bright even when to man's sight dark in death, and only waning to grow again,) travailing with desire of Christ's birth out of the Jews' nation, according to the promise. Then in Christ's birth, resurrection, and ascension, in spite of the Dragon or Devil, he sees fulfilled the mystic child's rapture to God's throne: the *Dragon's* colour *red* being explained as that of a murderer from the beginning;

phet *among the nations*; and also that there is no record of Jeremiah's death. He adds that his opinion is that of "all the ancients." A mistake, doubtless; as Enoch and Elijah were more generally supposed the two prophets.

The Apocalyptic Expositor Ambrose Ansbert, at B. P. M. xiii. 522, notices this opinion and reasoning as that of the Martyr Victorinus; a fact furnishing conclusive evidence of the Treatise under consideration being indeed that of Victorinus, inasmuch as the opinion appears to have been a singular one. As the point has not, I believe, been observed on before, and the question is so interesting a one, I subjoin the passage. "Victorinus hoc in loco duos testes Eliam vult intelligi et *Jeremiam*. . . Dicit enim præfatus vir, et (ut debitam ei venerationem exhibeamus) martyr Dei, . . . quia mors Jeremiæ in Scripturâ sacrâ non reperiatur, et quia Prophetam eum Dominus in gentibus posuerit, ille autem nondum ad gentes missus fuerit; et ideo ipsum cum Eliâ venturum credi debere, ut ecclesiam *gentium* contra Antichristi perfidiam roboraret."

<sup>1</sup> "Diligenter et eum summâ sollicitudine sequi oportet propheticam prædicationem; et intelligere quoniam Spiritus ex parte prædicit, et præposterat, et cùm præcurrerit usque ad novissimum rursus tempora superiora repetit." p. 418.—So again in the passage cited Note <sup>2</sup> p. 292.

I the rather call attention to this, because Professor M. Stuart not only says (Vol. i. p. 455) of *Victorinus*, that "no plan of the whole work is sought after," but that *Ambrose Ansbert* "seems *first* to have noted that the Apocalypse is occasionally retrogressive." (Ib. p. 458.)—Victorinus notes three retrogressions prominently: the first, after the sounding of the seventh Trumpet and half-hour's silence in heaven; the second, on the transition at the end of Apoc. xi. to the visions of the Dragon and Beast; the third, with reference to the Vial-outpourings, which he identifies with the Trumpets.

<sup>2</sup> "So Augustine viewed the Old Testament Church as one with that of the New Testament."



the *third of stars* swept by his tail, as the third part of men, or rather of angels, seduced by him; and his *seven heads* and *ten horns*, as of the same significancy with the *Beast's* seven heads and ten horns, of which more presently.—Then the time changes.<sup>1</sup> The Woman fleeing into the desert is the Church, made up or inclusive of the 144,000,<sup>2</sup> now in simply Christian guise: being forced by the Dragon's flood-like armies of persecution into mountains and deserts; and upheld in her flight by the two wings of the two witnesses.<sup>3</sup> The Dragon's fall from heaven, or interdiction from there appearing as before,<sup>4</sup> is explained as following Elias' 3½ years of witnessing,<sup>5</sup> and being the beginning of Antichrist.—For he (the Dragon) then stood on the sand of the sea,<sup>6</sup> as if to evoke him: the Antichrist, accordantly with St. Paul's prophecy to the Thessalonians, having to rise from hell.<sup>7</sup> As regarded the *Beast*, or *Antichrist*, his likeness to the *leopard* signified the variety of nations that would be in the kingdom; his *seven heads* both Rome's seven hills, and also seven Roman Emperors;<sup>8</sup> viz. *Galba*, *Otho*, *Vitellius*, *Vespasian*, *Titus*, (which five had fallen at the time of the Apocalypse,) the sixth, *Domitian* then reigning, the seventh *Nerva*, who was to continue but a short time, (for he reigned but one year and four months,) and the eighth *Nero*; who, as a *previous Roman Emperor*, might be called one of (or of the same body

<sup>1</sup> "Tamen non uno tempore utraque facta sunt: [sc. the Woman's parturition and flight into the wilderness:] Christus enim ex quo natus est seimus tempora intercessisse; ut illa autem fugiat à facie serpentis adhuc factum non esse." p. 420.

<sup>2</sup> "Ecclesiam illam catholicam, ex quâ in novissimo tempore creditura sunt 144 millia hominum Helix." 419.

<sup>3</sup> "Ake duo magnæ duo sunt Prophetæ." 420.

<sup>4</sup> "Ante oportet prædicare Heliam, et pacis tempora esse, et postea, consummato triennio et sex mensibus prædicationis Helix, jactari eum de cælo, ubi habuit potestatem ascendendi usque ad illud tempus, et angelos refugas universos." 420. So, I suppose, as described in Job i. *ibid.*

<sup>5</sup> There seems here some confusion in the chronology. For as the two Witnesses were to be the supporting wings of the woman, her 3½ years in the wilderness would seem to be the 3½ years of the Witnesses being alive. But Victorinus quotes in reference to the time, "Then let them that are in Judæa flee to the mountains;" a prophecy applicable to the time of the abomination of desolation being in the holy place; which abomination he explains afterward of Antichrist's establishment in Jerusalem:—an event this not of the *earlier*, but the *later* 3½ years. Perhaps he meant the act of the woman's safe transmission into the wilderness to be the Witnesses' last act. pp. 419, 420.

<sup>6</sup> "Stetit," not "steti."

<sup>7</sup> "Antichristum de inferno suscitari Paulus ait," *ib.* Victorinus distinctly identifies the *Beast from the sea* of Apoc. xiii., and *Beast from the abyss* of Apoc. xi. and xvii.

<sup>8</sup> "Septem capita septem reges Romanos, ex quibus et Antichristus est." p. 419. "Capita septem montes sunt in quibus mulier sedet; i. e. civitas Romana." p. 420.

with) the seven.<sup>1</sup> Of this Nero St. Paul spoke, when he said, "The mystery of iniquity doth already work," for Nero was then reigning: and, having had his throat cut, and so his head wounded to death, he was to revive and re-appear as Antichrist.—Victorinus notes his Jewish as well as Roman connexion. He would appear both under a different name, and in a different character from before. Professing before the Jews to be *the Christ*, with a view to gain them, and, instead of patronizing idolatry, now inculcating the religion of the circumcision, he would by them be received as Christ: (a king and a Christ worthy of them!) moreover, whereas once most impure, now renouncing all desire of women, and so fulfilling Daniel's prophecy.<sup>2</sup>—His number 666 is explained as some name of *Greek* numerals to that amount; and two solutions offered, veiled in a corrupt text, yet not I think undecipherable:<sup>3</sup> one, *αντεμος*, perhaps Victorinus' own; the other, *γενσηρικος*, interpolated by some later copyist.<sup>4</sup>—Of his ally the *False Prophet* the *two horns like a lamb's* signified his assuming the form of a just man; the *fire from heaven* that same which sorcerers seem to men's eyes even now to evoke: the *Beast's image*, a golden statue of Antichrist: which image the False Prophet would get placed in the temple of Jerusalem, and from which Satan will utter oracles.—So will there be the *abomination of desolation* in the Holy Place: called the *abomination*, because God abominates the worship of idols instead of himself, and the introduction of heresy into Churches;<sup>5</sup> the *desolation*, because many men, previously stable,

<sup>1</sup> Such seems Victorinus' meaning: "Bestia de septem est, quoniam ante istos reges Nero regnavit." p. 420.

<sup>2</sup> So Dan. xi. 37 is explained. An explanation noted by me p. 92 *suprà*.

<sup>3</sup> By previous writers who have noticed Victorinus' Apocalyptic commentary, the passage seems to have been abandoned as inexplicable. So e. g. by Malvenda, who, Vol. ii. 190, says of it, "Locus obscurus et depravatus, cui sanando non sum." Also by Dr. Todd of Dublin; who thus similarly abandons the enigma as insoluble; "Victorinus' explanation of the number 666 is evidently corrupt and unintelligible." Apocal. Comm. p. 281. And so indeed it at first struck myself; though soon the true explanation suggested itself.

<sup>4</sup> "Numerus ejus sexcenti sexaginta sex. Cum attulerit ad literam Græcam hunc numerum explebit. AI. N. L. T. CCC. F. V. M. L. X. L. O. L. XX. CCC. I. III. EVN. LCC. N. V. III. P. CIX. K. XX O LXX. CC." *ib.*—The two words meant are, as above stated, *αντεμος* and *γενσηρικος*: of which the first is given by Primasius, in the sense (says he) of *honorii contrarius*, as if for *ατιμος*, or *αεντιμος*; the other by Ambrosius Ansbertus, with reference to the Vandal persecutor of the fifth century, *Genserius*. The correspondence of those solutions with the text, slightly altered, will appear by separating the Greek letters and their numeral values in Latin, instead of intermixing them. Thus:—

1. { AN T E M O Σ      2. { Γ E N Σ H P I K O Σ  
 } I L CCC V XL LXX CC      } III V L CC VIII C X XX LXX CC

<sup>5</sup> Mark this point in Victorinus' view of the abomination in the temple.

will by these false signs and portents be turned from the faith.—As to the *ten kings*, Victorinus says that they would have already received royal power, when Antichrist should either have set out from the East Romewards, or from Rome Eastwards;<sup>1</sup> that three of them would be eradicated by him, and the other seven become his subjects, and also the haters and burners of the harlot city, Rome.

The Commentary now hurries to a conclusion. Of the *three angels* of Apoc. xiv., flying in mid-heaven, the first (the same as in Apoc. vii.) is Elias, anticipating Antichrist by his preaching; the other two, other prophets associated with him. The *earth's harvest* and *vintage* are meant of the nations destined to perish at Christ's coming: the blood shed to the extent of 1600 (= 4 × 400) stadia, bloodshed in all the four parts of the world. The *seven vials* are the same seven judgments before signified under the Trumpets; and poured out on the contumacious, after the Church's retirement from the scene into the wilderness.<sup>2</sup> *Standing on the glassy sea* signifies standing firm in baptismal faith. The *Woman* sitting on many waters, and borne by the seven-headed ten-horned Beast, is the Babylon alike of the Apocalypse, Isaiah, and Ezekiel; viz. the city ROME seated on the Devil, as before explained, of Rome red with the blood of saints: her wickedness having been consummated by a *Decree of the Senate*,<sup>3</sup> and extending to the prohibition of all preaching of the gospel in all nations. Then Christ (answering to him that was figured on the White Horse with his armies) will come and take

<sup>1</sup> "Decem reges accepisse regalem potestatem, cum ille moverit ab oriente, aut mittitur ab urbe Româ cum exercitibus suis." ib. A thoughtful notice of a difficult subject.

<sup>2</sup> "Dicit quæ in ultimo futura sunt, cum ecclesia de medio exierit." ibid.

<sup>3</sup> "Vidi, inquit, mulierem ebriam de sanguine sanctorum. Decreto Senatûs illius consummatæ nequitie." ib. A passage this which suggests the question, What in Diocletian's time may have been the *Roman Senate's* part in the decrees of persecution against Christians? Probably Victorinus may have referred to the earlier Roman Emperors' custom of having their acts formally authorized by the Senate; generally a mere form.

On a statement that "negotiandi causâ ædificia demoliri, et marmora detrahare, edicto Divi Vespasiani et Senatûs-Consulto cautum est," Burman De Vectig. pp. 110—113 thus comments. "Ita ferè Imperatorum mos fuit, postquam omnem potestatem quæ olim penes populum erat in se receperant, ut si quid novi juris promulgare vellent, orationem in Senatu haberent, quâ Patribus aperiebant quid statuere vellent, et simul quid ii statuerent consulebant. . . Deinde factum Senatûs Consultum ad Imperatorem perferebatur: qui, si illud approbabat, exire et legis vim habere jubebat; ita ut omne robur non à Senatu sed à Principe accideret." (How similar to the case of the Roman Popes and Roman Councils afterwards!—See my Vol. iii. pp. 232, 233.) So too Tillemont, ii. 160, on the reign of Aurelius Antoninus;—"C'étoit le style ordinaire des Empereurs de faire presque tout par l'autorité du Senat."

the kingdom; a kingdom extending from the river even to the world's end: the greater part of the earth being cleansed introductorily to it; the millennium itself not ending it. All souls of the nations will next, and finally, be called to judgment.<sup>1</sup>

7. In the "Virginal Banquet" of *Methodius*, Bishop of Tyre, who like Victorinus suffered martyrdom in the Diocletianic persecution, we find here and there an Apocalyptic expository notice that may be worth our observation:—more especially his application of the *Judaic* emblems of the Apocalypse to the *Christian* Church. Thus he expounds the 144,000 sealed ones in Apoc. vii. and xiv., "out of all the tribes of Israel," not as an election out of the literal Israel, but as a certain select company of the Christian Church, viz. its company of virgins; the palm-bearers in the same vision of Apoc. vii. being the general body of the faithful in Christ.<sup>2</sup> On the same principle he explains also *Mount Zion* and *the temple* to mean the Christian Church:<sup>3</sup> and again in Apoc. xii. makes the sun-clothed woman that brought forth the man-child to be the faithful Christian Church, bringing forth sons by regeneration in baptism. For, argues Methodius, this symbol cannot mean Christ's own birth into the world; seeing that John's commission in the Apocalypse was to see and record not things *past*, but things present and things to come.<sup>4</sup> Connected with which last-mentioned vision Methodius broaches a very original idea as to *the desert* into which the woman fled for refuge from the dragon. It is the Church's appointed sojourning place or state in the world: a scene and state *deserted of the evil*, and in which many pleasant fruits and flowers grow for her use, as in a garden of spices:<sup>5</sup> the 1260 days assigned for this meaning the whole time of her mundane sojourning, until the "*beata secula*," the blessed times to come.<sup>6</sup>—With regard to which blessed times Methodius follows the generality of the Fathers before him in explaining them as the world's seventh sabbath millennium, begin-

<sup>1</sup> Here comes the anti-premillennial addition. As *ten* is the number of the *decalogue*, says the interpolator, and 100 signifies the crown of *virginity*, therefore the *millennary* number (= 10 × 100) indicates a perfect man; who may be said (i. e. while in his earthly state) to reign with Christ, and to have the Devil bound within him, &c. p. 421.

<sup>2</sup> B. P. M. iii. 678, 689.

<sup>3</sup> Ib. 692.

<sup>4</sup> Ib. 692, 693.

<sup>5</sup> Referring to Cant. iv. 16. "Verè desertum à malis," he calls it. p. 693.

<sup>6</sup> Ib. 694.



ning with the 6000th year from Creation, after the type of the six days of creation, and seventh day of sabbath: "the first resurrection" being the literal resurrection of the saints to partake of it;<sup>1</sup> but the body's change to an *angelic* substance not occurring till the end of the millenary.<sup>2</sup> He also speaks of the conflagration as that by which the world is not to be annihilated but purified.<sup>3</sup>

8. Last in this my first period let me notice *Lactantius*; a writer who, in his famous work on the "Divine Institutions," formed a kind of connecting link between that period and the Constantinian æra, when the establishment of Christianity took place in the Roman empire: for his work was nearly all written before the end of the Diocletianic persecution; though dedicated to Constantine in one of the closing Chapters.<sup>4</sup> The time of his *writing* the Book determines me to place him in the *first* period, rather than the *second*. His sketch, towards the conclusion of his Treatise, of the ending of the great mundane drama, involved necessarily certain Apocalyptic notices. Of these the following are I think the chief; being however partly mixed up with ideas derived from the prophecies of Daniel, partly with others of mere imaginary origin.

He states, then, that the first grand preliminary to the consummation was the breaking up of the Roman empire;<sup>5</sup> an event to be hastened by the multiplication of emperors ruling it, with civil wars consequent, till at length *ten kings* should arise: whereupon *an enemy from the extreme North* should come against them,<sup>6</sup> overthrow the three *Asiatic* dynasties of the ten, be received and submitted to by the rest as their head, change the name and transfer the seat of the empire from West to East, and by his cruelties introduce a time of

<sup>1</sup> Ib. 697—699, 705, 714.

<sup>2</sup> Such seems his view. "Primâ festi resurrectionis die, quæ dies est judicii, simul celeberrimo eum Christo millenarium annorum requiem. Inde rursus sequens penetrantem cælos Jesum venio: . . . corpore meo non remanente tali quale prius erat; sed, post mille annorum spatium, mutato ex statu et habitu humano ac corruptionis in Angelicam magnitudinem et pulcritudinem." Ib. 699.

<sup>3</sup> p. 705.

<sup>4</sup> After Chapter 27 of the viiith and last Book of the Institutes, he thus addresses Constantine:—"Sed omnia jam, sanctissime Imperator, figmenta sopita sunt, ex quo te Deus summus ad restituendum justitiæ domicilium, et ad tutelam generis humani, excitavit."

<sup>5</sup> "Romanum nomen, quo nunc regitur orbis, (horret animus dicere, sed dicam quia futurum est,) tolletur de terrâ; et imperium in Asiam revertetur; ac rursus Oriens dominabitur, atque Occidens serviet." Ib. vii. 15.

<sup>6</sup> Ib. 16, ad iuit.

grievous calamity, especially to persecuted Christians; <sup>1</sup> portents on earth and in the sky accompanying, and plagues such as once in Egypt: <sup>2</sup>—that then, the consummation drawing on, a great prophet (*Elias*)<sup>3</sup> would be sent by God, with power of working miracles, shutting up heaven, turning water into blood, and by fire from his mouth killing such as would injure him; by whose preaching and miracles many would be turned to God:—which done, that another king would rise from Syria, begotten of an evil spirit; and, after destroying that former evil one, (the king of the North?) would conquer and kill God's prophet afore-mentioned, his work having been completed; <sup>4</sup> whose corpse, however, left unburied, would on the third

<sup>1</sup> "Tum repente adversus eos hostis potentissimus ab extremis finibus plagæ septentrionalis orietur: qui, tribus ex eo numero deletis qui tunc Asiam obtinebunt, assumetur in societatem à cæteris, ac princeps omnium constituetur. Hic insustentabili dominatione vexabit orbem; divina et humana miscabit; . . . denique, immutato nomine, atque imperii sede translata, confusio ac perturbatio humani generis consequetur." vii. 16.—A view derived, I presume, from Dan. xi. 40–43; where however the three kings subjugated are not noted as *Asiatics*, but those of Egypt, Ethiopia, and Libya. I infer Lactantius' belief that the *Northern king* would transfer the seat of empire to the *East*, from comparison of the language used in the citation above.\*

Lactantius seems to suppose this *King from the North* an *intermediate* holder of the Roman empire, under a new name, between the then reigning imperial dynasty and Antichrist. A view distinctly expressed c. 17; (see Note <sup>4</sup> infra;) and, in the Epitome, c. 11: which latter thus affirms the local transference of the empire to him, not to Antichrist. "Existet longè potentior ac nequior, (i. e. than the ten kings,) qui tribus deletis [viz. of the ten] *Asiam* possidebit; . . . *Remp. suam faciet*; nomen imperii sedemque mutabit." Amidst the evils of whose reign *another king* still worse would arise and destroy him, viz. Antichrist. "Inter hæc mala surget rex impius, non modo generi hominum sed etiam Deo inimicus. Hic reliquias *illius prioris tyranni* conteret, vexabit, interimet."

Yet in vii. 26 he writes as if he thought Antichrist would be the Roman empire's destroyer:—"Ne citius quam putemus tyrannus ille abominandus veniat, qui tantum facinus moliat; ac lumen illud effodiat, ejus interitu mundus ipse lapsurus est."

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. The *world* (whether the *Roman* or the *universal* world) being then, says he, to the people of God, what *Egypt* was to God's ancient people Israel, vii. 15.—Compare Apoc. xi. 8, "the city which spiritually is called *Egypt*:"—a passage which Lactantius probably had in his eye; as also the *Egyptian*-like plagues inflicted on the Apocalyptic world in the Trumpets and Vials.

<sup>3</sup> So Lactantius' Fragment on the Last Judgment.

<sup>4</sup> "Peractisque operibus ipsius," i. e. the works of God's prophet, (agreeably with the Apocalyptic declaration, 'When they shall have completed their testimony,') "alter rex orietur *ex Syriâ*, malo Spiritu genitus, qui reliquias *illius prioris mali, cum ipso*, simul dealeat." Ib. 17.—Is there in this an allusion to Daniel's predictive

\* Very curious must have appeared to Lactantius, some ten or twenty years after his thus writing, a comparison with it of Constantine's course and history as during that ten or twenty years unfolded:—himself a king from the extreme North, who thence bore down upon and overcame the three Asiatic kings of the Roman world, and made preparation for transferring the seat of empire from Rome to the East; but all as the friend and protector, not enemy, of Christianity and the Christians!

day be reanimated, and rapt before the enemies' eyes to heaven:—that the king his murderer would be a prophet too, but a prophet of lies; and with the miraculous power of evoking fire from heaven, arresting the sun in its course, and making an image speak: whereby he would make multitudes of adherents; branding them like cattle with his mark, and requiring worship from them as *God* and the *Son of God*: for that this would be in fact the ANTICHRIST; falsely claiming to be Christ,<sup>1</sup> but fighting against the real Christ, overthrowing his temple the Church,<sup>2</sup> and persecuting unto the death his saints the true Israel: <sup>3</sup>—that the fated time of his domination would be forty-two months; at the end of which time, the saints having fled in a last extremity to the mountains, the heaven would be opened for their deliverance; <sup>4</sup> and Christ himself intervene to save them, and destroy this Antichrist and his allied kings. After which the saints, raised from the grave, would reign with Christ through the world's seventh chiliad; a period to commence, Lactantius judged, in about 200 years at furthest:<sup>5</sup> the Lord alone being thenceforth worshipped on a renovated world; its still living inhabitants multiplying incalculably in a state of terrestrial felicity; and the resurrection-saints, during this commencement of an *eternal* kingdom, in a nature like the angelic, reigning over them.<sup>6</sup>

---

On the whole, in reviewing our Sketch of this 1st and earliest

statement, "But tidings out of *the east* shall trouble him;" i. e. the king of the north? Dan. xi. 43.

I presume the *Syrian* origin means *Jewish* origin: and from the Fragment of Lactantius on the "Last Judgment" infer that he expected Antichrist to profess the *Jewish* faith.

<sup>1</sup> "Hic est qui appellatur Antichristus: sed *se ipse Christum mentietur.*" ib. vii. 19.

<sup>2</sup> "Tunc erueret templum Dei conabitur." ib. vii. 17. That by this Lactantius meant the *Church*, appears from ib. iv. 13; "ecclesia quæ est verum templum Dei:" and again, 14; where he speaks of Christ raising up to God an "æternum templum quod appellatur *ecclesia.*" Compare Apoc. xi. 2; "the Gentiles shall tread down the temple, &c."

<sup>3</sup> "Israel non utique Judæos significat, quos abdicavit Deus; sed nos, qui ab eo convocati ex gentibus in illorum locum adoptione successimus." Ib. iv. 20. It is hence clear, I think, that Lactantius interpreted the *twelve Israelitish tribes* of the Apocalypse, as well as the Apocalyptic *temple*, in a *Christian* sense.

<sup>4</sup> Ib. vii. 17.—Lactantius had here in his eye, apparently, both Christ's precept to flee to the mountains, on the abomination of desolation being set up, and the Apocalyptic notice of *Armageddon*, Apoc. xix.

<sup>5</sup> "Non amplius quam ducentorum videtur annorum." Ib. vii. 25. A passage noted by me, Vol. i. p. 396.

<sup>6</sup> Mark Lactantius' distinction between the two classes. See my citations p. 135 *suprà*.

Period of Apocalyptic Interpretation, the following points may remain in our minds as among its most marked and important characteristics.

1st, that the Apocalyptic figurations were supposed to be such as began to have fulfilment *from the time of St. John*, or commencement of the Christian æra. I believe there is no one expositor of the period just past under review that entertained the idea of the Apocalyptic prophecy overleaping the chronological interval, were it less or greater, antecedent to the consummation; and plunging at once into the times of the consummation, and of the then expected Antichrist. See e. g. Irenæus and Victorinus on the 1st Seal; Tertullian on the 5th Seal; and also Methodius, &c.<sup>1</sup>

2. As regards *the 1st Seal*, and the interpretation of its white horse and horseman by Irenæus, and then Tertullian and Victorinus, as symbolizing Christ's victories by the gospel, we have to note that though it is Victorinus who first conjoins this its explanation with that of the contrasted horse and horseman of *the three next Seals*, as symbolizing the "*bella famæ and pestis*" that were to follow after the first gospel preaching and triumphs, antecedently to Christ's second coming, so as predicted by Christ in Matt. xxiv., yet it seems probable that Victorinus' predecessors, as well as his successors, like him combined this view of the 1st Seal with that of the next 3 Seals, and with similar reference to Christ's prophecy respecting those antecedents to his second coming. Which being so, and as this is a primary and cardinal point in Apocalyptic interpretation, it will be well here to bear in mind Irenæus' own caution, exprest with reference to another of the Apocalyptic mysteries; (I mean the Beast's name;) viz. that "if meant to be known at the time it would doubtless have been declared by him who saw the Apocalypse." As part and parcel of an interpretation of all the four first Seals taken from Matt. xxiv., whereof the explanation of the next three Seals as symbolizing war, famine, and pestilence constitutes another essential part, it is disproved at once by the impossibility of the 3rd Seal's symbol, with its chœnix or 5lb. of barley for a denarius, together with plenty of wine and oil, ever meaning *famine*.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Against certain Præterists Methodius says; "Johannes non de præteritis, sed de iis quæ *vel tunc fierent*, vel quæ olim eventura essent, loquitur." B. P. M. iii. 693.

<sup>2</sup> At p. 182 Mr. C. M., in explaining this Seal of "the severity of famine," notices the price of *wheat* only; and passes over what is said of the *barley, wine, and oil* in



3. As to the great subject of *Antichrist*, while there was a universal concurrence in the general idea of the prophecy, there was in respect of the details of application a considerable measure of difference;—these differences arising mainly out of certain current notions of the coming Antichrist as in some way *Jewish* as well as *Roman*, and the difficulty of combining and adjusting the two characteristics. The *Roman* view followed of course *Apocalyptically* from Antichrist's being figured as the Roman Beast's 8th head, after the healing of his deadly wound; (*for all identified the Beasts of Apoc. xiii. and xvii.;*<sup>1</sup>) and joined too in closest union with the seven-hilled Harlot: as well as from Daniel's depicting him as a little horn of the 4th or Roman Beast. Of his supposed *Jewish* connexion no *Apocalyptic* evidence occurred to the early patristic expositors: save only that Irenæus thought Dan's omission in Apoc. vii. from the sealed tribes might arise from that being the Jewish tribe of Antichrist's origin; a notion in which none, I believe, followed him. The idea arose chiefly doubtless from a vague expectation of his being a Pseudo-Christ, such as Christ told of in Matt. xxiv. 5, whom the Jews might receive: conjoined by some of the Fathers, as Irenæus and Hippolytus, with the idea that the abomination of desolation of which Christ then spoke as predicted by Daniel, and which would in fact have the Jewish sanctuary as its place of manifestation, was not only the one prophesied of in Dan. ix. 27, as what would synchronize with the end of the 70 hebdomads, but that associated with *Antichrist* in the prophecy of Dan. xii. 11; and the associated prediction which that verse refers to in Dan. xi. 36. Whence the conclusion that the ending epoch of each, and ending epoch also of the 70 hebdomads, would be at the end of Antichrist's 3½ years, at the consummation.

Now we have ourselves elsewhere asked, Was there not that in the designation of the desolating abomination in Dan. xii. 11 which might serve to distinguish it from the desolating abomination of Dan. xi. 31 and Dan. ix. 27; and the *latter* be meant distinctively by Christ, not the *former*?<sup>2</sup> And I wish here to state it as not improbable that they were questions asked, and to the same effect, by some also of the patristic expositors of the æra I am referring to. For total silence. Was he not aware of the decisive argument thence urged by me against all idea of famine? See Vol. i. pp. 164—166.

<sup>1</sup> Irenæus, v. 30, speaks of the Beast with the name and number as the Beast which was and is not. For the rest see pp. 284, 287, 295, 300, 301, *suprà*.

<sup>2</sup> See pp. 110, 111.

alike Clement of Alexandria, and Tertullian, and I may add too Tatian, all before the end of the 2nd century, and also Julius Africanus, at the commencement of the 3rd century, explained Daniel's 70 hebdomads, and their abomination of desolation, as having had their full accomplishment on Christ's death, and the consequent desolation of Jerusalem by the Roman armies; and so having no reference whatsoever to any desolation by the then future Antichrist.<sup>1</sup> Nor of the few who with Irenæus and Hippolytus

<sup>1</sup> I subjoin a sketch of the statements of these Fathers; and, where given, of their chronological calculations of the hebdomads.

1. *Tatian*, a writer of the 2nd century, between Justin Martyr whose hearer he was, and Irenæus who cites him, thus (though without specific mention of the hebdomads) speaks of Daniel's prophecy about the abomination of desolation (the one referred to Matt. xxiv.) as fulfilled in Jerusalem's *then imminent* destruction by the Romans. After mention of Christ's rebuking the disciples' vain pride in the beauty of the temple, by saying that in a little while not one stone would be left on another, he thus proceeds: "Mox abiens in monte Olivarum, urbem intuitus, paulisper condescit. Ubi secreto huic congressi discipuli initia futuræ hujus cladis condiscunt; viz. antichristos, bella, seditiones, terræmotus, pestilentiam, famem, terrifica de cælo signa, *idolum abominabile Danielis vaticiniis celebre*, extremam denique calamitatem eorum qui docebunt evangelium. . . Hierusalem vero, captis habitatoribus, et quaque-versum abductis, a gentibus tantisper calcatum iri dum evangelium universos illarum fines occupaverit: tum enim finem instare mundi." B. P. M. ii. 209.

Tatian, after Justin's martyrdom, became the author of the ascetic sect of the *Encratites*, and is mentioned among the early heretics. (See Irenæus i. 31, and Euseb. H. E. iv. 29.) But the passage I cite from him has nothing of course to do with his heresy. He is spoken of by Jerome as a learned and very voluminous writer.

2. *Clemens Alexandrinus* states the interval from the end of the 70 years' captivity to Jesus Christ as 69 hebdomads, in the first seven of which the temple was rebuilt; and one hebdomad as that of Jesus Christ's ministry. Further in one  $\frac{1}{2}$  hebdomad Nero set up an abomination in the holy city of Jerusalem; and in one  $\frac{1}{4}$  hebdomad was cut off, as well as Galba, Otho, and Vitellius: whereupon Vespasian, obtaining the empire, destroyed Jerusalem and desolated the sanctuary. Strom. B. i.

Jerome (on Dan. ix.), in sketching this exposition of the hebdomads by Clemens, calculates from the 1st of Cyrus; and observes that, instead of 490 years from that epoch to the destruction of Jerusalem by Vespasian and Titus, there elapsed on the most accurate computation 630 years. But Clement defines his commencing date as that of the 2nd of Darius Hystaspes:—"Mansit captivitas annis 70, ut quæ cessavit anno secundo Darii Hystaspis filii." This makes the difference somewhat less.

3. *Tertullian* thus computes the period.

From Darius (apparently Darius II, called Nothus) to Alexander's overthrow of the Persian empire 106 years. Then Alexander and the Ptolemies, to Cleopatra's death and Augustus' incorporation of Egypt with the Roman empire, 290 $\frac{1}{2}$  years. Add 28 years under Augustus to *Jesus Christ's birth*; and the whole, says Tertullian, is 437 $\frac{1}{2}$  years = 62 $\frac{1}{2}$  hebdomads. Then was all prophecy fulfilled; and the vision and the prophecy ceased to the Jews.

As regards the remaining 7 $\frac{1}{2}$  hebdomads, he reckons 52 $\frac{1}{2}$  years from Christ's birth to the 1st of Vespasian: (strangely omitting Claudius' reign of 13 years, and reckoning Nero's at 9 $\frac{1}{2}$  years instead of 14:) and then concludes; "Atque ita in diem expugnationis suæ Judæi impleverunt hebdomadas 70 prædictas à Daniele."

I am quite unable to follow either Clement's or Tertullian's calculations.

referred that last hebdomad and its abomination of desolation to the end of the world and Antichrist, do I find that any but *Hippolytus* expounded the 70th and last hebdomad as broken off from the preceding 69 by a great chronological gap. Certainly no such gap is spoken of by *Irenæus*.<sup>1</sup> And as *Apollinarius of Laodicea*, who lived a century and a half later under Valens, made the 70 hebdomads to have had commencement with Christ's first advent, and so to come down *continuously* to an epoch 490 years later, which he ex-

4. *Julius Africanus*, a writer placed by Jerome under Heliogabalus, or about A. D. 220, and who wrote expressly on Chronology. "Nulli dubium est," he begins, "quin de adventu Christi (i. e. Christ's first coming) prædicatio sit; qui post 70 hebdomadas mundo apparuit."

He makes the commencing date of these hebdomads to be the 20th Artaxerxes, when that prince issued his Decree (Nehem. ii. 1—8) for the rebuilding of Jerusalem; (the previous Decrees of Cyrus and Darius having been in considerable measure ineffective:) this being the 115th year of the Persian empire, and the 185th year from the beginning of the 70 years' captivity. Now the Persian kingdom lasted in all (from Cyrus to Alexander) 230 years, i. e. 115 years from the 20th of Artaxerxes; and the Macedonian empire 300 years: (i. e. I suppose to the death of Cleopatra:) and thence to the 15th year of Tiberius, when Christ was crucified, was 60 years: = in all to 475 years; i. e. 475 solar years. But the Jews often computed by *lunar* years, each of which is  $11\frac{1}{4}$  days shorter than a solar year: so as to make the difference of one year in every 32, and 15 in the aforesaid period of 475 solar years. So that 475 solar years would be 490 lunar years; or precisely 70 hebdomads of years. Then, at Christ's death, "consummata sunt delicta, et finem accepit peccatum, et deleta est iniquitas, et annunciata justitia sempiterna, quæ legis justitiam vinceret, et impleta est visio et prophetia."—The *desolation* of Jerusalem followed as a consequence of the Jews' rejection of Christ.

I abstract this from Jerome's full citation, in his Comment. on Dan. ix. It is, as the reader will see, by much the most elaborate and accurate of any of the calculations by the earlier patristic Fathers.\*

<sup>1</sup> For *Hippolytus'* view of the hebdomads see p. 285; for *Irenæus'* p. 279, *suprà*.

As regards *Irenæus*, a little fuller abstract of the only passage, v. 25, in which he mentions Daniel's hebdomads, may be useful in showing how evidently his reference of the abomination of desolation spoken of by Christ to *Antichrist* as the *author*, and to Daniel's *last half hebdomad* as the *time*, arose out of his confusion of all the various predicted abominations of desolation, as if one and the same.

Says Paul, Antichrist is to sit in *God's temple*: i. e. the Jerusalem temple of the true God, as no heathen temple is called in Scripture God's temple. And so too Christ; 'When ye see the abomination of desolation told of by Daniel standing in the *holy place*.' Which Antichrist is the little horn of Daniel's 4th or Roman Beast, Dan. vii. And he is to come in, Paul tells us, with lies; yet the Jews to receive him; as Christ said: 'If another come in his own name him ye will receive.' And then he will act as the unjust judge in the parable to the oppressed widow, who, forgetful of God, rested on an earthly helper; and avenge the earthly Jerusalem of its Roman oppressor, by transferring the kingdom to Jerusalem, and there sitting, *as if Christ*, in his temple. The same is the little horn from one of the goat's four horns, Dan. viii.; which was to be the author of the transgression of desolation, and to tread the host and sanctuary under foot. And Daniel notes too the duration of desolation; viz. that for half a

\* Mr. C. M., to my surprise, takes no notice of Julius Africanus' calculation; though with Jerome's citation from that writer before him. See his p. 194.

pected might be the time of Antichrist's coming and the consummation,<sup>1</sup> so might some such view very possibly have been that by which Irenæus referred the last week to the consummation. (I refer not to *Judas Syrus*, another and earlier writer on the subject mentioned by Eusebius; because how *he* managed to make the period of the 70 hebdomads end nearly at his own epoch of the 10th of Severus, or about A.D. 203, does not appear: though I infer from Eusebius' words that he too computed continuously.<sup>2</sup>) Hippolytus stands alone, as I said,<sup>3</sup> in the exprest view of the hebdomad the sacrifice should be taken away (Dan. ix. 27), even till the consummation; i. e. for  $3\frac{1}{2}$  years.

There is no chronological calculation whatsoever in Irenæus, I believe, of the 70 hebdomads; or notice how he connected the last hebdomad with the hebdomads preceding.

<sup>1</sup> *Apollinarius* of Laodicea, taking the words of Daniel about the decree for the restoration of Jerusalem mystically, as it would seem, reckons the 70 hebdomads to begin from the going forth of the word on Christ's birth of the Virgin Mary, "ab exitu verbi, quando Christus de Mariâ generatus est virgine:" (I cite his words, says Jerome, that I may not misrepresent him:) hence for 7 hebdomads, or to the 8th of Claudius, when the Roman arms were taken up against the Jews, the repentance of that people was expected, Christ having meanwhile fulfilled his ministry, and preached his gospel. At the expiration of 62 additional hebdomads, or 434 years, Elias would come, turn the heart of the fathers to the children, and rebuild Jerusalem and the temple, in the course of  $\frac{1}{2}$  week or  $3\frac{1}{2}$  years; then Antichrist come, and for  $3\frac{1}{2}$  years sit in the temple of God, thus restored, himself the predicted abomination of desolation; the last desolation and condemnation of the Jews following, because of their despising Christ's truth, and receiving Antichrist's lie. After which, and the consequent expiration of the 70 hebdomads, Christ would destroy Antichrist with the brightness of His coming.

Jerome adds that Apollinarius framed this his *chronological conjecture* about the hebdomads (*conjecturam temporum*) with reference to *Africanus'* stated opinion that the last hebdomad (separated from the rest) would coincide with the end of the world. But I presume this is a misprint, or slip of the pen, for *Hippolytus*, of whom he had just before been speaking as so expounding the hebdomads: whereas Africanus' opinion had been stated quite contrariwise, as supposing that all the 70 hebdomads had been fulfilled at Christ's first coming. Apollinarius considered it preposterous to *divide* the hebdomads; and that in any case they must be construed *continuously* and *connectedly*:—"Nec posse fieri ut junctæ dividantur ætates; sed omnia sibi juxtâ prophetiam Danielis esse temporum copulanda."

This *Apollinarius of Laodicea* flourished in the 4th century; and was a contemporary and friend of Jerome's early manhood: being quite a different person from, and above 150 years later than, the *Apollinarius of Hieropolis*, who wrote an Apologetic Oration to the Emperor Marcus Antoninus, and of whom Eusebius speaks in his H. E. iv. 27.

<sup>2</sup> Ἐν τούτῳ καὶ Ἰουδᾶς . . . εἰς τὰς παρα τῷ Δανιηλ ἑβδομηκοντὰ ἑβδομάδας ἐγγράφως διαλεχθεῖς, ἐπὶ τὸ δεκάτῳ του Σεβηρου βασιλείας ἰστησι τὴν χρονογραφίαν. H. E. vi. 7.

<sup>3</sup> *Origen*, in his Treatise against Celsus, vi. 45, cited by Mr. C. Maitland, p. 171, like Irenæus, applies what is said of the abomination of desolation in Dan. ix. 26 to Antichrist; but, like him, without a word of the hebdomads generally. Elsewhere, as cited by Jerome, on Dan. ix., he seems inclined to reckon the whole period of the hebdomads from the first of Darius to Christ. "Studiosius requirenda sunt tempora, à primo anno Darii filii Assueri usque ad adventum Christi quot anni sint; . . . et videndum est an ea possimus adventui Domini coaptare."



69 hebdomads reaching to Christ's first coming, and the 70th beginning separately, at some vast chronological gap, just before his second coming.<sup>1</sup>

Reverting to those early expositors' notices about Antichrist, let me observe further that in regard of his *religious profession*, though the expectation of its being *Judaism* was prevalent among them, yet the idea was also ever kept up (an idea derived from St. John's epistles) that *heretics professedly within the Church* might be considered also as Antichrists: moreover that when the great and chief Antichrist came, he would sedulously affect external resemblance to Jesus Christ; agreeably with the *lamb-like* Apocalyptic symbol.<sup>2</sup> Such a notion as that of a *professedly atheistic* or *infidel* Antichrist was as yet unknown.—Again, as to Antichrist's *Roman* connexion, while all admitted this, and thus the Pseudo-Sibyl and Victorinus spoke of him as the resuscitated Roman emperor Nero, and also Irenæus, and yet more strongly Hippolytus, suggested that he might very probably on this account have for his name and number *Lateinos*, yet then and thereupon their views differed. For the Pseudo-Sibyl and Irenæus thought that he would be prominent in Rome's destruction, transferring its empire to Jerusalem: Hippolytus, on the contrary, that he would be the restorer of the Roman empire in a new form, somewhat like a

<sup>1</sup> What an utter contrast is this to Mr. C. Maitland's representation of "*the primitive scheme*" of the 70 hebdomads; or generally received scheme of them in the 2nd and 3rd centuries that we have been reviewing! "According to *the primitive scheme*," says Mr. C. M., "the sense of the whole passage amounts to this:—70 sevens of years are fixed in the history of the Jews and of Jerusalem. . . Between the edict to rebuild Jerusalem and the mission of Christ there will elapse two periods, 7 sevens and 62 sevens of years. In the course of the first the city will be rebuilt: [as recorded I presume in Ezra and Nehemiah:] and at the end of the second Messiah will be put to death. Afterwards the Romans under Vespasian will destroy both city and temple: . . . and until the end of God's warfare with his people it is determined that the desolation of the city and temple shall continue. [Here comes the great gap, according to Mr. C. M., in "*the primitive scheme*."] But God will renew his covenant with many of his chosen people during a certain seven years, the remaining week of the 70: probably by means of Elias. . . But throughout the latter half of this week, i. e. for 3½ years, the daily sacrifice will be taken away, and on account of the abomination set up by Antichrist the temple will be made desolate. . . This is the plain *working sense* of the passage. Unlike its modern and fantastic rivals it has borne the burden and heat of the day!!" pp. 203, 204.

So Mr. C. M. makes *two totally different abominations of desolation* to have been included in "*the primitive scheme*," separated from each other by the interval of ages. Two questions here suggest themselves: 1. where the authority of a single primitive Father for such a scheme: 2. what the ground for such a view in the prophecy itself?

<sup>2</sup> See pp. 284, &c.

second Augustus. To which his opinion I must again beg my readers' special attention; the rather because, while expressing it, as I find from the original Greek,<sup>1</sup> he had the more usual reading before him in Apoc. xvii. 16 of *τα δεκα κερατα και το θηριον*, *ηοτ*, as his Latin translation first seen by me represents it, *τα δεκα κ. επι το θηριον*; the reading adopted, as it seems, by Tertullian. But how so? Because it was the *old imperial* Rome that Hippolytus evidently looked on as that which both Beast and horns would unite to burn: this being a mere temporary burning from which the Beast would in a new form next resuscitate it; and quite distinct from the everlasting fire from God described in Apoc. xviii., as its subsequent and final doom. On the Apocalyptic *Babylon's* meaning *Rome* all agreed.—Once more, as to the *time* of Antichrist's duration, though all reckoned it literally as 3½ years, (how but for this could they have looked for Christ's coming as near? <sup>2</sup>) yet, very remarkably, the testimony of Cyprian and of his Biographer was incidentally given even thus early to the *year-day* principle as a Scriptural one: all ready for its application to the prophetic chronological periods at God's own fit time afterwards.<sup>3</sup>

4. As to the Apocalyptic *Judaic* symbols there seems to have been a general reference of them in this æra to *the Christian Church* or *worship*. So Irenæus, Tertullian, Victorinus, Lactantius expounded the Apocalyptic temple and altar: so Tertullian, Methodius, Lactantius the Apocalyptic 144,000 sealed ones out of the 12 tribes, and Apocalyptic New Jerusalem. A point important to be marked in the primitive exposition.<sup>4</sup>

On which point, and the general subject of the intent of *Scripture symbols and figures*, we have to remember that *Origen*, already briefly noticed by me, lived and taught about the middle of the third century.<sup>5</sup> And, had he fulfilled his declared intention of giving the Christian world an Apocalyptic commentary,<sup>6</sup> we can scarcely doubt

<sup>1</sup> Viz. in Fabricius' Edition. Compare my Notes Vol. iii. 74, and p. 30 *suprà*.

<sup>2</sup> See my Vol. iii. pp. 264, 265.

<sup>3</sup> See my Vol. iii. p. 281, where the citation from Pontius is given; together with a notice of Mr. C. M.'s strange objection to its parallelism or force on the year-day question.

<sup>4</sup> For it is, of itself, fatal to each Judaic futurist or semi-futurist system of Apocalyptic interpretation.

<sup>5</sup> He died at Tyre A. D. 253, aged 70.

<sup>6</sup> "Omnia hæc exponere sigillatim de capitibus septem draconis (Apoc. xii. 3) non est temporis hujus: exponentur autem tempore suo in Revelatione Johannis." In Matth. Tr. 30.—Elsewhere Origen thus singularly notes this prophecy; "John wrote

but that it would have been of a character more mystical than those we have yet had to do with; though Victorinus' exposition of the symbols of the primary Apocalyptic vision furnishes us indeed with a partial specimen. Origen's principle of *anagogical*<sup>1</sup> or *spiritualizing* exposition, (a principle not altogether to be exploded, but needing in its application to Scripture a cautious attention to the requirements of context, Scriptural analogy, and good sense, abundantly greater than Origen cared to use,)<sup>2</sup> could not but have been largely applied

the Apocalypse; being commanded to keep silence, and not write what *the seven thunders* uttered." Comment on Joh. Tom. v. (Ed. Huet. ii. 88.) A passage noted by Eusebius, II. E. vi. 25. I suppose he had some anagogic solution of what he deemed an apparent contradiction.

<sup>1</sup> *αναγωγή*, a passing to a higher sense than the literal; i. e. to a more literal sense.

<sup>2</sup> Scripture, like man, said Origen, has a *body, soul, and spirit*:—viz. the *literal* sense, useful to those who preceded the Christians, i. e. the ancient Israel; the *internal* sense (intra literam), to Christians; and the *shadowing forth of heavenly things*, to saints arrived in heaven. So he remarks on Lev. vi. 25, about the sin-offering.—Elsewhere he speaks of the *historic* sense, the *moral*, and the *mystical*.\*

He carried his inclination to the *anagogical* so far, as to depreciate, and sometimes even nullify, the *literal* and *historic* sense. He often says that the literal sense is "proculandum et contemnendum."—So, 1. of *things typical*; as the sin-offering, Lev. vi. 25; "Hæc omnia, nisi alio sensu accipias quàm linea texta ostendit, sicut sæpe diximus, obstaculum majus Christianæ religioni quàm ædificationem præstant."—2. Of *historic statements*. So in his Hom. vi. on Genesis: "What the edification of reading that Abraham lied to Abimelech, and betrayed his wife's chastity? Let Jews believe it; and any others that, like them, prefer the *letter* to the *spirit*." So again on the Mosaic history of the creation; the statement of there having been three days without sun, moon, or stars, being pronounced by him impossible: and again on that of the devil leading Christ to a high mountain; &c.—3. Of *precepts*: e. g. that which says, "If a man smite thee on the one cheek, turn to him the other."

Now it is evident that St. Paul himself has authorized the ascription of an anagogical or spiritual sense, as well as the literal, to the *types* of the law. They were shadows of things to come. And to certain *facts* of Old Testament history he has also ascribed an allegorical, as well as literal sense. So in the allegory of Sarah and Isaac, Hagar and Ishmael. But surely in *historical* narratives to allegorize beyond what Scripture itself teaches, is unsafe: and to allegorize away a scripturally asserted historic fact, whether from judging it to be unedifying or impossible, most unjustifiable.

As regards *prophecy* Origen lays down the rule:—Whenever the prophets have prophesied anything of Jerusalem or Judea, of Israel or Jacob, then this (agreeably with St. Paul's own teaching) is to be referred anagogically to the *heavenly Jerusalem, Judea, and Israel*; as also in what is said of *Egypt, Babylon, Tyre*: "cum sint in cælo loci terrenis istis cognomines, ac locorum istorum incolæ, animæ scilicet."—I presume he would have thus spiritualized, not merely where there was other evidence of the terms being figuratively meant, but even where the local reference was most pointed and precise.

I have thought it well to abstract the above from a chapter in the Abbé Huet's Ori-

\* Bishop Marsh thinks that the *three* may be reduced to *two*; 1. the literal, grammatical, or historical; 2. the spiritual or allegorical. He also remarks on Origen's admission (T. i. p. 180) that the grammatical or historical applies in many more instances than the more spiritual interpretation. Lecture xi., on Scriptural Interpretation, p. 483.

by him to the Apocalyptic prophecy: especially as one involving constantly symbolic language, besides those allusions to *Babylon, Israel, Jerusalem*, which, we saw, were always, according to him, to be construed *anagogically* in Scripture. But this commentary he in effect did not write: and it remained for others fully to apply his principles to Apocalyptic exposition in a later æra.

5. On the *millenary question*, all primitive expositors except Origen, and the few who rejected the Apocalypse as unapostolical, were *premillenarians*; and construed the first resurrection of the saints *literally*.

PERIOD 2. FROM CONSTANTINE TO THE COMPLETION OF THE FALL  
OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE, A.D. 476.

The great Constantinian revolution, accomplished (as I before observed) just after Lactantius' publication of his 'Institutions,' could hardly fail of exercising a considerable influence on Apocalyptic interpretation. A revolution by which Christianity should be established in the prophetically-denounced Roman Empire, was an event the contingency of which had never occurred apparently to the previous exponents of Christian prophecy; and suggested the idea of a mode, time, and scene of the fulfilment of the promises of the latter-day blessedness, that could scarcely have arisen before:—viz. that its *scene* might be the earth in its *present* state, not the *renovated earth* after Christ's coming and the conflagration; its *time* that of the *present* dispensation; its *mode* by the *earthly establishment* of the *earthly Church visible*. For it does not seem to have occurred at the time, that this might in fact be one of the preparatives, through Satan's craft, for the establishment after a while of the great predicted *antichristian ecclesiastical empire*, on the platform of the same Roman world, and in a professing but apostatized Church.

1. *Eusebius* (my first author of this æra)<sup>1</sup> seems in earlier life to

geniana; as there occurs so much of Origenic *anagoge* in subsequent Apocalyptic interpreters, such as Tichonius, Primasius, &c.

<sup>1</sup> The dates of Eusebius' life are as follows. Born in Palestine in the reign of Gallienus, about A.D. 267: after ordination to the Christian ministry studied with and assisted Pamphilus in his school at Cæsarea, whence his cognomen of Pamphil: in the Diocletianic persecution witnessed the martyrdoms in Palestine which he



have received the Apocalypse as inspired Scripture; and interpreted its Seals, somewhat like Victorinus, of the difficulties of Old Testament prophecy opened by Christ.<sup>1</sup> When the extraordinary Constantinian revolution established itself, though doubts now commenced as to its apostolic authorship, yet he still continued to refer to its prophecies; with an application changed however, accordantly with the change in the times. Thus he applied to this great event both Isaiah's promises of the latter day, and also (as his language indicates) the *Apocalyptic* prophecy of the *New Jerusalem*;<sup>2</sup> at the same time that the symbolic vision of the seven-headed dragon of Apoc. xii., cast down from heaven, was with real exegetic correctness (as I conceive) applied to the dejection of Paganism, and the Pagan emperors, from their former supremacy in the Roman world.<sup>3</sup>—As regards *Daniel's hebdomads*, let me add, Eusebius, like most of the expositors before him, explained them continuously; and as long before altogether fulfilled.<sup>4</sup>

describes, and ministered to Pamphilus, who was for two years in prison: at the end of that persecution, about 314, was made Bishop of Cæsarea: soon after published his "De Demonstrat. et de Preparat. Evangelicâ:" in 325<sup>5</sup> assisted at, and was appointed to address Constantine in, the Nicene Council: in 326 published his Chronicon, and then his Ecclesiastical History, both of which he brought down to that year. In the year 335 he assisted in the Council of Tyre, convened by Constantine to consider charges made by Arius against Athanasius; and thence went to the consecration of Constantine's new church at Jerusalem. Afterwards he visited Constantinople, to make report to Constantine about the Council; and then pronounced before him the tricennial oration; about which time Constantine told him of his vision of the cross, and showed him the labarum made accordantly with it. After this he wrote his Book on the Eastern Festival, 5 Books against Marcellus, and last of all his Life of Constantine: then about the end of 339 died.

<sup>1</sup> Demonstr. Evang. B. vii.

<sup>2</sup> See my Vol. i. p. 256, Note 4.

<sup>3</sup> See Vol. iii. pp. 30, 31, 34, 35, with the Notes. This his view of the vision we may compare with that of the expositor Andreas afterwards. Eusebius intimates that Constantine may have alluded possibly to Isa. xxvii. 1, "The Lord shall punish Leviathan, that crooked serpent." But the *casting down* of the Dragon, which Constantine notes prominently, is not in Isaiah's prophecy, but that of the Apocalypse.

In speaking of the dejection of Pagan emperors I mean of course that Eusebius, like myself, intended the *Devil acting in them*.

<sup>4</sup> But this in a point of view somewhat strange and peculiar.

By the *holy one to be anointed* Eusebius understood the anointed high priests and rulers of the Jews, after their return from the Babylonish captivity. This is the point on which his explanation turns. And so he makes his chronological calculations in the form of the series of high priests and rulers afterwards succeeding:—first Joshua and Zerubbabel, then Ezra and Nehemiah, Joachim, Eliasub, Jehoiada, John, Jaddua; (the same that showed Daniel's prophecy to Alexander the Great;) then Onias, Eleazar, (in whose time the Septuagint version was begun;) a 2nd Onias, Simon, (contemporary with the writing of the Book of Sirach,) a 3rd Onias, (the same that was high priest when Antiochus Epiphanes desolated the temple,) Judas Maccabeus, and his two brothers successively Jonathan and Simon, with whose death ends the 1st

But to carry out such views of the New Jerusalem must soon have been felt most difficult: the Arian and other troubles, which quickly supervened, powerfully contributing to that conviction. It resulted, perhaps not a little from this cause, that the Apocalypse itself became for a while much neglected; especially in the Eastern empire, where the imperial seat was now chiefly fixed. There occur however passing notices, directly or indirectly bearing on Apocalyptic interpretation, in the writings of the two chief champions of the orthodox Trinitarian faith in the East and the West, I mean of course *Athanasius* and *Hilary*, which must not be past over in silence.

2. In *Athanasius* the main point to be marked is his strongly pronounced opinion respecting the *Antichrist* of prophecy, that an heretical anti-Trinitarian ruler of the Roman empire, like Constantius, would well answer to him; *albeit making a Christian profession*, and professedly *in the Christian Church*. Thus, in a general way, with reference to heretical leaders, he spoke of Antichrist coming with the profession, "I am Christ;" assuming Christ's place and character,

Book of Maccabees; then John, then Aristobulus, the first who assumed the royal together with the priestly diadem, and his successor Alexander.—Now from the 1st of Cyrus to the death of Alexander the Great is 236 years; and of the Seleucidian kingdom down to Simon's death 277 [lege 177] years; in all, from Cyrus to the epoch with which the 1st of Maccabees ends, 425 years. Add 57 more for the high priests John, Aristobulus, and Alexander; and we have in all for the reign of *Jewish anointed priests* 483 years = 69 hebdomads.—Also in the first 49 years, or 7 hebdomads of this period, from the 1st of Cyrus to the 6th of Darius, the temple and the street was built in troublous times; it being interrupted by the hostility of the Samaritans. So the Jews themselves said, "*Forty-six years was this temple building;*" to which Josephus adds *three* for the temple enclosure; making altogether 49 years.—After the high priest Alexander's death, when the Jews were distracted with dissensions, Pompey came in the 10th year of the 2nd Aristobulus, entered and defiled the temple, and sent Aristobulus bound to Rome. Then first the Jews became subject to Rome; and, soon after, Herod was made King of the Jews by a Decree of the Roman Senate.

As an alternative explanation Eusebius adds that the computation *may* be made to begin from the 6th of Darius, instead of the 1st of Cyrus. Thence to Herod and Cæsar Augustus is 483 years, or 69 hebdomads. Then Hyrcanus, the last pontiff of Maccabean race, was killed. Then the legal succession of priests ceased; the city and sanctuary was desolated by Herod; and also the covenant confirmed to many for a half hebdomad by Christ's preaching the gospel. After which  $3\frac{1}{2}$  years Christ was crucified; and the sacrifice ceased to the Jews: their temple sacrifices being thenceforward nothing better than sacrifice to the devil.

So Eusebius in his *Demonstratio Evangelica*, cited by Jerome. In his H. E. iii. 5, Eusebius speaks of the abomination of desolation "prophesied of by the prophets," (specially of course by Daniel,) as set up by the Romans on their taking of Jerusalem, and its consequent desolation.

like Satan transformed into an angel of light:<sup>1</sup> then elsewhere, in particular, spoke of Constantius as the precursor of Antichrist,<sup>2</sup> the image of Antichrist,<sup>3</sup> nay as every way answering to Antichrist. For what mark, said he, does Constantius lack of the Antichrist of prophecy?<sup>4</sup>—I may add that he too seems to have construed the 70 *hebdomads of Daniel*, like the majority of his predecessors in the ante-Constantinian age, as wholly fulfilled on the first coming of Jesus, the Holy One of Holies. For then, says he, the prophecy and the vision was sealed up, and the city and the temple taken.<sup>5</sup>

3. In *Hilary*, Bishop of Poitiers in France, the contemporary and friend of Athanasius, the following particulars of Apocalyptic exposition may be worth our notice.<sup>6</sup>—1. Somewhat like Victorinus and

<sup>1</sup> Vol. i. p. 500. (Ed. Colon. 1686.) *Contra Arian. Orat.* 4.

<sup>2</sup> *Epist. ad Solitar.* lb. i. 842, 862.

<sup>3</sup> lb. 860.

<sup>4</sup> lb. p. 860. Τις ἐστὶ τολμᾶ λεγεῖν Κωνσταντιὸν Χριστιανὸν, καὶ οὐ μᾶλλον Ἀντιχριστοῦ τὴν εἰκόνα; Τι γὰρ τῶν τούτου γνωρισμάτων παραλελοιπέν; ἢ πῶς οὐ πανταχοῦθεν οὕτως ἐκεῖνος εἶναι νομισθῆσεται; καὶ κείνος τοιοῦτος ἀνὴρ ὑπονοηθεῖη, οἷος ἐστὶν οὗτος; οὔτε ἐν τῇ μεγάλῃ ἐκκλησίᾳ τῇ ἐν τῷ Καισαρείῳ γινόμενῃς ὁυσίας, καὶ κατὰ Χριστὸν βλασφημίας, ὡς ἐξ ἐντολῆς αὐτοῦ πεποιηκασίν Ἀρειανοὶ τε καὶ Ἕλληνες; Οὐχ ἡ ὄρασις τοῦ Δανιὴλ οὕτως σημαίνει τὸν Ἀντιχριστὸν; ὅτι ποιήσει πολεμὸν μετὰ τῶν ἁγίων, καὶ ἰσχυρεῖ πρὸς αὐτοὺς, καὶ ὑπεροίσει ἐν κακοῖς πάντας τοὺς ἐμπροσθεν, καὶ τρεῖς βασιλεῖς ταπεινώσει,\* καὶ λόγους πρὸς τὸν Ὑψίστον λαλήσει, καὶ ὑπονοήσει τοῦ ἀλλοτριῶσαι καιρὸν καὶ νόμον; So t o p. 855; αὐτὴν [ἀσεβείαν] ὡς Χριστομαχὸν ἡγεμόνα τῆς ἀσεβείας ἐπιγραφόμενὴν Κωνσταντίου, ὡς αὐτοῦ τὸν Ἀντιχριστοῦ.

I rather give these citations, because Mr. C. Maitland represents the professedly Jewish view of the predicted Antichrist as still distinctively maintained by the Athanasian chiefs. "This denial of the Father and the Son was styled by Athanasius *Christ's enemy, Antichrist's forerunner*: but it does not appear that any one mistook Arianism for actual Antichristianity." p. 211. And then, by way of confirmation, he gives an extract from "The Catechism written for Prince Antiochus," as one "which once bore the honoured name of Athanasius," and, though not his, "is yet now attributed to some unknown writer of *Athanasius' time*;" stating that "Antichrist will come out of Galilee; as the Scripture says, Dan is a lion's whelp." ib. 215.

Now in answer to Question 76 of this Catechism, "Why do the Gentiles (ἔθνη) rage?" the writer says that "by ἔθνη are meant the *Romans*, that is, the *race of the Franks*:" ἔθνη λεγεί των Ῥωμαίων, ἡγουν των Φραγγων το γένος. This could not have been till the time of Charlemagne. The date of the Catechism therefore, instead of the 4th, can scarcely have been earlier than the 8th or 9th century. "Post ævum Monotheticum," says Cave, in his notice of Athanasius; i. e. after A.D. 700.

<sup>5</sup> *De Incarn. Verb.* Vol. i. p. 93: Παρουτος του Ἁγίου των ἁγίων εικωτως εσφραγισθη και ὄρασις και προφητεια και ἡ της Ἱερουσαλημ βασιλεια πεπανται, . . . και ἡ πολις και ὁ υἱος ἰαλω.

<sup>6</sup> I have just mentioned *Hilary's* name, Vol. i. p. 30, in my preliminary chapter, as witnessing to the authenticity of the Apocalypse. He testifies to St. John the apostle

\* With reference to Vetrician, Magnentius, and Gallus, overthrown A.D. 350—353. So Constantius was now sole emperor; and the *seven-hilled Rome* one of his capitals.

Eusebius he suggests the idea of the Apocalyptic seven-sealed Book, written within and without, signifying the various things predicted in Moses, the Psalms, and the Prophets, concerning Christ, and which were opened and revealed by Jesus; some already fulfilled when St. John was in Patmos, others yet unfulfilled and future. Moreover he thus somewhat originally divides and classifies them; viz. as Christ's *incarnation, passion, death, resurrection, glory on ascension to heaven, reign, and final judgment*: of which septenary, he says, the first five had been opened to the world on Jesus Christ's first coming; the rest would be opened on his second coming.<sup>1</sup>—2. To the Jewish symbols in Scripture prophecy he supposed generally that a *Christian* sense attached. So, more particularly, with regard to the New Jerusalem of Apoc. xxi., xxii.;<sup>2</sup> as also to the Zion, Jerusalem, Israel, and temple of the prophecies of the Old Testament.<sup>3</sup>—3. On the subject of *Antichrist* he stated in a Treatise written before the year 356,<sup>4</sup> and when the West had been comparatively undisturbed by the violent aggressions of Arianism, that the predicted abomination of desolation was meant of a future Antichrist: the term *abomination* having reference to Antichrist's appropriating to himself the honour due to God, as (after reception by the Jews) he sate in the Jewish holy place or temple;<sup>5</sup> that of *desolation* to his foreseen desolations of the once holy land and place by war and slaughter. Moreover he express his opinion that Moses and Elias, the same that appeared to Christ "ad sponsionem fidei" in the transfiguration, would be the two witnesses figured in the Apocalyptic prophecy as slain by Antichrist.<sup>6</sup>—A little later, after the flood of Arianism had swept with violence into the Western part of the Roman empire, the idea of Antichrist *within the professing Christian Church* forced itself on his mind, just as on that of Athanasius. Writing in 364

as its author in various places: e. g. in his Comments on Ps. ii. and cxviii., Vol. i. pp. 20, 292. At p. 292 he says; "Scripturâ in Apocalypsi calumniatorem eum esse testante:" and at p. 20; "Quòd autem folia ligni hujus . . . salutaria sint gentibus sanctus Joannes in Apocalypsi testatur." So also ii. 132. (My Edition is the Benedictine, Venice 1750.)

<sup>1</sup> Prologue on Ps. i. p. 4.

<sup>2</sup> i. 21.

<sup>3</sup> So of *Zion*, as the Church, on Ps. lxxix. 35, "The Lord shall build up Zion;" Vol. i. pp. 199, 200; also *ibid.* pp. 347, 358, 373, 392:—of *Israel* as the Israel of God, or Gentile Church, ("plebs gentium, populus ecclesie,") i. 329: and of the tribes of Israel spoken of in Ps. cxxii., ("thither the tribes go up,") as not those of the literal Israel, but the spiritual, i. 334:—of the *temple*, as meaning all the saints, i. 429, &c.

<sup>4</sup> So the Editor in his Preface to the Treatise.

<sup>5</sup> i. 617.

<sup>6</sup> i. 600.



against Auxentius, the Arian Archbishop of Milan, he exclaims, "Is it a thing doubtful that Antichrist will sit in Christian Churches?"<sup>1</sup> And both there, and in his Treatise "De Trinitate," written a little before 360, during his exile, he both denounces the Emperor Constantius as a precursor of Antichrist,<sup>2</sup> and directly designates the Bishop Arius, and the Bishop Auxentius, as Antichrists.<sup>3</sup>—4. While commenting on the transfiguration, ("After *six* days Jesus taketh Peter and John, &c.,") Hilary refers to the old idea of a *seventh sabbatical millennium*: saying that as Christ was transfigured in glory after the six days, so after the world's 6000 years there would be manifested the glory of Christ's eternal kingdom.<sup>4</sup> His great subject led him often to speak of the day and hour of the consummation being known to no man.<sup>5</sup> But this fact (considering the measure of doubtfulness attaching to our world's chronology)<sup>6</sup> he did not regard as militating against the idea.

4. Turning to the East again, a very passing notice will suffice, of the Eastern Church's three later patristic expositors of the 4th century, *Cyrl*, *Ephrem Syrus*, *Chrysostom*: since, though acknowledging the Apocalypse as inspired, they yet made but little use of it.<sup>7</sup>—As regards *Cyrl of Jerusalem* I may observe, that with reference to the expected Antichrist, he distinctly coupled together the two ideas of his being a *ruler of the Roman Empire*; (in fact the 8th head of the Apocalyptic Beast;) and his assuming to himself the *title of Christ*:—"This man will usurp the government of the Roman Empire, and

<sup>1</sup> See the extracts Note <sup>3</sup> *infra*.

<sup>2</sup> *Contrà* Constant. Imperat. 7.

<sup>3</sup> "An cum Creatorem et creaturam Patrem et Filium predicabis, per assimilatas nominum voces excludere posse te credis, ne esse Antichristus intelligaris?" So in his *De Trinit.* vi. 42, of *Arius*; on which passage see the Benedictine Note.—"Necesse est in ipsam nos ætatem Antichristi incidisse: cujus, secundum Apostolum, ministris in lucis se angelum transformantibus, . . . is qui est Christus aboletur." *Contrà* Auxent. 5. And so again, *ib.* 12, in a striking passage just a little after: "Unum moneo, cavete Antichristum! Male enim vos parietum amor cepit: male Ecclesiam Dei in tectis ædificiisque veneramini: male sub his pacis nomen ingeritis. Anne ambiguum est in his Antichristum esse sessurum? Montes mihi, et silvæ, et lacus, et carceres, et voragines, sunt tutiores: in his enim prophetæ, aut manentes, aut demersi, Dei Spiritu prophetabant. . . Congreget Auxentius quas volet in me synodos; et hæreticum me, ut sæpe jam fecit, publico titulo proseribat, &c." A passage well deserving attention from all who with Mr. C. Maitland (p. 63) are inclined to denounce anti-papal middle-age confessors, like the Waldenses, as "an Antichristian rabble."

<sup>4</sup> On *Matt.* xvii. 1.

<sup>5</sup> In *Matt.* &c.

<sup>6</sup> See my *Vol.* i. pp. 395—397, and *Vol.* iv. p. 230, et seq.

<sup>7</sup> See my *Vol.* i. p. 30.

will falsely call himself *the Christ*.”<sup>1</sup> But in what *temple* would he sit; the *Jewish* rebuilt temple, or *Christian professing Churches*? “That of the Jews.” But why? “Because *God forbid that the temple meant should be that in which we now are.*” Such was Cyril’s only reason against the latter view of *the temple* meant by St. Paul in his prophecy to the Thessalonians. This *Antichrist*, Cyril judged, was to be Daniel’s abomination of desolation standing in the holy place.—With regard to his contemporary *Ephrem Syrus* we may remark that he, like Hilary, noted how the wicked one, Antichrist, when come, would not cease to *make inquisition* for the saints by land and by sea; they seeking safety meanwhile in monasteries and deserts; the two witnesses Elijah and Enoch preceding him; and, on the Roman empire’s fall, Antichrist, and the consummation.<sup>2</sup>—As to *Chrysostom*, he judged that the temple of Antichrist’s enthronement would be not that which is in Jerusalem, but the Christian Church. “He will not invite men to worship idols, but will be himself an *anti-theos*. He will put down all gods; and will command men to worship *him*, as the very God. And he will sit in the temple of God: not that which is in Jerusalem; but *in the Churches everywhere.*”<sup>3</sup>

But it is time to turn Westward to *Jerome* and *Augustine*, those eminent expositors of the Latin Church, who, unlike the Greek fathers of the age, not only recognized the Apocalypse as a divine book, but continually referred to it: and in their passing notices on Apocalyptic interpretation threw out hints of much importance; and, on more than one point, with great and lasting influence.

### 5. *Jerome.*<sup>4</sup>

1. According to this father of the Church the Apocalypse was

<sup>1</sup> Catech. 15.—Cyril’s exposition of the *eighth head* of the Apocalyptic Beast must not be overlooked;—that Antichrist, after subduing three out of the ten kings of the Roman Empire in its later form, would, as the head and chief of the remaining seven, be the Beast’s *eighth head*.

<sup>2</sup> I abstract from Mr. C. Maitland’s citations, p. 217; not having myself the opportunity of referring to Ephrem Syrus. See too Malvenda, 424. <sup>3</sup> On 2 Thess. ii.

<sup>4</sup> The chief epochs and events of Jerome’s life are as follows.—Born at Strato on the Pannonian and Dalmatian confines, about A.D. 348; went to Rome while yet a youth to complete his education; was there baptized; and there exhibited his tastes, and prepared himself for his subsequent studies, in the collecting of a library, and visiting of the martyrs’ crypts and catacombs:—thence toured into Northern and South-

a book that had in it as many *mysteries as words*, while sundry parti-

ern Gaul ; and on return to Rome determined to become a monk : then, after a while, removed to Jerusalem, taking his library with him, and accompanied by Rufinus, Heliodorus, Evagrius, and others, of whom we hear often in Jerome's after life. This was when about 25.—In Jerusalem and the neighbouring desert he staid 4 years ; suffering perpetually alike from illnesses and temptations : a time this to which the famous paintings of Jerome under temptation in the desert refer. He was then too assailed by Arian teachers ; and, though professing the *ὁμοουσιον*, was accused by some as an Arian heretic, and ejected from his cell. Hence a visit to Antioch, where he heard Apollinarius of Laodicea, and was ordained by Paulinus, being then 30 years old ; at which time he began his earliest prophetic Comment, that on Obadiah. The Arian dissensions continuing, he determined on going to Rome. This was by way of Constantinople ; where he stopt a while, and received instructions from Gregory Nazianzen, shortly before the Constantinopolitan General Council, A.D. 381.—At Rome Damasus was then Pope : and Jerome staid there till Damasus' death in 384 ; admired and courted both by him and all the Christian body, from the fame of his austerities and sanctity in the desert ; many noble ladies of whom we read afterwards, especially Paula (mother to Eustochium), coming under his influence, and being induced by him to renounce the world. Hence an uprising of calumny against him, excited by both laics and clerics ; though the general voice had pronounced him a fit successor to Damasus in the Pontificate : and he quitted Rome in disgust, to resume the monastic life near Jerusalem, followed by Paulla, Melania, and other Roman ladies ; the former of whom, after 3 years, built a monastery at Bethlehem for the men, and four for female virgins ; also an inn for pilgrims to the holy places. Here, night and day, he laboured in his cell. At Rome he had translated the New Testament into Latin, at Damasus' request ; and also begun Comments on Ecclesiastes, Numbers, &c. He now completed these : having got a Jew to come to him by night to teach him Hebrew ; and in a tour through Palestine visited all the sacred places mentioned in the Old Testament, as he had before visited the scenes of St. Paul's travels in Asia Minor. In the course of his first five years at Bethlehem he visited Egypt also, there receiving instruction from Didymus of Alexandria. On his return from Alexandria he wrote his Comments on Ephesians, Philemon, Galatians, Titus ; all which he dedicated to Paula and Eustochium. Then next he composed Comments on the four minor Prophets, Micah, Nahum, Zephaniah, Haggai ; and then on Habakkuk : those on Hosea, Joel, Jonah, Amos, Zechariah, Malachi being not written till some 20 years later ; and those on the four greater prophets not till his old age. So Jerome states in a letter to Pammachius long afterwards. Meanwhile, his fame increasing more and more, the multitude of pilgrims to the Holy Land, and of visitors to himself, increased so as to be a burden ; (among them Sulpicius Severus and Orosius are to be noted :) and Jerome sent his younger brother Paulinianus to sell the wreck of his parental property, saved from the Gothic desolations of Pannonia, to help towards the expenses.—About this time occurred his accusation as a supposed favourer of Rufinus and Origenism ; and, in consequence, a sharp controversy ensued with *Rufinus* : also a new and friendly controversy, on a different subject, with *Augustine*, now famous as the Bishop of Hippo. Then followed the troubles of the Gothic invasion of Italy. In 407 Paulla died : in 410 Alarie took Rome ; and Marcella died of injuries received from the Goths. Jerome had then just finished Daniel, and was labouring on Isaiah and Jeremiah. He was stunned with the news ; as he states alike in his Preface to Ezekiel and Epitaph on Marcella. The crowding to his retreat of multitudes of fugitive and beggared Romans added fresh calamity ; and on this supervened that of an inroad of Huns into Syria. Notwithstanding, and though now “*ætatis ultimæ ac pene decrepidus*,” as he writes of himself to Augustine, he preserved all his mental energy, and continued his labours. So Ezekiel was finished. At length wearied and worn out in body, a slight fever carried him off ; the brethren and sisters of the

cular words had each in them a multifold meaning:<sup>1</sup> and that the Apocalypse was to be all *spiritually* understood; because otherwise Judaic fables must be acquiesced in, such as those about the rebuilding of Jerusalem, and revival in its temple of carnal rites and ordinances.<sup>2</sup> In regard however of which his spiritual or figurative understanding of the Apocalypse, we should remember the check urged by Jerome himself against any undue license of fancy, at least in explaining the Old Testament; so as by those who with "*anagoge veritatem historiæ auferant.*"<sup>3</sup>—2. The Apocalyptic 144,000 seen by St. John with Christ on Mount Zion, or sealed ones out of each and all of the tribes of the Apocalyptic Israel, are sometimes expounded by Jerome of the Christian apostles, martyrs, and saints generally, sometimes of Christian virgins or celibates more especially;<sup>4</sup> never of an election distinctively out of the Jews, or natural Israel.—3. As regards the *two Apocalyptic witnesses*, though he has not given us his own opinion as to who or what exactly were meant by them, and indeed seems by no means to have made up his opinion about them, yet *negatively* he has pretty clearly intimated that in his judgment they were *not* Enoch and Elias;<sup>5</sup> cautioning his questionist on the point,

neighbouring monasteries attending his last hours. This was about the year 420. He was first buried at Bethlehem. But afterwards his remains were translated to the Church now celebrated as that of S. Maria Maggiore at Rome. (My Edition is that of Antwerp, 1579.)

I have given this biographical sketch more fully than I should otherwise have been warranted in doing; partly because of the peculiar and almost romantic interest of the biography; more because of there being so much of reference to the remarkable events and persons of the period in Jerome's writings. <sup>1</sup> Letter 103 to Paulinus, 7.

<sup>2</sup> So in the Letter 148 to Marcella; "Omnis ille liber aut spiritualiter intelligendus sit, ut nos existimamus; aut, si carnalem interpretationem sequimur, Judaicis fabulis acquiescendum sit: &c." And so in his almost latest Scriptural comment on Ezek. xxxviii. <sup>3</sup> Epist. 126, Ad Evagrium.

<sup>4</sup> Of Christian *apostles* and *saints*, generally, in his Letter against Vigilantius: "Tu *apostolis* vincula injicies, ut usque ad diem judicii teneantur custodiâ, nec sint cum Domino suo: de quibus scriptum est, Sequuntur Agnum quocumque vadit?" For, though apostles only are here specified, the argument is directed against Vigilantius' general affirmation about the souls of departed saints and martyrs being unconscionable of the prayers of men.—Also on Is. lxxv. ad fin. "Agni credendi sunt omnes qui in vestibus candidis sequuntur Agnum quocumque vadit; quos Dominus Petro tradidit ad pascendum, dicens, Pasece agnos meos."

Of Christian *virgins*, specially, in his Adv. Jovinian. i. 25:—"Legamus Apocalypsin Joannis, et ibi reperiemus Agnum super montem Sion, et cum eo 144,000. . . De singulis tribubus, exceptâ tribu Dan, pro quâ reponitur tribus Levi, 12 millia virginum signatorum creditura dicuntur. . . Hi Virgines primitiæ Dei sunt: ergo viduæ, et in matrimonio continentes, crunt post primitias." So too in his Apology for the Anti-Jovinian Book, address to Pammachius, Ep. 50, ch. 3; and in the Treatise against Helvidius, ad fin.

<sup>5</sup> "De Enoch et Eliâ, quos venturos Apocalypsis refert (i. e. as Marcella represented



the noble Roman lady Marcella, in a passage already referred to by me against expounding the Apocalypse otherwise than as a book which is to be understood spiritually or figuratively.<sup>1</sup>—4. On *the local scene of the two witnesses' death*, “the great city spiritually called Sodom and Egypt, and where also their Lord had been crucified,” we find exprest in Jerome’s works two different opinions. On the one hand, in the earliest written of his prophetic comments, on Zeph. ii. 9, “Surely Moab shall be as Sodom and the children of Ammon as Gomorrah,” Jerome, in applying that designation and denunciation to *heretical teachers within the Christian Church*, fortifies that view of the passage by reference both to Isaiah’s designation of the false-teaching “*viri cœlesiastici*” of the Jews in his time as men of Sodom and Gomorrah, and also the Apocalyptic designation of the Christ-crucifying Jerusalem as Sodom and Egypt.<sup>2</sup> Again, in a Letter to Hebidia, written in his latter years, in explaining Matt. xxvii. 53, “Many saints which slept arose, and went into *the holy city*, and appeared unto many,” he says that it was not until its rejection of the gospel-message preached by the apostles, and consequent ending of its day of grace, and abandonment to “the two destroying bears from the wood,” Vespasian and Titus, that the literal Jerusalem lost its title of the *holy city*:<sup>3</sup> it being the case thenceforward indeed, but

the thing in her question,) et esse morituros, non est istius temporis disputatio; (viz. of the time of the saints’ general resurrection;) eum omnis liber aut spiritualiter intelligendus est, ut, &c.” See Note 2 p. 318.

<sup>1</sup> Elsewhere, viz. on Matt. xi. 14, he says; “*Sunt qui propter eam Joannem Eliam vocari putant quod, quomodo in secundo Salvatoris adventu juxta Malachiam præcessurus est Elias, . . sic Joannes in primo adventu fecerit.*” In regard of which Mr. C. M. remarks; “At some later time Jerome *maintained the second coming of Elias*; as when expounding Matt. xi. ”But this is incorrect. Jerome there speaks of others, not of himself. Mr. C. M. also refers to Jerome’s comment on Matt. xvii. 11; “*Ipse qui venturus est in secundo Salvatoris adventu juxta corporis fidem, nunc per Joannem venit in virtute et spiritu.*” This at first sight is like the expression of his own opinion to that effect. But comparing it with our other citations, it too seems to be the mere expression in that form of the opinion of others. On Malachi iv. 5 itself Jerome thus strongly expresses himself against it. “*Judæi, et Judaizantes hæretici, ante ηλειημενον suum Eliam putant esse venturum, et restitutum omnia.*” To some such Christ himself, he adds, answered; “*Elias quidem veniet; et, si creditis, jam venit: in Eliâ Joannem intelligens.*”

<sup>2</sup> The reader has in this a characteristic specimen of Jerome’s application of such passages and figures in Old Testament prophecy, to persons and matters connected, whether as true members or enemies, with the Christian Church.

<sup>3</sup> Let the reader mark here Jerome’s decidedly exprest opinion that after the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans the appellative of *the holy city* attached no more to that *literal* Jerusalem. In order to the support of the futurist or semi-futurist Judaic theory of the Apocalypse two points are needed in a patristic comment;

not till then, that, instead of designation as the holy city, it was spiritually called Sodom and Egypt. On the other hand, in an elaborate argument on the whole Apocalyptic passage written by Jerome's disciples Paula and Eustochium from Bethlehem, shortly before Alaric's taking of Rome, and which we cannot but suppose had the master's revision and sanction before its despatch,<sup>1</sup> a different view is argued for of the local scene of the Apocalyptic witnesses' death. With reference to their urgent invitation to Marcella that she should quit the Romish Babylon and join them in their retreat at Jerusalem and Bethlehem, they anticipate her objecting that Jerusalem is branded in the Apocalypse as Sodom and Egypt; and urge against this the necessity of explaining the passage quite otherwise than of the literal Jerusalem. And this on two different grounds:—1st, because in the immediate Apocalyptic context, in contrast to, not identification with, *the great city* of the witnesses' death, the Apocalyptic Jerusalem is designated as *the holy city*; ("the Gentiles shall tread down *the holy city*;" ) and that cannot consistently be called *Sodom* and *Egypt*, which is almost in the same breath called *the holy city*: 2ndly, because in Scripture *Egypt* is never used figuratively for *Jerusalem*, but perpetually for *the world*. Hence, on the whole, they conclude that the great city of the witnesses' death means *the world*.<sup>2</sup> Any one who consults Jerome's comments on the (Old Testament) prophets may see how exactly his view of the figurative sense of *Egypt* in *them* corresponds with this exposition of the *Apocalyptic* phrase.<sup>3</sup>

1st, that *the literal Jerusalem* be construed as *the place of the two witnesses' death*: 2ndly, that the same literal Jerusalem, and its supposed to be restored temple, be construed as *the holy city* and *temple* of Apoc. xi. 2, trodden and defiled by the Gentiles. Thus Mr. C. Maitland himself, in his abstract of Jerome, contends at p. 238 for the identity of the *literal Jerusalem* with *the holy city* of Apoc. xi. 2; quite forgetful of Jerome's chronological limitation of the application to it of that latter appellative.

Jerome's idea was that the local Jerusalem would never be rebuilt, though the Jews would be converted; but remain in ruins to the end of the world. "Obsessi sunt à Vespasiano et Tito; et civitas eorum, Hadriani temporibus, in æternos cineres collapsa est." So on Jer. xix. 7.

<sup>1</sup> "In this little world [viz. that of which Jerome was the centre, including specially the ladies at Bethlehem, Paula and Eustochium, &c.] whatever subject was discussed, . . . every difficulty, was alike referred to this great man of his age." So Mr. C. M. most correctly, at p. 236. Yet at p. 238 he supposes that Paula's elaborate letter to her and Jerome's common friend Marcella, written with the view of inducing her to join Paula herself and Jerome, was written and despatched without his seeing it!

<sup>2</sup> I beg to refer to my notice in Vol. ii. p. 435 of Mr. C. Maitland's attempted answer to this argument of Paula and Eustochium, and justification of the application of all the terms of the prophetic verse to the literal restored Jerusalem.

<sup>3</sup> So e. g. of *Egypt* in his comment on Ps. lxxviii. 12; "Nos omnes eramus in

On the great subject of *Antichrist*, 5thly, we meet in Jerome the same inconsistency, puzzling, and confusion, from his conjunction of some supposed *Jewish* as well as *pseudo-Christian* element in the expected Antichrist, as in certain early expositors. In regard of Antichrist's *political origin*, he is marked by Jerome as the *little horn* springing from out of the midst of the ten horns, or kings, of the 4th or Roman Beast, that divide among themselves the Roman empire.<sup>1</sup> And his great city *Babylon* Jerome construes as distinctly Rome.<sup>2</sup> Moreover it is because of its ruler Antichrist's blasphemies, he says, that the Roman empire is to be destroyed.<sup>3</sup> Again the professedly Christian (pseudo-Christian) *religious* character of Antichrist is remarked on also by Jerome repeatedly. Antichrist, says he, when interpreting St. Paul's prophecy of the Man of Sin, "is to sit in the temple, that is in the Church:"<sup>4</sup> "I think all the heresiarchs Antichrists:"<sup>5</sup> "It is only by assuming Christ's name that the simpler ones of believers can be seduced to go to Antichrist; for then they will go to Antichrist, while thinking to find Christ."<sup>6</sup> Yet Jerome also supposes Antichrist so to profess himself Messiah, or Christ,

Ægypto, et à Domino liberati sumus, . . in tenebris istius seculi:" also on Ezek. xx. 44, xxi. 1, xxiii. 19: "Ægypto seculi hujus:" "ad tantam venimus rabiem ut post multa tempora Dominicæ servitutis revertamur ad Ægyptum, et ea faciamus quæ in seculo fecimus, antequam nomen fidei acceperimus:" &c. So of Sodom in his Comment on Zephan. ii. 9, already referred to; "Hoc de hæreticis intelligamus, quòd reputentur quasi Sodoma et Gomorra." &c.

<sup>1</sup> "Dicamus quod omnes scriptores ecclesiastici tradiderunt, in consummatione mundi, quando regnum destruendum est Romanorum, decem futuros reges qui orbem Romanum inter se dividant:" out of whom Antichrist, "surrecturus de medio eorum," having subdued three, "septem alii reges victori colla submittent." And so he becomes a head to the revived Roman empire in this divided form. So the well-known passage from Jerome, already cited in my Vol. i. p. 390, on Dan. vii.

<sup>2</sup> "Filia Babylonis,—non ipsam Babylonem quidem, [i. e. not the Euphratean Babylon,] sed Romanam urbem interpretantur: quæ in Apocalypsi Joannis, et in Epistolâ Petri, Babylon specialiter appellatur." So on Isa. xlvii. 1. And so again in his Script. Eccl. on the Evangelist Mark.

<sup>3</sup> "Ideo Romanum delebitur imperium quia cornu illud loquebatur grandia." "In uno Romano imperio propter Antichristum blasphemantem omnia simul regna delenda sunt:" an event on which the adventus Filii Dei is to take place. So on Dan. vii. 11.

He notices elsewhere the old idea, as if still current with some, that Nero revived would be the Antichrist: "Multi nostrorum putant ob sævitie et turpitudinis magnitudinem, Domitianum Neronem Antichristum fore." On Dan. xi. 30.

<sup>4</sup> "In templo Dei;—vel Hierosolymis ut quidam putant, vel in ecclesiâ, ut verius arbitramur, sederit." So in reply to the 11th question of Algasia.

<sup>5</sup> Thus on Matt. xxiv. 5, "Many shall come in my name, saying, I am Christ, &c." Jerome comments as follows: "Quorum unus est Simon Samaritanus. . . Ego reor omnes hæresiarchas antichristos esse; et, sub nomine Christi, ea docere quæ contraria sunt Christo."

<sup>6</sup> Ib.

as that *the Jews* will believe on him as Christ :<sup>1</sup> consequently as in profession a *Jew*.<sup>2</sup>—The same partially confused view as that of sundry earlier expositors about Daniel's *abomination of desolation* had no doubt its influence to this effect. Yet Jerome distinctly recognizes the alternative interpretations of this abomination of desolation. It may mean, says he, on Matt. xxiv. 15, either Cæsar's image placed by Pilate in the Jewish temple, or Hadrian's in the ruined temple's holy place, "which has stood there to the present day :"<sup>3</sup> or it may mean simply Antichrist ; or "every perverse dogma which may stand in the holy place, that is in *the Church*, and show itself as God."<sup>4</sup> As to the prophecy of the 70 weeks, connected in the one passage of Dan. ix. 27 with the abomination of desolation, Jerome only gives the opinion of others, (the same that I have a little previously abstracted principally from him,)<sup>5</sup> but shuns giving any of his own.<sup>6</sup>—Antichrist's *time of duration* he of course expected to be  $3\frac{1}{2}$  years, literally. But I must beg attention to the manner in which, in his exposition of Ezekiel's symbolic bearing of the iniquity of Israel 390 days, and that of Judah 40 days, "*a day for a year*," Jerome incidentally supports the old Protestant view of its furnishing a Scriptural precedent for the *year-day* theory. For, like Venema, he supposes Ezekiel's *lying prostrate* for so many *days* to be typical of the

<sup>1</sup> "Quando pro Christo Judæi recipient Antichristum, impletâ prophetiâ Domini Salvadoris, . . . 'Si alius venerit in nomine suo illum recipietis.'" On Obad. 17.

<sup>2</sup> So on Dan. xi. 21 ; "Nostri melius interpretantur et rectius, quòd in fine mundi hæc sit facturus Antichristus ; qui consurgere habet [qu. *debet* ?] de modicâ gente, id est de *populo Judeorum*. . . Et simulabit se ducem esse fæderis, hoc est legis et testamenti Dei. Et ingredietur urbes ditissimas, et faciet quæ non fecerunt patres ejus. Nullus enim *Judeorum* absque Antichristo in toto unquam orbe regnavit."

<sup>3</sup> "Aut de Hadriani equestri statuâ, quæ in ipso sancto sanctorum loco usque in præsentem diem stetit."

<sup>4</sup> "Abominatio desolationis intelligi potest et *omne dogma perversum* ; quod cum viderimus stare in loco sancto, id est in *ecclesiâ*, et se ostendere Deum, debemus fugere de Judæâ in montes : id est," as he adds with characteristic *anagoge*, "dimissâ occidenti literâ, et Judaicâ pravitate, appropinquare montibus æternis." Ibid.

<sup>5</sup> See the Notes, pp. 304, 305 *suprà*.

<sup>6</sup> Jerome adds that the Jews of his time reckoned the 70 hebdomads, or 490 years, as fulfilled first in the restoration of the city and temple, as under Ezra and Nehemiah ; then the destruction of the temple, and cessation of the sacrifice, on occasion of the desolations of their people and city 62 hebdomads after by Titus, and again, yet 7 hebdomads later, by Hadrian. They are not very careful, he says, about the fact that, instead of 490 years from the 1st of Cyrus to Hadrian's war against the Jews, the real chronological interval is 696 years. Before the desolation Jerome makes them say that Christ will come and Christ be slain. But in what sense, as compared with Jewish notions, I cannot understand.



*penal prostration* of Israel and Judah for so many *years*; <sup>1</sup> not, like many late expositors, as typical of the previous prolonged duration of those nations' *sins*.

6. Jerome's view of the *Apocalyptic millennium* was much the same figurative view as Augustine's: his opposition to the literal view of the first resurrection being in his remarks on Victorinus' comment strongly exprest.<sup>2</sup>—At the same time he held the idea which the ancient premillennarians so much insisted on, that the world's destined duration, after the type of the six days of Creation, was to be only 6000 years, and then the saints' *sabbatism* to begin.<sup>3</sup>

Ere passing from Jerome let me remind the reader of his famous Latin translation of the New Testament, the Apocalypse inclusive;—that same which has ever since been so well known as *the Vulgate*: and let him mark in my biographical sketch of Jerome the favourable circumstances under which he made it; viz. while at Rome, in intimacy with Pope Damasus, with all Rome's manuscript stores at his command; also his indefatigable care in collecting books bearing on Biblical literature, as well as indefatigable labour in studying them. Hence the evidently high value and authority of the readings that we find in his translations, even when varying from our best present Greek manuscripts. Of these I will here notice *three*, which I wish

<sup>1</sup> "Quæramus qui sint *anni* 390 qui pro *diebus* totidem supputentur; quibus in sinistro latere propheta dormierit vinetus atque constrictus, . . . captivitatem et miseras decem tribuum, id est Israelis, ostendens." So he calculates from the time of Hosea's captivity to the time of the Jews' deliverance from their afflictions in the last year of Ahasuerus, (or Artaxerxes Mnemon,) as related in the book of Esther, and makes the amount 389 years 4 months: during all which time Israel "fuit in angustia, et jugo pressus captivitatis."

<sup>2</sup> See my page 288 *suprà*.

And yet in his Preface to Isaiah lxx., referring to different views of the Apocalyptic millennium, &c., Jerome says; "Which if I take *figuratively* I fear to contradict the ancients."—On Ezekiel xl. 5, I may observe, he says; "Quod templum Judæi secundum literam in adventum Christi sui, quem nos esse Antichristum comprobamus, putant ædificandum: et nos ad Christi referimus ecclesiam; et quotidie in sanctis ejus ædificari cernimus." Where the words "in sanctis ejus" are to be remarked; and suggest an idea of Jerome's perhaps regarding *the Church of the promises*, like Augustine, as that made up only of *true Christians*. I say perhaps; because he sometimes used *sancti* in the lower and merely ecclesiastical sense.

<sup>3</sup> So in his Letter 139 to Cyprian, on the Psalm xc. 4, after noticing St. Peter's saying that with the Lord one thousand years is as one day, he adds; "Ego arbitrator . . . ut scilicet, quia mundus in sex diebus fabricatus est, sex millibus annorum tantum credatur subsistere; et postea venire septenarium numerum et octonarium,\* in quo verus exercetur sabbatismus." With which compare Jerome's notice of the twelve hours of the labourers in the vineyard, in the comment on Micah iv., cited by me Vol. i. p. 396.

\* Compare the pseudo-Barnabas' *octad*.

my readers specially to remember:—1. the rendering of *bilibris* and *tres bilibres* in the 3rd Seal for *one chœnix* of wheat and *three* of barley; this marking very strikingly to any one who reflects on the so defined *weight* of barley that was to cost but a denarius, the absurdity of all idea of such a symbolization signifying famine:—2. that of *quatuor partes terræ* in the 4th Seal; *four parts* of the earth: not *one fourth* part, *quartam partem*:—3. the reading in Apoc. xvii. 16 either of *cornua quæ vidisti in bestiâ*; so in most MSS. and Copies; or, as in the Laurentian Copy, *cornua quæ vidisti, et Bestiam*; (not *Bestia*;) *hi odient Fornicariam, &c.*<sup>1</sup>—On two of these I have remarked already, in the progress of my Apocalyptic comment.<sup>2</sup>

Yet once more let me advert a second time to the exceeding interest that attaches to Jerome's lively depicting of the grand event of the Roman empire's predicted desolation by barbarian invaders, and incipient breaking up into the ten kingdoms, as in the course of fulfilment in his own time, and before his own eyes. "In our time the clay has become mixt with iron. Once nothing was stronger than the Roman empire, now nothing weaker; mixt up as it is with, and needing the helping of, barbarous nations."<sup>4</sup> "He who withheld is removed, and we think not that Antichrist is at the door."<sup>4</sup> Again, among the invading Goths that desolated the empire, and afterwards partitioned it between them, he significantly reckons *ten* nations.<sup>5</sup> Jerome had no idea of any such mighty chronological gap, as some modern expositors would advocate between the removal of the "let" and the rise of Antichrist.

The reader will not, I think, regret my having dwelt thus long on Jerome: considering that he was the most learned of all the ancient Fathers; and lived at an epoch so transcendently interesting, especially to the students of Daniel's and the Apocalyptic prophecies.

### 6. *Augustine.*

My copious abstracts in the 1st Volume from this eminent and holy Father of the Christian Church make it unnecessary for me to

<sup>1</sup> The accusative in the Laurentian MS. excludes the Beast from participation with the ten horns in the hating, &c. of the Harlot, just as much as the reading *in Bestiâ*. So translating Jerome must have regarded the *το θηριον* as an accusative. And so possibly also Hippolytus. See p. 308 *suprà*.

<sup>2</sup> On the extremely important reading of the 4th Seal, in my Vol. i. pp. 201, 202;—on the reading in Apoc. xvii. 16 in my Vol. iv. p. 31.

<sup>3</sup> On Dan. ii. See my Vol. i. p. 390.

<sup>4</sup> Epist. to Ageruchia. See my Vol. i. p. 393.

<sup>5</sup> See the citation *ibid*.

do more than call attention here very briefly to three or four points in his detached Apocalyptic interpretations.

1. That the Apocalypse embraced for its subject of prefiguration the whole period *from Christ's first coming to the end of the world.*<sup>1</sup>

2. That the 144,000 of the sealing vision (as also of Apoc. xiv.) depicted distinctively (*not* the earthly professing visible Church, *but*) the *Church of the saints*, or *elect*,<sup>2</sup> the constituency of what he calls the *City of God*, ultimately united into the heavenly Jerusalem:<sup>3</sup> while the appended palm-bearing vision figured the blessed and heavenly issue assured to them of their earthly trials and pilgrimage.<sup>4</sup>

3. That the millennium of Satan's binding, and the saints reigning, dated from Christ's ministry, when he beheld Satan fall like lightning from heaven; it being meant to signify the triumph over Satan in the hearts of true believers: and that the subsequent figuration of Gog and Magog indicated the coming of Antichrist at the end of the world; the 1000 years being a figurative numeral, expressive of the whole period intervening.<sup>5</sup>

I may add that he expounded the *woman clothed with the sun*, in Apoc. xii., of the *true Church*, or *Civitas Dei*; clothed with the *sun of righteousness*; trampling on those *growing and waning things of mortality* which the *moon* might figure; and travelling both with Christ personally, and Christ in his members.<sup>6</sup>—Further the complementary set of martyrs, told of to the souls under the altar, he viewed as martyrs to be slain under Antichrist.<sup>7</sup>—As to *Antichrist* himself,

<sup>1</sup> "Per totum hoc tempus quod liber iste (sc. Apocalypsis) complectitur, à primo scilicet adventu Christi usque in sæculi finem."—C. D. xx. 8. 1.

Elsewhere he notes the obscurity of the Apocalypse; very specially from its *repeating* the same objects under different figures."—C. D. xx. 17.

<sup>2</sup> So in his *Doctr. Christ.* iii. 51; "Centum quadraginta quatuor (mille), quo numero significatur *universitas sanctorum* in Apocalypsi."

<sup>3</sup> "Civitatem sanctam Jerusalem, quæ nunc in sanctis fidelibus est diffusa per terras." C. D. xx. 21. In which city he says, on Psalm cxxi. 2, that the angels will be fellow-citizens.

<sup>4</sup> See my Vol. i. pp. 309—313, with the extracts from Augustine in the Notes.

<sup>5</sup> See pp. 136, 137 *suprà*. So the Greek *Andreas* afterwards: as also *Primasius* of the Latin Church, before *Andreas*. It continued in fact the current opinion through the Middle Ages.—That M. Stuart should have ascribed the origin of this opinion (as he seems to do in his Vol. i. p. 459) to *Andreas*, not *Augustine*, appears surprising.

<sup>6</sup> So on Psalm cxlii. 3.—On Psalm xliii. 25, I observe, he explains the opened Book in Apocalypse x., given to St. John to eat, not of the *Apocalypse*, but of the *Bible*.

<sup>7</sup> On the Donatists claiming to be the complementary set of martyrs spoken of to the souls under the altar, Augustine observes; "Quid est stultius quàm quòd putatis prophetiam istam de martyribus, qui futuri prædicti sunt, non nisi in Donatistis esse completam? Quòd si a Joanne usque ad istos nulli occisi essent martyres veri, ut nihil aliud, vel temporibus Antichristi diceremus futuros in quibus ille martyrum

like other earlier Fathers, he viewed him as one that would arise, and reign  $3\frac{1}{2}$  years, at the end of the world; though meanwhile *Antichrist's body*, and his *great city Babylon*, might be considered realized in *the world* and its members. So, on this important point, Augustine endorsed in a manner with his great name the spiritualistic generalizing system of Tichonius.<sup>1</sup>

7. To which expositor, *Tichonius*, last of this æra, now proceed we.

We know both from Augustine,<sup>2</sup> and from the later expositors Primasius and Bede,<sup>3</sup> that a *Donatist* of that name wrote on the Apocalypse; whose time of flourishing, according to Gennadius, was about A.D. 380;<sup>4</sup> and was at any rate partially included within the 30 years of the Donatist Parmenianus' Episcopate, from A.D. 361 to A.D. 391;<sup>5</sup> as the latter took umbrage at certain anti-Donatistic sentiments expressed by Tichonius, though a Donatist, and wrote against them.<sup>6</sup> Perhaps we might prefer to fix the date a little later than 380; as Tichonius had communication with Augustine, and indeed is by some said to have been reclaimed by him from Donatism: and we know that it was only in 391 that Augustine was ordained Presbyter, in 395 Bishop.—Now there is still extant an Apocalyptic Commentary bearing Tichonius' name, drawn up in the form of Homilies, in number nineteen; appended to the fourth volume of the Paris Benedictine Edition of Augustine. And the question has arisen respecting these, whether they are the real work of this afore-said Tichonius, or not. The arguments *against* (as the Benedictine Editor observes) are, 1. that, whereas Primasius says there were decided Donatistic statements in Tichonius' work,<sup>7</sup> in this such are wanting, and anti-Donatistic inserted against *re-baptizing*; 2. that certain passages cited by Bede from Tichonius are here wanting; 3. that on a point in which Tichonius' opinion is said by Augustine to have been illustrated with a copious argument, the opinion is here

numerus completeretur." *Contra Gaudent*, i. 31. In this he coincides with Tertullian. See p. 281 *suprà*.

<sup>1</sup> Daniel's hebdomads, let me here add, Augustine explained as fulfilled at the time, of Christ's first coming. So in his Letter to Hesyehius.

<sup>2</sup> So Augustine, Vol. iii. p. 99, in his statement of Tichonius' seven Rules of interpretation given overleaf.

<sup>3</sup> Who both refer to him in their Apocalyptic Commentaries.

<sup>4</sup> So the Benedictine Editor of Augustine, Vol. ii. col. 371, Note.

<sup>5</sup> So the same Editor.

<sup>6</sup> He wrote a letter of reprehension to Tichonius. See my Note <sup>1</sup> p. 327.

<sup>7</sup> In the Prologue to his Apocalyptic Commentary, B. P. M. x. 287.



indeed given, but without any such copious argument in connexion. To which I may add that there occur here and there brief quotations (unless indeed *Tichonius* be the original) from *Augustine*.<sup>1</sup>—On the other hand there are the arguments following in favour of the *substantial* identity of the extant Treatise with that of *Tichonius*: (arguments omitted by the Benedictine Editor:)—1st, that the expository principles followed in the Treatise agree well with *Tichonius'* expository rules, as recorded by *Augustine*:<sup>2</sup>—2. that one of the anti-Donatistic sentiments, which more than once occurs in these Homilies, is precisely such a recognition of the Catholic Church as was objected to the real *Tichonius*, as an inconsistency, by his Bishop *Parmenianus*:<sup>3</sup>—3. that a particular clause on the horsemen of the second Woe, quoted by *Primasius* from *Tichonius*, appears in the precise words in these Homilies;<sup>4</sup> and also, substantially, three ex-

<sup>1</sup> Especially the two cited as from the *Tichonian Treatise* in my Vol. iii. pp. 277, 221, respecting the *Beast* and the *Beast's image*;—1. "Non abhorret à fide [rectâ] ut *Bestia* ista impia civitas intelligatur. . . populus infidelium contrarius populo fidei et civitati Dei." 2. "Imago vero ejus simulatio est, in eis videlicet hominibus qui velut fidem Catholicam profitentur, et infideliter vivunt." Which same explanations, almost *totidem verbis*, will be found in *Augustine's* C. D. xx. 9. 3.

<sup>2</sup> They are thus enumerated by *Augustine*, Vol. iii. 99; and as rules intended by *Tichonius* to solve the difficulties of Scripture.

1. *De Domino et ejus corpore*; there being sometimes a transition in the sacred writers from Christ the head to the Church his body, and inclusion of both under the same phrase or figure.—A rule rightly applicable sometimes, says *Augustine*.

2. *De Domini corpore bipartito*; the true members of Christ's body and the false.—A view of things right, says *Augustine*, but wrongly exprest; because hypocrites and false professors do not really belong to Christ's body at all.

3. *De promissis et lege*; otherwise exprest, like as by *Augustine* himself, *De spiritu et literâ*; in reference to cases where figures are used; and one thing said, another meant.

4. *De specie et genere*:—where a species is spoken of, e. g. Egypt, Judæa, &c.; but the whole world, of similar gentilism, shown by the strength of the expressions to be meant.

5. *De temporibus*:—where, especially in chronological statements, a *whole* is said for a *part*, or *part* for a *whole*; as Christ's three days in the grave, when the actual time was only one full day, with part of the day preceding, and part of the following; and *Jeremiah's* seventy years of Israel's captivity, though applicable to the Church's whole time of earthly pilgrimage. *Tichonius* applied this Rule to other numerals also; e. g. to the Apocalyptic 144,000; which designated, as he says, the whole body of the saints.

6. *Recapitulation*.

7. *De Diabolo et corpore ejus*:—things being said of the Devil when meant of the *wicked* that constitute his body, and vice versâ. (Just the converse to Rule 1.)

The agreement of the extant Homilies with the above will be noted from time to time in my abstract.

<sup>3</sup> *Tichonius*, says *Augustine*, Vol. xii. 66, "vidit ecclesiam toto orbe diffusam;" and that for this (ib. 63) he was reproved by *Parmenianus*. So in Hom. xix: "Civitas ista [sc. the New Jerusalem] ecclesia est toto orbe diffusa;" and elsewhere.

<sup>4</sup> "Et numerus, inquit, exercituum bis myriades myriadam; audivi numerum eorum:

planations taken by Bede from Tichonius.<sup>1</sup>—There remains to be noted a very important chronological indication in the tenth Homily, which speaks of Arianism as then dominant; “Sicut videmus modo *hæreticos* esse in hoc sæculo potentes, qui habent virtutem Diaboli: sicut quondam Pagani, ita nunc illi vastant ecclesiam:” and again, on the clause about all the earth worshipping the Beast, “Utique habent potestatem hæretici; sed præcipuè *Ariani*:”—statements possibly referable to the Arian Emperor Valens’ oppression of the Trinitarians in the Eastern Empire, which occurred during the life of the real Tichonius; yet not probably so: as Valens’ power extended only to the Eastern or Greek Empire; not to the Western Empire, in which evidently<sup>2</sup> (and most likely in Africa) the writer of the extant Homilies resided. Hence more probably this indication points to the succeeding century; when the Arian Vandal kings Genseric and Hunneric<sup>3</sup> did really desolate the orthodox African Church.—On the whole, and adding to the other evidence in favour of his authorship the important fact of the manuscript’s bearing his name, I feel little doubt in my own mind that the *main substance* of the extant Treatise is from *Tichonius*: though with certain alterations introduced, and an abbreviation into Homiletic form, by some Presby-

*sed non dixit quot myriadam.*” So the Tichonian Homily vii. Primasius, after commenting on the clause as read in his copy, “numerus octaginta millia,” thus adds; “Alia porro translatio, quam *Tichonius* exposuit, habet, ‘Et numerus equestris exercitus bis myriades myriadam. Ubi, expositionem præteriens, hoc tantum adiecit, *Non dixit quot myriadam.*” B. P. M. x. 312.

<sup>1</sup> 1. Says Bede on Apoc. xiv. 20; “Tychonius messorum et vindemiatorem ecclesiam interpretatur.” Says our Tichonius; “Si putandum est quòd ipse Christus visus est in nube albà messor, quis est vindemiator nisi idem; sed in suo corpore, quod est ecclesia.” 2. Says Bede on Apoc. xvii. 7; “Tychonius bestiam ad omne corpus Diaboli refert, quod decedentium et succedentium sibi generationum pro cursu suppleatur.” Says our Tichonius, Hom. xiv., on the verse, “The beast was, and is not, and is to be;” “Hoc fit . . . dum filii mali parentes pessimo imitantur; et, aliis morientibus, alii succedunt eis.” (Copied by Primasius and Ambrose Ansbert.) 3. Says Bede on Apoc. xix. 21; “Hanc cœnam Tychonius sic exponit; Omni tempore comedit ecclesia carnes immicorum suorum.” Says our Tichonius, Hom. xvii.; “Omnes enim gentes, quando in Christo credentes ecclesiæ incorporantur, spiritualiter ab ecclesiâ comeduntur.”

<sup>2</sup> There occurs a curious notice on Apoc. iv. 3, in the second of the extant Homilies, on the resemblance of the word *iris*, or its accusative *irini*, to the Greek word *ειρηνη*; as by a writer, and for readers, to whom alike the Greek was a foreign language. “Cui nomini si una in fine additur littera, et *irini* dicatur, utique hoc ipsum interpretatio sonare videtur; nam Græco vocabulo *ειρηνη* *pax* appellatur.”—Moreover it would seem that these *Homilies* on the Apocalypse were for reading in the Churches. (See e. g. the end of Hom. 1.) But the Apocalypse was a book, I believe, little read at that time in the *Greek Churches*.

<sup>3</sup> See my Vol. ii. p. 223, and Vol. iii. pp. 61—63.

ter of the Latin Catholic Church after the first quarter of the fifth century, probably an African. Thus we may fitly note its scheme of Apocalyptic interpretation as one appertaining to the æra under review: albeit, in its present form, as rather *post-Augustinian* than *pre-Augustinian*.

To begin, there are in two different manuscripts two different introductions. In the *one* MS. (probably the original) the writer states at once the opening of his 1st Homily, the Origenistic interpretative principle of *αναγωγή*, as that adopted in the commentary. "In lectione Revelationis beati Johannis Apostoli, fratres charissimi, *secundùm anagogen* . . . explanare curabimus." The *other* thus speaks: "Respecting the things seen by St. John in the Apocalypse, it seemed to some of the ancient Fathers that either all, or at least the greater part, presignified the coming of Antichrist, or day of judgment. But they who have more diligently handled it, judge that the things contained in it began to have fulfilment immediately after Christ's passion; and are to go on fulfilling up to the day of judgment: so as that but a small portion may seem to remain for the times of Antichrist."<sup>1</sup>—Which two beginnings are quite consistent. For the writer's evident meaning in those words, "consummanda usque ad diem judicii," is not that the Apocalypse was like a dramatic prefiguration of the great *events* of the coming future, to be fulfilled in succession and order until the consummation: but rather a representation (for the most part) of *general truths*, detached and unconnected, concerning the Church; all and ever in course of realization, and that will be so even to the end.

Thus, passing over his explanation of the primary Apocalyptic symbolization of Christ, the details of which he takes very much from Victorinus, and that of the Epistles to the seven Churches, which Churches he regards as representative of the Church universal,<sup>2</sup>—in the *Seals*, the first rider and horse, are expounded of Christ riding to victory on his apostles and prophets, the arrows the

<sup>1</sup> "Aliquibus ex antiquis Patribus hoc visum est, quòd aut tota, aut certè maxima pars, ex ipsâ lectione, diem judicii, vel adventum Antichristi, significare videatur. Illi autem qui diligentius tractaverunt, quòd ea quæ in ipsâ revelatione continentur statim post passionem Domini Salvatoris nostri fuerunt inchoata, et ita sunt usque ad diem judicii consummanda; ut parva portio temporibus Antichristi remanere videatur." Cited by the Benedictine Editor, in his Introductory Notice to the Comment, from a very old MS. in the Abbey of St. Peter at Chartres.

<sup>2</sup> Hom. i.

gospel-word preached, as pointed by the Spirit, in date from after the time of Christ's ascension: the three next riders as the Devil, riding on bloody-minded, hypocritical,<sup>1</sup> and wicked persecuting men, in antagonism to Christ's Church; the oil and the wine of the 3rd Seal signifying the righteous whom none can really hurt:<sup>2</sup> the souls under the altar as the cry of the martyred and persecuted against their persecutors.—So far with reference to the times of the Christian dispensation *generally*. In the sixth Seal, however, the earthquake is explained *specially* of the *last persecution*; and the falling of bad men from *heaven*, i. e. from *the Church*,<sup>3</sup> under it.

So arrived at the *sealing* and *palm-bearing visions* he expounds the one of the Church's ingathering of its mystical number, the 144,000;<sup>4</sup> the other of Church privileges enjoyed by them under the present dispensation:<sup>5</sup> for he regarded the 144,000, and palm-bearing company, as one and the same body,<sup>6</sup> constituted of the elect out of both Jews and Gentiles. The half-hour's silence he interprets, like Victorinus, as the beginning of eternal rest; the incense-Angel as Christ: then thus proceeds to expound the *Trumpets*, or Church-preachments acted out:<sup>7</sup>—viz. the *first*, of luxurious men of the earth, burnt up grass-like by the fire of concupiscence:<sup>8</sup> the *second*,

<sup>1</sup> Hypocritical in the third Seal, because of the rider's carrying in false pretence the *balance of justice*. "Stateram habebat in manu, quia dum se fingunt mali iustitiæ libram tenere, sic plerumque decipiunt." Of the *wine* and *oil* not to be hurt, he says, "In vino sanguis Christi, in oleo unctio chrismatis intelligitur."

<sup>2</sup> Victorinus' explanation of the three last horses as "bella, fames, et pestis," is also given as an alternative; Victorinus being however nowhere mentioned by name. "Super quartam partem terræ," is Tichonius' reading of Apoc. vi.

<sup>3</sup> This is an explanation applied in various similar figurations afterwards.

<sup>4</sup> "144,000 omnis omnino ecclesia est." A *Tichoniasm*. See Tichonius' Rule 5, in my Note, p. 327 *suprà*.—The 144,000 of Apoc. xiv. are similarly explained by him: not, as by Methodius, and sometimes by Jerome, of literal monks and virgins.

<sup>5</sup> On the verse, "I saw and behold a great company, &c.," he says, Hom. vi.; "Non dixit, 'Post hæc vidi *alium* populum; sed, Vidi populum; id est eundem quem viderat in mysterio 144 millium:'" including alike, he adds, both Jews and Gentiles.

<sup>6</sup> A singular explanation; but agreeable with that of the privileges of the *New Jerusalem*, noted p. 335 afterwards. Tichonius' remark on, "He shall lead them to living fountains of waters," stands thus: "Omnia hæc etiam in *præsenti vitâ* spiritualiter ecclesiæ eveniunt: cum, dimissis peccatis, resurgimus; et vitæ prioris lugubris ac veteris hominis exspoliati, in baptismo Christum induimur, et gaudio Sancti Spiritus implemur."

<sup>7</sup> "Septem angelos ecclesiam dixit; qui acceperunt septem tubas, id est, perfectam prædicationem: sicut scriptum est, *Exalta sicut tuba vocem tuam*."

<sup>8</sup> So Isaiah xl. 6, says Tichonius; "All flesh is grass."—"Quos Deus justo iudicio permittit incendio luxuriæ vel cupiditatis exuri."



of the Devil falling like a burning mountain on the world: the *third*, or star falling from heaven, of the falling from the Church of proud and impious men; and its making the waters bitter, of the heretical doctrine of re-baptism: <sup>1</sup> the *fourth*, of evil and hypocritical men in the Church struck with darkness by the Devil, through being given up to their pleasures: <sup>2</sup>—then the *fifth*, of evil men and heretics, fallen from the Church, <sup>3</sup> and with the heart's abyss of wickedness fully opened, so as to obscure the Church's light by their evil deeds and doctrine; the men disguised with crowns, like those of the 24 church-representing elders, and with scorpion-like stings in the tail, (for the false prophet he is the tail,) striking both good, under devilish guidance, though only to quicken them to humility and repentance, and bad, so as to infuse the poison of their doctrine:—also the *sixth* Trumpet, <sup>4</sup> and its horse-borne myriads from the Euphrates, (the river of the *mystic* Babylon,) of *the last persecution*: (that I presume, by Antichrist:) the Angel's cry from the golden altar signifying that of the faithful who dare to resist the mandate of the cruel persecuting king; the smoke, fire, and sulphur from the horses' mouths symbolizing the chief's antichristian blasphemies; the serpent-like tail, with head, the false teachers and their heretical poison; and the chronological tetrad of an hour, day, month, and year answering to the tetrad of a time, two times, and half a time, or the 3½ years of Antichrist's continuance. <sup>5</sup>

On the descent of the Covenant-Angel, i. e. Christ, Tichonius explains his opened Book as the Bible; his lion-like cry, after planting his feet on land and sea, as that of the universal gospel-preaching by the Church over the whole world; and the seven answering thunders as the same with the seven Trumpet voices, or Church-preach-

There is an erroneous transposition of part of the Exposition concerning the Seals, and part concerning the Trumpets, in the MS. of this 6th Homily, which should be noted by the reader. So too afterwards in the 7th Homily.

<sup>1</sup> "Hoc in his qui *re-baptizantur* manifestè intelligi potest." This is an *anti-Donatism* which has been noted as *anti-Tichonian*. But possibly it is such an anti-Donatism as *Tichonius* might have written. See Parmenianus' remonstrance, noted p. 327 *suprà*.

<sup>2</sup> The *eagle* crying Woe, that follows the 4th Trumpet, he explains of each and every minister's announcing of the plagues of the last days, and the coming day of judgment.

<sup>3</sup> "Una stella corpus est multorum cadentium de ecclesiâ per peccata."

<sup>4</sup> "Sed non dixit quot myriadam:" The Tichoniasm noted above, p. 327, Note <sup>4</sup>.

<sup>5</sup> So I think he means: "Hæc sunt quatuor tempora triennii et pars [qu. *partis?*] temporis."—Compare the Tichonian Rule 5.

ments, sealed to the bad, though understood by the good.—Then the introductory charge, prior to the *witness-narrative*, “Measure the temple,” &c., is well and rather remarkably explained of a recession and preparation of the true Church “*ad ultimum* ;” all other professors of religion except the true, whether heretics or badly-living Catholics, like the Gentile outer Court, being shut out:—and the sackcloth-robed witnesses themselves as either the *two Testaments*, or the light-giving *Church* fed by the oil of those two Testaments :<sup>1</sup> their appointed time of prophesying being the *whole time from Christ’s death*. For the phrase “these *have* power,” not, *shall have*, marks the whole of time current *till the last persecution* : and the chronological term *1260 days*, is one inexplicable as the numeral, not only “of the last persecution, and of the future peace, but also of *the whole time from the Lord’s passion* ; either period having that number of days.”<sup>2</sup> Thus we have here a view of the witnessing large and connected. And, during this prolonged time of the Church’s testimony, the killing their injurers with fire out of their mouths is well explained of the destroying effect of the Witnesses’<sup>1</sup> prayers ; and the heaven’s not raining, of the absence of blessing on the barren earth.—After which, and on their finishing their testimony, (a testimony carried on to the very eve of Christ’s revelation,) the *Beast from the abyss*, or “wicked ones making up the Devil’s body,”<sup>3</sup> *especially under Antichrist*,<sup>4</sup> shall conquer them that yield, says Tichonius, and slay the stedfast, in the *πλατεια*, or “*midst of the Church* :” till after *3½ days*, meaning *3½ years*,<sup>5</sup> their dead bodies shall rise, and ascend to meet Christ at his coming.

<sup>1</sup> First the expositor says, “*Duobus testibus meis, id est duobus Testamentis* :” then, presently after ; “*Nam Zacharias unum candelabrum vidit septiforme ; et has duo olivas, id est Testamenta, infundere oleum candelabro, id est ecclesie.*”

<sup>2</sup> “*Prophetabunt diebus 1260 : numerum novissimæ persecutionis dixit, et futuræ pacis, et totius temporis à Domini passione ; quoniam utrumque tempus totidem dies habet, quod suo in loco dieitur.*”—How this *time, times, and half a time* might come to be viewed as a fit designative of the whole Christian era was explained by Ambrose Auserbert. See my sketch p. 360 *infra*. How Tichonius might have inferred from it a nearness of the consummation to his own age will appear from a certain particular value put by him on a prophetic *time*, stated in my next page. How it meant the time of the *future peace*, I know not.

<sup>3</sup> “*Bestiam . . . impios dicit, qui sunt corpus Diaboli.*” Hom. 10. So the 7th Tichonian Rule.

<sup>4</sup> It seems plain that Tichonius refers the death of the Witnesses to this period.

<sup>5</sup> This early testimony for the *year-day* principle, and the reasoning added in its support, is noted by me in my Chapter on the year-day, Vol. iii. pp. 279, 280.—*Prosper*, Leo the Great’s secretary, about A.D. 440, concurred, we there saw, in the explanation.

Next let me sketch, in illustration of his Commentary, Tichonius' exposition of the connected visions of the *Dragon*, *Beast*, and *Beast-riding Harlot*; given in Apoc. xii., xiii., xvii.<sup>1</sup>

The *travailing Woman* then, he says, is the Church, ever bringing forth Christ in his members: the *Dragon*, the Devil seeking to devour them; his *seven heads and ten horns* indicating all the world's kingdoms ruled by him;<sup>2</sup> his *dejection from heaven to earth* by Michael, i. e. Christ, his being cast out of the Church, or hearts of *saints*, into the hearts of earthly men:—the floods cast from the Dragon's mouth against the woman, the multitude of persecutors: the two eagle-wings given to aid her flight from him, the two testaments, or perhaps the two witnessing prophets Elias and his companion: the woman's *wilderness-dwelling*, the Church's desolate state in this world; the *time, times, and half a time* measuring it, a period on the scale perhaps of *a year*, perhaps of a *hundred years* to a time:<sup>3</sup> (on the smaller scale, I presume, the term of special suffering under Antichrist, on the larger that of the Church's whole tribulation, from Christ's first to his second coming:)<sup>4</sup> the Dragon's rage and planning against the woman's seed, after the absorption of the floods from his mouth, the Devil's plan to raise up *heresies* against it, *after the failure of the Roman Pagan persecutions*:—floods absorbed “*ore sanctæ terræ*;” i. e. through the prayers of the saints.

Further, as before, the *Beast* he expounds as the impious of the Devil's body;<sup>5</sup> its leopard spots signifying the variety of the nations under his rule in the time of Antichrist, its seven heads and ten horns the same with those on the Dragon figured previously: the head wounded to death, and reviving, being the revival of heresies and heretics in power through Satanic influence, after demolition by Scripture testimonies: and the *Dragon's giving the Beast his authority*, “*what now we see*;” viz. heretics, especially Arians, vexing the

<sup>1</sup> Part in Hom. ix., part in Hom. x.

<sup>2</sup> “*Capita reges sunt, cornua vero regna*:—in septem capitibus omnes reges; in decem cornibus omnia regna mundi dieit.”

<sup>3</sup> “*Tempus et annus intelligitur, et centum anni.*” A statement this last peculiar to Tichonius, among the Christian Fathers; and borrowed probably from the Jews. (See my Vol. iii. p. 275, Note <sup>5</sup>.) There is no *Scripture* authority for it, as for the *year-day*.

<sup>4</sup> On the *one hundred years* scale the end of the Church's  $3\frac{1}{2}$  times, just as that of the Witnesses, (see p. 332, Note <sup>2</sup>.) would occur not very long after Tichonius' own time; about the end (as was then thought) of the sixth millenary.

<sup>5</sup> Compare, as before, Tichonius' *seventh* Rule, p. 322.

Church, (the Devil's influence aiding them,) so as *formerly did the Pagans*. A partial adoption this (as also on Apoc. xii.) contrary to his usual generalizing system, of the Constantinian explanation of the Dragon's dejection and discomfiture in the fall of Paganism.<sup>1</sup>—Further, the *second Beast* he interprets to be an heretical church,<sup>2</sup> “feigning Christianity, in order thereby the better to deceive:” and setting up for adoration the *Beast's Image*; i. e. a system of Satan masked or disguised under a Christian profession.<sup>3</sup>—The *Beast's mark and number* is stated as  $\chi\iota\tau'$ , = 616 numerally;<sup>4</sup> and which also indicated an affectation of likeness to Christ: (whose monogram, Tichonius seems to hint, was  $\chi\rho\tau$ :<sup>5</sup>) the heretics designated by the Beast boasting to be of Christ, when persecuting him.<sup>6</sup>

As to the *Woman on the Beast*, it is explained thus. “*Corruptelam dici tsedere super populos in eremo. Meretrix, bestia, eremus, unum sunt; . . . quod totum Babylon est:*”<sup>7</sup> and *Babylonia*, the great City, is expounded as *the world and its evil population*. (Of the seven hills nothing is said.) *The Beast that was, and is not, and shall be*,<sup>8</sup> is explained in the sense that bad people rise from bad, in perpetual succession. The ten horns hating the woman,<sup>9</sup> means that the wicked will hate and tear themselves; and, under God's permissive anger, make the world desolate.—Further, the cry “Come out of her, my people,” is one daily fulfilled in the passage of some from out of the mystic Babylon to the mystic Jerusalem; (while others pass from out of Jerusalem to Babylon;)<sup>10</sup> and again, the cry to the birds to congregate to the supper of the great God, figures out the conversion of nations; seeing that when they are incorporated into the Church,

<sup>1</sup> See the Notes in my Vol. iii. pp. 30—33; also p. 311, Note 3, *suprà*.

<sup>2</sup> “Habebat duo cornua similia agni, id est duo Testamenta ad similitudinem agni, quod est Ecclesia.” “Sub nomine Christiano agnum præfert, ut draconis venena latenter infundat: hæc est heretica Ecclesia.” <sup>3</sup> Such, I think, is the meaning.

<sup>4</sup> A reading observable; though unquestionably not the true one. See my extract from Irenæus, Vol. iii. p. 246, Note 1. Tichonius does not notice the other and truer reading,  $\chi\xi\tau'$ , 666. Nor does he propose any *name*, containing the number.

<sup>5</sup> See my notice of the monogram on Constantine's labarum, Vol. i. p. 239, 240.

<sup>6</sup> “616 Græcis literis, fiunt  $\chi\iota\tau'$ : quæ notæ solutæ numerus est: redactæ autem in monogrammum, et notam faciunt, et numerum, et nomen. Hoc signum Christi intelligitur: et ipsius ostenditur similitudo, quam in veritate colit ecclesia: cui se similem facit hæreticorum adversitas: qui cum Christum spirituliter persequantur, tamen de signo crucis Christi gloriari videntur.” <sup>7</sup> Hom. 13, a statement twice made.

<sup>8</sup> So Tichonius reads, *καὶ παρῆσται*. Hom. 14.

<sup>9</sup> “Et decem cornua quæ vidisti hi odio habent meretricem.” Hom. 15. I presume therefore Tichonius' copy read *ἐπι*, not *καὶ*, *το θηριον*, in Apoc. xvii. 16; or perhaps *et Bestiam*. See p. 324 *suprà*.

<sup>10</sup> Hom. 16.



they are spiritually *eaten* by it.<sup>1</sup> And so, as to the Beast's destruction, Tichonius makes it (ageeably with his system) that of the wicked who, from being constituents of the Devil's body, became members of Christ's body.<sup>2</sup>

So we advance towards the conclusion.—Omitting lesser points,<sup>3</sup> I may observe that in Apoc. xx. the *millennium* is explained, on the Augustinian principle, as begun at Christ's first coming and ministry: the strong man armed being ejected out of the hearts of his people by one stronger, and bound from ruling over them: the first resurrection meaning that on remission of sin at baptism;<sup>4</sup> the 1000 *years*, all yet remaining of the world's sixth chiliad; (the whole for the part);<sup>5</sup> and the "*little while*," of Satan's loosing, the 3½ years of Antichrist.

As to the *New Jerusalem*, alike in Apoc. xxi. and Apoc. iii., it is similarly explained of the Church *in its present state*; commencing from Christ's death:<sup>6</sup> (though not without a passing counter-view, given apparently by another hand, which applies it to the glorified Church after the resurrection:<sup>7</sup>) its four gates towards the four winds marking its diffusion over the world; the tree of life meaning the cross, and the river of life the waters of baptism.<sup>8</sup>—Agreeably with which view the *palm-bearers' blessedness* in Apoc. vii. was also explained, as we saw, of the Church *in the present life*; when Chris-

<sup>1</sup> "Omnes gentes, quando in Christo credentes ecclesiæ incorporantur, spiritualiter ab Ecclesiâ comeduntur." Hom. 17. <sup>2</sup> Ibid.

<sup>3</sup> Let me notice one. On Apoc. xvi. 14, speaking of the kings of the world as gathered to the war of the *great day of the Lord*, a primary explanation is given of the Lord's great day, as meaning "the whole time from Christ's death to the end of the world." Then, as an alternative, there is added a reference to the day of *Jerusalem's destruction*; which however I take to be an interpolation. "Potest hoc loco *dies magnus* intelligi illa desolatio, quando à Tito et Vespasiano obsessa est Hierosolyma; ubi, exceptis his qui in captivitatem ducti sunt, quindecies centena millia mortua referuntur." Hom. 13.

<sup>4</sup> Hom. 16, 17, 18. On Augustine, see p. 325 *suprà*.

<sup>5</sup> So the Tichonian Rule 5.

<sup>6</sup> Hom. 3 and 19.

<sup>7</sup> This occurs in Hom. 18, after a quotation from Apoc. xxi. 1, "I saw the New Jerusalem descending as a bride," &c.: the brief comment being thus added, "Illoc totum de gloriâ ecclesiæ dixit, *qualem habebit post resurrectionem*." But this is an insulated sentence: and in three other different places the prophecy is distinctly referred to the Church on earth. See for example the next Note.

<sup>8</sup> So in the Homily 19, where all the particular figures are gone into.—Similarly in Homily 3, on Apoc. iii. 12, "I will write on him the name of the city of my God, the New Jerusalem, which descendeth from heaven from my God," the comment is; "Novam Jerusalem cœlestem *ecclesiam* dicit quæ à Domino nascitur. Novam autem dixit propter novitatem nominis Christiani; et quia ex veteribus novi efficitur."

tians rise to new life at baptism, put on Christ, and are filled with the joy of the Holy Ghost.<sup>1</sup>

To this last expository view I must direct particular attention; as being now for the first time put forth in an Apocalyptic commentary; though not without a partial precedent, as we saw in Eusebius.<sup>2</sup> At the same time it is to be observed that by *the Church* Tichonius meant Christ's *true Church*; perpetually distinguishing between it and the *ficti et mali within*, as well as heretics and Pagans *without* it.—In his explaining away of *Babylon* the seven-hilled city, as merely meaning *the world*, though expressly defined by the Angel to mean *Rome*, he was supported, as we saw, by Augustine. This, with his correspondent generalizing view of *the Beast*, is another of the characteristic and notable points of Tichonius' commentary. With what misleading effect it past downward into the middle age, as the received system of interpretation, will appear in my next Section.<sup>3</sup>

PERIOD 3. FROM THE FALL OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE, A.D. 500,  
TO A.D. 1100.

The period included in this Section comprises that of the early establishment, and growth to mature strength, of the Papal supremacy over the ten Romano-Gothic kingdoms of the revived *Western Empire*; also in *Eastern Christendom* the reign of Justinian, and rise of the Saracens, and then of the Seljukian Turks, down to the first Crusade. Its history is sketched in my Part II., Chapters iii., iv., and v. How the end of the eleventh millenary of the Christian æra constituted an important epoch in the history of Apocalyptic interpretation, such as to furnish a fit ending to the present Period, will appear at the close of this Section.—We open on it with the important question, Did prophetic expositors now, after the breaking up of the old Roman empire, recognize the signs of the times, and look out for a Roman Antichrist?

The *Latin* expositors that I shall first notice under this division are

<sup>1</sup> Homily 6:—"Omnia hæc [viz. what is said of the living fountains of water] etiam in præsentî sæculo, et his diebus, spiritualiter ecclesiæ eveniunt: &c." <sup>2</sup> See p. 311.

<sup>3</sup> Tichonius' *Latin version*, let me here observe, was not Jerome's, called *the Vulgate*. Differences appear throughout. For notable particular exemplifications I may refer to Apoc. xiii. 18; where Tichonius, as already stated, reads "*sexcenti sexdecim*," the Vulgate *sexcenti sexaginta sex*:" and Apoc. xxii. 14; where Tichonius reads, "*Beati qui servant mandata hæc*," the Vulgate, "*Beati qui lavant stolas suas in sanguine Agni*."

*Primasius*, *Bede*, and *Ambrose Ansbert*, of the 6th and 8th centuries : then (after a few passing words on *Haymo*) the *Greek* expositors *Andreas* and *Arethas*, also of the 6th and 8th or 9th centuries, respectively. And I shall close with another Latin expositor who flourished later, perhaps near about the end of the 11th century ; I mean *Berengaud*.

1. Beginning with *Primasius*, his name appears in the second Conference of the fifth General Council, held at Constantinople A.D. 553 ;<sup>1</sup> where he is noted as a Bishop of the *Byzacene* or *Carthaginian* province ; in which province he is supposed to have been Bishop of *Adrumetum*.<sup>2</sup> The manuscript of his works was discovered in the monastery of St. Theuderic near Lyons, in the 16th century ; and was published, with a high eulogy on the author prefacing it, by the learned Gagnæus.<sup>3</sup> These works are all given in the xth volume of the B. P. M. ; that on the Apocalypse occupying from p. 287 to p. 339.

There is so much of general resemblance in this Apocalyptic Commentary to that of Tichonius, (to which indeed he refers, as also to Augustine, as an exemplar before him at the outset,<sup>4</sup>) that there will be no need to enter so much at large into it, after the full sketch just given of Tichonius. His mention of Jerome's Origenistic saying at the outset, that the Apocalypse has as many mysteries as words, and many hidden meanings too in each word,<sup>5</sup> is ominous ; and might well prepare us for the kind of commentary following. Indeed, his seeking for mysteries has imparted an air of mysteriousness and obscurity to parts of it, such that I do not wonder at Ambrose Ansbert's complaining of its frequent unintelligibility.<sup>6</sup> What follows will give a sufficient notion of his general views, and of his more remarkable particular explanations.

<sup>1</sup> Harduin iii. 68.

<sup>2</sup> So Moshcim, &c.

<sup>3</sup> So in his Dedication to the French king, Francis the 1st. B. P. M. x. 142.

<sup>4</sup> B. P. M. x. 287.—Ambrose Ansbert notices this also. " Post quem (Tichonium) Primasius, Africanæ Ecclesiæ Antistes, . . . quinque prædictam Apocalypsim enodavit libris. In quibus, ut ipse asserit, non tam propria quàm aliena contextuit ; ejusdem scilicet Tichonii bene intellecta deflorans." Ansbert adds that Primasius borrowed also from Augustine :—" sed et beatæ recordationis Augustini quædam . . . capitula annectens." B. P. M. xiii. 404.

<sup>5</sup> Ib. x. 288.

<sup>6</sup> " Fateor multa me in ejus dictis sæpissimè legendo scrutatum esse, nec intellexisse." Ibid. xiii. 404.

He begins with stating the objects of the Apocalypse. It needed to be revealed how the Church, then recently founded by the apostles, was destined to be extended; (for it was to have the world for an inheritance;) that so the preachers of the truth, though few and weak and poor as regards this world, might yet boldly make aggression on the many and the great.<sup>1</sup> Which *Church*, its great subject, was in different parts of the Apocalypse ever prominently though variously depicted:—alike, he says, by the seven Asiatic Churches and seven candlesticks, and seven stars; (the fitness of the septenary to signify unity being fancifully accounted for;)<sup>2</sup> by Christ himself, too, as figured on the scene, the Church being Christ's body;<sup>3</sup> and yet more by St. John as a representative: (even his opening act of falling as one dead before Christ, being but a type of the Church dead to the world:)<sup>4</sup> also, in the other and higher visions next vouchsafed, alike by the heaven, by the figured throne placed in it, by Him that sate on the throne, by the twenty-four elders, and by the four living creatures: which last however may mean the four Evangelists:<sup>5</sup>—“*Quod est thronus hoc animalia; hoc et seniores; id est ecclesia.*”<sup>6</sup>—I need not suggest the confusion of ideas, and incoherence of interpretation, necessarily arising from this confused generalization, and identification in meaning, of the varied scenic imagery of the Apocalypse.

The *Sealed Book* he explains as meaning either Testament: the Old Testament being, like the side of the Apocalyptic scroll *without* written, outwardly visible; the other the New, like the side *within* written, hidden within the symbols of the Old.<sup>7</sup> The successive symbols of its six *Seals*, as opened, he expounds very much like Tichonius; with additional conceits however, arising out of his straining to find out yet further mysteries.<sup>8</sup> Like him, besides noting certain

<sup>1</sup> Ib. x. 288.

<sup>2</sup> B. P. M. x. 289, 290.—*Seven* being a complete number: as man is made up of body and soul; the soul with its *three* parts, heart, soul, mind; the body with its *four*, hot and cold, moist and dry!

<sup>3</sup> “*Genus à parte,*” p. 290. So the Donatist Tichonius, Rule I.

<sup>4</sup> “*Joannes qui ista vidit, (and when he saw fell at Christ's feet as dead,) totius ecclesie figuram portat.*” Ib. 290. So also Victorinus and Tichonius.

<sup>5</sup> B. P. M. 294, 295.

<sup>6</sup> Ib. 301.

<sup>7</sup> Ib. 297.

<sup>8</sup> E. g. the fitness of a septenary, to signify completeness and unity, is illustrated by the seven moods of a verb in grammar: also by the seven ages distinguishable in the inward and spiritual history of a spiritual man: and yet other similitudes. pp. 297—299.



devilish agencies as meant figuratively in the *second*, *third*,<sup>1</sup> and *fourth*<sup>2</sup> Seals, opposed to Christ and his Church, after their going forth to victory, as figured in the *first*, he also adds Victorinus' literal solution of the *bella, fames, pestis*: and like him joins Victorinus in explaining the *fifth* Seal of martyrs generally, the *sixth* Seal, both in general and in detail, of the last persecution,<sup>3</sup> towards the end of the last age of the Church: the chronology here passing from the whole period of Christianity generally to its last epoch specially. By which persecution (a persecution I presume by Antichrist, though Antichrist is not indeed mentioned as its author) the world generally, Primasius supposes, is to be oppressed. The elemental convulsions in the Seal he expounds, as might be expected, figuratively.

Like Tichonius, again, he interprets alike the 144,000<sup>4</sup> and the palm-bearing white-robed<sup>5</sup> company to mean the whole Church of the elect; and interprets the four angels of the winds (a point unnoticed by the former expositor) to be the four winds spoken of by Daniel as striving on the agitated scene of the four great empires: while the Angel from the East symbolizes Christ *at his first coming*, restraining by the power of his gospel-preaching the hostile powers; this being the stone cut out of the mountain, which was to smite, and in fine destroy, the great image.<sup>6</sup> The great tribulation out of which the palm-bearers were to come he explains generally by the text, "We must through much tribulation enter into the kingdom of God;" not with reference to any final tribulation. And their predicted happiness he does not, like Tichonius, confine to the Church

<sup>1</sup> He translates *chanix*, like Jerome, by *bilibris*.—Primasius' Latin version, let me here observe, is not Jerome's Vulgate. It is more like Tichonius', though different.

<sup>2</sup> In the 4th Seal he thus accounts for the specification of the fourth part of the earth, as a scene of injury. The world is divided into two parts, one for God, one for the Devil; and the latter subdivided into three, Pagan, heretics, and false orthodox professing Christians. Now it is the first of these four only, or true Church, that is assailed.

<sup>3</sup> "Sexta ætas mundi, circà ejus finem novissima persecutio nunciatur." p. 303. He refers to Isaiah ii. 21, "They shall go into the clefts of the rocks, &c." in illustration of the Church, and her Christian faith, being the world's refuge under present suffering and future fears.

<sup>4</sup> On the mysteries of the names of the twelve Jewish tribes, as applied to the Christian Church, Primasius has not less than three folio pages, from 305 to 308. He speaks of Dan as if a tribe included, not excluded, p. 306. Yet at p. 314 he notices the current notion of Antichrist being born of the tribe of Dan.

<sup>5</sup> The robes being made white, after neglect of the grace of baptism, by the grace of the Lamb, or perhaps by martyrdom; the palms figuring the triumph of the cross. 308, 309.

<sup>6</sup> p. 304.

in its present state, though he seems to include it; but refers such particulars as, "God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes," to the Church's future bliss.—*The half-hour's silence* he explains with his two predecessors of the beginning of the saints' eternal rest.

In the *Trumpets* he still follows Tichonius. Throughout the time of the Church's preaching-voice, fulfilling the Angel's trumpet-blowings, there would be the destruction of the earthly-minded temporally or spiritually in God's wrath; by the Devil's burning fury; by the falling to earth, and consequent embittering of the streams of doctrine, of many once in the ecclesiastical heaven: as also by the obscuration in part of the Church's light; and by heretical teachers too, and false prophets, with venom-distilling tails, like those of the scorpion-locusts of the 5th Trumpet:—until, under the 6th Trumpet, or in the 6th age, the four *winds* (this should be marked) would be loosed from long partial confinement in the mystical river of Babylon; (this corresponding with the loosing of the Devil, mentioned in Apoc. xx., after the millennium;) and with the force of eight myriads,<sup>1</sup> or myriads of myriads, including both heretics and the whole body of the wicked, urge during the fated "hour, day, month, and year," or quadripartite period of the 3½ years, the last and great persecution.<sup>2</sup>

In the vision of the *rainbow-crowned Angel* of Apoc. x., Primasius combines Victorinus' and Tichonius' explanations. The Angel he explains to be Christ; the opened book the New Testament; the seven thunders the Church's preaching; the sealing a proper reservation of its truths such as Christian discretion might dictate. Again, Christ's charge to John to eat the book, and prophesy again, he explains as true both of John personally, by the publication of his Apocalypse and Gospel, so as Victorinus would have it, and of the Church's preaching always, so as Tichonius; a sweetness resulting to the preacher where the word is received by the hearer, and pain and bitterness where it is rejected and in vain.—*The measuring the temple* follows naturally; signifying, as it does, the informing and

<sup>1</sup> I am not aware that any manuscript, or any Expositor but Primasius, exhibits the various reading, *οκτω μυριαδες*. He notices the common reading of *two myriads of myriads* as that given by Tichonius.

<sup>2</sup> Primasius thinks that the *fire* and *sulphur* out of the mystical horses' mouths may refer to the *hell* whence their doctrine came, and whither it led, p. 312. Tichonius had explained them of the blasphemies uttered.

instructing the Church, especially in matters concerning the altar, or Christian faith.—Further, as to the *two Apocalyptic Witnesses*, their testifying included both the Church's witness, with the two Testaments, throughout the whole time of Christianity; that being the mystical sense of the 42 months,<sup>1</sup> as Tichonius had previously set forth;<sup>2</sup> and also specially their witness, and that of Elias, in the first half of Daniel's last hebdomad;<sup>3</sup> very much as Victorinus. The witnesses' death he explains as occurring in the *literal* Jerusalem: this death including the hiding of living Christians in secret refuge-places from Antichrist's violence, as well as the death of others: the  $3\frac{1}{2}$  *days* of their exposure as dead being the  $3\frac{1}{2}$  *years* of Antichrist.

In the vision of the *Woman* and *Dragon* we still see Tichonius' track followed. It is the Church bringing forth Christ *in his members*; and the Devil wielding the supremacy of this world's dominion, and seeking to devour the *new man*: which new man is as it were caught up to God's throne; because his conversation, as Paul says, is in heaven. The wilderness where the woman is nourished is this world of her pilgrimage; the two wings sustaining her, the two Testaments; the 1260 days' period of her sojourning, both that of the Christian dispensation generally, and specially the  $3\frac{1}{2}$  years of Antichrist.—Again, as to the *Beast*, of Apoc. xiii., it is the whole mass of the reprobate, making up the Devil's body; the last of its heads being *Antichrist*, under whom *fully* and *specially* the Devil will act out his purposes. Primasius, like others before and after him, strongly marks this Antichrist's affected impersonation of, or substi-

<sup>1</sup> 314.—By construing the 42 months and  $3\frac{1}{2}$  years literally, as well as mystically, and speaking of its having reference to the last persecution, (see p. 332 *suprà*,) Tichonius too seems to have intended to mark the witnessing under Elias; whom he makes to be the wings sustaining the woman of Apoc. xii. of the last persecution. But he does not express this.

<sup>2</sup> The prophesied *drought* Primasius makes to be *spiritual*; also the *killing* by fire from the witnesses' mouths to be *spiritual* death, through the Church's anathema.

<sup>3</sup> Through which, adds Primasius, the Jews are to believe on Jesus Christ, p. 315. He means, I suppose, the Jews *generally*, not universally. For respecting the Beast that kills the witnesses, i. e. Antichrist, he explains the *abyss* whence he is to rise as the "*latebræ nequitiæ cordis Judæorum.*" 314.—Primasius does not specify any individual companion to Elias.

Daniel's seventy weeks' prophecy, let me observe, Primasius, pp. 314, 315, supposes to refer to Christ's first coming mainly. But he is so obscure in part of his explanations that I am unable clearly to comprehend his meaning. For, though speaking of the 70 weeks, he yet makes Christ's coming after 62, and then allots the last week to the events of the consummation. Did he suppose the remaining seven to be the time from Christ's birth to his death?

tution of himself for, Christ; and blasphemous appropriation to himself of Christ's proper dignity.<sup>1</sup>—*The Image of the Beast* (the *second two-horned Beast*) Primasius seems to view as the *ecclesiastical præpositi*, or *rulers*, hypocritically feigning likeness to the Lamb, in order the better to war against him:<sup>2</sup> and (somewhat as Tichonius too explained it) by the *mask of a Christian profession*, under which mask the Devil puts himself before men, acting out the Mediator.<sup>3</sup> He gives for the Beast's name and number, 666, the words *αντεμος* and *αρνουμε*:<sup>4</sup> the former from Victorinus; the latter from, or antecedently to, the pseudo-Hippolytus.

The *Vials*, now filled with God's wrath, he views as the same that were previously seen held by the twenty-four elders, or seven Trumpet-Angels, full of the prayers of saints:<sup>5</sup> for, to the wicked such prayers "are a savour of death unto death in them that perish." They signify generally God's spiritual judgments on them. Under the sixth Vial Primasius speaks of Christ as *the king* (*regi*, in the singular,) from the East, or sun-rising:<sup>6</sup> and of the way as now prepared for his coming to judgment, by nothing of good remaining, and the earth being, as in the parallel symbol Apoc. xiv. 15, dried up in readiness for burning.—In Apoc. xvii. the Woman means the worldly, reprobate, or evil body; the desert in which she appears *God's absence*: (a striking sentiment!)<sup>7</sup> the ten horns of the Beast she rides on, Daniel's ten kings just preceding Antichrist; the dia-

<sup>1</sup> "Ut publicè audeat blasphemare, quando dignitatem ei (Christo) specialiter debitam sibi ausus fuerit adsignare; et, contrarius Christo, se velit pro eo accipiendum vel vi ingerere, vel fraude supponere." Ib. 319.—And again, p. 326; "Contrarius Christo (quod et nomen ejus Antichristus indicat) se velit haberi pro Christo."

<sup>2</sup> "Agnum fingit ut Agnum invadat." Ibid. The want of distinction between the two Beasts and the Dragon or Devil, continually appears. So of the second Beast. "Bestia cum duobus cornibus, quæ est pars Bestiæ, facit Bestiam adorare Bestiam."

<sup>3</sup> "Sathanas transfiguratur se velut angelum lucis, exhibens suis fallaciter solo nomine Christum. Porro ipse et suum et mediatoris implet locum; quod mediatorem non habet, nisi simulacrum Christi. Ipsam insimulationem dicit Bestiam habere plagam gladii, et vivere. . . Tres itaque, diabolus, bestia velut occisa, populus cum præpositis suis, duo sunt mediante imagine." Ibid. It is hard indeed in such passages to catch Primasius' meaning.

<sup>4</sup> For *αρνουμαι*, *I deny*; as a Christ-denying profession. The pronunciation of *αι* as *ε* is here indicated.—Primasius here adds sundry other numeral conceits.

<sup>5</sup> So Primasius, p. 323, by a strange mistake; the Angel in Apoc. viii. 3 who had the incense of the prayers of all the saints, being quite distinct from the seven Angels of Apoc. viii. 2.

<sup>6</sup> So reading *τω βασιλει*, for *τοις βασιλευσι*. p. 324.

<sup>7</sup> "Desertum ponit Divinitatis absentiam, cujus præsentia paradisi est." Ib. 325.



deins seen upon them marking them out as then the alone reigning powers. The seven hills indicate *Rome*; but Rome only as a type of the ruling power and dominion.<sup>1</sup> The destruction of Babylon in Apoc. xviii. is of course the destruction of all worldly, Christ-opposing powers.

The *millennium* Primasius expounds as Augustine and Tichonius; the new heavens and earth, and the new Jerusalem, as a new world, so changed from the old as may befit the saints in their new bodies; i. e. after their own resurrection, and the condemnation of the wicked.<sup>2</sup>

2. The venerable *Bede* comes next in our list of Apocalyptic expositors; the date of his death, in the Northumbrian monastery of which he was the ornament, being A.D. 735, at the age of 63.

At the outset of his Commentary his full citation of the seven rules of Tichonius prepares the reader for its general *Tichonian* character. It has however points of peculiarity in certain passages worth the notice.

The figures of the opening vision of Christ and the seven candlesticks, or Churches, together with the letters to those Churches,<sup>3</sup> are explained much as by Tichonius or Primasius; the latter of which expositors is also often referred to by Bede. Of the new vision commencing in Apoc. iv. his expository views, as to order and subject, are thus stated: "Descriptis ecclesiæ operibus, quæ et qualis futura esset, recapitulat à Christi nativitate, eadem aliter dicturus.<sup>4</sup> Totum enim tempus ecclesiæ variis in hoc libro figuris repetit."

So the seven-sealed Book, containing the mysteries of the Old and New Testament opened by Christ at his incarnation, is expounded as follows:—the 1st Seal to figure the primitive Church in its triumphs;

<sup>1</sup> p. 326.—This view is a little like that which Dr. Arnold and the Rev. T. K. Arnold, following certain German expositors, have advocated in our own day:—the thing symbolized being symbolic of something else.

<sup>2</sup> "Judicatis impiis atque damnatis, figura hujus mundi mundanorum ignium conflagratione præteribit; . . ut, cælo et terrâ in melius commutatis, . . mundus, in melius innovatus, aptè accommodetur hominibus in melius innovatis;" i. e. with "bodies incorrupt and immortal." ib. 334.

<sup>3</sup> Some, he says on Apoc. ii. 10, explained *the ten days' tribulation* of the ten Pagan persecutions from Nero to Diocletian. So Augustine, I think, somewhere suggests.

<sup>4</sup> The recapitulation, he says in his Preface, is generally after the 6th part in prophetic series.

the 2nd, 3rd, and 4th the "triforme contrà eam bellum," of bloody persecutors, false hypocritical brethren, and soul-destroying heretics such as Arius; the 5th the glory of deceased martyrs, under the golden altar of incense; the 6th the last persecution of Antichrist: all much as by Tichonius.—In the 4th I observe that Bede, while reading, like Jerome,<sup>1</sup> "super *quatuor partes terræ*," notices also that another Latin Version (evidently Tichonius' or Primasius')<sup>2</sup> read "super *quartam partem*," answering to the *επι το τεταρτον* of our present Greek MSS.

In the sealing vision of Apoc. vii. the 4 Angels of the winds are construed by Bede as the 4 great prophetic empires; whom Christ, the Angel from the East, restrains, in so far as the sealing or the care of his saints may require it: the 144,000 of Israel signifying the whole number of the redeemed;<sup>3</sup> and the palm-bearing vision their glory after death, more especially that of the saints victorious over Antichrist.—As to the half-hour's silence after the opening of the 7th Seal, Bede suggests that it may answer to the 45 days mentioned in Dan. xii., intervening, according to Jerome,<sup>4</sup> between Antichrist's destruction and the commencement of the saints' reign. An original explanation, I believe.

The Trumpets Bede explains generally like Tichonius and Primasius. The following points of detail may be remarked as interesting, and mostly original. The seven trumpet-blasts of the Church's preaching he compares with those after which the walls of Jericho fell.—In the 1st Trumpet, symbolizing the destruction of the impious by fire and hail, he refers it to the torments of hell, combining the transition from icy cold to fiery heat.<sup>5</sup>—After the 4th Trumpet

<sup>1</sup> See p. 324. Bede's version is in fact the Vulgate.

<sup>2</sup> For he gives *their* explanation with the reading.

<sup>3</sup> After 3 pages in development of this *mystical* and *Christian* view of the 144,000 of the sealed of Israel, Bede adds on the *literal* and *Judaic* view in 3 lines; "Potest et sic intelligi, quod, enumeratis tribus Israel quibus evangelium primo prædicatum est, salvationem quoque velit commemorare gentium." I observe that Mr. C. Maitland, p. 297, cites this from Bede without any notice of Bede's other and evidently approved view; which other is repeated by him, without any alternative explanation, on Apoc. xiv. 1.

<sup>4</sup> "Quare autem post interfectionem Antichristi quadragesimum quintum dierum silentium sit, divinæ scientiæ est." So Jerome, using the word *silentium*; which probably suggested to Bede the explanation.

<sup>5</sup> "Pœnam gehennæ: . . . ad calorem nimium transibunt ab aquis nivium." Compare Milton Par. L. B. ii.

Thither, by harpy-footed furies hal'd,  
At certain revolutions all the damn'd

the voice of the *eagle* flying through mid-heaven, with its cry of Woe, is the voice of preachers forewarning men of Antichrist's being near at hand;—"In the last days perilous times shall come:" "And then shall that Wicked One be revealed," &c.: after which the day of judgment.—On Apoc. ix. 6, "In those days men shall seek death, &c.," he cites illustratively Cyprian's remark respecting the Decian persecution, "Volentibus mori non permittebatur occidi."—In the 6th Trumpet the 4 Angels loosed are explained as the same with those holding the winds in Apoc. vii.; the plague being that of Antichrist and his heretical ministers loosed from the Euphrates, or river of Babylon, against the Church; and the hour, day, month, and year signifying the evil spirits' constant preparedness for destroying men.—The rainbow-crowned angel vision in Apoc. x. is inserted with a new recapitulation, to signify the preparation made by Christ's first coming for the destruction of the Adversary:—Christ's feet like pillars of fire answering to Peter, James, and John, who seemed pillars of the Church; the planting them on sea and land, the preaching the gospel over either; and the seven thunders the Church-preachings under influence of the divine septiform Spirit; with reservation of its mysteries from all but fit hearers.—In this Bede follows Primasius.

In the Vision of the two Witnesses, Apoc. xi., the measuring reed is explained by Bede as the gospel-rule, whereby all but true professors are excluded from the Church, and counted with Gentiles. These tread down the holy City, or Church, not only specially during Antichrist's time, but also in a manner always; he being the proper head of which they are the body. Meanwhile the two Witnesses, or Church formed out of the two people of Jews and Gentiles, and with Christ as *their* head, perform their ministry; <sup>1</sup> the 3½ years' time of their sackcloth-robed witness being commensurate with that of the treading down of the Holy City, and especially that of Daniel's abomination of desolation, or Antichrist. Their death signifies An-

Are brought : and feel by turns the bitter change  
Of fierce extremes, extremes by change more fierce,  
From beds of raging fire to starve in ice.

When did this idea of hell-torments begin ?

<sup>1</sup> At the end of this vision Bede notices the idea of Enoch and Elias' 3½ years of prophesying being the first half of the last of Daniel's 70 hebdomads, and Antichrist's 3½ years' reign the last half. But this only as an opinion current with certain other expositors;—"Quidam interpretantur."

tichrist's all but suppression of the witness during the time of his reign:<sup>1</sup> the great city of their death being the "civitas impiorum" which crucified Christ, and the  $3\frac{1}{2}$  days of their exposure as dead the  $3\frac{1}{2}$  years of Antichrist's reign; after the end of which the saints rise to glory.<sup>2</sup>

As to the *Beast* in Apoc. xiii. and xvii., its body is the whole body of the wicked, its last head Antichrist: the 2nd *lamb-like Beast*, meaning Antichrist's pseudo-Christian false prophets;<sup>3</sup> and what is said of their persuading men to make an *image* of the Beast, the persuading men to imitate and become like him. As to the city of Antichrist's origin Bede notes doubtingly the idea of its being the literal Babylon.<sup>4</sup> His name, like Primasius, he explains as *τειταν, αντεμος*, or *αρονυμε*.—The contrasted 144,000 with the Lamb on Mount Zion, he explains (as before in Apoc. vii.) not as mere virgins, but the whole faithful Church of Christ.

Of the *millennium* Bede sets forth of course the now universally received spiritual view, which had been first propounded by Jerome and Augustine.

Bede introduces his Apocalyptic Commentary by a versified sketch of what he viewed as its general purport and more characteristic points:<sup>5</sup> and he concludes by a request to the reader for his prayers.

<sup>1</sup> This view deserves to be remarked. Not, says Bede, that they do not still (i. e. after the Beast's conquering and killing them) resist the enemy with their testimony; but because the Church is then left destitute of its virtues, the adversary outshining it with his lying signs and miracles:—"Non quòd tunc eodem testimonio non nitantur hosti fortiter resistendo; sed quòd tunc ecclesia virtutum gratià destituenda credatur, adversario palam signis mendacii coruscante."

The not suffering their bodies to be put in graves he thus explains. "Votum eorum dixit, et impugnationem. . . Facient autem perspicuè de *vivorum occisorumque* corporibus: quia nec vivos sinent sacra celebrando in memoriam colligi, nec occisos in memoriam recitari, nec eorum corpora in memoriam Dei testium sepeliri."

<sup>2</sup> "Et post  $3\frac{1}{2}$  dies, &c. Angelus nunc inducit factum quod futurum audit, *regno Antichristi perduto* sanctos resurrexisse ad gloriam."

<sup>3</sup> So too Gregory i.; ap. Malv. i. 425.

<sup>4</sup> "De Babylone natum." So, he says on Apoc. xvii., "quidam."

<sup>5</sup> The reader may be interested to see these introductory verses. I therefore sub-join them:

Exul ab humano dum pellitur orbe Johannes,  
Et vetitur Coici est cernere regna soli,  
Intrat ovans cœli Domino dilectus in aulam,  
Regis et altithroni gaudet adesse choris.  
Hic ubi subjectum sacra lumina vertit in orbem,  
Currere fluctivagas cernit ubique rates;  
Et Babel et Solymam mixtis configere castris;  
Hinc atque hinc vicibus tela fugamque capi.



“Explicato tandem tanto tamque periculoso labore, suppliciter obnixèque deprecor, ut si qui nostrum hoc opusculum lectione vel transcriptione dignum duxerint, auctorem quoque operis Domino commendare meminerint; ut qui non solum mihi, sed et illis, laboraverim. Illorum vicissim qui meo sudore fruuntur votis precibusque remunerer; lignique vitæ, cujus eos aliquatenus odore famâque aspersi, suis meritis faciant visu fructuque potiri. Amen!”

3. *Ambrose Ansbert* is my next Latin Expositor. He fixes his own æra to about A.D. 760 or 770. For he dedicates his Apocalyptic Commentary at its commencement to Pope Stephen; and at the end tells us that it was written in the times of Pope Paul, and of Desiderius, king of the Lombards.<sup>1</sup> Now Desiderius was king of the Lombards from 756 to 774; in which year he was defeated, and the Lombard kingdom overthrown by Charlemagne. Also Pope Stephen III died in 757, Pope Paul in 767, Pope Stephen IV his successor in 772.<sup>2</sup> He further tells us in his Postscript, that he was a native of Provence in Gaul; and had become a monk of the monastery of St. Vincent in Samnium.<sup>3</sup> Elsewhere he mentions that he had to write the comment with his own hands, the aid of a *notary* not being afforded him.<sup>4</sup> The Commentary is a copious one, occupying some 250 folio pages in the Bibliotheca; viz. from p. 403 to p. 657 of its xiiiith volume. He makes mention of *Victorinus* as the earliest Apocalyptic expositor among the Latins; and as expurgated and altered

Sed mitem sequitur miles qui candidus Agnum,  
 Cum duce percipiat regna beata poli.  
 Squameus est Anguis: per Tartara cæca maniplos  
 Submergit flammis peste fameque suos.  
 Hujus quæ facies, studiumve, ordove duelli,  
 Ars quæ, quæve phalanx, palma, vel arma forent,  
 Pandere dum cuperem, veterum sata leta peragrans,  
 Excerpsi campis germina pauca sacris.  
 Copia ne potior generet fastidia mensis,  
 Convivam aut tenuem tanta parare vetet.  
 Nostra tuis ergo sapiant si fereula labris,  
 Regnanti laudes da super astra Deo.  
 Sin alias, animos tamen amplexatus amicos,  
 Quæ cano corripicns pumice frange, rogo.

<sup>1</sup> B. P. M. xiii. 403, 657.

<sup>2</sup> Trithemius strangely writes of his age; “Claruit sub Arnolde Imperatore A.D. 890.” Quoted B. P. M. xiii. 403.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid. 657.

<sup>4</sup> “Quia in hoc tam laborioso opere notariorum solatia decesse mihi videntur, ea quæ dictavero manu propria exarare contendo.” p. 408. He was in this respect less fortunate than Joachim Abbas afterwards.

by Jerome: also of the two next as *Tichonius* and *Primasius*:—a specification satisfactory, as showing us that we still possess all the earliest Latin expositors on this Book. A few detached notices on it are also mentioned by him as occurring in the works of Augustine and Pope Gregory the 1st.<sup>1</sup>

In his comment Ambrose Ansbert treads in the steps of Tichonius and Primasius so closely,\* that there seems to be as little need as in the case of Primasius to give lengthened details. At the outset he recognizes John's representative character,—representative of *the Church* generally, of *holy preachers* particularly: <sup>2</sup> also the principle of *the Church* (or at least its *prelates*) being figured in the twenty-four elders: and all comprehended indeed in Christ himself too, as being his body; the 24 thrones being thus included, as if one with it, in the circuit of Christ's own throne.<sup>3</sup> The seven-sealed Book Ansbert views with his predecessors as the Old and New Testament; the Old written without.<sup>4</sup> An ominous notice of the seven different modes of expounding, viz. the *historic, allegoric, mixt historic and allegoric, mystical, parabolic*, that which discriminates between Christ's first and second coming, and that which "*geminam præceptorum retinet qualitatem, id est vitæ agendæ vitæque figurandæ,*" is developed in some six folio pages preceding his exposition of the Seals.<sup>5</sup>—In which exposition of the *Seals*, while explaining the 1st, as usual, of the progress of Christ and his gospel, it is *spiritual* evils that he considers chiefly symbolized in those that follow. His chief difference from his predecessors is in making the rider of the black horse in the third Seal, with a pair of balances, to mean the Devil and his followers deceitfully weighing the world against Christ, so as to cheat men with the idea of the world being the more valuable; <sup>6</sup> also, in the fourth Seal, in making Death and the pale horse that he rides to mean the Devil killing men's souls by means of heretical teachers.

<sup>1</sup> p. 404.

<sup>2</sup> p. 407.

<sup>3</sup> "Quia singulariter et principaliter universam Dominus, sive in prælati sive in subditis, judicabit ecclesiam, ideoque seniores et throni una sedes dicuntur." Ib. 464. I suppose the *subditi* meant here are the subordinate clergy. <sup>4</sup> p. 469.

<sup>5</sup> Ib. 470—475. I think Ambrose Ansbert will be found sometimes as difficult of understanding by modern readers as he tells us he found Primasius.

<sup>6</sup> "Quibus (sc. malis hominibus) Principis sui affectus paratissimus servit; cùm, staterem in manu tenens, temporalibus stipendiis quorundam vitam mercari quærit, quæ illorum suamque esuriam saturare queat." In contrast with which he adds Christ's saying, "What shall a man give in exchange for his soul?"—Ib. 483.

In which Seal, let me observe, he reads with Jerome and Bede "on the four parts of the earth," not "the fourth part."<sup>1</sup> Further, it is observable that under the sixth Seal he makes the rocks of refuge in the last great persecution, and under fears of the approaching day of judgment, to be "*suffragia sanctorum*;" that is, of departed saints and of angels. For, says he, even with regard to "the elect," and the good works that may have preceded, yet "*necesse est ut semper ad cœlestium civium confugiamus latibula; id est Angelorum intercessionibus ab irâ Judicantis nos deprecemur liberari.*"<sup>2</sup> So does the taint of angel and saint worship, then current, appear on the face of this Apocalyptic Exposition.—In the scenic figuration next following the angels of the winds are explained as the evil spirits acting in the four great idolatrous empires, so as by Primasius; and the 144,000 as the mystic number of the elect: the numeral 12, here squared, having parallelism with the 12,000 stadia measure of the new Jerusalem.

Proceeding to the *Trumpets*, he makes the preparatory *half-hour's silence* to be that of the Church's silent contemplation: (a *half-hour*, not a *whole* hour, because in this state its contemplation can never be perfect:) and then (first I believe of expositors) compares the seven Trumpet-soundings with those of the jubilee-trumpets under the old law: as also those sounded on the seven days' compassing of Jericho;—Jericho, the type in its fall of that of this world.<sup>3</sup>—Inconsistently with what he had said before of the need of the "*suffrages of the saints*," he explains the Angel-Priest with the incense-offering so as Tichonius, Primasius, and Bede before him, to be Christ our Mediator.<sup>4</sup> In the 5th Trumpet he suggests that the specification of "*hair as the hair of women*" might refer to the fact of women having

<sup>1</sup> "Hunc super quatuor partes terræ potestatem accepisse denuntiat." On which he comments, as meant of the four divisions on the Devil's side,—heathen, Jewish, heretic, and that of false profession within the Church. Ansbert does not seem to have been aware of any other reading. This is the rather to be observed, because, though he used the common Vulgate Latin version, yet it was here and there with variations; as in Apoc. xvii. 16, noticed p. 352 Note <sup>4</sup> *infra*. <sup>2</sup> *Ib.* 487.

<sup>3</sup> *Ib.* 497. He notices this with unusual brevity: "Has certe Angelorum tubas illæ præsignabant quæ in Jubilæi usibus per Moysen factæ fuisse memorantur. Quibus septem dierum circuitu clangentibus, in typum hujus sæculi, muri Jericho cecidisse narrantur."

<sup>4</sup> This their concurrent explanation should be noted, in controversy with the Romanists. Ansbert cites 1 John ii. 1; "If any man sin we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous."

been so often misled by, and given patronage to, heretics: e. g. Constantine's sister, and afterwards Justina, in the case of Arius and the Arian heresy; Priscilla in that of Montanus; Lucilla in that of Donatus.<sup>1</sup> In the 6th Trumpet he supposes the four Euphratean Angels to be identical with the four Angels of the winds in Apoc. vii.;<sup>2</sup> and the hour, day, month, and year to be equivalent to the  $3\frac{1}{2}$  years; like Primasius and other expositors before him.

After this I see no variation from Primasius worth noticing, either in the exposition of the *rainbow-crowned Angel's* figuration in Apoc. x., or that of *the Witnesses* in Apoc. xi. Indeed he often quotes at length from Primasius, though without acknowledgment; for example in the exposition of the verse, "Thou must prophesy again," as applicable both to John specially, and the Church universally.<sup>3</sup> The two Witnesses also he makes to be the Church preachers generally, as well as Enoch and Elias specially;<sup>4</sup> reproving Victorinus for suggesting Jeremiah in the special case, instead of Enoch.<sup>5</sup> The great city in which the Witnesses would be slain might be either the world, or the earthly literal Jerusalem: their witnessing time of 1260 days (=  $3\frac{1}{2}$  years) either, mystically, the whole time of Christ's Church witnessing; (*a period borrowed from the  $3\frac{1}{2}$  years that was the whole time of Christ's ministry;*)<sup>6</sup> or 1260 days literally: the  $3\frac{1}{2}$  days' apparent death of the witnesses being the  $3\frac{1}{2}$  years of the last persecution. Following speedily on which will be the 7th Trumpet of the last judgment, at Christ's coming.<sup>7</sup>—In Apoc. xii., he expounds the travailing Woman, both of the Virgin Mary and the Church, specially and generally.—On Apoc. xiii. he makes Antichrist to be the eighth head of the Beast, accordantly alike with the symbol of the Beast from the sea in Apoc. xiii., one of whose seven heads had been wounded to death but revived; and also with the Angel's explan-

<sup>1</sup> Ib. 503.

<sup>2</sup> "Eosdem angelos qui super quatuor angulos ventos, terræ ne flarent, alligatos tenebant, in flumine maguo Euphrate victos perhibuit." p. 505.

<sup>3</sup> See the full quotation at p. 154 of my 2nd Volume.

<sup>4</sup> So, he says, Jerome and Pope Gregory. Ib. 522.

<sup>5</sup> See my p. 293 Note 6.

<sup>6</sup> So at p. 537, in his notice of the woman's flight into the wilderness for  $3\frac{1}{2}$  times. "Cur autem hoc totum ecclesie tempus tribus annis et sex mensibus generaliter designetur patet ratio; propter evangelicam scilicet prædicationem, [sc. by Christ,] quæ trium temporum et dimidii spatiis edita fuisse cognoscitur."—I do not remember to have seen any such reason given for this mystical sense in Ansbert's predecessors.—Elsewhere, p. 545, Ansbert compares the equivalent 42 months to Israel's 42 stations in the wilderness.

<sup>7</sup> pp. 526, 528.



atory observation to that effect in Apoc. xvii.<sup>1</sup> The second or two-horned Beast he explains distinctively from the other, like Gregory and Bede, as signifying *the preachers and ministers of Antichrist*:<sup>2</sup> feigning the *lamb*, in order to carry out their hostility against the Lamb: just as Antichrist too, the first Beast's head wounded to death, would, he says, exhibit himself *pro Christo*,<sup>3</sup> in Christ's place. The "bringing fire from heaven," he explains as pretending, and seeming to men, to have the power of giving the Holy Spirit, such as Simon Magus wished to obtain by money;<sup>4</sup> and that the second Beast would, by its preachings, signs, and dogmas, make men believe that the Holy Spirit resided in Antichrist.<sup>5</sup> (This idea seems to me original, and deserving of remark.) Also that the *Beast's image* meant Antichrist, as pictured to themselves by men (after the antichristian preachers' teaching) to be Christ's image, though really the Devil's image.—On the Beast's *mark* he observes, that its being required on the forehead meant a man's profession; on the hand, his acts: and that this was the case even *within* the Church, in the case of false professors. Further, as names containing the number 666, he mentions Irenæus' *τετραν*, as well as those in Victorinus and his interpolator, *αντεμος*, *γενσηρικος*: there being added for the first time a *Latin* solution also, (a very curious one,) *DIC LUX*.<sup>6</sup>

After the *Vials*, in which nothing appears to me observable, but that he makes the *ulcer* of the first Vial to be *infidelity*, (such as with the Jews and Pagans,<sup>7</sup>) the subject comes up again in Apoc. xvii., of the Beast and the Harlot riding him. Here Ansbert speaks of the old notion that *the Beast that was and is not* meant Nero, once one of seven Roman emperors, and destined to rise again in the character

<sup>1</sup> p. 542.

<sup>2</sup> So p. 541: repeated again p. 548, "quia soli præpositi prædicatores atque ministri Antichristi." Here he also nearly follows Irenæus. <sup>3</sup> Ib. 544.

<sup>4</sup> "Quos ut illi ministri Sathanæ facilius decipere possint, coram ipsis Spiritum sanctum dare se simulant; . . . sicut dudum Simon Magus, &c." p. 549.

<sup>5</sup> "Quomodo intelligendum est dare illi spiritum, nisi quia sive prædicationibus, seu signis et miraculis, suadere hominibus conatur spiritu prophetiæ plenum esse Antichristum?" p. 550.

<sup>6</sup> p. 552. Mr. C. Maitland (p. 319) erroneously inscribes the invention of this to *Rupert*, three or four centuries later. Ansbert speaks of it as his own discovery; "in-venimus."

<sup>7</sup> p. 576.—Let me add that the Euphrates, the river of Babylon, will, he considers, be dried up when its power to injure and persecute is dried up; and that thus the way will be prepared for Christ the King from the East, according to Primasius' reading of the word in the singular; or, if in the plural, for the apostles and ministers of the Church. Ib. 580 and 581.

of Antichrist, as “absurd:”<sup>1</sup> adding that the Beast (answering to Antichrist’s body) had in fact existed from the beginning in Cain, and the wicked afterwards; and that it might be said *to have been*, and *not be*, and *yet be*, because of the fleeting and successive generations in whom he rose and fell of evil men.<sup>2</sup>—Of the seven kings symbolized by the Beast’s seven heads, of which five had fallen, his solution is certainly as “*absurd*” as that he ridicules:—viz. that, as in man the five senses exist before reason, and then, on reason’s unfolding, man’s sixth and mature age begins, to be improved to the man’s salvation, or abused to his destruction, so in its sixth age, then current, the world had come to its maturity; and, preferring error,<sup>3</sup> that so in the seventh would come Antichrist.<sup>4</sup>—On the *millennium* he of course follows his two predecessors and Augustine. And the *New Jerusalem*, and its blessings, he explains partly of the Church’s present blessings; partly of those to be enjoyed in its future and heavenly state.<sup>5</sup>

4. Early in the next, or 9th century, flourished *Haymo*, Bishop of Halberstadt; who wrote an Apocalyptic Comment which forms a thick substantial duodecimo, (i. e. in the princeps Editio printed at Cologne, A.D. 1529,) after collation, it is said, of many manuscript codices. But I do not see need to cite from or refer to it at any length. For I have found it, on examination, to be very mainly copied or abridged from Ambrose Ansbert. There is scarce a chapter in which the examiner will not observe this.—I shall therefore only mention four notabilia in his Commentary;—1st, that in Apoc. vi. 8, on the 4th Seal, he reads like Jerome,<sup>6</sup> Bede, and Ambrose Ansbert, “super *quatuor partes terræ*, on *the four parts* of the earth,” not *the fourth part*; explaining it as meant either of the reprobates in all the four parts of the earth, or the four great kingdoms of prophecy: (he does not seem to have been aware of any different rendering:)—2. that in support of his view of the  $3\frac{1}{2}$  *days* of the two

<sup>1</sup> Ib. 592.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. So Tichonius. See p. 334 *suprà*.

<sup>3</sup> p. 593.

<sup>4</sup> Ansbert reads in verse 16 “the ten horns *and* the Beast;” (τα δεκα κερατα και το θηριον) not, as the common copies of Jerome’s Vulgate, “the ten horns *on* the Beast,” επι το θηριον.

<sup>5</sup> So on the river of life; “Possunt cuncta hæc non inconvenienter ad præsens tempus referri, quo, ad instar Paradisi, prædicationis flumine sancta rigatur ecclesia.” p. 646. At p. 647, however, on the absence of the curse, he explains it as fulfilled “in illâ *æternâ* felicitate,” &c.

<sup>6</sup> Haymo used the Latin Vulgate version; but often notices other various readings.

Witnesses lying dead meaning  $3\frac{1}{2}$  years, he cites (first I believe of expositors) the well-known passage from *Ezekiel* iv., as well as that from Numbers xiv.:—3. that the reading first given by him in Apoc. xvii. 16 is “cornua quæ vidisti in Bestiâ,” *ἐπι το θηριον*; there being noticed however by him afterwards the other reading “reges et Bestia,” given by Ansbert, or *καὶ το θηριον*:—4. that on Apoc. xviii. 3, speaking of the reprobated merchandise of Babylon, he applies it to those who then sold their souls for lordships and *bishoprics*; “comitatus et *episcopatus*, cæterasque dignitates hujus sæculi.”

I now turn to Primasius' and Ambrose Ansbert's two chief contemporary expositors in the GREEK Church and empire; viz. *Andreas*, and his follower *Arethas*.

5. *Andreas* was Bishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia. His age is said by Bellarmine, and also by Peltan the Jesuit, in his Preface to the first printed Edition of *Andreas*' Apocalyptic Commentary,<sup>1</sup> to have been uncertain; save only that it was later than Basil, the famous Father of the fourth century, since *Andreas* quotes him. By Cave and Lardner,<sup>2</sup> while admitting its uncertainty, he is assigned to the latter part of the fifth century. And so too Professor M. Stuart.<sup>3</sup> But I think internal evidence is not wanting to fix his date a half-century at least, if not a whole century, later.

For *first*, besides other authors, he quotes *Dionysius*, the so-called Areopagite;<sup>4</sup> one whose work is cited by no authority of known earlier chronology than the middle of the sixth century.<sup>5</sup> *Secondly*, after noticing (under the fourth Seal) a pestilence and famine in the Emperor Maximin's territory, at the close of the Diocletian persecution, in which dogs were wont to be killed that they might not prey on the unburied corpses, *Andreas* speaks of the very same things

<sup>1</sup> Prefixed to the original Edition in Greek, which is appended to Commelin's Edition (A.D. 1696) of Chrysostom's Commentaries on St. Paul's Epistles; also to Peltan's Latin Translation in the B. P. M. 589—635.

<sup>2</sup> Lardner cites Cave's statement. “Vixisse videtur circa exitum seculi istius, ac claruisse anno 500. Incerta enim prorsus illius ætas.” Lardner v. 77.

<sup>3</sup> In Apoc. Vol. i. p. 267.—Prof. Hug, in his Introduction to the New Testament, Vol. i. p. 230, (Wait's Translation,) speaks of *Andreas*' age as not known; and that people vary in their conjectures from the 5th to the 8th century.

<sup>4</sup> Viz. on Apoc. iv. 8.

<sup>5</sup> The earliest occasion, as Pagi admits, being the conference at Constantinople between the Catholics and the Severiani, A.D. 532.—Lardner, v. 73, allowing a margin of forty years, supposes that *Dionysius*' date may be perhaps set down at A.D. 490.

having occurred in his own time; “Και εν τη ἡμετερα δε γενεα τωτων ἕκαστον συμβῆαν ἐγνωμεν”—a statement scarcely applicable except to a time of very aggravated pestilence and mortality; and most exactly applicable to the æra of the great and almost universal plague and mortality under Justinian, prolonged from A.D. 542 to 594; during which it is expressly on record that corpses were frequently left unburied.<sup>1</sup>—*Thirdly*, while recording *generally* the calamities experienced by the generation then living, from barbarians invading the province or empire,<sup>2</sup> Andreas more than once *particularly* specifies the *Persians* as persecutors and slaughterers of Christians, both long previously, and even up to the time when he wrote; also their having been ever given up to magic (μαγειαις) and superstitions:<sup>3</sup>—statements well applicable to the period of Nushirvan’s invasion of the Syrian province, A.D. 546, or of his last brief war with the Romans, A.D. 572; and still more to that of Chosroes’ invasion and desolation of Cappadocia and other Roman provinces, in the year 611.<sup>4</sup> On the other hand there is no notice whatever of Mahomedism or the Saracens; who in the year 636 A.D. finally overthrew

<sup>1</sup> Gibb. vii. 421. I have noticed this famous pestilence in my Vol. i. p. 399.

<sup>2</sup> So on the sixth Seal, speaking of Christian Churches, and rulers both secular and ecclesiastical, fleeing from place to place, in the time of the “Pseudo-Christ” or Antichrist, in order to escape his persecution, he adds; ὡν και ἡμεις, προ της αυτου παρουσιας, δι’ αμαρτιας . . . πεπειραμεθα. And on the 4th Vial, Apoc. xvi. 9, he speaks of many of his fellow-citizens of the Eastern Empire impeaching God’s goodness for allowing such calamities to their particular generation; ὡς και νυν ὄραν ἐξεστι πολλους τοις κυκλωσασιν ἡμας εκ βαρβαρικων χειρων ἀρῆτοις δεινοις ασχαλλοντας, την θειαν αιτιασθαι αγαθοτητα ὅτι τας τσαντας κακωσεις τη ἡμετερα γενεα τετηρηκεν.

<sup>3</sup> On Apoc. xviii. 21—24, after stating the reason of the Apocalyptic Babylon’s doomed utter destruction to be its having deceived all nations with its sorceries, and shed the blood of saints and prophets, Andreas thus states the applicability of these characteristics to the Persian capital Ctesiphon; Δι ὡν ἀπαντων την ασεβη παρα Περσαις Βαβυλωνα δηλουσθαι εικος, ὡς πολλων ἁγιων κατα διαφορους καιρους μεχρι του νυν δεξαμενην αίματα, και ὡς μαγειαις και απатаις διηνεκως χαιρουσαν’ though the distinctly *Roman* origin and local empire of Daniel’s Antichrist forbid his resting on this solution of the prophetic symbol. Again on Apoc. xvii. 6 he similarly characterizes the then Persian rulers and capital; Κυριωτερωσ δε και ἡ παρα Περσαις το κρατος εχουσα και Βαβυλων και πορνη προσαγορευεται’ adding; τας εν Περσιδι τουτων [μαρτυρων] κολασεις τις αν εξαριθμησαιτο;

<sup>4</sup> The following chronological sketch (taken from Gibbon) of the Roman wars with Persia will illustrate what has been said: a sketch commencing from the æra of the great Theodosius, and his peace with Persia about 390 A.D.

A.D. 422, a slight alarm of Persian war; which however scarcely disturbed the tranquillity of the East. A Christian Bishop having in 420 destroyed a fire-temple at Susa, (the then Persian capital,) the Magi excited a cruel persecution of Christians in Persia. This was in the last year of Yezdegerd’s reign, and first of his son Bahram’s. Armenia and Mesopotamia were filled with hostile armies; but no memorable acts



both the Persian empire and the religion of the Magi.—*Fourthly*, on Apoc. xvii. 1—3, Andreas argues against *ancient Rome* being meant “as the city which now reigns over the kings of the earth,” because of its having *some long time before* lost its imperial dignity: <sup>1</sup> a statement scarcely applicable to the time of Theodoric, A.D. 500, when Rome exhibited not a little of its ancient splendour; <sup>2</sup> but strikingly according with the period from after its ruin by Totilas, about the middle of the sixth century, till the accession of Gregory to the Popedom at the end of that century; when, to use Gibbon’s language, Rome had reached the lowest point of depression. <sup>3</sup>—*Fifthly*, he alludes to the Roman Emperors reigning at Constantinople, as those that had held a rod of power strong as iron for the depression of heathenism: <sup>4</sup> a characteristic probably referable to the time of Andreas’ writing as well as to times previous. In which case the period of the Constantinopolitan Emperor’s great depression at the time

followed. A truce for 100 years was agreed on; and the main conditions of the treaty were respected for nearly 80 years: i.e. till about A.D. 502. Gibbon v. 428.

A.D. 502—505. A short Persian war; in which Amida was taken by the Persians, Edessa vainly assaulted, and “the unhappy frontier tasted the full measure of the calamities of war.” A peace followed; and Dara was built by the Romans near Nisibis: which for some years proved on that part of the frontier an effective defence. Gibb. vii. 138, &c.

A.D. 540. Nushirvan (also called Chosroes) invades Syria, takes Antioch, its capital, slaughters the people, pillages the churches, and sacrifices to the *Magian* god, the sun.—A.D. 541, 542, he is forced beyond the Euphrates by Belisarius; and, Dara and Edessa having shortly afterwards successfully resisted a Persian attack, “the calamities of war were suspended by those of *pestilence*; and a tacit or formal agreement between the two sovereigns protected the tranquillity of the Eastern frontier.” Gibb. vii. 311—318. In Colchos the war still continued, till A.D. 561; when a peace of fifty years was agreed on. Ib. 339.—A.D. 572—579. Renewal of war. Dara taken; Syria overrun and despoiled; *Cæsarea* (in Cappadocia) *threatened*; till in the battle of Militene the tide of success turned in favour of the Romans.—A.D. 579, Nushirvan’s death. Gibb. viii. 175—177.

Shortly after this Chosroes, Nushirvan’s grandson, under the pressure of civil war, fled for refuge to the Romans; and was soon with their aid restored. On Phocas’ murder of the Emperor Maurice, and usurpation of the Eastern empire, Chosroes, A.D. 603, invades the empire; A.D. 611 conquers and desolates Syria; then *takes and sacks Cæsarea*; and then, A.D. 614, Jerusalem; the *Magi* and the Jews urging the holy warfare: the sepulchre of Christ is pillaged of the offerings of 300 years, and 90,000 Christians massacred. In 616 Asia Minor is overrun again to the Bosphorus; and for some six or eight years the Persian dominion, and its *Magian worship of fire*, established; the Christians meanwhile being persecuted and oppressed: till Heraclius’s celebrated repulse of the Persians, and victories in 622. Gibb. viii. 217, &c.

<sup>1</sup> Ἡ γὰρ παλαιὰ Ῥώμη ἐκ πολλοῦ τοῦ τῆς βασιλείας κρατος ἀπεβάλεν· εἰ μὴ ὑποθωμεθὰ εἰς αὐτὴν τοῦ Ῥωμαίου παλιν ἀναστρέφειν ἀξίωμα.

<sup>2</sup> See Gibbon vii. 29, 30.

<sup>3</sup> Gibbon viii. 158—161.

<sup>4</sup> Δι’ οὗ (viz. the ἐκκλησίας λαος) ἤδη μὲν ταῖς τῶν ὀνυατῶν Ῥωμαίων χερσὶ, ταῖς κραταιαῖς ὡς ὁ σιδηρός, τὰ ἐθνη ἐποιμανεὺς Χριστὸς ὁ Θεός. On Apoc. xii. 5.

of Chosroes' invasions, from A.D. 611 to 622, would so seem to be set aside.—*Sixthly*, he speaks of certain Scythian Northern Hunnish nations, as among the most powerful and warlike of the earth: <sup>1</sup>—a statement perfectly applicable to the æra of the empire of the White Huns of Bochara and Samarcand: whose kingdom in 488 stretched from the Caspian to the heart of India, when Perozes the Persian king fell in an unfortunate expedition against them; <sup>2</sup> and continued till their subjugation, about A.D. 550, by the Scythian Turks of Mount Altai.<sup>3</sup>—On the whole we may date Andreas' Treatise, I think, with some measure of confidence, between A.D. 550 and 579:—about 550, just before the Huns' overthrow by the Turks, if Andreas' word *Hunnish* be construed strictly: about 575, if the word seem applicable also to the cognate race of the Turks.<sup>4</sup>

Let me now turn from this argument, which has indeed occupied us too long, to our Author's Apocalyptic Commentary. Like his predecessors, he speaks in the introduction of the tripartite sense of Holy Scripture, its *body*, *soul*, and *spirit*: and that the spiritual or anagogical sense is applicable in the Apocalypse, even more than in other Scripture.<sup>5</sup> Yet in fact Andreas admits a larger mixture of the literal, here and there, than Tichonius, Primasius, or Ansbertus: and there is also somewhat more of a consecutive historical view of its different parts; as of a prophecy figuring successive events from St.

<sup>1</sup> On the Gog and Magog of Apoc. xx. 8 he writes thus: Είναι δε τον Γωγ και του Μαγωγ τινες μεν Σκυθικα εθνη νομιζουσιν υπερβορεια, απερ καλουμεν Ουννικα, πασης επιγειου βασιλειας ως ορωμεν πολυανθρωποτερα τε και πολεμικωτερα, μονη δε τη θεια χειρι προς το κρατησαι της οικουμενης πασης επεχομενα.

<sup>2</sup> Gibb. vii. 137.

<sup>3</sup> Of these Turks, the subduers of the White Huns, the power and empire were well known to the Greeks of the time, by means of the embassies that past between them and the Constantinopolitan Emperor, from A.D. 569 to 582.—As to their *Scythian* nationality, Gibbon, ib. 288—297, notes the *Scythian* language and character in which the letters of the Great Khan of the Turks to the Greek Emperor were written.

Let me add another curious synchronism. Andreas, first, gives βενεδικτος as a solution of the Beast's name and number. And the 1st *Pope Benedict* dates from 572 to 577 A.D.

<sup>4</sup> By his referring (on Apoc. xx. 7) to the 6000th year from the world's creation, as if an epoch not then elapsed, some might perhaps infer an earlier date to Andreas' Treatise than either of the two mentioned: as the Septuagint Chronology, usually received in the Greek Church, (i. e. according to the Alexandrian copy,) would have made the 6000th year expire about A.D. 500. But there were other readings in certain copies of the Septuagint which made that epoch later: and moreover the Hebrew Chronology, which had by this time made progress in the West, may also not improbably have been preferred by Andreas in the East. See my Vol. i. p. 397.

<sup>5</sup> In the Prologue, p. 1.

John's time to the consummation.<sup>1</sup>—Passing by the primary figuration of Christ, which he explains somewhat as Victorinus, and the Epistles to the seven Churches (representative of *all* Churches), on which I give two or three of his detached remarks below,<sup>2</sup> he exemplifies in the heavenly scene next opened the *literalizing* tendency I spoke of, by explaining the *glassy sea before the throne*, not only *anagogically* of the virtues and blessed tranquillity of the heavenly state, but *literally* also, as perhaps the *crystalline heaven*.—Of the *seven-sealed Book* (the Book of God's mind and purposes, or Book of prophecy) he explains the several *Seals* to signify as follows:—1st, the apostolic æra, and apostles' triumph over Satan, more especially in the conversion of the Gentiles:—2nd, the æra of anti-gospel war, and bloody martyrdoms, next after the apostolic; when Christ's words were fulfilled, "I came not to send peace on earth, but a sword:"—3rd, that of Christians' grief for the falling away of professors, through inconstancy, vain-glory, or weakness of the flesh, and so, when *weighed in the balance*, being found wanting; the *oil* of sympathy for such being mixt by true Christians with the sharp *wine* of rebuke: (there being also perhaps, adds Andreas in a more *literal* sense, a famine at the time:)—4th, a calamitous æra of joint famine and pestilence, in judgment on the apostate and impious,<sup>3</sup> such as Eusebius relates to have happened under Maximin the Eastern Emperor, when corpses lay unburied, and dogs were killed that they might not devour them:—5th, the martyrs' cry for further venge-

<sup>1</sup> On Apoc. i. 1, "things which must shortly come to pass," he says: Το εν ταχει γενεσθαι σημαινει το τινα μεν αυτων παρα ποδας γενεσθαι της περι αυτων προφησεως, και τα επι συντελεια δε μη βραδυνειν διοτι χ:λια ετη παρα Θεω ως η ήμερα η εχθες λελογισται.

<sup>2</sup> 1. On the threat to the Ephesian Church of *removing its candlestick*, Andreas says that some referred it to the transfer of the earlier Ephesian Archbishopric (του αρχιερατικου της Εφεσου θρονου) to Constantinople!

2. On the Epistle to *Pergamos*, he says that he had formerly read Antipas' *martyrium*.

3. The promise to the Church of *Thyatira*, "*I will give to him the morning star*," he explains as meant either of Isaiah's Lucifer, (i. e. morning star,) to be trodden under foot by the saints; or of Peter's morning star, viz. the light of Christ, to be received into the hearts; or of John Baptist and Elias, the herald-stars of Christ's first and second coming, with whom the conquering saints are hereafter to be associated.

<sup>3</sup> Andreas makes not the slightest allusion to any limitation of the scene of the judgment to the *fourth* part of the earth: whereas in the Trumpets he expressly notices the limitation to the *third* part of the earth. So that I doubt whether Andreas' copy did not read τα δ' της γης, like Jerome's; or rather, perhaps, το τετραδιον, for το τεταρτον.

<sup>4</sup> Brief headings are added, (such as on this Seal, *Λυσις της τεταρτης σφραγιδος*,

ance against their injurers,<sup>1</sup> and so for the consummation: in regard of whom, while waiting till the martyr-number should be completed, it was shown that, white-robed in their virtues, they now repose on Abraham's bosom, anticipating eternal joys:—6th, a transition to the times and persecution of Antichrist: (though some had suggested, Andreas says, both here and in the sealing vision, a retrogressive reference to Titus' destruction of Jerusalem:<sup>2</sup>) in reference to which times of Antichrist the earthquake figured a change of things, or revolution, as usual in Scripture; the obscuration of the sun and moon God's judicial blinding of men's minds; the falling stars the apostasy and falling away of those who were thought to be lights in the world; and the rolling up of the sky, perhaps physical changes in the natural world *for the better*,<sup>3</sup> such as Irenæus expected at the consummation; or perhaps, seeing that the unrolling of Hebrew scrolls (unlike that of our books, says Andreas) was the unfolding of their contents, the revelation and manifestation of the heavenly blessings laid up for the saints.<sup>4</sup>—After which the 144,000 of the *sealing vision* depicted the body of true Christians, distinguished on Antichrist's coming by the sign of the cross from unbelievers: (not the Christians saved at the siege of Jerusalem:) the winds held signifying some deadly *stagnation* of the aerial element then to occur;<sup>5</sup> and the palm-bearing vision the happiness of the heavenly and everlasting rest, by God's throne, of the innumerable company of both earlier martyrs and the martyrs under Antichrist: when (the wicked having been cast into hell) the angels and saved ones of men will constitute but one family.

At the opening of the *seventh Seal* a regression is supposed from

εμφαινουσα τας επαγομενας τοις ασεβεισι μαστιγας,) connecting each Seal, in a manner, with that preceding it.

<sup>1</sup> Lest otherwise, says he, "the righteous put their hand to iniquity." Ps. cxxv.

<sup>2</sup> Not however on any presumption of the Apocalypse having been revealed before the destruction of Jerusalem, so as some of the Præterist expositors would argue from our expositor: any more than in the case of other expositors, who explained the 7 Seals as figuring the seven successive events of Christ's birth, baptism, ministry, accusation before Pilate, crucifixion, burial, and descent to hell. Of these expositors Andreas makes mention under the 1st Seal. Probably he may have alluded to Hilary. See p. 314 *suprà*.

<sup>3</sup> οίον ειλίγγιον τινα και αλλαγην επι το βελτιον.

<sup>4</sup> A very curious explanation! Είλιταριοις γαρ οι Έβραιοι, αντι των παρ' ήμιν βιβλιων, εκεχρηνητο' ών ή ανειλιξις ουκ αφανισμον, αλλα των γεγραμμενων φανερωσιν, απειργασατο. In the Apocalyptic figuration it was a *rolling up*, not *unrolling*, of the heaven.

<sup>5</sup> Somewhat like Pollok's description of the winds' stagnation just before the consummation, in his Poem entitled, *The Course of Time*.



this palm-bearing scene : its loosing, as of the 7th and last Seal, indicating as its result the dissolution of each polity of this world ;<sup>1</sup> the silence in heaven, the angelic hosts' reverential awe, or perhaps their ignorance of the time of the consummation ; the half-hour of its duration the brief space intervening before the end ; and the Trumpet-figurations judgments in the interval. Of these Trumpet-woes he explains the *first*, which was to fall upon the *land*, literally,<sup>2</sup> (and I think rightly,) of the burnings and slaughters through invading barbarians, by which the third part of things inland would be consumed :<sup>3</sup>—the *second*, on the *sea*, figuratively, as meaning the Devil and his burning wrath, falling on the world, especially near the time of the consummation :<sup>4</sup>—the third, again, similarly, of sufferings through the Devil fallen star-like (as Isaiah's Lucifer) from heaven :—and the eclipses in the *fourth* of very much the same judgments as in Joel ii. 31 ; mercy however restricting their duration to the third part of the day and the night.—Then the Angel's warning-cry, next heard, he speaks of as marking Angels' pity for men's woes.<sup>5</sup> And he interprets the *fifth* Trumpet's *scorpion-locusts* of demons, (once bound by Christ, but now loosed a little before the consummation ;"<sup>6</sup>) with influences darkening the soul, and for some fated quintuple of time<sup>7</sup> wounding with a poison-sting, which being that of sin, is death :<sup>8</sup>—also the *sixth* Trumpet's *four angels from the Euphrates* of hell's most evil demous,<sup>9</sup> bound (like those of the previous plague)

<sup>1</sup> Andreas seems to have regarded the 7th Seal as containing within it the seven Trumpets.

<sup>2</sup> Not (as some, he says, explained it) hell-torments. See p. 344 *suprà*.

<sup>3</sup> *Τὰς ἐκ βερβαρικῶν χερῶν γινόμενας πυρπολήσεις τε καὶ ἀνδροκτασίας ὅσημεραι*. His personal experience would make him well enter into this. See my p. 354, just before.

<sup>4</sup> Some explained it, he says, of the sea and those living in it, as destined to burn with *expiatory* fire after the general resurrection : *τῷ καθαρῷ πυρὶ . . . μετὰ τὴν ἀναστασιν*. And so, Andreas intimates, he might himself have preferred to explain it, but for the circumstance of its being said to be the *3rd part* only that was burnt up : whereas, in fact, the number of the lost is more than of the saved.

<sup>5</sup> Thus Andreas reads here *ἀγγελοῦ*, not *αἰτου*.

<sup>6</sup> *δαίμονας οὓς ὁ Χριστὸς ἐνανθρωπήσας ἐδήσεν ὅπως πρὸ τῆς συντελείας, τὰ οἰκεία ἐνεργήσαντες, κ. τ. λ.*

<sup>7</sup> So defined perhaps because of the *five senses* through which sin enters the soul !

<sup>8</sup> Some, Andreas says, explained the 5th Seal of *hell-torments* ; the sun-light all hid from the sight of the condemned by the smoke of hell : the five months being some certain defined time of intense anguish ; continued afterwards, however, though less intensely : (the reader may remember my similar division of the period of the 5th Trumpet's plague into that of 5 months of chief intensity, and a subsequent undefined time of less intensity :) the locust-stings symbolizing the never-dying worm of the punishments of the wicked.

<sup>9</sup> Some, Andreas writes, explained these four Angels of the Archangels Michael,

at Christ's coming; but now let loose, to stir up nation against nation, as well as against Christians: and urging on either *spiritually*-destroying suggestions to sin, or *literally*-destroying barbarian armies; perhaps *locally* from the Euphrates, as Antichrist would come from the East.<sup>1</sup>

In the vision of the *rainbow-crowned Angel* of Apoc. x., (a created Angel, according to Andreas,) the planting of his fiery feet on land and sea is curiously explained of indignation to be manifested against robbers by land, and pirates by sea: <sup>2</sup> the opened book, as the record of names and deeds of such specially wicked ones: the seven thunders, as seven voices prophetic of the future, either by this one Angel, or by seven others taking up the subject in response: the sealing them up, as tantamount to Daniel's sealing *till the time of the end*; the issues of futurity being till then uncertain: the oath, as to the effect that no long time after, at the conclusion of the sixth age,<sup>3</sup> and in the days of the seventh Trumpet, all would end, and the saints' rest begin.—Then, in what ensues, Andreas follows his predecessors in applying it personally to St. John: John's eating the book, (a book sweet for the joyous things predicted in it, bitter for the bitter things,) <sup>4</sup> and charge to prophesy again, being significant of his *personally* prophesying again to the end of the world, by the publication of his Apocalypse and Gospel.—In the *Witness* vision the temple meant the Christian Church; its outer court, the concourse to it of Infidels and Jews: <sup>5</sup> the Holy City (or New Jerusalem), the faithful Church; <sup>6</sup> the 3½ years of the Gentiles trampling it, those of Antichrist's persecuting the faithful: the two Witnesses, Enoch and Elias; endowed

Gabriel, Raphael, and Uriel; erewhile bound to the presence and contemplation of God, but loosed at the day of judgment, for the destruction of wicked men. A fancy repeated afterwards by Arethas.

<sup>1</sup> On Apoc. ix. 21, next following, "The rest repented not of the idolatries," &c., Andreas notices *religious hypocrisy and avarice*, as included in that charge.

<sup>2</sup> Were any such notable in the Eastern empire towards the middle of 6th century?

<sup>3</sup> *μετα την εξ αιωνων παραδρομην*. I suppose six millennaries, agreeably with the view of the early Fathers.

<sup>4</sup> Or, adds Andreas, (taking the book as before in the sense of a record of gross sinners and their sins,) John was taught by eating, &c., the sweetness of sin at the first, and its bitterness afterwards.

<sup>5</sup> Some, observes Andreas, otherwise expound the temple of God [the inner temple] as the Old Testament; the outer court, with its larger circuit, as the New Testament, so greatly more comprehensive: the 3½ years signifying the short time in which its mysteries are to be in force; viz. from the time of Christ's 1st to his 2nd coming.

<sup>6</sup> *ειτε την νεαν Ιερουσαλημ, ειτε την καθολικην εκκλησιαν*. In which clause either expression seems intended by Andreas of the Christian Church; for he explains himself to mean the *πιστοι* and *δοκιμοι* opprest by Antichrist's tyranny. See Note <sup>2</sup> p. 365 *infra*.

by God's mercy with miraculous powers antagonistically to the Satanic supernatural powers of Antichrist: the time of their slaughter by Antichrist, that of their warnings against him being completed: the scene of their lying dead, the old and desolate Jerusalem: (Antichrist there fixing his royal seat probably, in order to seem the fulfiller of the prophecy, "I will raise up the tabernacle of David that is fallen," and so deceiving the Jews into a belief on him:) the rising of the Witnesses,  $3\frac{1}{2}$  days after death, their literal resurrection: the tenth part of the city falling, and seven thousand slain, the judicial fall and ruin of the impious of the seventh age of the world, not even the Witnesses' resurrection having induced repentance: the rest that glorified God, those that, when the martyrs rose to glory, might be deemed not unworthy of salvation.—Then the seventh Trumpet figured the general resurrection; the temple's concomitant opening, the manifestation of the heavenly blessedness of the saints; and the lightnings and thunderings, the torments of the damned.

In the vision of the *Dragon and Woman*, Apoc. xii., Andreas (following "the great Methodius," whom he cites)<sup>1</sup> makes the Woman to signify the Church, bringing forth (just as in Isa. lxvi., which the citation refers to) a Christian people: the moon under foot meaning either the world, or the Jewish ritual law; and the male child, and his iron rod, having fulfilment in the Roman Christian people and emperors, ruling the heathen.<sup>2</sup> Further, the Dragon was the Devil: his seven heads symbolizing seven chief devilish powers, from conquering which the Christian warrior wins his diadems; his ten horns, the ten antidecalogic sins, or decuple division before the consummation of the mundane empire: his symbolical fall, that when he was first cast out of heaven on his transgression; or that spoken of by Christ as fulfilled on his coming, when Satan seemed like lightning to fall from heaven.—During Antichrist's  $3\frac{1}{2}$  years' reign, the Church's *abstraction from the world* is to fulfil the figure of the Woman's flight into the wilderness, with perhaps a literal flight into deserts: the two Testaments being in God's providence the wings supporting and preserving her from the waters, or multitude of the

<sup>1</sup> See pp. 298, 299 *suprà*.

<sup>2</sup> Ἀρρην δὲ νῖος ὁ τῆς ἐκκλησίας λαός. . . δι' οὐ ἠδῆμεν, ταῖς τῶν δυνατῶν Ῥωμαίων χερσὶ, ταῖς κραταιαῖς ὡς ὁ σιδηρός, τα εἴθνη ἐποιήμανε Χριστὸς ὁ Θεός. An explanation similar to my own.—Andreas adds that the people of God are moreover to rule the nations after the resurrection of the dead.

impious, (whether men or dæmons,) ejected by the Dragon against her.

Then, on the *Beast* of Apoc. xiii.,<sup>1</sup> Andreas, professedly, but not really, following Hippolytus,<sup>2</sup> interprets it as Antichrist: stating that this Antichrist, or *pseudo-Christ*,<sup>3</sup> is to rise after the ten kings' rising, answering to the ten toes of the prophetic image: and, coming with the title of Roman king,<sup>4</sup> to overthrow *their* principedoms; like Augustus healing and restoring the Roman kingdom, when (like the *Beast's* wounded head) as it were dissolved by its division into ten.<sup>5</sup>—The *second Beast* with *the two horns like a lamb*, he prefers to explain, after Irenæus, as Antichrist's *προδρομος* and *false prophet*: exhibiting a show of piety; and with pretence of being a lamb, when in fact a wolf.—*The image of the Beast* he supposes to be literally meant of some image of Antichrist made by the False Prophet; through which the Devil would speak, as by the heathen idols.—Antichrist's *miracles* he explains as Satanic impostures: his *name*, with the *number 666*, as either a *personal noun*, such as *Λαμπητις*, *Τειταν*, *Λατεινος*, *Βενεδικτος*; or an *appellative*, as *κακος οδηγος*, *αμνος αδικος*, *παλαι βασκανος*, *αληθης βλαβερος*; of all which names the number is 666.<sup>6</sup>—With regard to the *Harlot* seated on the *Beast* in Apoc. xvii., he observes that *Rome* had been judged by certain earlier writers to be the city intended; because of its being built on seven hills; and having had too seven chief persecuting emperors, from Domitian to

<sup>1</sup> In Apoc. xiii. 1, Andreas reads *εσταθην*.

<sup>2</sup> See p. 285 *suprà*.

<sup>3</sup> So Andreas calls him three or four different times, on Apoc. xii., xiii., xvi., &c.

<sup>4</sup> *ὄν* (viz. of the Greek, Persian, and Babylonian empires, signified by the *Beast's* likeness to the *leopard*, *bear*, and *lion*,) *κρατησει ὁ Αντιχριστος, ὡς Ῥωμαίων βασιλεὺς ἐλευσομενος*. So again on Apoc. xvii. 11, xviii. 24.

<sup>5</sup> *Τὴν Ῥωμαίων βασιλείαν, τὴ διαίρει σφαγὴν τροπὸν τινα ὑπομενοῦσαν, τὴν μοναρχίαν τε, θεραπεύεσθαι δοκοῦσαν, κατὰ τὴν εἰκόνα Ἀυγουστοῦ Καισαροῦ*. So again on Apoc. xiii. 11: just as Hippolytus, before him. See p. 285 *suprà*. Of which restoration of Rome's empire, however, Mr. C. M. in his notice of Andreas says nothing.—Andreas offers the alternative solution of the revival of one of the *αρχόντες* of the empire, after being killed, by Antichrist's magical arts.

<sup>6</sup> We have here in Peltan's Latin version a most extraordinary perversion of the sense of the original Greek. The Greek is; *Ὀνοματα πολλὰ ἐστὶν εὐρεῖν, τοῦ ἀριθμοῦ τουτου περιεχόντα, προσηγορικὰ τε καὶ κυρία*. *Κυρία μὲν, οἶον Λαμπητις, Τειταν, ἐκ του τεινω, καθ' Ἴππολυτου, Λατεινος, ὁμοίως δια διφθογγου, Βενεδικτος, ὁπερ ἐρμηνεύεται εὐλογημενος*. The Latin translation; "Multa confingi possunt nomina quæ numerum illum complectantur, cum propria, tum etiam appellativa, idque in omni propemodum lingua. Proprium, e. g. Græcè sit *Λαμπητης*, Latinè *Benedictus*, Persicè *Sarmnaus*. Similis in cæteris linguis efformatio fiat." This is copied into the B.P.M. In my Vol. iii. p. 249, not then having access to the original Greek, I noticed the evident mistakes about the *Benedictus* in Latin, and the *Sarmnaus*.



Diocletian inclusive. But he objects its having then for some time lost its imperial majesty : unless, indeed, he adds, very remarkably, this should in some way be restored to her ;<sup>1</sup> “ a supposition involving the fact of a previous overthrow of the city now ruling,”<sup>2</sup> i. e. Constantinople. Further he notices the fact of ancient *Babylon* and *Jerusalem* having been each called a harlot ; and that the *old Rome* was called *Babylon* by St. Peter : also the special fitness of either appellative to the then *Persian capital* (Ctesiphon). So too the characteristic “ drunk with the blood of saints,” applied alike to *Old Rome*, under the emperors, down to Diocletian ; to *New Rome*, or *Constantinople*, under Julian and the Arian Emperors : and to the *Persian capital* : for who can calculate the sufferings of the saints in *Persia* ? Thus the harlot-city meant might be any one of those, if at the time of the end invested with the world’s supremacy : or perhaps, *Andreas* adds, *generically* the dominion of this world.—The “ Beast that was, and is not, yet shall be,” he explains to signify the Devil ; broken in power by Christ’s death, and banished into the abyss or elsewhere, yet fated at length to revive in Antichrist. The Beast’s *seven heads* he interprets to mean the seven successive seats of the world’s supremacy, Nineveh, Ecbatana, Babylon, Susa, Pella, Rome, Constantinople ; or the first kings reigning in each respectively, the representatives of the respective empires. He adds however Hippolytus’ alternative explanation of them as seven ages : and Irenæus’ suggestion that as seven is a sacred number, so there might be fated a septenary of dominant empires in the world ; the old Roman empire being the 6th, and perhaps that of new Rome or Constantinople the 7th : but in this, and in every case, the seventh having in St. John’s time not come. The Beast, or Beast’s eighth head, is Antichrist ; called “ one of the seven,” because of springing from one of the heads, or kingdoms, viz. the Roman ; for he is to rise and flourish not as a foreigner, but as *king of the Romans*.<sup>3</sup> The ten horns or kings that were to reign *one hour* with the Beast, he identifies with Daniel’s ten horns : and construes the one hour to mean either some short time, or perhaps a quarter of a year ; because ὥρη in Greek

<sup>1</sup> So too on verse 7 ; εἴτε τὴν παλαιὰν Ῥώμην, αὐτὴς τὸ ἀρχαῖον κράτος ἀναλαμβάνουσαν.

<sup>2</sup> Because of its being said of the great city meant, “ This is the city which *ruleth* over the kings of the earth,” in the present tense.

<sup>3</sup> ἐκ τῶν ἑπτὰ δὲ ὡς ἐκ μίας αὐτῶν [βασιλείων] βλαστάνων· οὐ γὰρ ἐξ ἄλλου ἔθνους . . ἀλλ’ ὡς Ῥωμαίων βασιλεὺς . . ἐλευσεται.

means not only an hour, but also one of the year's four seasons. In verse 16 he reads "The ten horns *and* the Beast (*και το θηριον*) shall hate the whore." But in his comment he speaks as if the ten horns did so, under the *Devil's* influence, not *Antichrist's*: and marvels at his so acting against a harlot antichristian city.<sup>1</sup>

Reverting to Apoc. xiv., I may observe that Andreas views the 144,000 with Christ on the Mount Zion (or *Christian Jerusalem*) as the virgin-saints of the New Testament; a body different probably from those of Apoc. vii., because of the fact of the former being noted (which the others are not) as *virgins*.—The three flying angels are warners against Antichrist, and the Babylon of this world.—The earth's harvest he makes to be Christ's gathering of the *good*; (like wheat, with its increase of 30, 60, or 100 fold;) while the vintage is the gathering of the *bad* to judgment.<sup>2</sup>—Then, advancing to the *Vials* in Apoc. xv., xvi., he explains the harpers by the glassy sea to be the saved ones; and the glassy sea itself, mixed with fire, to symbolize their tranquil happy state, yet as those that had been saved by fire: the song of Moses being that sung by the saved ones of the Old Testament dispensation, that of the Lamb by the saved ones of the New.<sup>3</sup> The statement that none might enter the temple till the plagues of the seven Vial-Angels<sup>4</sup> had been fulfilled, he expounds to mean that the saints might not enter on the rest of the heavenly Jerusalem, till after the finishing of God's indignation against the wicked.—The plague of the first Vial he makes to be the inward corroding ulcer of heart-grief at the plague suffered; and perhaps also *literally* outward ulcers, the fit symbol of that within.<sup>5</sup> Again, the statement under the sixth Vial respecting the way of the kings from the East being prepared he expounds as meaning that a way would be opened for Gog and Magog to come across the Euphrates: or perhaps for Antichrist coming from Persia, whither the Jewish tribe of Dan, whence he is to spring, was once carried captive: he,

<sup>1</sup> διο συνεργησει ο διαβολος τοις υπ' αυτα ημιοχοιμενοις δεκα κερασι . . την εκπορευσασαν εκ των θειων εντολων πολιν . . ερημωσαι.

<sup>2</sup> The vine to be trodden without *the city of the just*, της των δικαιων πολεως.

<sup>3</sup> Compare my own remarks on the passage Vol. iii. pp. 474, 475.

<sup>4</sup> In referring to the dress ascribed to the Vial-angels, he notices the curious reading of λιθον, as well as of λινον, like Jerome before him: "clothed in *stone* pure and white."

<sup>5</sup> εικος δε και αισθητως τα τουτων τραυματιζεσθαι τα σωματα, προς ελεγχον της ελκωθεισης αυτων ψυχης. Let the reader mark this. It is much the same idea that I have often express about a symbol being drawn from the life and times; and which I have indeed on this very passage illustrated from the facts of history. See Vol. iii. pp. 357, 375.

together with other kings from the East, bringing death with him; whether to men's souls, or bodies, or both. The pouring out of the seventh Vial into the air, he supposes to indicate lightnings and elemental convulsions, such as once at Mount Sinai; in fulfilment of Heb. xii. 27, "Yet once more I shake not the earth only, but also heaven." As to the great city tripartited, as the result of this seventh Vial's outpouring, he judges it to be Jerusalem, great from its religious celebrity, rather than from its actual extent; and which is then and thereupon to be divided, in respect of its population, into Christians, Jews, and Samaritans.

I need only add that, as to the *millennium*, he explains it anagogically, as Augustine: notes there being *two deaths*, that of the flesh and of sin temporary, that of hell eternal: also *two resurrections*, that by baptism, and that to incorruption; the first, and its accompanying millennial rule of the saints over sin and Satan, being but an introduction to the other.—*Gog and Magog* meant the Scythian or Hunnish nations; even in Andreas' time a mighty power, and only restrained by God till the time of Antichrist: that these will, on Antichrist's coming, gain the empire of the world; surround the Church, or camp of the saints; and also assail "the new Jerusalem," the city loved by God, whence the Gospel went forth.<sup>1</sup>—The heavenly Jerusalem he explains as the saints' heavenly state; then when St. Paul's prophecy of the creation's deliverance is to take place from the bondage of corruption: the state being one of perfect union, many mansions, and eternal joy; its full fruition taking place not till after the saints' rising again.<sup>2</sup> Such expressions as that the kings

<sup>1</sup> Thus Andreas unadvisedly here gives the title of *New Jerusalem* to the literal earthly Jerusalem; though explaining the New Jerusalem of Apoc. xxi. distinctly of the Christian Church.

Indeed he virtually suggests the same here too as an alternative. For, he adds, there also they say that Antichrist will sit in the temple of God; whether the old Jewish one restored by Antichrist, or the *Catholic Church*, which is the true temple: *ειτε εν τῷ Ἰουδαϊκῷ τῷ παλαιῷ θείῳ, καθαιρεθεντι δια την κατα Χριστον τολμαν, και ὑπ' αὐτου (Ἀντιχριστου) ανορθοῦσθαι προσδοκωμενῳ τοις θεομαχοις Ἰουδαίωις· ειτε εν τῷ αληθῶς θείῳ ναῷ, τῇ καθολικῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ.*

<sup>2</sup> That it is to this time that Andreas mainly refers the symbol appears continually. Thus on the call on all to praise God, both small and great, Apoc. xix. 5, preparatorily to the introduction of the bride or New Jerusalem, he speaks of those who have died young, as *rising* to partake in the song: *Οἶμαι δὲ και οἱ νυν μικροὶ τῇ ἡλικίᾳ και ἀτελεῖς παιδὲς θυησκοῦτες, μεγάλοι ἀνισταμενοὶ τον μεγαλοουργῶν Θεου ὑμνησοῦσιν.* Again, the glory of the New Jerusalem is on Apoc. xxi. 8 defined as the saints' eternal glory: and again, speaking of the 12,000 furlongs of the city, xxi. 16, Andreas thus mystically explains the number: *των μεν χιλίων δηλοντων της ἀπεραντου ζωῆς*

and nations of the earth bring their glory into it, he expounds of the then manifested glory of the good deeds of such as have reigned over their passions, and have pleased Christ.<sup>1</sup> On the "sea then being no more," he explains it both literally and figuratively. What need any more of the sea, when men need not to sail on it, for fetching from other regions the earth's fruits and merchandise? And what can there be of the troublesome tossings of life, which the figure means, when no more of fear or trouble is ever to betide the saints?

In a concluding summary Andreas states very distinctly his view of the Apocalypse being a prophecy of the things that were to happen *from Christ's first coming* even to the consummation.<sup>2</sup>

I observe in fine that there is an air of much piety in this Commentary. I may exemplify in Andreas' remark on the sin of adding to, or taking from, divine Scripture, Apoc. xxii. 18, 19.<sup>3</sup> He here waxes quite warm in speaking of the superiority of Scriptural to all classical or dialectic knowledge.<sup>4</sup>

6. *Arethas*, a successor of Andreas in the Bishopric of Cæsarea, was his follower also in great measure in the Commentary that he wrote on the Apocalypse. Thus much he tells us himself.<sup>5</sup> Re-

την τελειότητα, των δε ἑπτακοσίων το ἐν αναπαυσει τελειον, των δε δεκαεσσαρων τον διπλουν σαββατισμον, της ψυχης και του σωματος. Yet here and there we find a reference in his comment to the Church's present state: e. g. on the *leaves* of the tree being even now for the healing of the nations; contrastedly with the *fruit* of perfect knowledge to be enjoyed in the world to come.

<sup>1</sup> οἱ ἐν τῇ γῆ των παθων βασιλευσαντες την των αγαθων πραξεων δοξαν και τιμην ἐν αὐτῇ οἰσουσι. κ. τ. λ.

<sup>2</sup> βιβλον (i. e. the seven-sealed Book) των απο της αυτου (Christ's) παρουσιας μεχρι της συντελειας γεγενημενων.

<sup>3</sup> So Andreas understands the passage; and not as referring simply to taking from, or adding to, the Book of the *Apocalypse*. Φοβερα ἢ κατα των παραχαρακτων των θειων γραφων καταρα.

<sup>4</sup> Τα γραφικα ιδιωματα των Αττικων συνταξεων, και των διαλεκτικων συλλογισμων, αξιολοπιωτερα και σεμνοτερα' ὅσον δε το μεσον των παρ ἡμιν και ἐκεινοις ἐνδοξων και το ἐν νῷ λαβειν ἀμηχανον' οἱμαι γαρ εἶναι πλεον ἢ ὅσον φως σκοτους διεστηκε.

I must add that Peltan's Latin translation, to which alone I had access in my three first Editions, is *often* disgracefully incorrect. A notable example has been given p. 362 *suprà*.

<sup>5</sup> On Apoc. viii., speaking of the incense-Angel, he says; "Huic angelo Andreas, qui ante me dignè Cæsareæ Cappadociæ episcopatum sortitus est, quemque pontificem assimilat." And the heading title to his Commentary in the Latin translation, and I presume in the original Greek also, is as follows:—"Aretæ, Cæsareæ Cappadociæ Episcopi, in D. Joannis Apocalypsim compendiarîa explanatio, ex beatissimi Andree Archiepiscopi Cæsareæ Cappadociæ, Deo gratis, commentariis concinnata." Dupin is evidently mistaken in saying that there is no ground for regarding this Arethas as a Bishop of Cæsarea.



specting his date there seems to me to have been a considerable mistake on the part of most that have expressed an opinion about it. Alike Coccinus, the Editor of the B. P. M. (which work gives a Latin translation of *Arethas'* Commentary in its ixth Volume,<sup>1</sup>) and Cave too, and Lardner, and just recently Professor M. Stuart,<sup>2</sup> assign to him the date of A. D. 540 or 550. On the other hand Casimir Oudin and Fabricius incline to identify him with a Presbyter of the same Cappadocian Cæsarea, of the name *Arethas*, who, about A.D. 920, translated a work of the Constantinopolitan Patriarch Euthymius. But, says Cave,<sup>3</sup> Oudin had no argument or evidence to adduce in favour of his conjecture. Nor indeed Fabricius either; if (not having access to his work) I may judge from the reference to him in Lardner.<sup>4</sup> I have observed, however, very decisive evidence in the Commentary itself, of *Arethas* having lived as late at least as near the end of the eighth century. For he speaks of the capital and palace of the *Saracens* as being then still at Babylon, evidently meaning Bagdad:<sup>5</sup>—a capital not built till A.D. 762;<sup>6</sup> and where the Saracen Caliphs continued to hold a waning empire through the ninth century, till its extinction A.D. 934 by the Bowides.<sup>7</sup> A curious reference to Constantinople, which will be found in my page 370 following,<sup>8</sup> may possibly appear to furnish a further indication. The identity of our Cæsarean *Bishop* with the Cæsarean *Presbyter* that translated Euthymius seems to me more than doubtful. The very appellative of the one as a *Bishop*, the other as only a *Presbyter*, constitutes a presumption against that idea. Moreover, *Arethas'* reference to the *Saracens* and *Bagdad* seems to indicate the fact of their empire being still powerful there.—I say *still*, after *Arethas'* “in hoc usque tempus;” and *powerful*, because of his representing it as in place of the old lion-like Babylonian empire. Hence, on the whole, we may I think reasonably reckon his date as somewhere

<sup>1</sup> Pp. 741—791.

<sup>2</sup> On the Apocalypse, Vol. i. p. 268: “*Arethas* . . who lived near the middle of the 6th century.”

<sup>3</sup> Hist. Litt. i. 408, ad ann. 540. “Verum id gratis affirmat Oudinus; nec enim præsto ei est argumentum quo sententiam suam confirmet.”

<sup>4</sup> Hug too, i. 230, assigns him to the xth Century; but without giving his reasons.

<sup>5</sup> On Apoc. xiii. 2: “Per os leonis regnum designatur Babyloniorum: cui *Saracenorum* regnum manifestè successit; quòd, in hoc usque tempus, regia eorum Babylone sit.” B. P. M. 771.—I have noted this already in my Vol. i. p. 39.

<sup>6</sup> See my Vol. i. pp. 461, 462, and Vol. iii. p. 439.

<sup>7</sup> See my Vol. i. p. 466.

<sup>8</sup> Note 2.

within the limits of the first half of the 9th century; between A.D. 800 and 850.<sup>1</sup>

In the heading of his Apocalyptic Commentary there is, as hinted by me just before, an intimation of its having been very much taken from that of Andreas. He generally indeed gives the opinions of the latter; sometimes in the form of direct quotation, and by name; more often silently: adding however from time to time some strange conceits of his own.<sup>2</sup> It is only the more important variations from Andreas that need here to be noticed. And these are as follows.

Under the *sixth Seal* he singularly explains the earthquake, &c., there figured, of the literal earthquake and elemental convulsions *at Christ's death and resurrection*:<sup>3</sup> particularly dwelling on the adjective *ὅλη* attached to *σεληνη* in his copy:<sup>4</sup> the moon having been (just agreeably with it) *whole*, and *at the full*, on occasion of its eclipse at the time of Christ's death, and so the eclipse miraculous.—He adds, however, a notice of the interpretation by certain other expositors, explaining it “tropicè” of the destruction of Jerusalem; and that of Andreas, referring it to the convulsions under Antichrist.

Under the *Sealing Vision* he suggests the possible reference of the four angels of the winds to the desolations of Judæa by the Romans; or, yet more probably, to the desolations by Antichrist: then, in speaking of the sealing itself, more distinctly and decidedly explains the sealed 144,000 as meaning the Jews converted to Christianity before the destruction of Jerusalem, asserting that Jerusalem was not destroyed when John received these revelations; the Virgin Mary having only lived fourteen years after Christ's ascension, and John immediately after her death removed to Ephesus.<sup>5</sup> Which

<sup>1</sup> Mr. C. Maitland (p. 276), while noticing after me (though without acknowledgment) the passage in Arethas about the Saracens and Bagdad, yet strangely dates him A. D. 650; i. e. above 100 years before Bagdad was built!

<sup>2</sup> Of these his explanation of the 3rd Seal may furnish a specimen. Besides symbolizing *famine*, it may have a *moral* signification. The chænix of wheat for a denarius means faithful witnesses for Christ, each counted worthy of a denarius; “quasi datæ sibi divinæ imaginis custodes exactissimi commonstrati:” while the three chænixes of barley are the weak ones who have failed in the day of trial, but repented; and who altogether are only valued at a denarius!

<sup>3</sup> Like those alluded to by Andreas on the first Seal, as observed by me p. 358, Note 2, and who explained the sixth Seal of Christ's *sepulture*.

<sup>4</sup> So the best critical Editions, *καὶ ἡ σεληνη ὅλη ἐγένετο ὡς αἷμα*: the *ὅλη* being alike in the three most authoritative MSS. A, B, C; i. e. the Codex Alexandrinus, Codex Vaticanus, and Codex Ephraemi.

<sup>5</sup> “Nondum enim vastatio à Romanis illata Judæos involverat, ubi hæc Evangelista

passage has been naturally adduced by the advocates of an early date to the Apocalypse, in support of their opinion : but of which the value as an authority, small in itself because that of so late a writer, is rendered yet smaller by the fact of *Arethas* having not once only, but twice, stated from *Eusebius*, that it was under *Domitian's* reign that *John* was banished to *Patmos*.<sup>1</sup>—On the *Angel's* charge, “Thou must prophesy again,” *Arethas* observes that it was hence that the vulgar opinion arose that *John* was to live to the end of the world ; and then to prophesy with *Enoch* and *Elias*, and with them suffer martyrdom, in the time of *Antichrist*.<sup>2</sup>—In the first part of *Apoc. xii.* he interprets the travelling *Woman* to mean the *Virgin Mary* ; and the *Woman's* flight of  $3\frac{1}{2}$  years into the wilderness to have been fulfilled in the *Virgin's* flight into *Egypt*, and stay there near  $3\frac{1}{2}$  years till *Herod's* death : adding however the alternative solution also of the *Woman* signifying the *Church* ; and the wilderness flight her retirement from the world during the  $3\frac{1}{2}$  years of *Antichrist's* reign.—With regard to the *Beast* of *Apoc. xiii.*, or *Antichrist*, he suggests the same solutions of his name and number as *Andreas* ; viz. λαμπρις, τειταν, λατεινος, ό νικητης, κακος οδηγος, αληθης βλαβερος, παλαι βασκανος, αμνος αδικος : and suggests that the second *Beast* would act the same part as forerunner to *Antichrist* that *John* the *Baptist* did to *Christ*.—On the declaration that the great city was to be divided into three parts, he notices *Andreas' idea*, that it was the literal *Jerusalem* that was to be so tripartited : and also, as an alternative, that it might mean the world and its empire, as subjected successively after *Christ*, in *chronological* tripartition, to *Pagan*

oraacula suscipiebat ; neque Hierosolymis, sed Ioniâ quæ apud Ephesum. Equidem post passionem Domini quatuordecim tantum annis permansit in Hierosalem theotocum Domini tabernaculum in hac temporariâ vitâ, post passionem inquam ac resurrectionem incorruptæ suæ prolis ; cui etiam (Joannes), tanquam matri sibi à Domino commendatæ, semper aderat. Post hujus enim mortem nequaquam jam in Judæâ mansisse fertur ; sed Ephesum commigrasse ;” &c.—A statement which is palpably incorrect.

<sup>1</sup> First on *Apoc. i. 9* ; *B. P. M.* 743 : “ Relegatum autem ipsum in Patmum insulam sub Domitiano fuisse, *Eusebius Pamphili* in *Chronicâ* suâ citat.” Next on *Apoc. iii. 10*, *B. P. M.* 751 ; “ Horam tentationis . . persecutionem illam dicit quæ secunda post *Neronem* sub *Domitiano* excitata fuit, quemadmodum in *Historiâ* suâ *Eusebius Pamphili* testatur : quando etiam idem *Evangelista* in *Patmum* ab eodem *Domitiano* exilio relegatus fuit.” In which last passage he does not state it simply as *Eusebius' opinion*, that *St. John* was then banished to *Patmos* ; but rather propounds it as his own also. See my *Vol. i. p. 40*.

<sup>2</sup> The idea of *St. John's* living to the end of the world arose rather, we know, from *Christ's* saying, (*John xxi. 22*.) “ If I will that he tarry till I come, &c.”

kings, Christian kings, and Antichrist.<sup>1</sup> The *Babylon* there mentioned he prefers to understand of *Constantinople*; with reference apparently to some recent domineering of the civil power over the ecclesiastical; which made that city answer, in his view, pre-eminently to the type of *Babylon*.<sup>2</sup>—On the summons to the birds in Apoc. xix., to gather to God's great supper, he strangely explains them to mean the souls of saints, called from a state of depression to meet Christ in the air.<sup>3</sup>—And, finally, he makes the New Jerusalem to represent the habitation and polity of the saints after the resurrection, conjunctively with Angels: “*Civitas quod omnium tum Angelorum tum hominum futura sit domicilium.*”<sup>4</sup>

6. I now return Westward from Greek Christendom, to note a somewhat later Latin Expositor of the Apocalypse;<sup>5</sup> one whose

<sup>1</sup> A curious notion.

<sup>2</sup> “*Et quænam hæc (Babylon)? Nulla sane alia quàm Constantinopolis; in quâ olim colebatur justitia, nunc autem in eâ homicidæ habitant, ex mutuâ contentione, dum cives laici ecclesiasticis æquari contendunt: imo ne æquales quidem fieri contenti sunt, nisi aliquis etiam ex eis premium referat, ad majorem divinæ indignationis accensionem.*” B. P. M. 778.

<sup>3</sup> “*Aves quæ per medium cæli volant animas dicit sanctorum; quæ, à depressis humi rebus emergentes, juxta magnum Paulum procedunt ad occurrendum obviam Domino in aera.*” B. P. M. 783. 4 p. 786.

<sup>5</sup> In passing let me here briefly notice a curious passage that occurs in a Treatise on Antichrist by *Adso*, a monk of the monastery of *Derve in Champagne*; dedicated to Gerberga, Queen of Louis d'Outremer, and consequently of about the date of 950 A.D. Having spoken of *Babylon* as Antichrist's birth-place, of his being educated by sorcerers at *Bethsaïda* and *Chorazin*, then coming to *Jerusalem*, proclaiming himself the Son of God, by gifts, miracles, or terror converting kings and people to acknowledge him, and then at length persecuting the saints, and commencing the great tribulation of 3½ years,—*Adso* proceeds to state that the precise time for his manifestation would be marked by the ‘*discessio*’ of its constituent kingdoms from the Roman Empire: (so, like some of the early Fathers, he explained the *αποστασια* of St. Paul:) which time had not then as yet come; because, says *Adso*, though the Roman Empire has been in chief part destroyed, yet, *so long as the Frank kings last*,\* to whom belongs the empire, so long the Roman dignity will not altogether perish. And then he adds; “Some of our doctors affirm that there will arise in the last times a king of the Franks, who shall again re-unite under his rule all the Roman empire: and after a prosperous reign shall go to *Jerusalem*, and lay down his sceptre and crown at *Mount Olivet*:—that this will be the end of the Roman empire, and then immediately will follow Antichrist.” †—*Adso* further observes, that the Antichrist would sit either in *the Jewish temple*, rebuilt by him, and there receive worship; or perhaps in *the Christian Church*; also that after killing the two witnesses, *Enoch* and *Elias*, he would be slain

\* Compare the statement by the Pseudo-Athanasius, p. 309 *suprà*.

† This tradition is noted in the *Encyclopedie Methodique*: and it may perhaps remind some of the French Chief Bonaparte's mighty empire, and Syrian expedition, in these latter days; as also of certain prophetic speculations propounded thereon, by expositors that deemed him to be *Daniel's* so called wilful King.



epoch, I now think, was near about the conclusion of the period included in this Section, though elsewhere referred by me to a considerably earlier period:—I mean *Berengaud*.

In my Vol. iii. p. 279, I have noticed this Commentary. I had stated originally that the writer (probably, from his reference to the Rules of that order, a Benedictine monk) had in a singular manner intimated his name under the enigmatis form of Greek numerals;<sup>1</sup> also that by his noting the facts of the Saracens who had overrun Asia, as well as the Lombards who had conquered Italy, having had their kingdoms overthrown when he wrote,<sup>2</sup> his æra seemed fixed as not earlier than the end of the ninth century. An approximation this to his real age which well agreed with that drawn by the Benedictine editors of Ambrose, from his specification of archdeacons receiving hush-money for overlooking the fornication of the priesthood, as a sin of the then times: this crime being prominently noticed in Synods held at Paris, Chalons, and Aquis-Granum, in the same ninth century.<sup>3</sup> But the crime continued flagrant long after, so as to be by no means any certain or specific chronological designative.<sup>4</sup> And a notice as to the then existing Jerusalem being inhabited by Christians<sup>5</sup> seemed to me afterwards to mark a much later æra than the 9th century; in fact one subsequent to the taking of Jerusalem by the crusaders. A lateness of date corroborated by the late epoch at which *Berengaud*'s comment is said to have come into notice.<sup>6</sup>

on Mount Olivet by Michael, or Christ, with the breath of his mouth. Soon after which (not immediately) would follow the last judgment.

This treatise is given in the 9th Volume of the late Paris Benedictine Edition of Augustine, col. 1647—1652. It is the same that has been incorrectly ascribed by some to Aleuin, by others (e. g. *Malvenda*, i. 398) to Rabanus Maurus.

<sup>1</sup> “*Quisquis nomen auctoris seire desideras, literas expositionum in capitibus septem visionum primas attende. Numerus quatuor vocalium quæ desunt, si Græcas posueris, est 81.*” Now the first letters of these seven parts, or visions, are B R N G V D S: and if ε ε α ο be inserted, which together make up (5 + 5 + 1 + 70 = 81,) the name will result, *Berengaudus*.

<sup>2</sup> “*Saraceni totam Asiam subegerunt, Gothi Hispaniam, Longobardi Italiam, &c. Hæc regna, eo tempore quo visio ista Johanni demonstrata est, potestatem nondum acceperant: sed unâ horâ tanquam reges potestatem acceperunt, quia singularum istarum gentium potestas pauco tempore permansit.*” So on Apoc. xvii.

<sup>3</sup> See my Vol. i. p. 473, Note 1, where *Berengaud* is also noticed.

<sup>4</sup> See my Vol. ii. p. 14.

<sup>5</sup> See p. 376, Note 1.

<sup>6</sup> I copy what follows from Mr. C. Maitland's book, p. 319; “About this time (viz. 1400 A.D.), without name or date, the Apocalyptic Commentary of *Berengaud* stole into notice. It was first copied from by the Block Book Apocalypse, published soon after 1400; and next quoted by Dionysius the Carthusian, who wrote not later than 1470.” So too Dr. S. R. Maitland, before him; Reply to Morning Watch, pp. 19, 20.

The Commentary is one too original to omit noticing; and goes on a regular connected chronological plan, which (however unsatisfactory it may be as an exposition) makes it easy to read, in comparison with the other Latin Commentaries of the æra under review. This chronological plan is sketched at the outset, and adduced repeatedly, even to the end. It is founded on the frequent septenary division of the Apocalyptic prefigurations: to all which seven (except the seven epistles to the churches) Berengaud supposes that substantially the same chronological reference and order attaches; a chronology commencing from the creation, and reaching to the consummation.

Thus in the opening figuration of Christ he remarks on eight particulars as given in the description; his *priestly garment*, his *zone*, his *head*, his *eyes*, his *feet*, his *voice*, his *sword*, and his *face as the sun*: and of these the first *seven* are expounded as typical of that “*civitas Dei quæ ex omnibus electis constat;<sup>1</sup> et quæ ab initio usque ad finem tendit, in septem partes divisa.*” Which seven parts are, 1. the elect from the Creation till the Flood; 2. the patriarchs and saints from the Flood to the giving of the Law; 3. the multitudes saved under the ministry of the Mosaic Law; 4. the prophets; 5. the apostles; 6. the multitude of the Gentiles that believed in Christ; 7. the saints that are to conflict with Antichrist at the end of the world. The 8th particular noted in the symbol, viz. Christ’s face as the sun, he makes to prefigure the Church of the elect *after the resurrection*; when they too shall all shine as the sun in the firmament.—The testifyings of the saints in these seven ages of the world would be, he suggests after Bede and Ansbert, like Israel’s seven days’ compassings of Jericho; and that during their preachings in the seventh age its end would come suddenly.

After this, the seven Epistles to the Churches having been expounded as lessons of warning and instruction to the Church in general,<sup>2</sup> Berengaud explains the heaven that was afterwards opened

Neither of these authors notice the reference by Berengaud to Jerusalem, as a chronological indication.

<sup>1</sup> Observe how Augustine’s view of the *Civitas Dei*, as made up only of the *elect*, had travelled influentially downward.

<sup>2</sup> On the promise, “I will write on him the name of the New Jerusalem,” &c., Berengaud observes that it may seem marvellous that this New Jerusalem should be described as descending from heaven, when it is known that the elect continually ascend from earth to heaven, instead of descending. But he solves the enigma by ex-

to St. John as the Church, Christ being the door to it; the twenty-four elders as the twenty-four fathers of the Old Testament dispensation; the four living creatures as all the doctors of the Church; (Victorinus' explanation of their twenty-four wings being here, though without mention of him, adopted; <sup>1</sup>) the seven-sealed Book as the Old and New Testament; (the New that written within;) and the seven horns of the Lamb that opened it, as the elect of the same seven ages of the world that were before enumerated. The Lamb's opening the seals of the book signified his opening, or explaining to the faithful, the spiritual meaning of the same successive æras and histories. A very characteristic feature this in Berengaud's Commentary; and which what follows will sufficiently explain to the reader.

1st Seal. The *white horse* meant the righteous *before the Flood*, white in token of innocence; the rider, God; the bow in hand, his token of vengeance and conquering, as against Adam, Cain, and the world destroyed by the flood.—The Lamb having opened the Seal, it became understood how Adam typified Christ, Eve the Church, Cain the Jews, Abel the Christians; and so on.

2nd Seal. The *red horse* meant the righteous *from the Flood to the Law*: red, as the *golden* colour, with reference to their wisdom; or red as *blood*, because of their persecutions: the peace broken being that evil peace with the heathen which God put aside; those killed, alike the just and unjust in their mutual contentions. By Christ's opening this Seal the spiritual mysteries of the ark were unfolded; and those also of the patriarchal histories, as of Abraham offering Isaac, Jacob's vision at Bethel, &c.: on each of which mysteries Berengaud dilates.

3rd Seal. The *black horse* was the *Doctors of the Law* till the rise of the Prophets: the black marking the severity of the Mosaic law; the balance, its rigid requirements of justice, as of eye for eye, &c. The intent of the wheat and barley was very obscure. Perhaps the chænix (or two pounds) of wheat meant the two Testaments, the food for souls; the denarius marking its connexion with Christ; <sup>2</sup>

plaining it of *Christ's* descent; in whom all the saints (the constituency of the New Jerusalem) were even then federally existent.

<sup>1</sup> See p. 290.—Here Berengaud contrasts the incessant occupation in divine worship of the twenty-four elders and four living creatures, with the earthly-mindedness and earthly occupation of many in monasteries.

<sup>2</sup> "Denarius Dominum designat. Binæ ergo libræ tritici denario copulantur; quia

while the barley might signify the good works of saints. Or the wheaten bilibres might be the two precepts of love to God and man; the denarius, the eternal life that is their reward, as in Christ's parable of the workmen in the vineyard, Matt. xx.; the Church (in the voice from the four living Creatures) praying Christ to give the denarius of eternal life to them that observe those precepts.<sup>1</sup> By the *wine* guaranteed from hurt might be meant Christians of active life; by the *oil* those given to contemplation.

4th Seal. The *pale horse* symbolized the *Prophets*; pale through fear of the evils they denounced on sinners: the rider, still Jehovah Jesus; He being *death* to the reprobate. (A rather harsh appellation this for Christ, Berengaud allows; and that, but for the requirements of the Seal's chronological place and order, its symbol might naturally have been expounded rather of *Antichrist*.)—By Christ's apostles the prophets' *writings* had been spiritually explained. Therefore, it being needless to enter on that, Berengaud confined his spiritualizing illustrations to the *history and doings* of the prophets; as of David, Elijah, Elisha, &c. &c.

5th Seal. *Souls under the altar*. This vision referring to the martyrs under the New Testament dispensation, Christ opened its seal, when he explained to the doctors of the Church his parables and dark sayings about the sufferings of his disciples, and their after glory.

6th Seal. The *elemental convulsions*, &c., here enacted, figured the destruction of Jerusalem, falling of its priests and governors, darkening of its nation, once bright by the revelation granted it, even as the sun in the world's system, and passing away of God's covenant and the Old Testament dispensation from the Jews to the Gentiles. The cry to the hills and rocks for covering was illustrated by the actual hiding of many of the Jews in the cloacæ from the Romans' fury: as Christ hath said, "Then shall ye begin to call upon the hills," &c.

In the *Sealing Vision* the four angels are explained to mean the four great empires, combined at length into the Roman, which desolated other lands, restraining the winds of life and happiness: Christ

quod sancta Scriptura loquitur ad unius Dei omnipotentiam, magnitudinem, bonitatem, atque severitatem pertinet." I suppose Berengaud meant the denarius to figure Christ, somewhat like Arethas, (see p. 368 Note <sup>2</sup>.) as having the king's image on it.

<sup>1</sup> Compare Arethas on the same 6th Seal, p. 368, *suprà*.



being the sealing angel, and the 144,000 the number of elect alive at one and the same time.<sup>1</sup> Berengaud expounds the Christianized meaning of each of the names of the twelve Jewish tribes; last of all that of *Benjamin*, meaning the *son of my right hand*. Whence, says he, a natural transition to the palm-bearing vision. "Having brought down the saints' history in their mystical names to this point of their collocation at God's right hand in heaven, it is fit that this vision should next, in the 7th place, represent their heavenly blessedness."

His first chronological septenary thus ended, Berengaud makes a singular break between it and the next, by interpreting the 7th Seal as a kind of parenthetical notice of Christ's first advent: the half-hour's silence figuring the general peace under Augustus, and Roman toleration of the Church, continued till Nero's persecution.<sup>2</sup> Then, coming to the septenary of the *Trumpet-Angels*, he explains them of divinely-taught preachers, sounding forth the brazen trumpet, under nearly the same septenary of æras as was noted before; the six first being the *patriarchal*,<sup>3</sup> the *lawgiving*,<sup>4</sup> the *prophetic*,<sup>5</sup> *Christ's own æra*,<sup>6</sup> that of the *Gnostic confuting primitive doctors*,<sup>7</sup> and that of the *Rome-subduing martyrs*.<sup>8</sup>—And, after a parenthetical exposition of Apoc. x., as depicting the source of the Church's support and light, like as of Israel in Egypt, under all the trials above noted,—the *Angel's descent* in which is construed of Christ's incarnation, veiled in the cloud of humanity, with the iris of mercy and light of divine glory attendant,

<sup>1</sup> This explanation of Berengaud's is cited by me in support of my own, Vol. i. p. 297, Note 1.

<sup>2</sup> "But why Christ's advent under the seventh and not the fifth Seal?" A question which Berengaud thus answers:—Because on the seventh day God rested from creation; and Christ is our rest.

<sup>3</sup> The fire of the symbol being the fire of the Holy Spirit, burning up what was evil in the heart.

<sup>4</sup> The fiery mountain cast into the sea being explicable of Mount Sinai cast among the Jews; the faithful amongst whom, dead to the law, lived to God.

<sup>5</sup> The prophets themselves being like burning stars to light the people; and with threats that had bitterness in them, acting so as to produce repentance.

<sup>6</sup> By whose doctrine the elect Jews were struck, and Judaism eclipsed in them.

<sup>7</sup> Doctors preaching against the first of the three woes; viz. *heretics*, lapsed like a falling star from heaven: during five months of which æra, a period meant to signify the present life, men that sought death by mixing in the world would be sickened at it; and so return, and live.

<sup>8</sup> Martyrs opposed to the four angels; *i. e.* (these being the same as the four angels in Apoc. vii.) to persecutors out of the Roman empire; an empire signified also by Babylon's river, the Euphrates. These martyrs he supposes by their invincible resolution and gospel-preaching to have stirred up the Roman Pagans to persecute them;—the horses' heads being the Roman emperors; the sulphur from the horses' mouths their blasphemy; and the fire their persecuting proclamations.

his feet the two Testaments, the Book opened in hand that of the Scriptures, the seven thunders figures of the seven virtues, unknown in their full spirituality except through Christ, and sealed up partially from weaker Christians, unable to bear them, the charge to eat the book, and prophesy again, being true both of John personally, when returned from Patmos, and of all the apostles and Christian teachers,—after this Berengaud supposes a sudden transition to the times of Antichrist, and of the two Witnesses against him: the transition, he says, being not unnatural; as passing from Christ's ministry when the Jews were cast out, to that of Enoch and Elias, which is to restore them.

And, in the account of the *Witnesses*, Berengaud expounds the measuring the court and its worshippers to signify Christian ministers, ministering to their edification: the reed being the gospel; the rod, church discipline; and those cast out as Pagans, the Jews: the fire from the Witnesses' mouth signifying their doctrine kindled by God's Spirit; their heaven-shutting, a judgment literally to be understood, it might be, but rather spiritually: their place of death, the street of the world's great city, Babylon,<sup>1</sup> consisting of all the reprobate; and its duration,  $3\frac{1}{2}$  *days*, meant in the sense of  $3\frac{1}{2}$  *years*.<sup>2</sup>

Then, their revival and resurrection described, the prophecy passes, says Berengaud, to describe the history and evils of the great Witness-slayer, *Antichrist*: a commencement being however made from the Devil's first injuries to Christ and the Church, at his first advent; prior and preparatory to the last injuries through Antichrist.—In Apoc. xii. the *travailing Woman* might mean both the Virgin Mary and the Church:<sup>3</sup> Christ himself being the male child born of the one, Christians of the other; the one snatched up to God at his ascension, the others at death: the opposing *Dragon's* [or Devil's] *seven heads* figuring the reprobate of the same *seven ages*, as before specified; and his dejection effected by Michael, through Christ's ministry, casting him out of the hearts of the elect, into the reprobate. The Woman's  $3\frac{1}{2}$  *times'* nourishment in the wilderness, after the Dragon's dejection, means first, and on the scale of literal time, the early disciples feeding on

<sup>1</sup> It is not Jerusalem, says Berengaud, for three reasons:—1. that *the great city* of the Apocalypse is always Babylon: 2. because the present Jerusalem is not built precisely on the site of the old: 3. because the present city of Jerusalem, being inhabited by Christians, cannot justly be called Sodom and Egypt.' See the citation in my Vol. ii. p. 430.

<sup>2</sup> A passage noted by me Vol. iii. p. 279.

<sup>3</sup> So Arethas.

Christ's doctrine, separate from the world;<sup>1</sup> as also the feeding of the *souls* of the faithful ("dapibus gloriæ cœlestis patriæ") on the glories of a heavenly home, during the whole time from Christ's passion to the world's end: while the wilderness of her refuge symbolized heaven; (such is Berengaud's singular explanation;)<sup>2</sup> somewhat like the wilderness of the ninety-nine sheep in Luke xv. 4.—Then at length the Devil goes against the *remnant* of the Woman's seed, *left at the end of the world*; and attacks them through the *Beast*, i. e. *Antichrist*.

Of which *Beast* Berengaud explains the *seven heads* as the seven principal vices, affixed like the seven wicked spirits in the parable; and the *ten horns* wearing diadems, as the nations subjugated by him: his mouth speaking great things, as of one boasting himself to be the Son of God; his blasphemies, as of one denying Jesus Christ's godhead, asserting the worthlessness of Christ's religion, and inability of martyrs and saints to profit men: also as arguing from the fact of men's passions being implanted by God, in proof that they might abandon themselves to licentiousness. (This is, I think, the earliest suggestion I have noticed of Antichrist being in any way an *avowed infidel*, and *open advocate of licentiousness*.)—The *second Beast* he interprets as the Preachers of Antichrist: its two lamb-like horns signifying his constituency of Jewish and Gentile reprobates; just as the Lamb's seven horns figured all the elect: and the *Beast's image*, images of Antichrist, which Antichrist's priests will make men worship.—As to his *name* and *number*, says Berengaud, I know it not: for any one might at baptism have a name of that number given him. Then, passing on to the vision of Apoc. xvii., the *Beast-riding Harlot* is explained (besides her general signification as the world) to be especially *Rome*; and her predicated burning and spoiling by the ten kings, as the destruction of ancient Rome by the Gothic barbarians:<sup>3</sup> (with reference however, as Rome was professedly Christian at that time, to the reprobate in her:) also *the Beast* (here *the Devil*) ridden by her, as that which "*was*" during his unquestioned sovereignty of the world before Christ's coming; which "*is not*," i. e. in the same power as before, since Christ's overthrow of Satan; and which "*is to*

<sup>1</sup> The 3½ years' duration of Christ's ministry being the ground-work of the larger interpretation of the 3½ years, so as with Ambrose Ansbert. See p. 350 *suprà*.

<sup>2</sup> Compare Methodius' "à malis desertum;" p. 293 *suprà*.

<sup>3</sup> I beg my readers to mark this.

be" again, on Antichrist's revelation. As to the Beast's *heads*, they meant the same as the Dragon's in Apoc. xii. Of these the *first five* had passed away when John had the Apocalypse revealed to him, the *fifth* being the Jews just then destroyed by the Romans: the *sixth* signified the then existing Roman Pagan persecutors; and the *seventh*, Antichrist. The *eighth*, or *Beast itself* of Apoc. xvii.,<sup>1</sup> was, as just before observed, the Devil.

On other lesser points I have only to add that Berengaud makes the 144,000 of Apoc. xiv. to be the elect in heaven,<sup>2</sup> while the 144,000 of Apoc. vii. were the elect alive on earth; explains the earth's *harvest* of the good, its *vintage* of the bad: in Apoc. xv. reads *λιθον* for *λινον*, like Jerome and Andreas, said of the dress of the Vial-Angels; and interprets the Angels themselves as preachers of the same seven æras as before. In Apoc. xvi. he makes the *Euphrates' drying up* to mean the drying up of persecution, that so the way may be opened to the Gentiles to believe; explains the *millennium* like Augustine; and, on the Angel's showing St. John the New Jerusalem, notes very distinctly John's representative character; "Johannes typum gerit cæterorum fidelium."

---

In conclusion, on considering retrospectively the character of the Apocalyptic exposition of this our 3rd Period, from A.D. 500 to A.D. 1100, or thereabouts, the question following may naturally suggest itself;—How was it that when the "*let*," so much talked of by the earlier Fathers, had just before this period's opening been so strikingly taken away, by the utter breaking up of the old Roman empire proper, and its division into something ominously like the ten predicted subdivisions of prophecy, there was yet wanting among prophetic expositors all recognition of that sign of the times;<sup>3</sup> and little thought or care being manifested about the apparently necessary consequence of Antichrist's development occurring even then synchronically. And we shall find, I think, in answer to the question, that three causes connected with prophetic interpretation powerfully contributed to that result:—1st, the universal prevalence in the West of

<sup>1</sup> He seems to make the Beast of Apoc. xiii. *Antichrist*; of Apoc. xvii. the *Devil*.

<sup>2</sup> Without spot, says Berengaud, because of the pollution contracted from the world having been washed away by penitence and tears, or by works of charity, or *per flagella*, by scourging, or at any rate "post mortem igni purgatorio."—Purgatory was now established.

<sup>3</sup> At least till Berengaud; see p. 377.



the Origenic or Tichonian *anagogic* principle of interpretation, throughout almost the whole of the period under review;<sup>1</sup> and indeed to a considerable extent in the East also; whereby all that was topographically or chronologically most definitely applicable to Papal Rome in the prophetic symbols was spiritualized away into some mere general religious or moral truth: witness the explanations of the Apocalyptic symbols of the *Beast*, and *Beast's seven heads*, and *Beast's ten horns*, and *Babylon*, in Primasius, Bede, Ambrose Ansbert, Andreas, as if respectively the body of the Devil regnant, the world's successive ages, the world's kingdoms, and world itself:<sup>2</sup>—2ndly, the fact of the *Greek Byzantine ruler* being still called and thought of as *Roman emperor*, after the Gothic catastrophe, albeit not having Rome itself as the seat and centre of his power, like the Beast of the Apocalypse; as also, some three centuries later, Charlemagne and the Frank emperors in the West: whence the reasoning, as if the "let" still remained, that we see exemplified alike in Adso of Western Europe,<sup>3</sup> and the pseudo-Athanasius,<sup>4</sup> and Theophylact and Ecumenius too, who were Greek Biblical expositors of the 10th and 11th centuries:<sup>5</sup>—3. the generally received idea of the time they lived in being a part of the Apocalyptic millennium, precursive to the little 3½ years' season of Satan's loosing, and the manifestation of Antichrist.<sup>6</sup>—To all which there is to be added the *political* fact that

<sup>1</sup> Mr. C. Maitland says (p. 279), with reference to the mediæval æra, which he dates from Rome's separation from the Byzantine dominion, accomplished A.D. 730, "Once more the popular style of [prophetic] exposition is entirely changed." My readers will naturally be surprised at such a statement: as they will have seen that in the West, for some two or three centuries after that date, all the chief expositors, as Bede, Ambrose Ansbert, Haymo, did but follow the same mystical anagogic style of exposition as Tichonius and Primasius before them; while in the East Arethas professedly followed Andreas of the 6th century. Possibly Mr. C. M. may have meant that it changed after Jerome.

<sup>2</sup> See pp. 341, 342, 346, 352, 362, 363, *suprà*.

<sup>3</sup> So *Adso* of the 10th century: abstracted p. 370 *suprà*. So too *Lanfranc*, Archbishop of Canterbury in the 11th century, on 2 Thess. ii. 7:—"He who now letteth: he means the Roman empire; after the destruction of which Antichrist will come."

<sup>4</sup> For the *pseudo-Athanasius*, see p. 313 Note <sup>4</sup>.

<sup>5</sup> *Theophylact* was Archbishop of Bulgaria in the 11th century. Speaking of the *let* being the Roman empire, and of its taking away as of an event still future in his time, he says; "Eo dissoluto, vacuo insidiabitur [Antichristus] imperio, eique instabit; conabiturque cum hominum tum Dei imperium rapere." So too *Ecumenius*; an expositor who was his contemporary, or nearly so. (See *Malvenda* i. 396.) In their exposition of St. Paul these both follow Chrysostom generally; and, like him, forbore from writing any direct Apocalyptic commentary.

It may be well to compare on this point the surmisings of *Andreas* and *Arethas*. See pp. 362, 369. <sup>6</sup> So all the expositors after Tichonius and Augustine.

the Bishops of Rome, (the true Antichrist, as I doubt not,) rose gradually and almost furtively, in the first centuries of this æra, to political power; and with such admixture too of lamb-like pretensions to sanctity, as well as lion-like pretensions in character of Christ's Vicegerent,<sup>1</sup> as served in that dark and unintellectual æra to blind the minds of expositors to the Pope's real answering to the prophetic Antichrist: though this was but in truth what Hippolytus and others had inferred from prophecy respecting the mode of Antichrist's incoming. Further the *moral* fact is to be remembered, that the corruption of Christian doctrine and worship enforced by Papal Rome,<sup>2</sup> which was one grand mark of the antichristian apostasy, was participated in, more or less, by the expositors themselves, alike in the West and in the East:<sup>3</sup> whence the rather their blindness to the great fact of the already developed Antichrist.

But, as the 11th century wore away, everything prepared for, and symptoms very significative betokened, that a new æra of prophetic interpretation was approaching. The *Papacy* had risen under Gregory VII, ere the conclusion of the 11th century, to such a height of power as well as of pretension,<sup>4</sup> and abused it to the enforcement of such unchristian dogmas, albeit in the profest character of Christ's Vicar, as to force on the minds of the more discerning surmisings about the Popes and Papal Rome, and their possible prefiguration in Apocalyptic prophecy, scarce dreamed of before. Already, just before the year 1000, *Gherbert* of Rheims had spoken in solemn council of the Pope upon his lofty throne, radiant in gold and purple; and how that, if destitute of charity, he was Antichrist sitting in the temple of God.<sup>5</sup> And *Berenger* in the 11th century, as if Apocalyptically instructed, and with special reference to the Popes' enforcement of the antichristian dogma of transubstantiation, declared the Roman See to be not the apostolic seat, but the seat of Satan.<sup>6</sup>—The passing

<sup>1</sup> So Gregory I. See my Vol. i. pp. 401—403.

<sup>2</sup> See my Vol. i. p. 473.

Mr. C. Maitland (p. 291) well cites the Papal jurist of the 14th century, Marsilius of Padua, in testimony to the otherwise well authenticated fact that Papal Rome's revolt from the Byzantine emperors, under Gregory III, was a consequence of the emperor proscribing, the Pope affirming, the worship of images.

<sup>3</sup> See, for example, Ambrose Ansbert's exprest approbation of angel-mediatorship, p. 349 *suprà*. <sup>4</sup> Especially in Gregory's mighty contest with the emperor Henry.

<sup>5</sup> See my Vol. ii. p. 78, Note<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>6</sup> See Vol. ii. pp. 280, 281.

Let me observe that it is stated by Bishop Hurd that Berenger wrote a Commentary

away of the *millennial year* 1000, without any such awful mundane catastrophe, loosing of Satan, and manifestation of Antichrist, as had been popularly expected,<sup>1</sup> tended to make men earnestly reason and question both on the long received millennial theory, and on that of the Antichrist intended in prophecy, more than before.<sup>2</sup>—Moreover the incoming of the 12th century from Christ promised (should the world last through it) to open to expositors the first possible opportunity of some way applying the *year-day* principle (which had never been unrecognized) not to the smaller  $3\frac{1}{2}$  *days'* prophetic period only, but also to the great prophetic period of *the 1260 days*, without abandonment of the expectation, ever intended, of Christ's second advent being near.<sup>3</sup>

Such, I say, were the new circumstances of the times, which promised to operate powerfully in the new opening æra on prophetic interpretation. Besides that the very intellectual expansion of men's minds necessitated a change from the long established mystical system of interpretation, for one more definite and explicit. Even in the Commentary by Berengaud, with its seven successive æras, (however unskillfully and unsuccessfully applied to the Apocalyptic prophecy,) we yet see an illustration of the natural tendency of expositors' minds, then already acting, towards the adoption of some *chronologically consecutive scheme of Apocalyptic interpretation*: in place of that so long prevalent in Christendom, which explained it as mainly significant of *general and constant Christian truths or doctrines*:—some one more consonant in this respect with common sense; and also with the precedent of Daniel's prophecies, as expounded in great part by inspiration itself.

#### § 4. FROM A.D. 1100 TO THE REFORMATION.

In this fourth Period it is my purpose to sketch most prominently

on the Apocalypse: and he ascribes Berenger's anti-Romish sentiments on the subject of transubstantiation to this origin; as I have observed in my Vol. ii. p. 281, on the Witnesses. How much could we have desired that this Commentary should have been preserved to us! But I am not aware that it is anywhere extant.

<sup>1</sup> See my Vol. i. p. 470.

<sup>2</sup> Mr. Faber (On Waldenses, p. 394) speaks of Tissington, a writer of the 14th century, saying that it was a day-dream of Berenger's (*Berengarium somnium*) that at the expiration of 1000 years from Christ's death Satan was loosed; and his loosing evidenced in the promulgation of before unequalled heresies and errors by the *Romish Church*, especially that of transubstantiation.

<sup>3</sup> See my Vol. iii. p. 265.

the partially contrasted and partially accordant views of the Apocalyptic prophecy, propounded very influentially by the Romanist *Joachim Abbas and his followers*, on the one hand, and *the early pioneers of the Reformation* on the other. A briefer notice will suffice of *Anselm of Havelburg* before Joachim, and of *Albertus Magnus* and *Thomas Aquinas* after him.—I have already just hinted the various new and important characteristics of the now opening æra which combined to exercise a considerable influence on Apocalyptic interpretation, and to give a new and increased interest to the Apocalyptic Commentaries that now appeared: besides that, in the progress of time, new and important acts had occurred in the history of Christendom, with which to compare the details of prophecy. Germs of thought now arose that were to receive afterwards a fuller development; and prophetic views destined, ere very long, to help towards producing great and unexpected results.

1. And 1st, before proceeding to Joachim Abbas, let me briefly notice a short Treatise on the Apocalyptic Seals by *Anselm*, Bishop of Havelburg in the Magdeburgensian Diocese:<sup>1</sup> a Treatise composed A.D. 1145, as appears on the face of the document; and on the following occasion. It seems that Anselm (who had been previously Secretary to the Emperor Lotharius the Second) having been sent on an embassy to the Greek Emperor Manuel at Constantinople, was challenged by some Greek bishops there, publicly to discuss the points of difference between the Latin and the Greek Churches; with which request he complied: and that having successfully defended, as was thought, the Latin cause, he was desired by Pope Eugenius to write an abstract of the discussion; which he did, in the form of dialogue. By way of introduction to this discussion, and with a view to answer difficulties on religion, which might arise in some minds, from the circumstance of *so many different forms of religion existing* in different countries and different ages, he prefixed to the Dialogues a preliminary book, showing that there had been from the first one body of the Church, governed by one Spirit; that in the Old Testament times, from Abel even to Christ, the Church had ever held the rite of sacrifice, though with ceremonies often varied; and been under the influence of faith, though with imperfect knowledge

<sup>1</sup> It is given in D'Achery's *Spicilegium*, Vol. i. 161.



of the articles of Christian faith: also, with reference to New Testament times, that various different successive states of the Church had been expressly foreshown, indeed *seven* different states from Christ to the consummation; the prefiguration of them having been given in the *Apocalyptic Seals*. In this curious manner it is that Anselm's views on this prophecy were given to the world. It may perhaps be called the earliest *Church-Scheme*, properly speaking, of the *Apocalyptic Seals*; and is, in brief, as follows.

1. The *white horse* typifies the *earliest* state of the Church, white in the lustre of miraculous gifts: <sup>1</sup> the rider Christ, with the bow of evangelic doctrine, humbling the proud, and conquering opposers; so that the Church (Acts v. 14) was then daily increased.

2. The *red horse* is the *next* state of the Church, red with the blood of martyrdom; from Stephen the proto-martyr to the martyrs under Diocletian.

3. The *black horse* depicts the Church's *third* state, blackened after Constantine's time with heresies, such as of Arius, Sabellius, Nestorius, Eutyches, Donatus, Photinus, Manes; men pretending to hold the balance of justice in their discussions, but falsely weighing words and arguments: <sup>2</sup> while on the other hand, Church Councils laid down what are rightly called Canons, (so Anselm seems some way to have understood the voice from among the Cherubim in the Apocalyptic vision,) by which the faith was defined.

4. The *pale horse* signified the Church's *fourth* state, coloured with the hue of hypocrisy too generally prevalent afterwards; "as *pale* is neither white nor black, but either falsely." And so, adds Anselm, has the Church suffered from these, that the rider may well be called Death, Death the slayer of souls.—This state he makes to have commenced from the beginning of the fifth century, and to have continued even to his own time. Nor will it terminate, he asserts, till the time when the tares shall be separated from the wheat in judgment, and the saints follow the Lamb whithersoever he goeth.

5. *Souls under the altar*. Here is the Church's *fifth* state. There the souls of the saints which will have shed their blood for Christ,

<sup>1</sup> "Equus albus primus est status ecclesiæ, candore miraculorum nitidus et pulcherrimus." 166.

<sup>2</sup> "Hæretici . . . qui, dum in manu suâ dolosam stateram trutinantes habent, æquitatem de fide disputando proponunt; sed minus cautos levissimo unius vel minimi verbi pondere fallunt, et in partem sui erroris pertrahunt."

considering the infinite miseries of the Church in its three previous states, moved with compassion will cry out, "How long, O Lord, dost thou not avenge our blood?"

6. The *sixth* state of the Church is when there shall arise the most vehement persecution in the times of Antichrist,<sup>1</sup> answering to *the great earthquake* of the sixth seal. Then Christ, the Sun of righteousness, shall be hidden; Christian professors fall from the Church into earthly-mindedness; and the heaven, or Church itself, pass away, together with its sacraments, altogether from the public view.

7. The *seventh* state is that of the saints' rest; a rest in the beatific vision: as it is said, "When he had opened the seventh seal there was *silence in heaven* for about the space of half an hour."

So Anselm of the seven Apocalyptic Seals: a scheme chiefly exhibiting views of the Church's successive trials and evils.—I may observe, further, that in one or two passing notices of the vision of the Dragon and travailing Woman, Apoc. xii., he makes what is said of the Dragon's persecution of the Woman, or Church, after she had brought forth Christ her male child, to be chronologically parallel with the times of the red horse of the second Seal; also the Dragon's going forth to persecute the rest of the Woman's seed, Apoc. xii. 17, to have been fulfilled in the heresies introduced after Constantine's overthrow of Paganism,<sup>2</sup> by heretics that bore on their hearts the *mark of the Beast*.

2. I now pass on to *Joachim Abbas*; a person of greater repute and greater influence, as an expounder of prophecy, than any other whatever in the middle age. He was a Calabrian by birth, and in early life had made the pilgrimage to Jerusalem: a city at that time still held by the successors of the Crusaders; though threatened by Mussulman enemies surrounding it. The lively recollection of what he then saw had probably not a little influence on Joachim's interest in and views of prophecy. Indeed it was there and then, in the Holy Church and Sepulchre, that the idea was first impressed on his mind of having a call to the illustration of prophetic Scripture.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Norbert, a contemporary of Anselm, and friend of the celebrated Bernard, is an example of the expectation entertained at this point by some persons of reputation, of the speedy appearance of Antichrist. See my Vol. ii. p. 368, Note <sup>2</sup>.

<sup>2</sup> Compare pp. 315, 333 *suprà*.

<sup>3</sup> See Moreri in his Dictionary, on the article *Joachim*.

About the year 1180 he had been elected Abbot of the monastery of Curacio in Calabria, near Cosenza: but, having already at that time become famous for his gift in Scriptural research and explication, he received express permission from Pope Lucius III, in the year 1182, to retire a while from the Abbey and its active occupations, in order to give himself more entirely to these studies. In 1183, at the Convent of Casemaire, Luke, then a monk of the monastery, and afterwards Archbishop of Cosenza, tells us that he was assigned as secretary to Joachim: <sup>1</sup> and that night and day both himself and two other monks were employed by Joachim, as his assistants and scribes in two works on which he was then busy; one on the *Concord of the Old and New Testament*, the other on the *Apocalypse*.<sup>2</sup> It was for a year and a half, according to this informant, that Joachim thus occupied himself at the convent, "dictating and correcting." At what time he finally finished his Apocalyptic comment seems uncertain. In A.D. 1190, when our king Richard was at Messina, on his way to the Holy Land, he was full of the subject. We have in Roger de Hoveden an interesting account of the king's sending for him, and hearing him lecture on it, induced by his high reputation for prophetic lore; <sup>3</sup> together with a sketch of certain views as to the future which he then propounded from the Apocalypse: views partially contradicted however by the event soon after; and which in the commentary, as finally corrected by him, appear, as we shall see afterwards, considerably modified. In the copy of the commentary handed down to us,<sup>4</sup> I observe a notice of something that he states

<sup>1</sup> I take my account from Fleury's *Histoire Ecclesiastique*, Liv. lxxiv.—Luke makes this year 1183, the date of the commencement of Joachim's writing:—"Il en obtint la permission d'écrire, et commença à le faire." Ibid.

<sup>2</sup> "L'Abbé me donna à lui pour lui servir de secrétaire; et j'écrivois jour et nuit dans des cahiers ce qu'il dictoit et corrigeoit sur des brouillons, avec deux autres moines ses écrivains."—The intimate connexion of the two Works will appear at my p. 387.

<sup>3</sup> "The same year (1190) Richard hearing by common report, and by the relation of many persons, that there was a certain ecclesiastic of the Cistercian order in Calabria, named Joachim, abbot of Curacio, who had the spirit of prophecy, and predicted future events to the people, sent for him; and took pleasure in hearing the words of his prophecy, and wisdom, and learning. For he was a man learned in the Holy Scriptures; and interpreted the visions of St. John the Evangelist, which the same John relates in the Apocalypse, which he wrote with his own hand: in hearing which the king of England and his followers took great delight."

What follows in Roger respecting Joachim's explanation of Apoc. xii., xiii., xvii., and of the Woman, Dragon, and Beast Antichrist, there symbolized, is given at p. 418 infra.

<sup>4</sup> My edition is that of Venice, 1527; of 224 leaves.

himself to have heard in the year 1195.<sup>1</sup> Hence I conceive that he corrected and improved the Work till near the time of his death ; which happened, according to Fleury, in the year 1202.—I now proceed to give a sketch of his exposition.

A brief *Prologue*, and then an *Introductory Book*, are prefixed to the Exposition ; which Exposition is itself divided into six PARTS.—In the *Prologue* he takes care prominently to state, that he had not entered on the work presumptuously, and merely from his own judgment ; but by the authority, and at the command, of the Roman See ; a brief Monitory of Pope Clement on which point, and one which alludes to the previous mandates of the two Popes preceding, is inserted.<sup>2</sup> And, in the same spirit of deference to the Roman See, he leaves also prefixed a solemn charge to the Priors and Brethren of his Abbey, to have his writings immediately and formally submitted to its judgment ; in case of his death occurring before this was done.<sup>3</sup>

From the *Introductory Book*, (one of several chapters, preceding the main Commentary,)<sup>4</sup> it may suffice to note what he says of the Three Ages, the Apocalyptic seven-sealed Book, and the Concord of the Two Testaments.

<sup>1</sup> See p. 397 *infra*. Again, he in one place seems to allude to A.D. 1200, as the date of his final recension. See my Note <sup>2</sup>, p. 388.

<sup>2</sup> “ Breve Admonitorium seu Preceptorium Summi Pontificis, ut quàm citius perficiat expositionis Apocalypsis, et se Pontifici presentet.”

“ Clemens Episcopus, servus servorum Dei, dilecto filio Joachim Abbati de Curatio, salutem et apostolicam benedictionem.

Canonis suadet, et debitum evangelicæ charitatis, ut in cunctis actibus nostris ad id plurimum intendamus, qualiter secundum veritatis evangelicæ testimonium opera nostra bona luceant coram hominibus ; ut ex eis proficiendi materiam capiant, et exemplum. Quum igitur, jubente et exhortante bonæ memoriæ Lucio Papâ prædecessore nostro, expositionem Apocalypsis et Opus Concordiæ inchoasse, et postmodum auctoritate Domini Papæ Urbani successoris ipsius composuisse dicaris, caritatem tuam monemus et exhortamur in Domino, per Apostolica Scripta mandantes, quatenus laboribus tuis in hæc parte peroptatum et debitum finem imponens, (gratiâ Domini prosequente,) ad utilitatem proximorum opus illud complere, et diligenter studeas emendare ; veniensque ad nos quàm citius opportunitas aderit, discussioni apostolicæ sedis, et judicio, ut præsentet. Sin velis in abscondito retinere, diligenti curâ prospicias quâ possis Summi Patris-familias offensam de talento scientiæ tibi credito satisfactione placare.” Leaf 1<sup>2</sup>. \*

Datum Late. sexto Idus Junii, Pontificatûs nostri anno primo. (i. e. A.D. 1188.)

<sup>3</sup> The date given is MC ; which is evidently incorrect. I presume it should be MCC. Leaf 1<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>4</sup> It occupies from Leaf 2<sup>2</sup> to 26<sup>2</sup>.

\* N. B. In what ensues a numeral so marked, 1<sup>2</sup>, signifies the second page of the Leaf.



1. Noticing the old Jewish threefold division of time, *before the law, under the law, and under the Messiah or gospel*, he observes that the last period of these three may be itself divided into three; viz. that of the *gospel letter, gospel spirit, and vision of God*; so making up five in all;<sup>1</sup> and that, omitting the first and last of the five, he would mean by *the three states of the world*,<sup>2</sup> when spoken of in his Treatise, the three intermediate æras: viz. 1. from Abraham to John the Baptist and Christ; 2. from Christ to the time of the fulness of the Gentiles; 3. from that to the consummation.

2. He states that certain *mysteries of the Old Testament history* were depicted by the *seven Seals* of the Apocalyptic seven-sealed Book: and that these mysteries were *opened* by Christ after his resurrection.<sup>3</sup>

3. He illustrates the *concord of the two Testaments*; and correspondence of certain events affecting the Old Testament Church, with certain that affected the New Testament Church, the latter being a kind of fuller expansion and accomplishment of the types of the former: and this in the seven æras following, signified under the seven Seals.<sup>4</sup> We have here the key to Joachim's Apocalyptic views.

OLD TESTAMENT.

SEAL

1. From *Abram or Jacob, to Moses and Joshua*; in which æra occurred Israel's war with the Egyptians.
2. *Joshua to David*.—Wars with the Canaanites.
3. *David to Elias and Elisha*.—Schism of Israel and Judah, and civil wars.
4. *Elisha to Isaiah and Hezekiah*.—Wars first with Syrians, then with Assyrians, resulting in Israel's ten tribes' destruction.
5. *Hezekiah to Judah's captivity* by the Babylonians; after previous partial suffering from the Egyptians under Pharaoh Necho. Meanwhile there had been settled in the Samaritan countries a mixt people; half heathen, half not.

NEW TESTAMENT.

SEAL

1. From *Christ to death of John the Evangelist*.—Conflict of the Church with the Jews, under the N. T. Moses.
2. *Death of St. John to Constantine*.—Persecutions of Pagan Rome.
3. *Constantine to Justinian*.—Persian oppression of the Church. Schism of the Greek Church from the Latin.
4. *Justinian to Charlemagne*. Persian persecutions. Saracens overrun and desolate the Greek Church and nation.
5. *Charlemagne to the time now present*.—The Greek Church now separated from the Roman. German Emperors from Henry the 1st (men worse than heathens) endeavour to destroy the liberties of the Church. The Latin or Roman Empire answers to Babylon.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Leaf 5<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>2</sup> Leaf 6.

<sup>3</sup> Leaf 6<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>4</sup> See his Leaf 6 to 10.

<sup>5</sup> See p. 391, Notes <sup>1</sup> and <sup>2</sup>, *infra*.

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <p>6. <i>Jews' return to Malachi's death.</i>—<i>Babylon overthrown by the Persians.</i> Jews suffer from Assyrians under Holofernes, and Syro-Macedonians under Antiochus.<sup>1</sup></p> <p>7. <i>Malachi to John the Baptist and Christ.</i> World's first state ends.</p> | <p>6. <i>Times just about beginning,</i> in which the <i>Roman Babylon</i> (or Babylon of the Roman empire) will be struck to death.</p> <p>7. <i>End of the second state in the world's conversion and sabbath.</i><sup>2</sup></p> |
|--|--|

"Apertio sexti sigilli," he concludes, "nuper initiata, in paucis annis vel diebus consummationem accipiet. Exinde erit sabbatum, sicut in diebus Johannis :<sup>3</sup> et in eo status iste secundus consummationem accipiet. Ut autem in tempore sexti signaculi percussa est vetus Babylon, ita et nunc percutietur nova. Et sicut tunc Assyrii et Macedones deterruerunt Judæos, ita et nunc Saraceni, et qui post eos venturi sunt pseudo-prophetæ, facient mala multa in terrâ, et talem tribulationem qualis non fuit ab initio. Consummatis autem pressuris istis adveniet tempus beatum :"—a time when "the knowledge of the Lord shall cover the earth as the waters cover the sea,"<sup>4</sup>

Other chapters are on "the Dragon and Antichrist ;" "De duplici intelligentiâ distinctionis ;" "Pulchrum mysterium ;" "On the difference of sabbaths ;" "On the perfection of the numbers five and seven," &c., not now needful to enter on. Let me only in passing call attention to the heading of one ; "De vitâ activâ designatâ in *Petro*, et de contemplativâ in *Joanne*."<sup>5</sup> On various occasions this view of Peter as type of the priestly order, John of the monastic, is put forward by Joachim.

In proceeding I omit noticing the Part i. of Joachim's Commentary,<sup>6</sup> relative to the Epistles to the seven Churches, as not to my point : and pass on to its Part ii.,<sup>7</sup> Leaf 114, where it enters on the subject of the Seals : observing, as we pass on, that he explains the four Cherubim around the throne to signify the four ecclesiastical orders of pastors, deacons, doctors, and the contemplatives :<sup>8</sup> or, with a certain reference to chronological succession, first, the apostles ; second, the martyrs and confessors ; third, the doctors of the 4th and 5th centuries ; fourth, the virgins or monks.<sup>9</sup>

<sup>1</sup> An evident anachronism ; as it was not till long after Malachi that the Syro-Macedonians oppress the Jews. But (L. 8) he calls *Haman* a Macedonian.

<sup>2</sup> At Leaf 9<sup>2</sup>, he allows *two generations*, or some 60 years, from A.D. 1200, as the *interval of transition* from the *second* to the *third state*. I shall have to remark afterwards on certain inconsistencies and obscurities in his statements about his 6th and 7th Periods.

<sup>3</sup> What sabbath in St. John's days ?

<sup>4</sup> Leaf 9<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>5</sup> Leaf 17<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>6</sup> From L. 26<sup>2</sup> to L. 99.

<sup>7</sup> Extending from L. 99 to L. 123.

<sup>8</sup> So L. 106, on Apoc. iv. 6.

<sup>9</sup> So on the opening of the four first successive Seals, L. 114—116.

The *1st Seal* then having been opened by Christ, its *white horse* was the primitive Church: the *rider* Christ, as man, with his crown of righteousness, in person conquering alike the world, death, and Satan; and to the disciples triumphantly assigning the kingdom, the Jewish perfidy being overcome. (Just as Israel emerged from, and conquered, the Egyptians.) It was the first Cherub, or *Apostolic Order*, which, as with a voice of thunder, here invited the world to contemplate.

In the *2nd Seal*, the *red horse* symbolizes the Roman Pagan priests and armies: the *rider* the Devil, that great homicide, or the Roman persecuting Emperors actuated by him. So were wars kindled, and peace disturbed. And especially what bloodshed of the saints in the Roman persecutions; till the Church's victory over Paganism under Constantine and Pope Sylvester! (So, in Jewish history, the conquest of the Canaanites under the Judges, to Samuel and David.) The *Order of Martyrs* by their sufferings invited attention to this Seal.

*3rd Seal.* The *black horse* was the Arian Clergy, masters of error and darkness: the *balance* symbolizing the "disputatio literæ,"<sup>1</sup> and cunning dialectics of the Arians. "Sed tu tene tuum pondus: tu serva numerum quem audisti!" viz. "a chœnix of wheat for a denarius." This chœnix, or *two pounds (bilibres)*, of *wheat* (the food of man), Joachim explains as having reference to the two Testaments, of which the perfect doctrine well corresponds with the Denarius, as the perfect number; while the three chœnixes or bilibres, i. e. the six pounds of barley (more properly the food of cattle), might refer to the "sex tempora laboriosa," from Abraham to John the Baptist, "quibus indicta sunt omnia servilia ad sanum atque perfectum intellectum perducere!" Or perhaps the two pounds' weight of wheat, announced from among the four living creatures, might allude to the cry of the two Seraphim, Holy, Holy, Holy! "Which cry had the wretched Arius heard, he would never have impeached the Deity of the Son or Holy Ghost."<sup>2</sup>—The Order of the *Catholic Doctors* here proclaimed the truth.

*4th Seal.*—The *pale horse* signified the *Saracens*, those destroyers of much of the Greek Church and Empire; the *rider* Mahomet. For,

<sup>1</sup> Joachim often cites St. Paul's saying, "For the letter killeth, but the Spirit giveth life."

<sup>2</sup> Joachim suggests various other fanciful analogies.

“*Quis tam rectè Mors appellari potuit quàm ille perditus Maometh, qui tot millium hominum factus est causa mortis!*” (Joachim identifies this with the little horn of Daniel’s fourth Beast; and supposes the subject to be continued to the 5th and 6th Seals, as well as referred to again more fully afterwards.) By “Hades following” was perhaps meant *Meses Mutus*; a Mahomedan persecutor of Christians, then ruling in Mauritania.<sup>1</sup>—It was the Order of *Monks and Virgins* that here answered to the fourth Cherub, crying, Come and see!—(Israel’s fourth tribulation, from the Syrians and Assyrians, is the Jewish parallel referred to by Joachim.)

*5th Seal.*—By the *altar of God*, which is associated with this Seal, as the four Cherubs were with the Seals preceding, is meant the *Romish Church*, including both clergy and monks. As the four primary persecutions originated in Judæa, Rome, Greece, and Arabia, so this fifth in Mauritania and Spain; where many Christians of the Romish communion have been killed even until now. For, whenever the Saracen powers might seem to have fallen, they have always remarkably been revived, *like the Beast’s head* in Apoc. xiii.: much as was also revived the Assyrian power, again persecuting Israel, under Holofernes.<sup>2</sup> To which are to be added the injuries suffered by the Romish Church from the Latin Emperors.<sup>3</sup>—“And they cried, How long, O Lord, dost not thou avenge, &c.” A different cry this from that of the proto-martyr Stephen! For of the just, some, like him, are more patient.—The *white robes given* signify how the martyrs pass from mourning to joy.—The words, “till their brethren be judged, that are to be slain even as they,” show that after the fifth Seal, “*in cujus extremitate nos sumus,*”<sup>4</sup> there remains still to be accomplished a final martyr-conflict and suffering.

*6th Seal.*—*Earthquake, &c.* Here is the beginning of the Apocalyptic Babylon’s *day of judgment*. “*Perpende verba hæc misera*

<sup>1</sup> Joachim omits the last clause of the verse, “And power was given over the fourth part (or over four parts) of the earth, to kill with the sword, and with famine, and with pestilence, and with wild beasts.” So that we cannot clearly tell which reading he followed, *the 4 parts, or the 4th part*.

I suppose however that he read *four parts*; because, in explaining the symbol of Mahomet and the Saracens, he says, “*Gentem crudelem ejus detestanda germina terræ latitudinem occupasse dolemus.*”<sup>2</sup> So Joachim, L. 116<sup>3</sup>.

<sup>3</sup> I add this from Joachim’s general sketch of the Seals (see p. 387 *suprà*), though here omitted; because it is referred to in the next Seal, and was therefore omitted by oversight.

<sup>4</sup> L. 117<sup>2</sup>.



Babylon; ecce enim appropinquat desolatio tua; à sæculis predicta est. . . . Necessè est enim ut in sexto recipias quod in quinto tempore contulisti." But who or what is Babylon? Whoever by moral or physical influence opposes the Church of Peter.<sup>1</sup> Specially he includes here all false Christians or false members of the Roman Church in the Germanic Roman Empire; those princes inclusive who are to tear the Harlot, as stated in Apoc. xvii., and who are afterwards openly to fight with the Lamb: "Ipsi enim reges qui percussuri sint Fornicariam, ut emundent superficiem terræ, pugnaturi sunt cum Agno; et Agnus vincet illos."<sup>2</sup> This *day of judgment*, he says, is to be understood in a larger sense, as well as stricter: the *large* for a certain indefinite period of judgment; as Paul, "Us on whom the ends of the world are come:"<sup>3</sup> a *stricter*, when the just shall rise to eternal life, the wicked to eternal punishment.—Here the *earthquake* is the earthquake of terror in the hearts of men: the *sun and moon darkened*, the spiritual eclipse of Christian doctrine, as set forth both by the monastic and the clerical orders: (of which, as even now almost commencing, fearful symptoms appear:) the *heaven passing away*, the passing away of the light-dispensing Church, so as that there be no more public preaching: (though some will still exhort in secret:) just as it is said in Apoc. xiii., "that none might buy or sell," i. e. none offer (professedly) the priceless gospel, but they that had the Beast's mark. The *islands and mountains fleeing away* means the dissolution of episcopal churches and monasteries. The *kings of the earth* noted are the same that in Apoc. xix. are seen to gather against the Lamb; being God's instruments, bad though they be, for purging the Lord's threshing-floor of its chaff in the mystic Babylon. At which time many thousands will fall in martyrdom, to complete the martyr-number, as intimated in the fifth Seal.<sup>4</sup>—Then, Babylon having thus been judged, the Mahomedan nations (joined by false prophets apostatized from Christianity)

<sup>1</sup> "Quicumque Petri ecclesiam moribus viribusque impugnant, Babylonis se filios contremiscant." 117<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>2</sup> On Apoc. xvii. Joachim more fully explains himself about Babylon, and the Beast, and the kings that loved the harlot; the latter including wicked anti-papal prelates, as well as princes. Babylon, it must always be remembered, is supposed by Joachim to mean the *Western Roman Empire*; and so to include what he calls *Jerusalem*, i. e. the true Romish Church, within it. But see the Comment on that Chapter.

<sup>3</sup> 118.

<sup>4</sup> See again the Comment on Apoc. xvii.

will prophesy triumph to their law. But the Lamb shall conquer them.

*Sealing Vision.*—The *four angels* here are the same evil angels as those that (Ps. lxxvii.) once afflicted Egypt; and which use infidel nations that surround the Church as their agents: judicially permitted to withhold the life-giving influences of the winds; i. e. of the preaching of spiritual doctrine. (Or, if good angels, they may signify the *four preaching orders*, judicially withholding the word, under God's direction; like as in Amos viii., and in the rain-withholding of the two witnesses.) The *sealing angel* is either Christ, risen from the dead, and having the name of the living God as the Divine Author of life: or perhaps the *Roman Pontiff*, charged like Zerubbabel of old to rebuild Jerusalem and the temple; Christ acting and triumphing in him, "maximè cum ipse solus principaliter teneat locum ejus."<sup>1</sup>—Whichever it be, he will arise as with the influence of the morning sun; at which the wild beasts, or adverse powers of darkness, will get them away to their dens (Ps. civ.), while he preaches with certain evidence the near resurrection of the dead:—that so, in this breathing-time between the two last tribulations, the faithful ones may be prepared with the armour of light, to resist in the evil day; to complete the mystic number of the elect 144,000, including both converted Jews and Gentiles (these being the same that are again mentioned in Apoc. xiv., and figured too in the 144 cubits of the Holy City,) and to fight the remainder of the battle, under the Lamb and his followers, with the Beast and kings of the earth.—The interval will be like the six years after the return from Babylon, in which the Temple's rebuilding was completed.—Besides which 144,000, an innumerable number will be killed for Christ's name, whose blessedness is declared in the palm-bearing vision; a blessedness partly in this world, where they begin the ascription of praise to God the Saviour, and lasting afterwards through eternity: the angels (here meaning *all the elect ones*<sup>2</sup>) crying, Amen! Their serving him alike day and night in his temple, means serving him in times alike of joy and sorrow, in his Church;<sup>3</sup> for no temple appeared in the New Je-

<sup>1</sup> 120<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>2</sup> "Omnes angeli in hoc loco omnes illi electi homines intelligendi sunt; qui, etsi non sint enumerati inter quinque ordines qui specialius pertinent ad civitatem, pertinent tamen ad suburbana et vicus." L. 121<sub>2</sub>.

<sup>3</sup> "Non quidem post finem seculi, cum cessabit servitus et nox doloris; sed in omni

rusalem; nor is servitude known in heaven. And so at length they reach heaven afterwards; when they drink of the fountain of life in his presence, where there are no tears.

*7th Seal.* As in Luke xxiii. it is said that "the women rested (*siluerunt*) on the Sabbath according to commandment," so the *half-hour's silence* of this seal may mean the *sabbath-keeping*, especially in a contemplative life. So in Ps. lxxxiv., "I will be *silent* to hear what the Lord God may say concerning me."—In the corresponding æra under the Old Testament, viz. after Ezra and Malachi, there was a cessation too from writing Scripture. So under the coming 7th Seal the time of expounding Scripture will be ended: the mysteries of the Old Testament being solved "per concordiam;" or manifest concord, I suppose, with those of the New Testament dispensation. (Did Joachim believe the prophetic Expositor's office closed in *himself*?)—He adds; "The *half-hour* specified I deem to be the seventh and last *half time* of the  $3\frac{1}{2}$  prophetic times, whether literally or mystically understood."<sup>1</sup>

PART III.—With the *Trumpets* Joachim makes the chronology of the Visions to retrogress to the commencement of the Gospel dispensation: the seven Trumpet-Angels being New Testament preachers, appointed to raise their voice like a trumpet; just as Israel's trumpet-priests round Jericho. With what those priests did in one week we may compare what has been done in the sixth age of the world: the world being fated to fall, together with Antichrist, on the completion of seven times from Christ's birth; which seven times are all included under the world's sixth age.<sup>2</sup>

The incense-Angel is explained as Christ, after his death and ascension, offering (together with the saints) the prayers of his people;<sup>3</sup> then sending down fire of the Holy Spirit on the apostles, and all others of spiritual understanding. Whereupon, like the thunder-

tempore isto quo perseverat edificium templi, et ignis purgatorius aliquantos affligit." 122<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> L. 123.

<sup>2</sup> "Notandum quod non corruerunt muri Jerico, nisi in septimo, vel post septimum circuitum, et quasi in consummatione diei. Completis septem temporibus ab incarnatione Domini, cum ruinâ Antichristi ruet pariter præsens mundus. . . Etenim septem illa tempore sub sextâ continentur ætate." L. 124.

<sup>3</sup> Christ is the *one mediator* between God and man, says Joachim distinctly; just as says the Scriptures. But not, he presently adds, the only *intercessor*. Else "decepitur (quod absit) et errat universa ecclesia; quæ quotidie sanctorum suffragia confidenter expostulat." (!) 124<sup>2</sup>.

ings and voices in vision, the voice of the Gospel sounded forth to the world; and a movement of men's hearts and souls resulted, like to the earthquake.—This stated, Joachim next proceeds to expound the Trumpets.

*Trumpet 1.*—The Trumpet-Angel here is the Apostolic band, and chiefly St. Paul, preaching against Judaism the spirituality of the law; while the hail, mixed with fire and blood, cast on the earth, signifies the spirit of hardness of heart, mixed with fiery and bloody zeal, infused into the Jews: <sup>1</sup> the result being that a third of professedly believing Jews (the vain carnal-minded of them) apostatized from the faith to Judaism or heresy.

*Trumpet 2.*—This Trumpet-Angel signifies the Martyrs and Doctors of the post-apostolic age, preaching against the Nicolaitan heresy: *Nicolaus* with the zeal of his hot malice, who taught doctrines like those of Balak, being like a burning mountain cast into the sea of Gentilism; through which a third were caused to die from the faith.

*Trumpet 3.*—The third Trumpet-Angel symbolizes the Christian Doctors from the time of Constantine. The falling meteor was *Arius*: whose pestiferous error fell on bishops and priests, from whom should flow forth streams of wisdom; and embittered the waters, Scripture being now perverted by them.—Which Arian error, and Arian persecution too, continued till the time of the Saracens.<sup>2</sup>

*Trumpet 4.*—The Trumpet-Angel in this case typifies the Holy Monks and Virgins: who, like celestial luminaries, walking in the high pathway of contemplation, gave light to the world; but were in a large measure quenched by the outburst of the licentious Mahometan heresy, and of the Saracens.

The *Woe-denouncing Angel* that next followed, I think, says Joachim, to have signified Pope Gregory I: who wrote so much, and so earnestly, on the world's end as near at hand, and the coming trials of the consummation.<sup>3</sup> If his predictions were not fulfilled, the failure arose, not from Gregory's having been deceived, but from God's mercy in withholding judgment, and prolonging the time of probation.

*Trumpet 5.*—“And who the *scorpion-locusts* of this Trumpet but

<sup>1</sup> “Facta est grando duritiæ, mixta cum igne zeli, et cruore odii, et missa est in cor Synagogæ, semper terrena quærens.” 127<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>2</sup> 129<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>3</sup> Such, the reader may remember, is in part my own explanation of the vision. It is interesting to find it suggested so early. But, so viewing it, how could Joachim place the *Saracens*, as he does, before, not after, the woe-denouncing angel?



the heretics commonly called *Pathareni*,<sup>1</sup> the modern Manichees?" So Joachim expounds the symbol. It is notable as about the earliest application of such Apocalyptic emblems by Romish writers to anti-Romish schismatics.

And here, let me observe, Joachim gives the current account of these heretics (the commingled Waldenses and Cathari apparently) just, no doubt, as it had reached him: nor can I pass on without briefly sketching it, as being a testimony hitherto unnoticed. He tells then that they believed all *bodies* and *flesh* to have been created by the Devil,<sup>2</sup> and Christ not to have come in the flesh; condemned lawful marriages, and enjoined abstinence from eating flesh:<sup>3</sup> though plausibly professing all the while to be the holders and teachers of the apostolic faith:<sup>4</sup> that they lived a simple life, supported by their own labour; and made great pretence to purity and righteousness;<sup>5</sup> yet, when meeting at night in their synagogues, did there the deeds of darkness:<sup>6</sup> that their origin was of ancient date, beyond known record:<sup>7</sup> that they were divided into *believers* and *perfect men*; the latter alone bound to observe their stricter rules of life:<sup>8</sup> that they were bent on proselyting;<sup>9</sup> using, or rather abusing, Scripture (like the lamblike-horned false Prophet) for the purpose;<sup>10</sup> affirming that the poor man, on joining them, became instantly rich;<sup>11</sup> arguing from their own simpler and more primitively Christian life, in contrast with that of the Catholic clergy:<sup>12</sup> that in doing this they made light of the risk incurred; even as if they despised the present life,

<sup>1</sup> 130<sup>o</sup>. So A.D. 1179, in the third year of the Lateran Council: "Hæreticorum quos alii Catharos, alii *Patarinos*, alii *Publicanos* vocant." Also, in A.D. 1183, Pope Lueius III.; "Imprimis Catharos, et *Patarinos*, et eos qui se *Humiliatos*, vel *Pauperes* de Lugduno, falso nomine mentiuntur:" Hard. vi. ii. 1683, 1878. and again the Letter of Innocent III, A.D. 1199, which has been referred to by me Vol. ii. pp. 354, 425: "Quosdam qui *Valdenses*, *Cathari*, et *Paterini* dicuntur."

<sup>2</sup> "Omnia corpora," 130<sup>o</sup>; "omnem carnem," 133. <sup>3</sup> 132<sup>o</sup>.

<sup>4</sup> 131.—"Verbis verisimilibus:" "Hæc quasi rationabiliter concinantes. 131, 132.

<sup>5</sup> "Justitiâ præditos." 131. Compare what I have said of the heretics examined at the Council of Arras, early in the 11th century, in my Vol. ii. p. 276.

<sup>6</sup> "Nocturno, ut fertur, tempore." 130<sup>o</sup>.

<sup>7</sup> "Diu est ex quo confuta fuit secta illa: licet nesciamus à quo fuerit inchoata vel aucta." 131<sup>o</sup>. Hence the 5 months, or 150 years, assigned to the locusts figuring them. Compare my remarks on this point Vol. ii. pp. 357, 381—384.

<sup>8</sup> Compare what is said in my Vol. ii. p. 398, of the twofold division of the Waldenses into the *Perfecti*, and the *general body* of the disciples: also, ib. 287, of the division of the heretics examined at Cologne in 1147, into the general body, called *believers*, and those especially set apart, called the *elect*. <sup>9</sup> 131.

<sup>10</sup> "Utuntur auctoritatibus Scripturarum; immo non utuntur, sed abutuntur." 132<sup>o</sup>.

<sup>11</sup> "Qui pauper venit ad illos protinus, inquit, efficitur dives." 131. Compare what is stated in my Vol. ii. pp. 272—399, &c. <sup>12</sup> p. 131.

and counted on eternal life, if punished with death in consequence;<sup>1</sup> in which case, and when burnt as heretics by the Catholic authorities, they were esteemed by their brethren as men crowned with martyrdom.<sup>2</sup>—Is not all this very corroborative of the view given by me of these so-called heretics, and other cognate sects, in my second Volume?

As to the Apocalyptic details, they are thus applied to the Pathareni. The original *opener of the abyss* God only knew. That it was some of the clergy however was evident,<sup>3</sup> taught by the father of lies to probe the depths of worldly science; *the scorpion-locusts* being the Pathareni heretics, emerged out of the smoke of the heresy:—again the *trees* and *grass*, which the locusts are bid not to hurt, are the perfect and the simple-minded Catholics; the latter of whom, when interrogated by the heretics, turn a deaf ear, saying it is not for them, but the clergy, to dispute on questions of faith.<sup>4</sup> On the other hand the men converted by the Pathareni into “believers” soon feel the venom of the sting of their perverters; the very “paleness of their face” showing them to be so wretched that they would rather die than live:<sup>5</sup>—conscience meanwhile accusing them of having joined the heretics only from regard to temporal benefit: it being a custom of these Pathareni to make collections at their meetings;<sup>6</sup> and to hold out to poor Catholics, with whom they express sympathy, that by joining them they may both temporarily profit, and also, keeping the apostolic faith, gain eternal life.<sup>7</sup>—The *breastplates* indicate the hard-heartedness of the *Perfecti*: the rushing *locust-wings* their *noisy* arguings from Scripture: the *five months* of their commission, a period probably of so many *generations*: five months being equivalent to five times thirty days, and sometimes a *day* used for a *year*.<sup>8</sup> For it is long since the sect first began; indeed no one knew when.<sup>9</sup>—Finally,

<sup>1</sup> “Ut, quasi equi preparati ad prælium, nihil vereant adversi: despicientes penitens vitam temporalem, ac si per supplicia adepturi eternam.” 132. See my Vol. ii. pp. 311—313.

<sup>2</sup> “Nam et martyres Dei nominant suos, qui forte (!) a Catholicis concremati sunt igne; existimantes illos principes sectæ suæ, gloriâ et honore coronatos in cœlis.” 132. “Ut . . . vel occisi (sicut asserunt) coronentur martyrio.” 131<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>3</sup> “Clericum fuisse . . . apparet.” 130<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>4</sup> 131. Compare Sergius’ remark in my Vol. ii. 257.

<sup>5</sup> 131<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>6</sup> “Collectas bonorum suorum.” 131. A statement deserving observation; as not, I think, noted elsewhere about the Sect. <sup>7</sup> 131.

<sup>8</sup> “Solet aliquando dies des gnare annum.” 131<sup>2</sup>. The reader will mark this application of the *year-day* principle by Joachim Abbas. Another similar one will be found at p. 401 infra: also p. 406. See my Vol. iii. p. 282.

<sup>9</sup> I have already noted this on the preceding page.

the locust-king Abaddon might be the pseudo-Apostolic man whom these heretics all profess to obey.<sup>1</sup>

On the whole, adds Joachim, considering what St. John says, that "whosoever denies Jesus to have come in the flesh is an *Antichrist*," and also what St. Paul prophesies of apostates in the last days, "forbidding to marry, and that there should be abstinence from meats," we may probably conclude that *Antichrist* is *even now in the world*, though the hour of his *revelation* has not yet come: the time for *this* being under the sixth Trumpet, after the desolation of the Roman Empire,<sup>2</sup> which still offers him resistance. But the fifth Trumpet-woe is indeed but a preparation for the sixth: so that Antichrist must anticipate the latter in his *rise*; so as under the fifth, either by himself or by his messengers, to have begun to spread his poison.<sup>3</sup>

*Trumpet 6.*—The *voice from the four horns of the altar* means the concurrent voice of the four evangelists, declaring the evils fated to occur at this epoch of the consummation:—the *four angels bound*, the same four evil angels as in Apoc. vii., waiting only the summons to do evil, on the summons of their father the Devil, *at any time, and for any time, whether "the hour, day, month, or year:"*<sup>4</sup> the *Trumpet-Angel*, Christian preachers; whose it is to loose the evil angels, either by *ceasing to pray* for Christendom, or simply (so as Isaiah in what is said of his making the heart of the Jews hard) in the sense of announcing their being loosed:<sup>5</sup> whereupon the four angels are to lead on deceived myriads, as believers in the Antichrist, or rather Antichrists, of prophecy. Among these, some of the *Saracens* will be eminent; the same that constituted the fourth Trumpet-plague; now revived, after a temporary decline, like the Beast from the earth: many Jews too joining, and also the *Pathareni*. "Indeed," adds Joachim, "a sensible and God-fearing man, escaped from captivity, in Alexandria, told me last year, i. e. A.D. 1195, at Messina, how he had been assured by a certain eminent Saracen, that the Pathareni had sent envoys thither to conclude an alliance with the Saracens, which had in effect been concluded."<sup>6</sup> Thus was a foundation laid for the

<sup>1</sup> "Nempe et Apostolicum cui omnes obediunt se fatentur habere; de quo in præsentī loco subsequenter adjungitur:" (L. 133:) i. e. in the next verse about Abaddon.—Compare what I have said of the Pope of the Paulikians, Vol. ii. p. 289.

<sup>2</sup> Mark here another instance of the mistake about the Roman Empire, as if still unbroken and undivided, on which I have observed p. 379 *suprà*.

<sup>3</sup> 133.

<sup>4</sup> 134.

<sup>5</sup> 133<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>6</sup> 134.

*mystery of iniquity.* By these other savage nations are to be led on ; as the Turks from the East, the Moors and Berbers<sup>1</sup> from the South, and from the North savage nations north of Germany : all which, until the sixth Trumpet-blast, continue bound in, or by, the great river Euphrates, or Roman empire ; an empire intended to be a bulwark to the Church. But when the sixth Vial has been poured out, and the Euphratean waters dried up, then these powers are to fall on *Rome*, the proud city, the mystic Babylon. (Would that it may take warning!) A prelude to which has been seen recently in the case of its Emperor Frederic : who (in 1189) crossed the sea with multitudes ; but returned (in 1191) with a mere remnant, nothing done.<sup>2</sup>—The lion-like heads of the symbol, adds Joachim, indicate open force ; the serpent-tails, secret poison ; whereby (the numbers being irresistible) the enemy will both dominate over the body, and by torments seek to quench faith in the soul. Joachim further intimates the identity of these powers, especially the Saracen, with the ten toes of Daniel's image ; as also with the ten horns of the Beast ; or ten kings in Apoc. xvii., that are to tear and desolate the harlot city Rome.<sup>3</sup>—And he observes that he is not to be thought inconsistent or absurd in thus a second time supposing the Saracen power to be an actor on the scene ; in the 6th, as well as in the 4th Trumpet : because the Beast's last head but one, after seeming to be dead, revived again as its last head, to do worse evils than before.

In Apoc. ix. 20 a notice having been added of men's general non-repentance after the plagues above-mentioned, and of their worshipping dæmons, and idols, &c.,<sup>4</sup> there is given in Apoc. x. a vision of an angel of light, sent to improve the respite before the last and greatest tribulation : the elect being thus helped to salvation, and the condemnation of the impenitent increased.

But who meant by *this Angel* ? Doubtless some eminent preacher, in the spirit and power of Enoch, if not Enoch himself,<sup>5</sup> descending

<sup>1</sup> Or *Meselmuti* : 134<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>2</sup> 134<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>4</sup> On this there occurs a curious applicatory passage in Joachim. " Sed forte dicit aliquis, Numquid ego dæmones et simulacra colo, ut timeam super hoc iudicium Dei ? Ego non dæmonia sed Deum colo. Idola enim muta et surda in toto pæne orbe contrita sunt." Yes, but, says Joachim, covetousness is idolatry. (136<sup>2</sup>.)—Did the thought never occur to him of the *saints' images*, (" surda et muta " as the heathen idols,) and *their* worship ; a worship enjoined under pain of anathema by the 2nd Nicene Council ?

<sup>5</sup> Joachim says, Enoch or Elias, but prefers Enoch : Elias being one of the witnesses according to him ; Enoch not so. 137.



from heaven to earth, i. e. from the contemplative to the active life: the *iris* about his head indicating his spiritual intelligence; his *face like the sun*, the communication of the light of spiritual intelligence; his *feet as pillars of fire*, the firmness of his tread (through recognition of their concord<sup>1</sup>) in either Testament, Old or New, the land or deeper sea; as also his shedding forth lustre on either: his *lion-like voice* being a cry directed against the infidels remaining; and the *seven thunders* the accordant answering voices of doctors inspired by the seven spirits of God: voices sealed however from the carnal; as says the apostle, "The natural man understandeth not the things of the Spirit of God," and Christ, "Cast not your pearls before swine;" though the book of Scripture will be still opened to all. The Angel's oath indicates that it will be one part of the answering preacher's mission to proclaim the last time, and day of judgment, as near at hand: though till the event it must remain uncertain, as Augustine says,<sup>2</sup> how long may be the last day spoken of in Scripture, or in what order the details of judgment; save only that the judgment must begin, and that speedily, at the house of God; and that the subsequent "*time being no more*," means the ending of the troublesome times of the world in the final sabbath:<sup>3</sup> which warning cry, however, the children of this world will not hear; but say, "Where is the promise of his coming?"<sup>4</sup>

In the charge "*Go take the Book and eat it*," John is the representative of the *monastic order*;<sup>5</sup> as Peter elsewhere of the *clerical*. And, the latter being almost effete and worn out,<sup>6</sup> it will be the special office of the former, when enlightened by the spiritual expo-

<sup>1</sup> "Quid in pedibus ejus, qui erant quasi columna ignis, nisi *sensum concordie duorum Testamentorum*?" 137<sup>2</sup>, 138. This, concurrently with what he says of the Angel being a great preacher, descending from the contemplative to the active life, makes me think that Joachim regarded himself as mainly the Angel intended: one grand point of his views being the *concord of the Old and New Testament*; as stated p. 387 *suprà*.

<sup>2</sup> "In fine mundi, vel circa ipsum finem, has res didicimus affuturas:—Helyam Tesbyten venturum, fidem Judeorum, Antichristum persecuturum, Christum judicaturum, mortuorum resurrectionem, bonorum malorumque discretionem, mundi conflagrationem, ejusdemque renovationem. Quæ omnia quidem ventura esse credendum est; sed quibus modis, et quo ordine veniant, magis tunc docebit rerum experientia, quam nunc ad perfectum hominum intelligentia valet." Quoted by Joachim, L. 140.

<sup>3</sup> L. 140.

<sup>4</sup> 139<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>5</sup> 141<sup>2</sup>, 142. "Monachis designatis in Joanne." So too in Joachim's Introductory Book, 17<sup>2</sup>, &c.

<sup>6</sup> "De hac serotinâ prædicatione, quam facturus est ordo ille quem designat Joannes, *consummato jam pene illo ordine quem significat Petrus*, &c." 142<sup>2</sup>.

sitions of the messengers of truth, to preach the Gospel of the coming kingdom.—This will be the *third* preaching course opposed by the enemy: the other two being that by Moses, and that by Christ and his apostles.<sup>1</sup>

Apoc. xi. 1; “And there was given me a reed like a rod; and the Angel said, Rise and measure the temple, &c.” The *holy city* here mentioned means (not Jerusalem and the Jewish synagogues, nor yet the Greek Church and empire, which are rather Samaria, but) the holy Roman Church and empire, “*tota Latinitas* :”<sup>2</sup> the *temple* symbolizing the ecclesiastical order, generally; the *altar*, specially the consistory of cardinals.<sup>3</sup> To this Church was the promise given, “Thou art Peter, and on this rock, &c. ;” while the Greek Church, because of its schism from the Universal Shepherd, and not being under the apostolic *reed* or discipline, is but like the temple’s *outer court*, which is cast out and given to the Gentiles. Already we see this in great part fulfilled; the Saracens having widely laid waste the Greek churches. And it must be desolated yet more;<sup>4</sup> just as the ten schismatic tribes of Israel were in Old Testament times wasted, and carried captive, by the Assyrians.<sup>5</sup>—And, adds Joachim, (here more fully stating his view of the judgments coming on *Rome* and *the Popedom*, which views, already hinted under the sixth Trumpet, will occur again at Apoc. xiii. and xvii., and call for the reader’s special notice,) because of the Latin Church not repenting, but adding sin to sin, therefore the Gentiles, after desolating the Greek or outer court, are also to tread for 42 months the *holy city*, or *Latin Church and Empire* :<sup>6</sup>—the so defined period being identical with the 3½ times of the reign of Daniel’s *little horn*, or *eleventh king*.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Ibid.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. Compare what I have observed on *Lateinos*, as the name and number of the Beast, Vol. iii. pp. 252, 253. <sup>3</sup> 142<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>4</sup> On the capture of Constantinople, and overthrow of the Greek Empire by the Turks, whom Joachim and others regarded as very much identified with the Saracens, this exposition of Joachim’s might naturally be recalled to mind, as if then having its fulfilment.

<sup>5</sup> Compare again the Concord of the Old and New Testament; as noted by me p. 387 *suprà*, from Joachim’s Introductory Book.

<sup>6</sup> At L. 143, 145, Joachim distinguishes between the being *given* to the Gentiles, so as was the Greek Church, and the *trodden down*, which was to be the punishment of the Latin; the latter being still, “in respect of faith, a virgin.”

<sup>7</sup> Under the 11th king, says Joachim, (L. 145<sup>1</sup>;) or as a contemporary with him, I think, there is to rise also the king of fierce countenance told of in Dan. viii. 23:—the two combining in persecuting the Church, as did Pilate and Herod: the one, like Pilate, a Gentile chief; the other, like Herod, a heretic.

At L. 143 Joachim draws out a curious analogy between the Jews, Greeks, and

On the *Apocalyptic Witnesses* there arise, says Joachim, the two questions; 1. *Who the two?* 2. Whether to be taken *personally* or *figuratively*?—On the *primary* question he states the general patristic opinion that they were to be Enoch and Elias; but, with deference, expresses his own opinion that they meant rather *Moses*<sup>1</sup> and *Elias*:—the same that appeared together at Christ's transfiguration, and whom what is said in the Apocalyptic sketch of the Witnesses better suits: viz. their turning the waters into blood, which Moses did, conjointly with other plagues in Egypt; and inducing a drought of 3½ years, which did Elias.—As to the *second* question, he quotes Jerome, saying, when asked about Enoch and Elias, the then supposed Witnesses to come, "that all the Apocalypse was to be *spiritually* understood: because otherwise Judaic fables would have to be acquiesced in; such as the rebuilding of Jerusalem, and renewal in its temple of carnal ceremonies."<sup>2</sup> Whence, argues Joachim, we must suppose that Jerome only expected two individuals, or perhaps two spiritual orders, to come in the spirit and power of Enoch and Elias, so as did John the Baptist previously; to preach, and have the fight with Antichrist.<sup>3</sup>—On the whole the leaning of Joachim's mind seems to be to Jerome's view; and that the *spiritual* or *figurative* signification was to be attached to the indicated witnesses, *Moses* and *Elias*; the two orders of *clerics* and *monks* being perhaps thereby intended: (the *latter* by *Elias* who was unmarried:<sup>4</sup>) some

Latins, on the one hand, and on the other Mary Magdalene, John, and Peter, successively visiting Christ's sepulchre:—Mary Magdalene first approaching it, while yet dark, (so as the *Jews* are in the dark,) and reporting to John and Peter: John, who was to become episcopal head of the *Greek* metropolitan city, Ephesus, next approaching it, but not entering in; until after Peter, the future Bishop and head of the *Latin* Church, had first entered. So, ultimately, the Greeks are to be recovered from their schism and heresy; and to join the Latin or true Church of Christ and Peter. L. 143—145.

<sup>1</sup> Whose death is not recorded, adds Joachim, like other deaths; it being said that none knows his sepulchre.

<sup>2</sup> So, respecting Jerome, at my p. 318 *suprà*.

<sup>3</sup> Joachim mentions another thing stated by Jerome, as both his own and an earlier patristic notion respecting Enoch and Elias; viz. that in their net dying these two were typical of those that at the consummation are not to die, but only to be changed at Christ's coming. But how could they be such a type, argues Joachim, if they have yet *personally* to conflict with Antichrist, and die in the conflict? L. 148, 148<sup>2</sup>. Hence the probability that, if these two were meant in the Apocalypse, it was only in a figurative sense.

<sup>4</sup> "Moses fuit vir Levita, et pastor populi Israel; Helyas vir solitarius non habens filios aut uxorem. Ille ergo significat ordinem clericorum; iste ordinem monachorum." 148<sup>2</sup>.

individual preacher having also previously appeared, as in Apoc. x., or some spiritual preaching order, answering to *Enoch*: which three he further identifies<sup>1</sup> with the three angels flying in mid-heaven with gospel-voice and warning cry, before the fall of Babylon, described in Apoc. xiv.—At the same time, when coming to the notice of the 42 *months* of the prophesying, he enunciates both as regards the Apocalyptic Witnesses, and the Beast also that they are to conflict with, a larger and more general explication, as well as the more special: “the 42 *months* in which they are to preach, clothed in sackcloth, signifying *so many generations* of the *cleric* and *monastic witnessing orders* ;”<sup>2</sup> i. e. according to his own explanation elsewhere,<sup>3</sup> on the year-day principle, 1260 *years*. During all which time, says he, the Gentiles and antichristian unbelievers, even till Antichrist, are to tread the Holy City; though but partially, and not so as under Antichrist proper:—just as we have already seen the outer court (or Greek Church) many years trodden by them.<sup>4</sup>—The Witnesses’ *shutting heaven* during the time of their prophesying is to be understood figuratively; so as in Isaiah, “Make the heart of this people fat, &c.,” and, “I will command the clouds that they rain no rain on my vineyard:” also the *fire evoked by them from heaven*, of the power of the Spirit in their words to confound their adversaries.<sup>5</sup> Their being said to stand before *the Lord of the whole earth*, may mean before Daniel’s little horn, or xith King; (just as Moses and Aaron stood before Pharaoh;) seeing that he, as Prince of the world, is to reign for 3½ times, in judgment on the sins of men. Or, if Christ be meant as the Lord of the whole earth, their standing before him may indicate that in the time of their witnessing (or at least before its conclusion) Christ is to appear in that character, and to take to himself this earth’s

<sup>1</sup> L. 147<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>2</sup> “*Quadragesima duo menses, quibus prædicant induti saccis, significant totidem generationes; quibus (et verbis et exemplis) clamant dicentes, Penitentiam agite; appropinquavit enim regnum cælorum.*” 148<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>3</sup> Viz. on the *five months* of the scorpion locusts. See p. 396 *suprà*.

Hence no doubt, in part, and from Joachim’s notice about the *two generations* from A.D. 1200, noted p. 388, the Benedictine Editor of Bernard draws his inference; “*Abbas Joachim existimabat Antichristum intra sexaginta annos à suo tempore ad futurum. Vixit autem circà annum 1200.*” (Vol. i. p. 846. Paris 1839.) Besides that elsewhere, viz. in his Lib. Concord. ii. 16, and v. 118, Joachim writes, “*Accepto haud dubiè die pro anno, et 1200 diebus pro totidem annis.*” So Brit. Mag. xvi. 370, 371, referred to by Todd and Harrison, Warb. Lect. 432. I have not observed any more direct expression of opinion to that effect elsewhere in Joachim’s Apocalyptic Commentary.

<sup>4</sup> L. 148<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>5</sup> L. 149.



dominion: as it is said in Psalm ii. 8, "I will give thee the heathen for thy inheritance, and uttermost parts of the earth for a possession."<sup>1</sup>

"And when they shall have completed their testimony, the Beast, &c." By this Beast (as will be again stated on Apoc. xiii. and xvii.) there seems to be meant "the unbelieving multitude that were to persecute the Church, from Christ's death down to Antichrist inclusive:" the same as the fourth Beast of Daniel.<sup>2</sup> Which Beast, towards the end of his reign,<sup>3</sup> (false prophets assisting,) will both by fraud and force make war upon the two witness-leaders, and the body of the saints, too, more generally:<sup>4</sup> first however inflicting a death-blow on the Babylon (or Roman) power resisting him.<sup>5</sup>—As to the place of their slaughter it might be the literal *Jerusalem*, were the two Witnesses to be slain two men literally. Against this, however, stands the fact that Jerusalem is never called *the great city*, so as Nineveh or Babylon.<sup>6</sup> Therefore we may rather understand generally by the phrase *the kingdom of this world*; the body of the citizens of which have had part in slaying the saints, and in spirit participated in Christ's crucifixion: also by the witnesses slain, all the preachers of truth.<sup>7</sup> At the same time, if the prophecy is meant *especially* about two individual witnesses, the city *may* be (though still not necessarily so) the literal Jerusalem; Daniel's 11th king having then proclaimed himself saviour of the Jewish people, and led them back to Jerusalem.—As to the  $3\frac{1}{2}$  *days* of the witnesses lying dead, the meaning is affected by the same considerations. If the witnesses be two bodies or successions of men, and the 1260 *days* of their prophesying be meant *typically* of the whole time from Christ to the consumma-

<sup>1</sup> Ibid.

<sup>2</sup> L. 149z. See Joachim on Apoc. ix., p. 397 *suprà*.

<sup>3</sup> "Circà finem regni sui factura est prælium contrà sanctos." 150.

<sup>4</sup> "Præuntibus eos (sanctos) duobus viris qui sint duces eorum." *ibid*.

<sup>5</sup> "Prius dabit operam resistentem sibi diutius pereutere Babylonem; et postea eriget contrà Deum cornu contumaciæ suæ." *ibid*.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid*.—Jer. xxii. 8, was either overlooked by Joachim, or considered inapplicable. And, if the latter, not without reason. See my Vol. ii. p. 435. It is never to be forgotten on this point that the Apocalypse has itself most expressly defined "*the city the great one*" in it to mean the *seven-hilled Rome*: and to suppose any other quite different city to be also intended in it by that self-same appellative is to suppose its writer a patron of Babylonian confusion.

<sup>7</sup> 150, 150z. Joachim thus observes on the adverb *where*; ("where also their Lord was crucified;") "Hoc adverbium *ubi* plerumque in divinà paginà non tam loci situm, quàm aut populum qui aliquando fuit in loco, aut populi ejusdem similitudinem signat." 150z.

tion, (already in Joachim's time near 1260 *years*), then the  $3\frac{1}{2}$  *days* must mean some lesser time, after which the kingdom under the whole heaven is to be given to the saints. But if they be two individuals, and the larger specification of time is to be taken *literally*, then there must be meant the two literal witnesses' literal resurrection at the brief literal interval of  $3\frac{1}{2}$  days: though not the general resurrection of the dead, which is to be not till the end of the world.<sup>1</sup> He speaks of a large gathering of people, on the occasion, and to the place: and says that in the earthquake following, the tenth part of the city (the holy city or Church) which fell meant those clerics who, though professedly in Rome, are yet really infidels, belonging to Antichrist; and who will then openly apostatize from the faith: also that the seven thousand are laymen deceived by these clerics of Antichrist's faction, and who will also similarly apostatize.

But if Enoch (or perhaps Moses) and Elias are thus to come in the third state before the consummation, how need we to watch and beware, lest any enemy come saying, "*We* are Enoch and Elias," and deceive many! Because it is as clear as the light that a Beast *with two horns like a lamb* is to come; symbolizing false prophets, such as Christ bids us to beware of.<sup>2</sup>

*Trumpet 7.*—Now the mystery hidden in the Old Testament, from Moses to John the Baptist, will be consummated.—The *great voices in heaven* are preachers of that æra in the Church, announcing and rejoicing over the coming good; the 24 typical elders representing the union of all prelates in the song.<sup>3</sup>—The *time of the dead being judged* is that of the Beast and False Prophet being cast into the lake of fire; Antichrist and his fellows being specially meant in the corrupters of the earth then to be exterminated:<sup>4</sup> at which [time will begin the third or sabbath state; <sup>5</sup> corresponding, perhaps, with

<sup>1</sup> Ibid.

<sup>2</sup> 148. About the *False Prophet* see p. 408 *infra*.

<sup>3</sup> 152.

<sup>4</sup> "Ad Antichristum et socios ejus referendum est; quòd, sicut præter solitum corrupturi sunt terram, ita præter solitum exterminabuntur de terrâ." He compares this, and makes it parallel, with Zechariah's prophecy: "I will gather all nations; and I will pour out my spirit on the house of David and the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the spirit of grace and supplication; . . . and I will take away the false prophet from the land." 153.

<sup>5</sup> "Ad tempus illud referendum est in quo Bestia et Pseudo-propheta mittentur in stagnum ignis ardens sulphure; et ad *tertium statum mundi*, qui erit in *sabbatum et quietem*: in quo, exterminatis prius corruptoribus terræ, regnaturus est populus sanctorum Altissimi; quousque induti novis corporibus, et pacto judicio generali, ascendant simul cum Domino suo ad paratum sibi regnum ab origine mundi." 152<sup>2</sup>.

Apoc. xx. 4, "I saw thrones, &c.:"<sup>1</sup> until the saints in the new bodies ascend to inherit the kingdom prepared for them.

I think, adds Joachim, that there will elapse but a brief interval between the sixth trumpet's sounding and the seventh's.<sup>2</sup>

PART IV. Apoc. xii.—The *travailing Woman* here figured, Joachim makes to mean *the Church* generally; but specially that Church of hermits and virgins, the children of which are the 144,000 of Apoc. xiv.: this Church answering to the prototype of the Virgin Mary, "Queen of heaven;" being clothed with Christ the Sun of righteousness, trampling on all sublunary glory, and bearing the crown of the twelve virtues.<sup>3</sup>

Of the figured *Dragon*, or Devil, the *body* are the multitudes of the reprobate; the Dragon's *seven heads*, the seven chief Church-persecuting successive kings of the reprobate;<sup>4</sup> his *ten horns*, ten kings that have yet to reign;<sup>5</sup> his *tail*, the last antichristian tyrant at the end of the world; *the third part* (said of the stars drawn by the tail), the same third as in the four first Trumpets.<sup>6</sup>

The Apostolic Church having brought forth Christ, its male child, (as He said, "Who is my *mother*? Are not these?")<sup>7</sup> the Devil tried to kill him; but he rose, and ascended into heaven.—In the first battle of martyrs ensuing, Michael, the invisible protector of the Church, acted chiefly through Peter and his successors;<sup>8</sup> the invisible Dragon through the Dragon's two first heads, Herod and Nero. This great battle may seem to have ended in the days of Constantine. And so the Apocalyptic song of exultation is to be referred to that emperor's time, when the saints then surviving were crowned with

<sup>1</sup> "Puto autem quòd mox, ubi completa fuerit passio sanctorum, incipiet septimus Angelus exaltare vocem suam; ostendens jam omnino consummata esse mysteria regni Dei: apparentibus signis in sole et lunâ et stellis (Luke xxi.); . . . nempe et quod dictum est in hoc loco, '*Et tempus mortuorum,*' in septimâ parte hujus libri scriptum; 'Vidi sedes, et sederunt super eas, . . . et regnaverunt cum Christo.'" 152<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid.      <sup>3</sup> L. 154, 154<sup>2</sup>, 155.

<sup>4</sup> "Septem capita septem sunt nomina tyrannorum qui sibi persequendo ecclesiam per tempora successerunt." Who the kings meant "in summâ hujus libri sufficienter digessimus." 156<sup>2</sup>.

Joachim thus distinguishes the Dragon's seven heads from the Beast's:—"Capita Draconis reges, non populi, intelligendi sunt; capita vero *Bestiæ* populi, non reges." *ibid.*

<sup>5</sup> Joachim notes the fact of the diadems being distinctively on the ten horns in the Beast's case. *ibid.*      <sup>6</sup> See p. 394 *suprà.*      <sup>7</sup> 157.

<sup>8</sup> 158<sup>2</sup>. The same mystical sense Joachim (*ibid.*) makes to attach to Michael in Dan. xii. 1.

glory.<sup>1</sup>—Thereupon the Devil, (cast down to the earth, or into the hearts of the earthly-minded,) persecuted the woman by means of the Arian heretics and heresy;<sup>2</sup> and she fled to a life of retirement and contemplation: the two wings helping her being wisdom and the love of God; the time of her sojourning in the wilderness (like Elias'  $3\frac{1}{2}$  years of seclusion) being 42 months, or 1260 days; i. e. the whole time of the Dragon, and that in which all mysteries are to have their consummation; the water cast out of his mouth against her being Arian heresies and persecutors.<sup>3</sup>—The Dragon's *first* war having thus been against Christ and his apostles, the *second* against the early martyrs under Pagan Rome, and *third* against the confessors against Arianism, his *fourth* was to be against those that were given to contemplation, psalms, and prayer.<sup>4</sup>

Apoc. xiii.—The *Beast* here figured is a compound and combination, says Joachim, of Daniel's four Beasts.—In Daniel the *first* Beast was the Jewish Antichristian body; the *second* the Roman Pagans; the *third* the Arians; the *fourth* the Saracens: the first resembling a lion, with two wings, answering to the Pharisees and Sadducees; the second a bear; the third a leopard, with four heads; (signifying the Arian Greeks, Goths, Vandals, and Lombards;) the fourth very terrible, and having ten horns.<sup>5</sup> All which bestial resemblances were united in this Apocalyptic Beast; and which had similarly also seven heads in all, and ten horns.—How terrible Daniel's *fourth*, or *Saracenic*, is told by its desolation of the churches in Syria, Palestine, Egypt, Africa, Mauritania, and the islands of the sea; where Christ's name is abolished, and Mahomet acknowledged as the prophet of God.<sup>6</sup> Besides that the other Beasts submitted after a while to the Christian Church: but this, though once humbled and apparently dead, has revived, and is as terrible as ever. The ten horns with diadems are ten kings *yet to be*, at that closing time of the calamitous

<sup>1</sup> L. 160. The reader will do well to mark Joachim's adoption of Constantine's own historical explanation of this part of the vision. So, very much, Eusebius, as we saw p. 311 *suprà*; Andreas, p. 361, and Anselm, p. 384.

<sup>2</sup> 160<sup>2</sup>. Still I conceive Joachim is on the right track.      <sup>3</sup> 161, 161<sup>2</sup>.      <sup>4</sup> 162.

<sup>5</sup> 162<sup>2</sup>, 163.—One might be curious to know how Joachim satisfied himself in not applying to Daniel's four Beasts, (signifying as they did the world's four great empires,) the inspired explanation of the parallel four parts of the symbolic image, previously exhibited: as these were also to signify the four great empires, destined to rule successively till the consummation.—Joachim's solution is quite original.

<sup>6</sup> "Alas indeed!" adds Joachim, "if Antichrist, when he appears, shall do as much evil as this Mahomet, his precursor and preparer!" 163<sup>2</sup>.



period, when the Beast's kingdom shall end.<sup>1</sup>—"I saw *one* of the heads *as it were* wounded to death, and *the deadly wound was healed.*" The Jewish, Pagan, and Arian heads were *actually* wounded to death;<sup>2</sup> and who ever heard of their revival? though the Beast itself indeed, (or antichristian body,) survived under another head. But with the Saracen head many may think the prophecy of the wounded head's revival to have been already fulfilled. In the time of Pope Urban and the early crusaders, A.D. 1095,<sup>3</sup> when Jerusalem had been taken by the Christians, the Saracens in Egypt and Asia made stipendiary, the African neighbouring cities conquered by the Norman kings of Sicily, and the Moors repeatedly vanquished in Spain, the Saracen supremacy seemed wounded to death. But now, says Joachim, it is revived, and as terrible as ever.<sup>4</sup> He prefers, however, to understand the deadly wound as still future when he wrote, and to be effected by spiritual weapons rather than temporal:<sup>5</sup> also the revival to be in a power answering to Daniel's *eleventh* or *little horn*:—a horn unspecified by St. John; probably because of his prominent specification of the Dragon, or Devil, who was in fact most specially to inspire and rule in it.<sup>6</sup> Joachim dwells on the fearfulness of the consequent apostasy; "All the world wondered after the Beast:" commiserating those that might then be alive; urging mothers to teach their children to flee for safety to the deserts; and answering the arguments of infidelity, drawn from the enemy's success and dominancy, by reference to God's faithfulness and wisdom. "Here is the faith and patience of the saints."—As to the Beast's

<sup>1</sup> So he reserves his explanation of them to the 6th part of his Treatise, on Apoc. xvii. L. 164.

<sup>2</sup> 163<sup>o</sup>, 164<sup>o</sup>.—On his Arian tetra-kephalous Beast's wounding to death, Joachim twice specifies three chief Arian powers subdued thus: "Gothi et Vandali et Longobardi et alii Ariani heretici partim deleti sunt ab exercitu Romano, partim ad Catholicam fidem conversi." 163<sup>o</sup>, 164<sup>o</sup>. With which compare my notice of the three horns plucked up by the Papal Antichrist, in my Vol. iii. p. 167.

<sup>3</sup> He tells of signs and prodigies accompanying. "Anno etenim 1095 (ut fertur) incarnationis Dominicæ, signum in aere satis apparuit admirandum;—stellas scilicet innumeras circumque discurrere, et velut in modum avium aereas semitas pervagari." Quo præcedente signo, ad exhortationem Urbani Papæ, &c." In my Edition it is printed 1015, plainly by mistake. <sup>4</sup> 165.

<sup>5</sup> lb. Compare the report of what Joachim said to king Richard on this point, as given p. 419 *infra*, from Roger de Hoveden. The address to Richard was in the year 1190: the Apocalyptic comment transmitted to us, with Joachim's last corrections, was sent forth not till after the year 1195, (see my p. 397,) or perhaps 1200, (see p. 386,) after the failure in main results of the English and French king's expeditions.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*

42 months,  $3\frac{1}{2}$  years, or 1260 days of duration, taken generically, with reference to the "totius Bestiæ universitatem," the length is stated as 1260 years in Joachim's Book De Concordiâ:<sup>1</sup> besides which there is to be a final paroxysm of the Beast's persecution for  $3\frac{1}{2}$  years literally.<sup>2</sup>

The *second Beast*, says Joachim, is plainly explained by John himself to signify a false prophet, or pseudo-prophetic sect or body;<sup>3</sup> the two horns being not improbably, he adds, Satan's counterfeits of the Enoch and Elias that are expected: just as Antichrist will be his counterfeit for Christ. Hence the double danger of receiving the counterfeit as true, rejecting the true as counterfeit! "What if Enoch and Elias were to knock at thy door to-morrow?"<sup>4</sup>—It would seem that these false prophets will issue out of the bosom of the Church; knowing and speaking the Christians' language, and so more powerful to deceive.<sup>5</sup> These may confederate with the former Beast, Daniel's eleventh Horn, and make the earth worship it: as Simon Magus confederated with the Pagan Nero against Christianity, the Jews with the Romans, and Arians with the secular emperors; or as the *Pathareni*, "the dregs of heretics," now sustain themselves through worldly potentates.<sup>6</sup> And so soon as "the new Babylon" (i. e. Rome)<sup>7</sup> shall have been given into the hand of the Beast to be desolated, and Daniel's eleventh king (the last of these kings) have begun to reign in the Saracen kingdom,<sup>8</sup> then the false prophets may seize the occasion of making an alliance with the Gentile king; and preach up his religion as true, the Christian as false.<sup>9</sup>—But why two Beasts? Because, as Christ is both anointed *king* and *priest*, so Satan may put forth the first Beast to usurp his kingship, the second to usurp his priestly dignity: the latter having at its head some

<sup>1</sup> 1652. "Qualiter anni isti ad totius Bestiæ universitatem pertineant in opere Concordiæ dictum est." "Accepto haud dubiè die pro anno, et 1260 diebus prototidem annis." So Joachim's Liber Concordiæ, 2. c. 16, and 5. c. 118: a passage cited by Dr. Todd on Antichrist, p. 458, from a Paper in the British Magazine; and here expressly referred to by Joachim. I have already at p. 402 noted this.

<sup>2</sup> 1652.

<sup>3</sup> 1662, 167.

<sup>4</sup> 1662, 1672.

<sup>5</sup> 1672.

<sup>6</sup> "Pathareni, hæreticorum fex, mundi potestatibus se tuetur." 1672. So Joachim, writing near the year 1200 A.D. It will interest the reader, I think, to compare my historical notices, Vol. ii. pp. 357, 403.

<sup>7</sup> Or Rome's reprobates. See Joachim's explanation on Apoc. xvii. p. 412 *infra*.

<sup>8</sup> "Tempore quo rex ille undecimus et ultimus in regno Saracenorum regnaturus est." 1672.

<sup>9</sup> 1672. Joachim suggests the resemblance of this *second* Apocalyptic Beast to the earth-born goat's little horn in Dan. viii.; whereas the *first* Apocalyptic Beast is to be resembled to the little horn of the sea-originating fourth Beast of Dan. vii.

*mighty prelate*, some *Universal Pontiff*, as it were, *over the whole world*; who may be the very *Antichrist*, of whom St. Paul speaks as being extolled above all that is called God and worshipped; sitting in the temple of God, and showing himself as God.<sup>1</sup> This may be while making use of the strength of the first Beast for his purposes.—Other doctors regard the first Beast, or Daniel's eleventh king, and also Gog, as Antichrist: which I, says Joachim, regard as thus far true, because there are, as St. John says, many Antichrists; and what may be wanting of fulfilment in the one, may be supplied in another.<sup>2</sup>

The *Beast's image* Joachim makes to mean "some tradition composed by false prophets in memory of the first Beast,"<sup>3</sup> saying that this is the kingdom that is to endure for ever; some expression, I suppose he means, of the Beast's mind, profession, and doctrine.<sup>4</sup> Its *receiving breath and speaking* is when the malignant spirit shall do miracles by it. The *character* to be impressed is some edict of his commands:<sup>5</sup> the *sellers and buyers* that must bear it, preachers and hearers.—The *name* and *number 666*, said to be "the number of a man,"<sup>6</sup> is mysterious. "We must wait and know the name, before speculating as to the number; which name however is not revealed." This premised, Joachim proceeds to a passing speculation on the subject, as fanciful surely as any of the speculations of his predecessors. The number 666 may be fitly typical, he says, of the whole time from Adam to the end of the world. For 600 may represent the six ages of the world, or whole time of the Beast; 60 the six periods of the

<sup>1</sup> I must give the original of this remarkable passage, 168. "Sci verisimile videtur quòd, sicut Bestia illa quæ ascendet de mari habitura est quendam magnum regem de sectâ suâ, qui sit similis Neronis, et quasi imperator totius orbis, ita Bestia quæ ascendet de terrâ habitura sit quendam magnum Prelatum, qui sit similis Symonis Magi, et quasi *Universalis Pontifex* in toto orbe terrarum; et ipse sit ille *Antichristus* de quo dicit Paulus, Quod extollitur, etc."—So Bernard thought the Antichrist might be an *Anti-Pope*; and Theodoret, much earlier, said that the Antichrist *εν τη εκκλησια αρπασει την προεδρειαν*. See my Vol. i. p. 394; iii. p. 99.

<sup>2</sup> 168.

<sup>3</sup> "Aliqua specialis traditio, quam component pseudo-prophetæ in memoriam ipsius Bestiæ; dicentes hoc esse regnum illud quod mansurum est in æternum." *ibid.* So too 168<sup>2</sup>; "imago significat nephandissimam traditionem ipsius."

<sup>4</sup> At 182<sup>2</sup>, on the clause on Apoc. xv., "I saw the conquerors over the Beast's *image*," Joachim thus varies the explanation; "In imagine doctrina Bestiæ designatur."

<sup>5</sup> "Quid per characterem, nisi aliquod scriptum, vel edictum, preeceptorum ipsius." 168<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>6</sup> Some Latin codices for "numerus *hominis*," read "numerus *nominis*," Joachimi tells us. 169.

sixth age from Christ, in which the Beast has more grievously persecuted the Church of God; 6 the time (42 months) of Daniel's eleventh king, or little horn, in which the persecution is to be consummated.—This however he admits to be speculation. “Expectanda usque ad tempus revelatio hujus nominis; et tunc ei qui habet intellectum licebit numerum computare.”<sup>1</sup>

Apoc. xiv.—xvi. I must hasten over these intervening chapters, to resume and complete the abstract of Joachim's views on the Apocalyptic Beast, as again described in Apoc. xvii., and the Babylon connected with it.—The 144,000 on Mount Zion he expounds as the monks and virgins of the Church, opposed to those that had the Beast's mark; and who in the *fourth* period have to sustain the chief burden of the conflict against the Saracenic Beast:<sup>2</sup>—the first of the *three Angels flying in mid-heaven* as identical either with the woe-denouncing eagle of Apoc. viii. 13, (i. e. “the holy Pope Gregory I, whose voice of warning of God's coming judgment was just before the false prophet Mahomet's deceptions,”<sup>3</sup>) or the Angel-prophet with the little book of Apoc. x. 1; the other two with the Witnesses of Apoc. xi. respectively;<sup>4</sup> the voice of the first synchronizing with the opening of the 5th Seal, and 5th period; the other two with the opening of the 6th:<sup>5</sup> the last (perhaps the two last) sounding after the destruction of Babylon by the Beast and ten kings;<sup>6</sup> and when, the Roman Christian Empire having thus fallen, they will be hoping to destroy Christ's name from off the face of the earth.<sup>7</sup>—The voice, “Blessed are the dead, for they rest, &c.,” intimates the glorious *sabbath* awaiting both those who, after the completion of the sufferings of Christ's body in the sixth period, shall then reign with Christ; and those too who, Antichrist having fallen, shall remain on earth in this life until the last day:<sup>8</sup> in which day at length will be the harvest of the good, and the vintage-treading of the bad.

<sup>1</sup> Ibid.

<sup>2</sup> So on Apoc. vii. See p. 392, *suprà*. The Beast here meant, of the Church's 4th period, he defines as the Saracenic Beast previous to the healing of the deadly wound; and so under his last head but one. 170. <sup>3</sup> 173. See p. 394 *suprà*.

<sup>4</sup> So p. 402 *suprà*.

<sup>5</sup> See Joachim's Scheme of the Seals, p. 388 *suprà*.

<sup>6</sup> Joachim must have remembered that the Witnesses are to be *slain* in the street of the great city Babylon. How then, it may be asked, prophesy against the Beast after Babylon's destruction?—But in that verse about the Witnesses he inconsistently explains the great city as the empire of this world. <sup>7</sup> 173<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>8</sup> “Adjunctum est de *requie sabbati*: quod nimirum, ut sextâ die passus est Domi-



So Joachim comes to his PART V., and to the *Vials* of wrath poured out by the seven Vial Angels: <sup>1</sup> which, though *specially* called the *last* plagues, yet had reference to the same six or seven periods, and same evils, that were before noted under the Seals' and Trumpets' septenaries; with this difference however, they were now depicted distinctly as effusions of God's jealousy and wrath against those who suffered from them.<sup>2</sup> Of these Vials the first was poured on Judaizers, who worshipped the Beast under his first head of Herod and the Jewish synagogue: the 2nd on the Gentile Church's recreants from the Christian faith before Constantine: the 3rd on the Arian bishops and teachers after Constantine: the 4th on the hypocritical of the contemplative orders: the 5th on false ones in the Clergy and Conventuals, who, though they ought to be God's seat, have yet yielded themselves to be the seat of the Beast: <sup>3</sup> the 6th on the Roman State or Empire, as being the New Testament Babylon; the drying up of its Euphrates figuring the weakening of its strength, through God's just judgment, so as to disable it from resisting the kings from the East that are to come and desolate it.<sup>4</sup>—After which its desolation that "Wicked One" is to be revealed, of whom Paul speaks; the three spirits like frogs, next figured, being meant of him

nus, sabbato autem requievit à laboribus suis, ita in sexto tempore (ut sæpe jam dictum est) complebitur passio corporis Christi: et erit post hoc sabbatum gloriosum: seu in illis qui jam regnabunt cum Christo; seu in his qui, Antichristo ruente, remanebunt super terram, mansuri in hac vitâ pro velle Dei, quousque compleatur illud tempus quod vocatum est novissimus dies. In quo novissimo die, consummatis universis mysteriis et laboribus sanctorum, quid jam nisi messis et vendemia restat?" 175.

The above is important as bearing on Joachim's millennial views. Compare the Note <sup>1</sup> p. 405; also p. 388 *suprà*.

<sup>1</sup> It is to be observed with reference to these angels, that Joachim, like Andreas and others before him, had in his Latin Version the curious reading, "vestiti lapide mundo;" agreeably with the Greek reading *λιθων*, instead of *λιων*, in Apoc. xv. 6; and which like them he explains of *Christ*, the rock: (so L. 184<sup>2</sup>;) also that he explained the *οἱ νικῶντες*, in xv. 2, of those that received no other doctrine than that of the Roman Church, and who were thus triumphant over the Beast. (L. 183.)

<sup>2</sup> A long and obscure disquisition precedes Joachim's comment on the vials, with reference to the reasons and objects of God's outpouring of his jealousy. So from 177 to 182. It springs not from hatred on his part against those who suffer from them; but from desire of, and with a view to, their conversion. 186<sup>2</sup>. <sup>3</sup> 189<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>4</sup> Joachim in his explanation refers this 6th vial specially to the *mundani*, or Christian professing men of the world *without* the inner sanctuary of the Church: "quatenus inchoato tempore sexto, sentiant saltem *exterius* plagam, quam *intus*, pro consuetâ cæcitate, gravioris plagæ vulnera sentire non possunt."—The descriptive phrase *from the East*, or *sun-rising*, Joachim distinctly explains as to be taken *literally*. 190<sup>2</sup>. The subject is referred to again in his Comment on Apoc. xvii. 16, "The ten horns shall hate her," &c. See L. 199<sup>2</sup>.

and his associates.—And then who can tell how soon Christ may come? “Behold I come as a thief.”—Finally, by the *air* on which the 7th Vial is poured out, there is meant that spiritual Church which will remain after the judgment on Babylon; a judgment by which it will be cleansed, and made meet for the bridal.<sup>1</sup>—So Joachim comes to the vision of the *Harlot and Beast* in Apoc. xvii.

PART VI. Apoc. xvii.—The *Angel-revealer* of this vision is the 6th Vial-Angel; the 6th period, current at the time referred to, being the time of its right understanding.<sup>2</sup> By the *harlot* he meant Rome:—not indeed the *Church of the just* that sojourn in Rome, but rather the multitude of Rome’s reprobate or opposing members; the harlot’s place moreover being not in one province or kingdom, but over the whole area of the Christian empire.<sup>3</sup> The *kings of the earth* that fornicate with her, Joachim makes to be bad prelates with the charge of souls:<sup>4</sup> the *Beast* (as before) the infidel powers, in connexion with the Roman empire, that have persecuted the Church, from the apostolic age till now.<sup>5</sup> Its seven successive *heads* are as follows:—1. Herod and his successors’ Judaic kingdom: 2. the Roman Pagan empire, to Diocletian inclusive: 3, 4, 5, and 6, the four Arian empires, Greek, Goth, Vandal, and Lombard: 7th, the Saracen or Mahomedan empire, now still existing. Besides which, says Joachim, *seven kings* are mentioned: not as identical with the heads, but simply thus, “And there are seven kings;” i. e. kings eminent among the persecutors. Which kings chronologically correspond with the seven periods of our æra; though neither chronologically nor politically correspondent with the seven heads: being 1. Herod; 2. Nero; 3. Constantius; 4. Mahomet, or rather perhaps Chosroes; 5. the German Emperor who first troubled the Church about investitures; 6. Daniel’s little horn, or eleventh king; i. e. *Saladin*, the reigning Saracen or Turk, who has just taken Jerusalem.<sup>6</sup> This is the “one that is;” (the 6th period of the Christian æra being the standard time present, used by the Angel in his statement;) and under and

<sup>1</sup> “In *aere* spiritualis illa ecclesia designatur, quæ relinquetur velut munda seges; excisis de terrâ tribulis, et cunctis reliquiis Babylonis.” 192<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>2</sup> Joachim notes at the outset both the importance and plainness of the vision. “Qui nescit quod passura sit meretrix pro erroribus suis, de facili decipitur nutibus oculorum suorum.” 194.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>5</sup> “Bestia significat universas gentes infideles quæ aliquando subjectæ fuerunt Romano imperio, et persecutæ sunt Christum, et ecclesiam ejus.” 196. <sup>6</sup> 196<sup>2</sup>, 197.

by whom the Roman Babylon is to be desolated. After which, alike the 6th king and 7th head having perished, (the latter wounded unto death,) a brief respite will be granted for the faithful, then the Beast arise under its revived 7th, i. e. its 8th head,<sup>1</sup> and the 7th king,<sup>2</sup> to make one more persecution, and after it to perish for ever.—With regard to the *ten horns*, or *ten kings*, that have not yet received power, but receive it one hour after the Beast, there is a difficulty: for, according to Daniel, it is while these ten are reigning that the eleventh is to arise. Here however it is said, after the *Beast*; not, after the *6th king*.<sup>3</sup>—That the harlot city reigning over the kings of the earth, and to be spoiled by them, means *Rome*, is undoubted; this being told us not by other Fathers only, but Peter himself:<sup>4</sup> but in the sense of including the members of its empire, not those within the city walls only. The comfort is, adds Joachim, that *Jerusalem* carries in *Babylon*;<sup>5</sup> and that to it the promise is given, “Thou art Peter,

<sup>1</sup> One of the seven, says Joachim, as uniting all the errors of the seven. 1962.

<sup>2</sup> Probably, says Joachim, “sub nomine sexti regis alius surgere intelligatur post alium: [qu. *illum?*] quatenus post illum de quo dicit Joannes, *Unus est:*” (197:) i. e. Saladin. It is rather difficult to understand Joachim’s meaning. Probably Joachim was puzzled by his mistaken reading of “*post bestiam* ;” referred to in my next Note.

<sup>3</sup> “*post Bestiam.*”—So Joachim reads. An evident mistake in the Latin translation; as the Greek is not *μετα το θηριον*, but *μετα του θηριου*.

<sup>4</sup> Referring to 1 Peter v. 13; “The Church which is in *Babylon* ;” meaning, it was understood, *Rome*. 198.

<sup>5</sup> “In hoc verbo [*the Church* which is in *Babylon*] consolatio non modica fact, est populo qui vocatur Romanus; quandoquidem in ipsâ urbe quæ vocatur *Babylon* peregrinatur civitas *Jerusalem.*” 198.

A writer in the *British Magazine* for 1839 strongly marks this distinction in Joachim. Joachim’s plan, says he, was the ultra-Guelphic plan of regenerating society by means of the Pope, as Peter’s successor, and the monastic orders; with supersession of all the Church-meddling power of the Roman or German emperors, (the Apocalyptic *Babylon*), and of the secular clergy, who “fornicated with” or favoured it.—The result was to be, adds this writer, “that *Babylon*, with the aid of many clerici, men of the expiring [2nd] status, was to lay waste the courts of *Jerusalem*; yet she herself perish by the hands of the *Bestia Patarena* and of *Antichrist*; and every remnant of the *Clerici*, or Church secular, perish likewise: but a remnant of the eremitic order to survive all tribulation, and reign with the Holy Ghost in the 3rd status.” Todd, p. 455. In the expression *Bestia Patarena*, and its identification with *Antichrist*, the writer seems to me incorrect. See on Apoc. xvii.

The writer in the *B. M.* further observes that Joachim and the Joachites spoke of an *Antichristus mixtus*, or *mysticus*, *Reipublicæ*, in contradistinction to the *Antichristus verus*. The former he supposed to be not one *Antichrist* or *Pseudo-propheta*, but many: one already born, and which “was destined to subvert the Babylonian empire, put forth ten horns, afflict the Church during 56½ years of the two generations of the period of transition: [or time of the end:] then at last, “*regnantibus decem regibus illis, singulis in suis locis,*” to put forth its horn of blasphemy, being the xith king, and *Antichristus verus*, of 3½ years. Todd. 461. The writer refers to a Commentary of Joachim on *Jeremiah*, as well as that on the *Apocalypse*. The

&c.:" so that it is only the sons of Babylon, within the Roman Church and empire, to whom the doom belongs.<sup>1</sup> So long as the waters she sits on remain, the kings cannot prevail against her. But when her Euphrates is dried up, then they will attack her; <sup>2</sup> God having put it into the hearts of these "exteri reges" to give their kingdoms to the Beast, or ruling chief of the Beast, on seeing his success against the subjects of the Roman empire: the result of which alliance will be the tearing and spoliation of Roman Christendom, together with persecutions of Christians and Christianity; whence a general apostasy, though not without some faithful martyrs.

In Apoc. xviii. the *kings of the earth* that wail over Babylon are wicked prelates: the *fire* spoken of, that of the eternal punishment of her reprobate members, of which the temporal is but a pledge; the *merchandise*, that of ecclesiastical functions, bought or bartered by priests for money.<sup>3</sup>—The song of exultation on the fall of Babylon, given in Apoc. xix., Joachim expounds as the song of the *Church on earth*; escaped out of, and freed from, the New Testament Babylon: a song which he compares with that of the Jews restored with Ezra from the ancient Babylon; and "such as had been never heard in the Church since the days of Constantine."<sup>4</sup> Its two subjects of congratulation are "the destruction of the Harlot, and the liberty of the Church:" and alike converted Jews, ("for then the Jewish people will be converted to the Lord,") and Greeks too and Latins will join in it; crying "Hosanna! Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord."<sup>5</sup> The song of the twenty-four elders, &c., is explained to include the answering Alleluia in heaven, as well as of the earthly ecclesiastical orders symbolized by the four living creatures, for the

former, which I have not seen, supplies what is wanting in the Apocalyptic Comment to the completeness of this view. The writer adds, however; "Whether the ten-horned empire was the Bestia itself, still future, or a future form and predicament of a Beast which had long existed, is a point on which the Abbot of Flore does not express himself with perfect consistency." Ibid.

<sup>1</sup> 193.—Joachim here speaks of some that rested on Benedict's words, quoted by Pope Gregory I; "Rome shall not perish by the assaults of kings; but by earthquakes, &c." This however, says he, had reference to the *Gothic kings then attacking Rome.*

<sup>2</sup> 197<sup>2</sup>. He refers to the 6th Vial.

<sup>3</sup> He exemplifies in those who refused to impart the divine sacraments, intrusted to them "pro salute vivorum et mortuorum," "nisi aut accipiant aliquid, aut accipere sperent." 201. Also in those who "inhiant temporalibus lucris," and seek the favour of the rich; (199;) and altogether resemble Judas, who for thirty pieces of silver betrayed Christ. 201<sup>2</sup>. Compare Apoc. ix. 20; and my historic illustrations of it, in reference to the time when Joachim wrote, Vol. ii. pp. 17—20. <sup>4</sup> 203, 203<sup>2</sup>. <sup>5</sup> 203<sup>2</sup>.



liberation of the righteous, the conversion of the Jews, and bringing in of the fulness of the Gentiles.<sup>1</sup> And so, adds Joachim, will begin that kingdom for which we continually pray, "Thy kingdom come."—Oh how good, says he, will it be for us to be there: Christ being our shepherd, king, meat, drink, light, life!<sup>2</sup>

But, after this so solemn a rejoicing, there remains yet another tribulation,<sup>3</sup> depicted in the chapter following.

Apoc. xix. "And I saw heaven opened, and behold a white horse, &c.: and I saw the Beast, and the kings of the earth, and their armies, gathered to make war, &c."—Parallel with this, says Joachim, is the prophecy in Zech. xiv. 2; "I will gather all nations to Jerusalem to battle: and the Lord shall go forth and fight against those nations."—Here is the Beast "*which had been, and was not, and is to ascend from the abyss and go into perdition:*" i. e. the Beast under his last *head*:—also the *seventh king*, "which had not yet come, but was about to come, and to continue a short space;" though indeed this king is not here mentioned; as if to intimate that this is the *Antichrist*, in whom the red Dragon dwells bodily.<sup>4</sup>—This last point however, says Joachim, is doubtful; and whether this *seventh king*, or the *sixth*, (the one which *is*,) or he that is called *Gog*, or any other, be properly *Antichrist*. What we know is that the *sixth king* will be worse than the five preceding, and the *seventh* than the sixth; and that these will be the two last *heads* of the Dragon. I think, too, that the first will be king over the *Beast from the sea*, the second over the *Beast from the land*, or *False Prophet*.<sup>5</sup>—Whether Christ's figured manifestation on the white horse, to destroy the Beast in this his last form, be a *personal* coming, or only *providential*, is a point doubted by Doctors. At first Joachim inclines to decide on the view of its being a *personal* coming: both because of what Paul says, "Whom the Lord shall destroy by the brightness of his coming;" and what Christ, "*Immediately* after the tribulation of these days, they shall see the sign of the Son of Man, &c."<sup>6</sup> Afterwards he admits that it *may* be explained of Christ's acting invisibly in his Church militant.—And what the armies of saints following him on white horses? I think,

<sup>1</sup> 204.<sup>2</sup> 205.

<sup>3</sup> This second tribulation of the 6th period is to follow, he says, "post gaudium illud tam solemne, quod post hebdomadam quæ intitulatur de passione:" i. e. after the *Easter sabbath*, succeeding the Church's *Passion Week*. 206. Compare Luther's somewhat similar use of the figure, as cited in my Vol. ii. p. 136.

<sup>4</sup> 207.<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*

says he, they must signify either distinctively the saints that rose from the dead when he rose, (Matt. xxvii. 52,) or all the saints dead in Christ generally, as now to appear with Him; i. e. if Christ's coming be personal.<sup>1</sup> If not, then they may be Christ's saints on earth.<sup>2</sup>—The *sword from the rider's mouth* is expounded as what St. Paul speaks of, "Whom the Lord shall consume with the *breath of his mouth*:" (a parallelism deserving notice :) his *eyes like fire*, as indicating the all-revealing brightness thrown on things at the day of his judgment; like that spoken of by Paul, 1 Cor. iv. 5.<sup>3</sup>

PART VII. Apoc. xx.—So, says Joachim, we come to the *seventh* Part, in which we have to treat of that *great sabbath* which is to be at the consummation: a<sup>7</sup>period which I have called *The third State*, or "*seventh age of the world*;" and which may be termed the *Age of the Spirit*, as the two former were of the *Father* and of the *Son*.<sup>4</sup> The idea of all secular time and things ending with the fall of Antichrist had been overthrown, he adds, by St. Remigius; who had shown that a certain time, of uncertain length, would still remain after that event:—the idea itself having arisen from want of observation that *the last day* of Scripture is not to be understood as signifying the last moment of the world; but rather the *world's last age*, or *time of the end*: a point illustrated by St. John's saying above a thousand years before, "It is the last hour."<sup>5</sup> Whether

<sup>1</sup> "Unum è duobus arbitror esse tenendum:—quòd aut mortui qui sunt in Christo eum eo protinus apparebunt viventes, secundùm supra-scriptam Apostoli auctoritatem; (1 Thess. iv. 15—17;) aut illi apparebunt suscitati eum ipso, qui cum eo pariter resurrexerunt à mortuis:" viz. as in Matt. xxvii. 52, referred to just before. P. 207<sup>2</sup>.—The first view is the *pre-millennial* theory.

<sup>2</sup> For saints in the mortal state may conquer even in suffering: "qui, sequentes passionem Domini sui, ita pugnaturi sunt in corporibus suis tradendis pro nomine Crucifixi in tempore sexto, quomodo ipse in die sexto in candido illo equo suo superavit et vicit." Ibid.

What is said of the *heaven appearing opened*, in order to the exhibition of the vision, may be meant, he adds, of the opening of Scripture truth at the time; so that all that the vision relates to may appear clear. 208.

<sup>3</sup> 208, 208<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>4</sup> 209<sup>2</sup>, 210.

<sup>5</sup> "Maximè cùm jam sint transacti amplius quàm mille anni, ex quo dixit beatus Joannes, Filioli novissima hora est." 210.

A sentence which cannot but suggest the opening of the Waldensian Noble Lesson; "Well have 1100 years been completed since it was said, It is the last time." See my Vol. ii. pp. 365, 390.

I have already observed, at p. 388 suprâ, that between his second and third status Joachim supposed a transition interval (common in some sort to both states) of two Apocalyptic months or generations, = 60 years; viz. from A.D. 1200 to A.D. 1260.

Christ's coming is to be at the beginning of this sabbath time, or the end of it, has seemed to some doubtful: but, says Joachim, again reverting to the pre-jubilean theory, both St. Paul's and Christ's own words, referred to above, seem to fix it at the commencement of the sabbath period.<sup>1</sup>—As to this constituting the seventh millenary of years from the world's creation, Joachim speaks of the idea as set aside by both the Greek and Latin mundane chronology: much more than 6000 years from the world's creation having past, according to the *Greek* chronology: and much less (though the time, Joachim thought, must be close at hand) according to the *Latin*.<sup>2</sup> His own view was, that the Apocalyptic millenary period was specified simply as being a most perfect number: that the binding of Satan spoken of might possibly have had an *incipient* fulfilment from the time of Christ's resurrection; and in that sense the Apocalyptic *millennium* extend from that epoch to the world's consummation: but that its *perfected* fulfilment would be in the *sabbath-time* after the Beast's destruction: <sup>3</sup>—which sabbath might be longer, or shorter, as God pleased; <sup>4</sup> indeed, so short perhaps that the real and chief Antichrist might possibly exist and act in the great antichristian battles both before and after it.<sup>5</sup> But time would unfold this.—As to the *first resurrection* he conceived it identical with Daniel's prediction that, after the destruction of the Beast and its little horn, the kingdom and power under the whole heaven should be given to *the saints of the Most High*; <sup>6</sup> and with that too in Ezek. xxxvii., which speaks of a resurrection before Gog's coming.<sup>7</sup> Perhaps, he says, on the clause,

This was to be an æra of great tribulation to the Church; and more especially the 3½ years at its conclusion.

<sup>1</sup> 210.—Let me here again remark how, immediately that the Christian æra had so far advanced as to allow of the *year-day* principle being applied to the 1260 *days'* prophetic period, without placing Christ's second advent necessarily at a distance, it was so applied. Compare again Note <sup>2</sup>, p. 388. <sup>2</sup> 211.

<sup>3</sup> “Secundùm aliquam sui partem incarcerationatus fuerit Draco ex eo tempore quo superavit eum Christus in die mortis suæ; secundùm vero universitatem capitum suorum, ex eâ die, vel horâ, quâ Bestia et Pseudo-propheta mittentur in stagnum ignis.” And again: “Secundùm partem incepit ab illo sabbato quo requievit Dominus in sepulchro: secundùm plenitudinem sui, a ruinâ Bestiæ et Pseudo-Prophætæ.” 211.

<sup>4</sup> “Tunc erit magna pax; . . . ejus terminus erit in arbitrio Dei.” 210<sup>2</sup>. “Quis scit quàm breve esse poterit sabbatum ipsum?” *ibid*.

<sup>5</sup> “Ista tria prælia” (viz. that of the ten kings destroying Babylon, or Rome, that of the Beast against the Lamb, and that of Gog, the two first pre-sabbatical, the last post-sabbatical) “tam fortassis erunt vicina, ut ille Homo Peccati possit omnibus interesse; maximè autem in secundo et tertio.” At the last, I presume, in his resurrection-state, after the healing of his deadly wound. 210<sup>2</sup>, 211.

<sup>6</sup> L. 212.

<sup>7</sup> L. 212<sup>2</sup>.

“The rest of the dead lived not till the 1000 years were ended,” the saints are then to rise, and enter at once on life eternal, without that terrible ordeal of the judgment of the white throne which others must go through.<sup>1</sup> But he admits difficulties in the view; and the need of waiting for further illustration.—As to *Gog*, he might very possibly be the Antichrist.<sup>2</sup>

The *new heaven* and *new earth* Joachim expounds to mean the final blissful state, when the tares shall have been gathered from the wheat, and the just shine as the sun in the kingdom of their Father;<sup>3</sup>—the *new Jerusalem*, on the other hand, to figure the Church even in its earthly state, and from its first beginning at Christ’s birth.<sup>4</sup>

So I conclude my abstract of Joachim; an abstract which I have made at greater length and in more detail than any other, because of its peculiarity, importance, and interest.<sup>5</sup> For the same reason I subjoin in a Note Roger de Hoveden’s account<sup>6</sup> of Joachim’s Expo-

<sup>1</sup> “Forte intelligamus sanctos protinus post resurrectionem suam absque terribilibus illius iudicii examine, et absque intervallo dierum, intraturos ad veram vitam; cæteros vero non statim, sed post consummationem iudicii.” Ibid. Compare Joachim on Apoc. xix. 14, p. 416 *suprà* 2 213. <sup>3</sup> 215<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>4</sup> “Non est referenda ista visio, et iste descensus, ad horam illam ultimam in quâ manifesta erit gloria Hierusalem; sed ad tempus nativitatis ipsius (Christi).” Ibid.

<sup>5</sup> Let me quote from Fleury a brief obituary sentence on this remarkable, and I trust sincere, though on many points deluded man. “Vers ce tems là mourut in Calabrie l’Abbé Joachim, fameux par ses prophetes. Il avait environ 72 ans quand il tomba malade a Pietrafitta, près de Cosenze; et mourut au milieu de trois Abbez et de plusieurs moines: a qu’il recommanda de s’aimer les uns les autres, comme Jesus Christ nous a aimez; ce qu’il repeta plusieurs fois. Il mourut le trentieme jour de Mars 1202; et son corps fut porté en son Abbaye a Flore.” Fleury H. E. Liv. lxxv. chap. 41.

<sup>6</sup> The interpretation of this vision according to Joachim, Abbot of Curacio, is as follows:—The woman clothed with the sun, with the moon under her feet, signifies the Holy Church covered and clothed with the Sun of Righteousness, which is Christ our God: under whose feet the world, with its vices and lusts, is ever to be trampled. “And upon her head a crown of twelve stars.” Christ is the head of the Church: her crown is the Catholic faith which was preached by the twelve apostles. “And bringing forth, she was in pain to be delivered.” Thus the Holy Church, which is continually blest with new offspring, is in pain from day to day, that it may bring forth souls to God; whom Satan endeavours to snatch away, and draw down with himself to hell. “And behold a great red Dragon, having seven heads and ten horns.” That Dragon signifies the Devil: who is well said to have seven heads; for every wicked one is a head of the Devil. He puts seven as the finite for the infinite, for the heads of the Devil are infinite; that is, the persecutors of the Church, and the wicked. But though they are infinite, nevertheless this Joachim in his exposition specified seven persecuting powers; whose names are Herod, Nero, Constantius, Mahomet, Melsemut, Saladin, Antichrist. St. John also says in the Apocalypse; “There are seven kings; five have fallen, and one is, and one is not yet come:” which the same Joachim thus explains: There are seven kings, namely, Herod, Nero, Constantius, Mahomet, Melsemut, Saladin, Antichrist. Of these, five have fallen;



sition of Apoc. xii. xiii., to our King Richard; whereby we shall be namely, Herod, Nero, Constantius, Mahomet, Melsemut: and one is; namely, Saladin; who at this time oppresses the Church of God, and keeps possession of it with the sepulchre of our Lord, and the holy city Jerusalem, and the land in which the feet of our Lord stood. But he shall in a short time lose it.

Then the king of England asked, "When shall this be?" To whom Joachim answered, "When seven years shall have elapsed from the day of the taking of Jerusalem." "Then," said the king of England, "Why have we come here so soon?" To whom Joachim replied, "Your coming is very necessary; because the Lord will give you victory over his enemies, and will exalt your name above all the princes of the earth."

It follows: "One of them is not yet come;" namely, Antichrist. Concerning this Antichrist the same Joachim says that he is already born in the *city of Rome*, and will be elevated to the *Apostolic see*. And concerning this Antichrist the Apostle says; "He is exalted and placed in opposition, above all that is called God:" and "then shall be revealed that wicked one, whom the Lord Jesus will slay with the breath of his mouth, and destroy with the brightness of his coming."

And the king turning to him said: "I thought that Antichrist would be born in *Antioch*, or in *Babylon*, of the tribe of Dan; and would reign in the temple of the Lord, which is in *Jerusalem*; and would walk in that land in which Christ walked; and would reign in it for three years and a half: and would dispute against Elijah and Enoch, and would kill them; and would afterwards die; and that, after his death, God would give sixty days of repentance, in which those might repent who should have erred from the way of truth, and have been seduced by the preaching of Antichrist and his false prophets."

It follows; "and ten horns."—The ten horns of the Devil are heresies and schisms; which heretics and schismatics set up in opposition to the ten commandments of the law, and the precepts of God. "And unto his head seven crowns." By crowns are signified kings, and princes of this world, who will believe on Antichrist. "And his tail drew the third part of the stars of heaven;" because of the great multitude of men believing on him. "And cast them upon the earth."—He calls the inferior persons who shall believe on Antichrist stars; and says, "the third part of the stars of heaven," because of the great multitude of men believing on him. "And cast them unto the earth:"—that is, he casts all into hell, who shall continue to believe on him. "Which stood before the woman who was about to bring forth; that when she had brought forth, he might devour her son." The Devil is always practising against the Church; that he may seize her offspring, and devour what he has seized: and he is properly said to "stand;" because he never declines from his wickedness, but always stands stiff in malice, and inflexible in the craft of his fraud. Or, in another sense, his tail signifies the end of this world: in which certain wicked nations shall arise who are called Gog-Magog; and shall destroy the Church of God, and subvert the Christian race. And after that shall be the day of judgment. And in the time of Antichrist many Christians abiding in caverns of the earth, and in the solitude of the rocks, shall keep the Christian faith in the fear of the Lord, even until the destruction of Antichrist. And this is what he means when he says, "The woman fled unto the wilderness of Egypt, where she had a place prepared by God, that they should there feed her 1260 days." But "her man-child, who should rule all nations with a rod of iron," is especially our Lord Jesus Christ: who, after his passion and resurrection, ascended into heaven, and sitteth at the right hand of God the Father Almighty, and shall come again to judge the quick and the dead, and the world by fire. Whose followers if we are, and persevere in the way of his commandments, we shall be caught up to meet him in the air, and shall be with him for ever.

And although the said Abbot of Curacio maintained this opinion concerning the coming of Antichrist, nevertheless Walter, archbishop of Rouen, and Girard, archbishop of Auxerre, and John of Worms, and Barnard, bishop of Bayonne, and other ecclesiastics well versed in the Scriptures, endeavoured to prove the contrary: and,

enabled to compare his prophetic views in the year A.D. 1190 with those in A.D. 1196 or 1200.<sup>1</sup>

Moreover, on account of this its peculiarity and interest, I have thought it well worth the while to draw up, and append on the opposite page, a *Tabular Scheme* representing it; though certainly no very easy task to me. This will, I think, much facilitate an acquaintance with it on the part of my more intelligent and inquisitive readers.

---

although many plausible arguments were adduced on each side, the matter still remains undecided. Maitland's Translation, Letter to Digby, p. 70.

<sup>1</sup> See Note <sup>1</sup> p. 386, and Note <sup>2</sup> p. 388.

Ere closing this notice of Joachim, let me recall to my readers' recollection his contemporary Pope Innocent III's interpretation of the Apocalyptic number 666, as signifying the time of the duration of Mahommedism; an interpretation given by him A.D. 1214 to the 4th Council of Lateran, and which I have referred to in my Vol. iii. p. 257, on the Number of the Beast. It is as follows.

“Post tempora Gregorii perditionis filius Machomettus pseudopropheta surrexit: ejus perfidia etsi usque ad hæc tempora invaluerit, confidamus tamen in Domino qui jam fecit nobiscum signum in bonum, quòd finis hujus bestię appropinquat: ‘*Cujus numerus,*’ secundum Apocalypsin, ‘*intrà sexcenta sexaginta sex clauditur:*’ ex quibus jam pœne sexcenti sunt anni completi.” Hard. vii. 3.

And so too, as we saw *ibid.*, Roger Bacon, referred to by Mr. Foster in his *Mahomedanism Unveiled*, 232. The agreement of this view of the coming future, chronologically, with that of Joachim will be evident; and, no doubt, helped it on to a more general reception and belief.

A.D.	1-100.	100-310.	310-550.	550-800.	800-1200.	1200-1260.	1260. . . . .
SEALS.	I. Christ and Apostolic Church triumphing over Judaism.	II. Roman Pagan Persecutions and Blood-shedding.	III. Arians, with false balance and Scripture perversion.	IV. Mahomet and the Saracens' desolations.	V. Persecutions and Martyrdoms by Saracens in Spain and Mauritania.	VI. Babylon's judgment day begins. Christianity visibly suppress.	VII. Half-hour's silence, the Sabbath, Perhaps the last half of the 3 1/2 times.
TRUMPETS.	I. Judaizers' indurated as hall, of Christianized Jews apostatize.	II. Nicolaitans' burning mountain, in the sea of Gentilism.	III. Arius' falling star.	IV. Light of Monks and Virgins quenched by the Saracens.	V. Locusts, or Pathareni.	VI. Confederacy of Saracens, Turks, Moors, and Northern Germans acclaim Rome.—Mystery of Iniquity preparing.	VII. Sabbath beginning, as in Apoc. xx. Mystery ended. Antichrist.
VIALS.	I. on Jews & Judaizers,	II. on Gentilizing recreants.	III. on Arian Bishops and Doctors.	IV. on vain and hypocritical Monastics.	V. on Monastics apostatizing to the Beast.	VI. Ephraim's Reman dried lips. Antichrist's 3 frogs.	VII. Air purified for Church's bridal
WITNESSES AND TRAVAILING WOMAN.	: The 42 months or 1260 days of the City of Christendom.	: 42 months or 1260 days of the City of Christendom.	: 1260 days of the 42 generations, <i>partially</i> Gentile-trod.	: Christ's gen in Woman or 1260 years. and given to Greek Church ejected.	: V. Witnessing Wilderness years.	: Body. Moses, 3 1/2 yrs. Elias. } yrs. Gentiles.	: rit. End: to God.
BEAST'S SEVEN AND EIGHT HEADS.	I. Antichristian Jews, under Herod. (= Daniel's 1st Beast).	II. Roman Pagans, Nero to Diocletian. (= Daniel's 2nd Beast.)	III. IV. & V. Arian Greeks, Goths, and Vandals. (= Daniel's 3rd four-headed Beast.)	VI. Arian Lombards. (= Daniel's 4th Beast.)	VII. Mahometan, Saracen, or Turkish Empire; now under Saladin.	VIII. The 7th Head wounded, revives as Daniel's Little Hero; still under Saladin.	: Age of the Spirit of the Spi
SEVEN CHIEF KINGS.	I. Herod.	II. Nero.	III. Constantinus.	IV. Mahomet.	V. German/Ghibelline Emperors. A.D. 1195.	VI. Saladin over the decem- royal anti-Romish confederacy.	: Age of the Spirit of the Spi When to end known only

The observant reader cannot but have remarked the novelty of many of Joachim's views ; alike on some of the latter Seals, Trumpets, and Vials ; on the *year-day* construction of the 1260 prophetic *days* of the Woman and Witnesses ; and on the Dragon, Beast, Harlot, and Millennium : views not only conceived with much originality of thought ; but also propounded and urged with a measure of earnestness, and conviction of their truth, abundantly greater than had attached to any previous Apocalyptic Expositor, subsequent to the grand epoch of the Gothic overthrow of the Roman empire.— And could these new opinions on the Apocalypse, promulged thus publicly and earnestly by one so venerated as the Abbot Joachim, fail of exercising a marked influence on the subsequent interpretation of this wonderful prophecy ? In truth we find the effect marked and speedy. In *the Romish Church* itself, while some held mainly to the old generalizing views of Tichonius, Primasius, Ambrose Ansbert, Bede, and Haymo,—of which class *Albertus Magnus* and *Thomas Aquinas*, both of the xiiith century, were much the most illustrious—others, as *Almeric*, *Pierre d'Olive*, &c., quickly followed in the track of Joachim with yet bolder innovations. Moreover certain *open dissidents from the Romish Church*, despised nearly up to this time as contemptible heretics, began too to make their voice effectively sound forth, on *two* points at least in which Joachim had innovated ; a voice which, after one temporary suppression, has even to the present day never ceased. The fulness with which I have sketched the views of the Tichonian commentators, makes it needless for me to enter at all prominently into others on the same principle : and I shall therefore content myself with placing a brief notice of the Apocalyptic views of *Albertus Magnus*, and of those of *Thomas Aquinas*, below.<sup>1</sup> It is to *these innovators* just mentioned, whether

<sup>1</sup> 1. *Albertus Magnus*.

The celebrity of this man is handed down to posterity in his surname, *Albert the Great*. He is spoken of by Mosheim as a man of vast abilities, and the literary dictator of his time. Born early in the thirteenth century, he was in 1260 made Bishop of Ratisbon ; but soon retired again to the Dominican convent at Padua, of which he was Provincial : and, after a life spent in study, died there in 1281. His works are said to make up twenty-one folio volumes. His Treatise on the Apocalypse was printed separately at Basle in small 4to, in 1506 ; the edition which I now have in hand.

His frequent reference to Haymo is stated in a commendatory Preface prefixed by one Bernard of Luxembourg, of the order of Preachers. “ Sæpe etiam in roborationem dietorum suorum allegans *Haymonem* ; unum de antiquioribus expositoribus Apocalypseos : qui fuit magister Karoli Magni, monachus Ordinis Sancti Benedicti.” But



*within* or *without* the Romish Church, that I wish to draw my reader's chief attention, in all that remains of this present fourth Section.

he refers to *Bede* quite as much, I think, as to *Haymo*: also sometimes to one *Gilbert*, who seems to have been a commentator of celebrity in the preceding century; and not seldom moreover to "*the Gloss.*"\* The following points seem, to me the most noticeable in *Albert's* Apocalyptic Commentary.

The *Epistles* he considers to have depicted the Church Universal, with reference to its state in its successive chronological periods:—viz. 1. that of the apostles; 2. of the post-apostolic martyrs to *Constantine*; 3. that of the Arian struggle, and struggle with other heretics, in the 4th and 5th centuries; 4. that of the confessors and doctors afterwards, during whose time *Mahomet* introduced his heresy; 5. that of still later time (I suppose commencing from *Charlemagne*) during which the temporalities of the Church were increased; 6. that of the time then present; ("per hanc signatur moderni in ecclesiâ;") 7. and lastly, that of the future time, apparently of *Antichrist*.—In the second *Epistle*, to *Smyrna*, he suggests (like *Bede*), as an alternative explanation of the *ten days* of tribulation spoken of, that it may have reference to the ten persecuting kings designated by the *Beast's* ten horns; viz. *Nero*, *Domitian*, *Trajan*, *Antonine*, *Severus*, *Maximin*, *Decius*, *Valerian*, *Aurelian*, *Diocletian*; or perhaps to "the times of ten Popes [the ten persecuted Popes, I presume] after *Clement*."

As a general view of the *Seals*, he cites and acquiesces in *Bede's* explanation. "Secundùm Bedam in primo sigillo orditur status primitivæ ecclesiæ; in tribus sequentibus bellum cùm ecclesiâ triforcæ: &c."† also in his view of the *half-hour's* silence on the *seventh Seal's* opening, as betokening the "quietis æternæ initium:" of which, says *Albert*, *Bede* thus observes, "Post interitum Antichristi requies aliquantula futura creditur in ecclesiâ."

In the *Trumpets* *Albert* again for the most part follows *Bede*: but more chronologically, as in reference to judgments that occurred on the reprobate in nearly the same chronological periods as before; the sixth being that of *Antichrist's* invasion.—In *Apoc. x.* the vision passes, according to *Albert* (after *Bede*), to describe *Christ's* descent from heaven at his incarnation; the *seven thunders* being the voices of preachers, terrible from the denouncing of the seven-fold punishment of the lost, (viz. exclusion from the saints' inheritance, and from the vision of God, &c. &c.,) understood by the good, sealed to infidels.—In *Apoc. xi.* the temple means the Church; the *casting out*, the excommunication from it of false brethren. The 42 months are explained both generally of all the time of the wicked trampling the Church, and especially of the 3½ times of *Antichrist*; the *two witnesses* as *Enoch* and *Elias*; (though some, evidently *Joachim*, had lately said *Moses* and *Elias*;) the place of their slaughter as the literal *Jerusalem*, where *Christ* had been himself literally crucified, and would now be crucified figuratively in his members; the 3½ days of their lying dead in the sense either of 3½ years from after *Antichrist's* death, on the year-day principle; or more probably of 3½ days after their death.‡—In *Apoc.*

\* Meaning, I suppose, when so cited, the *Glossa Ordinaria*, or earliest Latin *Catena* of Scripture Comment, compiled by *Walfrid Strabo*, finally Abbot of *Reichenau*, a monastery near *Constance* in German Switzerland, who died about A.D. 850. He was often called *Fuldensis* from having studied at the School at *Fulda*, (so *Gieseler* ii. 32.) and *Strabo* from his squinting.—The *Glossa Interlinearis* was compiled by *Anselm of Laon* in the 11th century. On which *Dr. S. R. Maitland* had to remark in his controversy with the *Morning Watch*, p. 20.

On *Apoc. xi. 3*, &c., *Albert* cites the "*Glossa*," and also an "*alia Glossa*" differing from the former. † See pp. 343, 344 *suprà*.

‡ *Mr. C. M.* (p. 333) speaks of *Albert's* having "even attempted to clear the *Gloss* of the charge of countenancing the year-day principle," and of the "attack" made on it by him having such effect that "it never again held up its head." I cite *Albert's* two notices on the point, that the reader may judge.—1. "Dicit, *Et post 3½*

And, in so doing, it will be with special reference to these two grand hermeneutic innovations which I alluded to as so important

xii. the *woman* is explained as either the Church, or the Virgin Mary: the twelve stars of the coronet meaning, on the former hypothesis, the twelve apostles; on the latter, the twelve prerogatives of the blessed Virgin: while the Dragon's seven heads figure the seven evil spirits, and his ten horns the ten kings, as in Dan. vii.—In Apoc. xiii. the Beast is Antichrist: (or possibly, as Haymo, the Devil:) the seven heads signifying all powers adhering to him; or else the chiefs of iniquity from the beginning, Cain, Nimrod, the four empires, Antichrist. God's tabernacle, blasphemed by him, meant Christ's flesh, perhaps, in which dwelt the fulness of the Godhead bodily: (might not questions about *transubstantiation* have suggested themselves to Albert as he wrote this?) or else Christ's saints.—The *second Beast* signified the preachers of Antichrist: the *image of the Beast*, a conformity to Antichrist, urged on men by the preachers: (“sic dicit Glossa et Haymo:”) or perhaps a material image. The name and number 666, construed in Greek words, might be, as Bede says, *αυτεμος* or *τετραν*: the latter as the *sum of righteousness*, which Antichrist would call himself: or perhaps, adds Albert, with the same idea, in Latin words, *Dic Lux*; in the sense “Dic me esse Lucem.” A conceit this last copied from Ansbert.\*

The *seven Vials* are described as the seven last plagues on the *reprobate*, in the *time of Antichrist*; though the specification following might lead us to suppose a succession of plagues was meant from the earliest promulgation of Christianity: “In primâ continetur damnatio Judæorum reprobiorum; in secundâ Gentilium reprobiorum; in tertiâ hæreticorum; in quartâ damnatio Antichristi; in quintâ suorum ministrorum; in sextâ falsorum Christianorum; in septimâ damnatio dæmonum.”—The great city *Babylon* is stated to mean that “vanitatis mundanæ:” the *seven mountains*, all the proud: the *seven kings*, those of chief wickedness in the course of all time; 1. those before the flood; 2. those from Noe to Abraham; 3. those from Abraham to Moses; 4. those from Moses to the Babylonish captivity; 5. those from that captivity to Christ; 6. those from Christ to the time then present; 7. Antichrist.

*dies* : id est post  $3\frac{1}{2}$  annos post mortem Antichristi. Et sic sumitur *dies* pro *anno* : et sic intelligunt illud de generali resurrectione. Sed probabilius videtur quòd quarto die resurgunt à suâ interfectione, sicut alii exponunt.” So on Apoc. xi. 11. Then, 2ndly, at the end of Apoc. xi., in his notice of the “dubitabilia” of the chapter. “Tertio queritur super illo verbo, post  $3\frac{1}{2}$  dies. Glossa ; post  $3\frac{1}{2}$  annos post mortem Antichristi. Contrâ, post eorum mortem non regnabit (Antichristus) tantum. Responsio :—Quartâ die post mortem resurgunt. Et, quod objicitur de Glossâ, dicendum quòd  $3\frac{1}{2}$  anni non computantur à morte eorum, nec à morte Antichristi; sed à principio suæ prædicationis, vel à tempore potestatis Antichristi. Sensus est Glossæ, post  $3\frac{1}{2}$  annos ab eorum prædicatione, vel Antichristi potestate, quæ terminabitur in ejus morte.”

Thus my readers will see that Albert has not a *word of objection* against the *year-day* principle itself, as here applied; or a word to clear the Gloss of countenancing it: but only answers a chronological objection, by first suggesting the literal explanation as more probable; secondly suggesting a *terminus à quo*, with which the Gloss's year-day view would suit. Thus Albert admits in fact that the year-day explanation may be the right one. How far it be true that the year-day principle after this “attack” by Albert “never again raised its head,” appears from the fact of the year-day view of the  $3\frac{1}{2}$  days being advocated as an alternative by *T. Aquinas* and *Lyranus*, among others, in the two next generations after Albert, and also by *Berengand* and *Bernardine*, as Mr. C. M. himself tabulates them all four, p. 271: not to add the Jesuit *Alcasar*, long afterwards.

I should observe that Mr. C. Maitland's representation as to *T. Aquinas* explaining the  $3\frac{1}{2}$  days as possibly  $3\frac{1}{2}$  years, is taken from an Apocalyptic Treatise generally ascribed to him, which I have not seen.

\* See p. 351 suprâ.

in Joachim's explanation; viz. 1. that of the *Apocalyptic Babylon* being in a certain sense *Papal Rome*; 2. that of the predicted *Anti-*

The *ten horns* might mean either ten kingdoms into which the Roman empire was to be divided in the time of Antichrist, or all the reprobate.

On the *millennium* Albert repeats the old Augustinian explication. The *New Jerusalem* he interprets as a figure of the saints' glorified state.

## 2. *Thomas Aquinas.*

This *angelic doctor* of the Romish Church was a pupil of Albertus: but ran a shorter career than his master: the date of his birth being 1224, of his death 1274. The scene of his literary labours and triumphs was Italy; chiefly Naples, where he died. His *canonization*, or (as the recent Popish Editor and Annotator \* of his work *De Antichristo*, † which is the subject of my present notice, characteristically expresses it) his *apotheosis*, was solemnized in 1323. Whence a question as to the supposed early date of the MS.; superscribed as it is as a work of *St. Thomas*. But, it seems, his fame was such, that the Pope's act was anticipated by the public voice; and the title *saint* attached to him even before the year 1300, per prolepsin.

His subject, *Antichrist*, leads him necessarily to speak of Apoc. xi., xiii., xvii., concerning the *Apocalyptic Witnesses, Beast, and Babylon*.

He begins by noting what is to precede the preaching of the two witnesses, *Enoch and Elias*:—viz. a *universal agitation of the people*, as predicted by Christ, Luke xxi. 25, 26; a *general religious hypocrisy*, as predicted by St. Paul, 1 Tim. iv. 1; and, agreeably with St. Paul's prophecy to the Thessalonians, an *αποστασια*, or *defection of the nations included in its empire from the Roman rule*: the Roman empire meant being still existent, having only changed from a temporal empire into a spiritual; and thus a defection indicated from the Roman ecclesiastical government and faith, as well as from its temporal rule. ‡

In the *Apocalyptic prophecy of the Witnesses*, he explains the *fire out of their mouths* figuratively of their "scientia spiritualis;" the city of their slaughter, like Albertus, as the literal Jerusalem; § the Lord's crucifixion spoken of by the narrating Angel, like him also, as both literally and figuratively meant; and the witnesses "tormenting them that dwell on the earth," as those "quorum damnationem prædix-

\* Hyacinthus de Ferrari O. P. S. Theologiæ Magistri, Bibliothecæ Casanat. Præfeci.

† This is the title of the first of Two Treatises by Thomas Aquinas; that of the second being *De Præambulis ad Judicium*. They are connected Treatises; and were published at Rome, with the usual license, in 1840. They contain each of them about 130 octavo pages. The first Treatise is the one referred to in my Notes and Numerals, except where the Numeral ii. is inserted.

‡ T. Aquinas, in a rather remarkable manner, tries here to overcome the difficulty arising from the fact of the nations, once subjected to Roman rule, having separated from, and broken up the old Roman empire; yet Antichrist, as he would have it, not even then come. So, similarly, in his comment on 2 Thess. ii. :—"Sed quomodo est hoc? Quia jamdiu gentes recesserunt a Romano imperio, et tamen needum venit Antichristus. Dicendum est quod nondum cessavit; sed est commutatum de temporali in spirituale, ut dicit Leo Papa in sermone de Apostolis. Et idcirco dicendum est, quòd discessio a Romano imperio debet intelligi, non solum a temporali, sed a spirituali; scilicet a fide Catholicâ Romanæ ecclesiæ." (I quote from the Venice edition of T. Aquinas' Works, 1775.)

Let me add another extract from this Comment; one respecting *the mystery of iniquity*, and its *working* at the time even when St. Paul wrote. T. Aquinas says; "Figuraliter occultatum operatur in fictis qui videntur boni, et tamen sunt mali; et hi operantur officium Antichristi." Pretty nearly a correct view I conceive. On the *temple of Antichrist's enthronization*, spoken of by St. Paul, he offers the three ancient explanations of the *Jewish temple restored; the Church*; (to which latter he seems to incline;) or εἰς ναὸν taken in the sense "as a temple." § See my Vol. ii. p. 439.

*christ's probable elevation to the throne of a Universal Pontiff, in fact the Papal throne.* The careful guards with which Joachim fenced

erunt, et contradicendo iniquitati eorum."—On their *resurrection* he discusses the question whether they are so to rise, like Lazarus, as to die again? and concludes in the negative; and, on the *earthquake* concurrent with their ascension, explains the tenth of the city that fell to mean many just that will then fall by the sword of the enraged Antichrist; the 7000 being the number that never bowed their knees to him. Thus he regards the city *here* meant as the *holy city* spoken of Apoc. xi. 2; which, as well as the *temple* of Apoc. xi. 1, he interprets (p. 121) to signify *the Church*.

Then, on *Antichrist*, he makes the *literal* Babylon his birth-place; explaining what is said in Apoc. xvii. about Babylon "being drunk with the blood of the saints," of the blood of saints killed in *Old Testament* times, before Christ's coming; also, like Adso\* (after Augustine †), tells of his being nourished in Chorazin and Bethsaida, and infused with the Magian philosophy of Babylon. The Beast's (or Antichrist's) seven heads he makes *all* bad princes adhering to him; the ten horns (like Andreas ‡) his *anti-decalogic* enmity.—The *second Apocalyptic Beast* he expounds, after Albert, to be Antichrist's false apostles and preachers: the *two horns like a lamb* indicating their (professedly) preaching Christ, holding Christian doctrine, and professing Christ's miracle-working power; but all in falsehood.§ "They will in fact exalt their head *Antichrist*, as we exalt *Christ*." He speaks (p. 87) of Antichrist making war with the saints, "per blandimenta et promissiones et exhortationes," and this even (p. 114) by urging the authority of Scripture, as well as by violence; repeats the old patristic notion that he will pretend to be Messiah to gain the *Jews*, and rebuild the temple at Jerusalem: also (p. 92) that, to gain the *Gentiles*, he will utter *oracular statutes*, answering to the Apocalyptic Beast's *speaking image*, and to Daniel's *maozim*. Elsewhere (p. 82) he adds Albert's explanation of the *Beast's image*, as meaning resemblance to him in heart.—He alludes to some of the *Vials* in the course of his argument. The 4th Vial poured out on the *sun*, (p. 104,) means poured out on *Antichrist*; because Antichrist "se solem existimabit, et dicet mundum illuminatum per eum esse: ipse enim sibi usurpabit nomen veri solis, id est Christi." (I have elsewhere quoted this, viz. in my Vol. ii. p. 69, in illustration of the notable fulfilment in the *Roman Popes* of some of the chief Roman doctors' own declared anticipations about *Antichrist*.) Further, on the 6th Vial, he advances the extraordinary fancy, that by "the waters of the *Euphrates* being dried up" we are to understand the interdiction of the waters of baptism, in order thereby to a preparation of the way of Antichrist. The denounced *going into captivity* of those that send into captivity, &c., he explains of Antichrist's being sentenced to the prison of hell; so perishing by "the sword" of divine justice. (129.) I may add that in one place, (ii. 67,) he makes the *scorpion-locusts'* tormenting power in Apoc. ix., (elsewhere, i. 99, expounded of Antichrist's false preachers,) to signify the tormenting power of bad angels over the lost in hell; so that these wretches shall "wish to die, and not be able."

Finally, with reference to the consummation, he, like Bede and Albert, explains the *half-hour's silence*, in Apoc. viii. 1, of a certain respite-time of tranquillity for the gospel-preaching of the 7th trumpet, before the end of the world; and with Bede too ||

\* See the Note p. 370 *suprà*.

† In Matt. xi.

‡ See p. 361 *suprà*.

§ "Doctrinam habebat similem doctrinæ Agni, id est Christi, et miraculorum Agni similitudinem: sed veritatem cornuum Diaboli; scilicet doctrinam fætentem, et virtutem miraculorum phantasticam. Et inde aperitur falsitas Bestiæ, id est Antichristi; quia apostoli ejus simulabunt se bonos, et tamen mala suadebunt." i. 97. So a Gloss from Gregory I., cited p. 96 by the Editor: "Cornua (sc. agni), quia simulabunt se habere innocentiam, et puram vitam, et veram doctrinam, et miracula quæ Christus habuit, et suis dedit."—The reader should mark the long chain of opinion on this point of the religious hypocrisy of Antichrist, as a Christian professor.

|| See p. 344 *suprà*.



these opinions, so as that they should neither impeach, nor be inconsistent with, his fidelity to the Romish See, are almost amusing. Though Babylon meant Papal Rome, including its subject states, yet this was chiefly with reference to the imperial Ghibelline Romanists, both princes and priests, and the evil-minded multitudes existing in it; so as still to leave to Rome's Papal Church itself its promised prerogative of infallibility; "Thou art Peter, &c."<sup>1</sup> Again, though Antichrist, it would seem, was to sit on the Papal throne, yet this, in Joachim's view, would of course be as *a usurper* of that throne.<sup>2</sup> But the fitting of Scripture prophecy with the living reality of Papal Rome, in respect not of the disaffected and evil-minded in it, but of the *religious system, ecclesiastical government, and head there actually enthroned*, enthroned in mighty supremacy over Western Christendom, (for the contingency of Rome's revived empire, looked on by Andreas some six centuries before as scarce imaginable,<sup>3</sup> had indeed now more than had fulfilment,) this fitting, I say, when the idea had once been bruited, was too striking not to impress itself deeply on many a thinking mind in Christendom. Scarce had Joachim rendered up his last breath among his brethren, when one and another and another, more or less following Joachim, took up and exprest the view.

3. First *Almeric* and his *disciples* (teachers alluded to, I see, by Thomas Aquinas) declared that *Rome* was *Babylon*, and the *Roman Pope* *Antichrist*.<sup>4</sup> At the same time they proclaimed, agreeably with the predictions of Joachim, that the Third Age, the Age of the Holy

makes it to include Daniel's last 45 days of the 1335, following on Antichrist's reign during the 1290: a tranquillity soon issuing in a general state of carnal security, such as in 1 Thess. v. 3.—Of the *millennial binding of Satan* he in one place (i. 119, 120) gives the old Augustinian explanation, as having reference to time past, and commencing from Christ's ministry: yet seems elsewhere (ii. 63) to apply it to a judgment on the Devil *after Antichrist's destruction*. "In illâ sententiâ ultimi judicii præerunt executioni Michael et omnes angeli, qui præerunt malis angelis ad torquendum: qui et religabit Sathanam et omnem virtutem ejus; Apoc. xx. 1." It was another step, in the track of Joachim Abbas, to the abandonment of the so long received millennial theory of Augustine.—Once more the *New Jerusalem symbol and state* is explained of the saints' heavenly state after the judgment; (ii. 88;) and among the hallelujahs of praise attending its introduction (90), Thomas Aquinas somewhat fancifully expatiates on the music of the seven planetary spheres.

<sup>1</sup> See pp. 387, 390, 413 *suprà*.

<sup>2</sup> See pp. 408, 409.

<sup>3</sup> See pp. 355, 363 *suprà*.

<sup>4</sup> "Quem (sc. Bestiam Antichristum, Apoc. xiii.) quidam hæreticorum jam sequentes dicunt omnes confessores qui fuerunt in ecclesiâ à tempore Silvestri Papæ esse damnatos, et in inferno."—On which says Aquinas' recent Roman editor, Hyacintho

Spirit, a time of light and reformation, had even then begun to dawn with the opening of the new xiii<sup>th</sup> century :<sup>1</sup> the rumour being also widely and influentially circulated by them, that the Franciscans, in their revival of preaching, were the fulfilment of the prefigurative Apocalyptic vision of the Angel flying abroad with the everlasting gospel, to preach to every nation under heaven.<sup>2</sup>—Then, a few years later, *Jean Pierre d'Olive*, another professed follower of Joachim, and leader in Languedoc of the austerer and more spiritual section of the recently-formed Franciscan body, in a Work entitled *Postils on the Apocalypse*, affirmed that “the Church of Rome was the Whore of Babylon, the Mother of Harlots, the same that St. John beheld sitting upon a scarlet-coloured Beast, full of names of blasphemy, having seven heads and ten horns;”<sup>3</sup> and the chief and proper Antichrist a pseudo-Pope :<sup>4</sup> also, very remarkably, that some reformation, with fuller effusion of gospel light, might probably be expected prior to Rome's final predicted destruction ; in order that, through its rejection of that light, God's destruction of it might be the rather justified before the world.

de Ferrari : “ Ex Amalrici discipulis erant isti ; qui dicebant *Romam esse Babylonem,\* et Romanum Pontificem Antichristum* ; sanctorum cultum idololatriam esse, &c.” He refers for authority to Berti, Brev. Sec. xiii. : and adds ; “ Ideo *tempore Silvestri Pape*, &c., quia ipse excommunicavit eos à quibus exulavit.” Th. Aquin. De Antichristo, i. 102.

Mosheim states that Amalric was sometime Professor of Logic and Theology at Paris : that his disciples received with the utmost faith Joachim's predictions ; that he held sundry heretical opinions : and that his bones were dug up and publicly burnt in the year 1209. Mosh. xiii. 2. 5. 12, 13. <sup>1</sup> Mosh. *ibid.* <sup>2</sup> See my Vol. ii. p. 34.

<sup>3</sup> So Mosheim xiii. 2. 2. 36. Vitranga, p. 1007, says, “ Legi excerpta interpretationis ejus Apocalypticæ (i. e. P. Olivi) cum admiratione.” He refers to Baluzius' Miscell. as containing it.—In his Section 54, selected for condemnation by the Papal inquisitors, I see the Apocalyptic Harlot is made to comprehend both Rome Pagan and Rome Papal. “ The woman here stands for the people and empire of Rome, both as she existed formerly in a state of Paganism, and as she has since existed in the [profest] faith of Christ, though by many crimes committing fornication with this world.” ap. Gieseler ii. 304.

<sup>4</sup> “ Quòd Antichristus proprius et magnus erit Pseudo-Papa, caput Pseudo-Prophetarum.” Gieseler ii. *ibid.* To whose abstract of Pierre d'Olive's 60 Articles I beg to refer the reader. Pierre d'Olive died, according to Gieseler, A.D. 1297.

---

\* In this, I ought to observe, Amalric had for a supporter the Parisian “ irrefragable doctor ” of the Schools himself, *Alexander de Hales*. (Died 1245.) In his Comment on Apoc. xvii. 2 he thus writes :—“ The Franciscans dwelling on earth, that is, loving the things of earth, were made drunk, that is, were turned aside from their right path, by the wine of her corruption ; i. e. of *the city of Rome*, or of some *prelates of the Church*.” Cited by Mr. C. Maitland, 338. I have not myself had an opportunity of consulting his Apocalyptic Commentary.

The same view of Papal Rome was echoed by not a few other profest Romanists. And so, however inconsistent these its propagators, it travelled down through the xiiiith century; to be stereotyped in the xvth for all literary posterity, in *Dante's Inferno*,<sup>1</sup> and the Epistles of *Petrarch*.<sup>2</sup>—Moreover, near about the same time with Pierre d'Olive, by another professedly Romanist expositor, the usual strange oversight as to the predicted disruption of the old Roman empire into ten kingdoms having long before taken place was in a certain manner corrected. I allude to *Eberhard*, Bishop of Salzburg: who, in the Council of Ratisbon, held A.D. 1240, while declaring that the Popes under a shepherd's skin concealed the wolf, and that Hildebrand, 170 years before, had laid the foundations of the Babylonian Empire of Antichrist,—declared also that the old Roman Empire had been long taken away from the earth, according to St. Paul's prophecy, the new Western Empire being but a name and shadow: <sup>3</sup> and that there had risen in its place ten horns, "Turcæ, Græci, Ægyptii, Afri, Hispani, Galli, Angli, Germani, Siculi, Itali;" and among, and over them, the Pontifical little horn, having eyes and speaking great things."<sup>4</sup>—Further, a century or so later, another expositor, *Oremius*, in a Treatise about *Antichrist*, suggested with reference to "the great city" of the death of the Witnesses, "spiritually called Sodom and Egypt," that, though more probably Jerusalem, yet it might also very possibly be *Papal Rome*; and, as to the place of Antichrist's birth, that although Babylon, yet this might be Babylon in its figurative sense of Rome.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Inferno, Canto xix. 106:—

Di voi pastor s'accorse 'l Vangelista,  
Quando colei che siede sopra l'acque  
Puttaneggiar co' regi a lui fu vista:  
Quella che con le sette teste nacque,  
E dalle diece corna ebbe argomento.

This with reference specially to the simony and avarice of the Popes and Roman Church. On which says his Commentator, Pompeo Venturi; "Dante *empiamente* intende qui nell' infame donna la *dignità Pontificia*, come residente in Roma; e, per meglio dire, stessi *Pontifici simoniaci*."

<sup>2</sup> In his xxth Epistle he calls the Papal Court the Babylonian Harlot, Mother of all idolatries and fornications.

<sup>3</sup> Compare Hippolytus, p. 285 *suprà*.

<sup>4</sup> Aventinus' Annal. Boiom. B. vii.

<sup>5</sup> Martene's Collect. Ampl. I borrow this from Mr. C. Maitland, p. 347; not having myself access to Martene's book. He dates him A.D. 1360.

Of the few Romanistic Apocalyptic expositors between T. Aquinas and the Reformation, unnoticed in my text above, the most eminent perhaps were *Petrus Aureolus* the Franciscan, who wrote about A.D. 1317, *Nicholas de Lyra* of the 14th century, (died 1310,) and *Dionysius Carthusianus* about the middle of the 15th century.

4. Meanwhile, in a different and purer channel,—I mean among the *Waldensian Schismatics*, or rather *Waldensian Witnesses for Christ*,—the same idea, quite independently taken up, was never thenceforth forgotten; and was thus transmitted downwards by them to the Wickliffites and Hussites of the xivth and xvth centuries. Already before Joachim had published his Apocalyptic Book, as it would seem, the Waldenses in their Noble Lesson had hinted that whereas the Antichrist was to come, “even then there were many Antichrists;” Antichrist being explained by them, not in its peculiar and proper meaning, but as opposers of Christ.<sup>1</sup> In 1207 we find the Waldensian Arnold asserting and defending in a public disputation at Carcassonne, the proposition that Rome was the Babylon and Harlot of the Apocalypse.<sup>2</sup> About A.D. 1250 Reinerius tells us that this representation of Papal Rome, and of the Pope being the head of all errors, was one of the Waldensian heresies:<sup>3</sup> and somewhat later,

As regards the *latter*, I believe there was nothing very new or remarkable in his Apocalyptic view.—In *Petrus Aureolus* I infer from Mr. C. M.’s notice of him, p. 349, that the *Saracens*, *Byzantine Emperors*, and *Turks*, figured prominently among the Church’s enemies, supposed to be Apocalyptically predicted.—But *Lyranus’* scheme was more peculiar. He explained the prophecy as continuously historical, (without break even at the 7th Trumpet’s sounding,) in reference to the history of Roman Christendom from the Apostolic æra to the time of the end. Thus the *Seals* run on to Diocletian’s time: the 6th Seal figuring the terrors of Diocletian’s persecution; the sealing vision, the saved Church’s conversions under Constantine. The *six Trumpets* are the voices of Councils, or Church, against the chief successive heretics, Arius, Macedonius, Pelagius, Eutyches, Valens, and those of A.D. 493 in Italy and Greece; the *Angel of Apoc. x.*, the emperor Justin interposing with his little book of decrees in favour of Catholic truth; the two witnesses, Pope Sylvester and the Bishop Mena, exiled or imprisoned for 3½ years (answering to the Apocalyptic 3½ days) by Justinian; \* the man-child of Apoc. xiii., Heraclius; the Beast of Apoc. xiii., Chosroes’ son wounded in conflict with Heraclius; the 144,000 of Apoc. xiv., monks and virgins to that number slain by the Saracens soon after Heraclius’ death; the Vials, acts of Roman Popes, or of princes sanctioned by them, against iconoclastic or Ghibelline emperors, heathen people, or false Popes, from Adrian’s iconoclastic bulls, A.D. 740, to Peter the Hermit and the 1st Crusade A.D. 1094. The 5th Vial Lyra construed of the emperor Otho’s vial of wrath on Pope John, thrust by Crescentius into the Papal see: so says Pareus, making *Papal Rome* the “seat of the Beast.”†—Further, Lyra expounded Daniel’s 45 days as 45 years. Malv. ii. 244.

<sup>1</sup> See my Vol. ii. pp. 370, 393.

<sup>2</sup> See *ibid.* 371.

<sup>3</sup> See my Vol. ii. p. 371.

\* The common explanation, says De Lyra, expounds the two witnesses as *Enoch* and *Elias*, the future witnesses against Antichrist; and that their bodies, after slaughter by Antichrist, will be “in medio civitatis magnæ; i. e. *Congregationis Antichristo adherentis*, quæ erit valdè magna.”

† The Babylon of Apoc. xvii., however, De Lyra explains, I think, to be the *Turkish* empire; the seven hills its seven chief provinces, and seven kings those provinces, ruling Pashas.



perhaps a century or more later, the whole theory is developed in their treatise on Antichrist.<sup>1</sup>

5. And then next, turning to another country, but to religionists of perhaps Valdensic origin,<sup>2</sup> and certainly on main points of Valdensic principles, we find the same mighty truth (for such I must beg permission to call it) proclaimed by *Wicliffe*,<sup>3</sup> and his *Wicliffite followers*. Among whom, A.D. 1391, *Walter Brute's* testimony stands so conspicuous, as detailed to us by the venerable Foxe from original documents,<sup>4</sup> written and registered on his being brought before the Bishop's Court at Hereford, that I think I cannot better conclude this Section than by a brief abstract of it, as exhibiting the *Wicliffite* Apocalyptic views.

It seems then that this *Walter Brute*, by nation a Briton or Welshman, who was "a layman and learned, and brought up in the University of Oxford, being there a graduate," was accused of saying, among sundry other things, that "the Pope is Antichrist, and a seducer of the people, and utterly against the law and life of Christ." Being called to answer, he put in first certain more brief "exhibits:"<sup>5</sup> then "another declaration of the same matter after a more ample tractation;"<sup>6</sup> explaining and setting forth from Scripture the grounds of his opinion. In either case his defence was grounded very mainly on the Apocalyptic prophecy. For he at once bases his justification on the fact, as demonstrable, of the *Pope* answering alike to the *chief of the false Christs* prophesied of by Christ, as to come in his name; to the *Man of Sin* prophesied of by St. Paul; and to both the *first Beast*, and *Beast with the two lamb-like horns*, in the Apocalypse: the *city of Papal Rome* answering also similarly to the Apocalyptic *Babylon*.

No doubt, he admits, this had been a mystery long hidden. But if so, and only recently revealed, it would not be unaccordant with

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.* p. 394.

<sup>2</sup> See my Vol. ii. p. 428.

<sup>3</sup> "Wiclif's days were passed in incessant warfare against 'this Master of the Emperor, this *Fellow of God*, this *Deity on earth*.' And whatever may at any period have been his respect for the Pope in the *ideal* perfection of his character.—of the *actual* Pope he scruples not to pronounce that he is 'potissimus Antichristus,' *the veriest Antichrist*." Le Bas, 333.

Among Wiclif's writings Le Bas mentions one *in Apocalypsin Joannis*. This I have not seen.

<sup>4</sup> Foxe, Vol. iii. pp. 131—188.

<sup>5</sup> *Ib.* 136.

<sup>6</sup> *Ib.* 139.

God's dealings and declarations.<sup>1</sup> "Make the heart of this people fat, that seeing they may not see, &c.," was said by Isaiah of a long permitted judicial blindness on the Jews; and again by Daniel, ch. xii., in one of the self-same visions that would now come into question, "*Seal up* the vision till the time of the end:" (let my reader mark this just application of that prophetic statement :) also, as to the revealer of them, Apoc. ii., "*He* hath the key of David, and openeth and no man shutteth:" and, with reference to the persons revealed to, Dan. ii. 30, "As for me, this secret is not revealed to me for any wisdom that I have;" and Luke x. 21, "Thou hast revealed them unto babes."—Nor was reason wanting why the revelation should be made *now*, in respect of *time*, said Walter Brute; and *here*, in the *British nation*.<sup>2</sup> 1. *Now*: because there are signs of *Christ's coming being near at hand*, "to reform his Church; and by the disclosing of Antichrist to call men again to the perfection of the gospel, from their heathenish rites, and ways of the Gentiles, by whom the Holy City was to be trampled for 42 months."<sup>3</sup> 2. *Here*, in Britain, as being by God's special favour the earliest *kingdom* converted to the Christian faith; viz. under King Lucius, when Eleutherius was Bishop of Rome:<sup>4</sup> and in effect the *very wilderness* (here begin Walter's special Apocalyptic interpretations) in which the Woman, the Church, (after by faith bringing forth Christ into the world, who was soon taken up to God and his throne,) did, on the Dragon or Devil's persecuting her, thus early take refuge: where too, when the Serpent, especially under Diocletian, sent waters of persecution after her to drown her, "the earth, i. e. the [British] *stableness of faith*,"<sup>5</sup> helped the Woman by supping up the water of tribulation;" and where subsequently, for the 1260 *days*, or, as was meant, 1260 *years* of the prophecy, (a period otherwise exprest by a time, times, and half a time,<sup>6</sup>) the true faith had ever since continued.

Then he passes to the great subject of *Antichrist*.—Very vain, he says, had been the usual and long-received ideas about Antichrist:<sup>7</sup>—ideas as of one that was to be born in Babylon of the tribe of Dan,

<sup>1</sup> Foxe, vol. iii. pp. 139, 140.    <sup>2</sup> *Ib.* p. 141.    <sup>3</sup> *Ib.* p. 142.    <sup>4</sup> About 180, A.D.

<sup>5</sup> Compare Tichonius' explanation, "*ore sanctæ terræ*," noted p. 333 *suprà*.

<sup>6</sup> His mode of identifying this with the 1260 days is curious. The *time* first mentioned is the greatest time that we speak of, i. e. 1000 years; the *times* next mentioned 100 years each, of which we have two here indicated, these together with the former making 1000 + 200 years; then the *half time* added being about 50 years. Foxe, 143.

<sup>7</sup> P. 144.

to circumcise himself, give himself out as the Messiah, or Christ, come for the Jews' salvation, and preach  $3\frac{1}{2}$  years where Christ preached; then in three ways to seduce the people of Christendom, viz. "with miracles, and gifts, and torments;"<sup>1</sup> and to fight with the two Witnesses, Enoch and Elijah, and kill them, and be himself finally slain by lightning. Vain too what was often added, as to Daniel's 1290 days, or  $3\frac{1}{2}$  times, of the abomination of desolation, having application to Antichrist's being worshipped for that number of days in God's temple; and then the 45 days additional of the 1335 signifying 45 days of repentance granted to such as should have worshipped Antichrist:<sup>2</sup>—also the explanation of the Beast with seven heads and ten horns; as meant of a yet future Antichrist. For all this, argues Walter, both Scripture and reason contravene. How is it likely that one avowedly of the tribe of Dan should propose himself, and be believed on both by Jews and Christians, as Christ, when it is notorious to both that Christ is of the tribe of Judah?<sup>3</sup> Or how again, when coming as a man of war and bloodshed: whereas the character of Christ's coming is foretold as one of peace, under which men should beat their swords into ploughshares and pruning-hooks?—Then he opens his own view of those prophecies. 1. That in Dan. xii. 11, which says that "from the time of the sacrifice being taken away, and the abomination of desolation set up, there shall be 1290 days," refers plainly to what was said before in Dan. ix. :—how that "after 70 weeks Christ should be slain, and the city and the sanctuary destroyed by a prince that should come; and that he would confirm the covenant with many for one week; and in the half week the sacrifice and offering should cease; and in the temple there should be an abomination of desolation: and even to the fulfilling up of all, and to the end, shall the desolation continue." For, as the 70 weeks after which Christ was to be slain meant *weeks of years*, not *days*, so, similarly, the 1290 *days* of the desolation meant 1290 *years*: and the prophecy had fulfilment in the fact of the Romans destroying Jerusalem; and, on its last desolation by Adrian, placing an idol, or abomination, in the holy place: a desolation which has ever since continued, now nearly about 1290 years; and which was to continue till the revealing, or in other words the exposure, of Antichrist.—

<sup>1</sup> So Adso, p. 370 *suprà*.<sup>2</sup> Compare T. Aquinas, p. 427 *suprà*.<sup>3</sup> How well and justly argued!

2ndly, in Apoc. xiii. the *first Beast* there figured in vision *with seven heads and ten horns*, which men explain of an imagined yet future Antichrist, meant rather the *Roman emperors*; who did much persecute the Lord's people, both Jews and Christians. For the *Woman* seen seated on this Beast afterwards was expounded by the angel to mean the city on seven hills, "which then reigned over the kings of the earth," i. e. *Rome*; "a city upholden by her cruel and beastly emperors:"—and its power was to continue 42 months, or 1260 *days*, i. e. 1260 *years*; a *day* being (as before) meant for a *year*: just as also the *ten days* of tribulation predicted to the Church of Smyrna signified the *ten years* of Diocletian's persecution; and the *5 months*, or 150 *days*, of the scorpion-locusts of Apoc. ix. the 150 *years* of the locust-like begging friars, from their first rise to their primary exposure by Armachauus.<sup>1</sup> And the prophecy was fulfilled in the duration of the Roman empire just 1200 *years*; from its commencement under Julius Cæsar, to the death of its last emperor, Frederic.<sup>2</sup>

But then "who is the Antichrist, lying privy in the hid Scriptures of the prophets?"—"I now pass on to the declaration of that conclusion," says Walter Brute; "bringing to light the things which lay hid in darkness. For what was said in the darkness let us say in the light; and what we have heard in the ear let us preach upon the house-tops." If then, proceeds he, the high Bishop of Rome, calling himself God's servant, and Christ's chief Vicar in this world, do make and justify many laws contrary to Jesus Christ, then must he be the chief of those false Christs foretold by Christ as to come in his name, and deceiving many. Now 1st, as to the fact of *the Popes calling themselves Christs*, it is evident: since Christ means *anointed*, a characteristic and appellation specially applied in Scripture to *kings* and *priests*; both of which the Popes claim to be, as both *high priests* and *chief kings*, invested authoritatively alike with the temporal and spiritual sword. Then 2ndly, as to *the difference of Christ's laws and the Pope's*, the first of Christ's laws is that of *love*; but the Pope wagethe war both against infidels and against Christians. And though it be alleged that miracles have been done by those who have preached

<sup>1</sup> i. e. Fitzralph, a great enemy to the Friars; in 1333 Chancellor of Oxford, in 1347 Bishop of Armagh.

<sup>2</sup> Here Walter Brute is less happy. His own theory of Antichrist required his application of this chronological period as the measure of *Papal Rome's* duration in power.



or engaged in such crusading wars, yet does not this justify them ; because “for no miracles may we do contrary to the doctrines of Christ.”<sup>1</sup> And, as to miracles, did not the Egyptian magicians perform them ? Is it not said by Christ that false prophets would rise, that would do them ? by Paul, that Satan was transformed into an angel of light ? by Christ again, that at the last day he would have to reject many saying to him, “We have prophesied in thy name, and in thy name done wonderful works ?” even as the second Apocalyptic Beast was said to do miracles ? The standard of truth must be God’s word. “Is not my word like fire, &c. ?”—Further, Christ’s second law might be said to be that of *forgiveness* and *mercy* : mercy to sinners. But here too how contrary the Pope’s and priests’ law : giving judicial sentence of death, and perhaps exciting crusading wars against heretics. In which last act there is a practical ante-dating of *times* too. For Christ said that here the tares were to grow with the wheat ; and the separation to be made by himself only at the time of the day of judgment.<sup>2</sup> Whereas the Pope would have the separation made by himself now ; so changing *times*, as well as *laws*.

Then next our confessor and prophetic expositor proceeds to argue against the Romish doctrines of the keys, auricular confession, transubstantiation, and a sacrificing priesthood.<sup>3</sup> And, after describing the universal and awful habit with all classes of the priesthood, of “selling prayers, pardons, &c.,” in direct contradiction to Christ’s charge, “Freely ye have received, freely give,” he breaks into the exclamation ;<sup>4</sup> “I would to God that all the buyers and sellers of spiritual suffrages would with the eyes of their heart behold the ruin of the great city Babylon, and that which they shall say after that fall. For doth not the prophet say, ‘And the merchants of the earth shall weep and mourn for her, because no man shall buy any more their merchandise ; crying, Alas ! that great city Babylon, because that in one hour she is become desolate ?’ ”—Then he expounds the second Beast as the Popes, with their assumed kingly and priestly power ; speaking like a dragon, and allowing none to sell their spiritual pardons, &c., but such as bore their mark ; interprets the Beast’s name, with the number 666, to be DVX CLERI ; and concludes<sup>5</sup> with another earnest word of warning from Apoc. xix. : “My counsel is, let the buyer be aware of those marks of the Beast ! For, after the fall

<sup>1</sup> 175.<sup>2</sup> 162.<sup>3</sup> 171, 171.  
28 \*<sup>4</sup> 183.<sup>5</sup> 185.

of Babylon, 'If any man hath worshipped the Beast and his image, and hath received the mark on his forehead or on his head, he shall drink of the wine of God's wrath, and be tormented with fire and brimstone in the sight of the holy angels and of the Lamb; and the smoke of their torments shall ascend evermore.' "

### § 5. THE ÆRA AND CENTURY OF THE REFORMATION.

At the Reformation the light which had previously gleamed here and there on the subject of Antichrist, and then been at length for a while all but extinguished, burst into a blaze; and the voice of the Waldenses, Wicliffites, and Hussites, protesting against the Popes as the Apocalyptic Beast, and Rome as the Apocalyptic Babylon, revived, after a temporary suspension, in power hitherto unparalleled. Vain was the authoritative prohibition of writing or preaching on the subject of Antichrist, by the 5th Council of Lateran.<sup>1</sup> There was an energy in the impression and the voice, as if derived not from books or earlier traditions, but from the Spirit's own teaching. Alike in Germany, Switzerland, France, Denmark, Sweden, England, it was received as an almost self-evident and fundamental truth by the founders of the several Protestant Churches: indeed as, in itself, a sufficient justification of the mighty act of their separation from Rome.<sup>2</sup> But the difficulty remained to adjust and explain certain *details* of the Apocalyptic prophecies respecting the Beast, Antichrist, and Babylon; as well as to offer a satisfactory and consistent solution of the many other mysteries of this prophetic Book. Nor was the difficulty slight; or one soon, or as yet fully, to be overcome.

It is my purpose in the present Section primarily, and at large, to set forth the Apocalyptic views in the 16th century of the *Fathers of the Protestant Reformation*; then very briefly, in conclusion, to sketch the views of Apocalyptic exposition with which, after long

<sup>1</sup> "Tempus quoque præfixum futurorum malorum, vel *Antichristi adventum*, aut certum diem judicii, prædicare vel asserere nequaquam præsumant." Harduin ix. 180S.—I have already quoted this in my Vol. ii. p. 84.

<sup>2</sup> "On this principle [viz. "that the *Man of Sin*, or *Antichrist*, could be no other than *the man that fills the Papal chair*"] "was the Reformation begun and carried on; on this the great separation from the Church of Rome conceived and perfected. For, though persecution for opinion would acquit those of schism whom the Church of Rome had driven from her communion, yet on the principle that she is *Antichrist's*, they had not only a right, but lay under the obligation of a command, to come out of the spiritual Babylon." Warburton's Works, p. 488.

reflection, the *Papal Doctors*, as that century drew to a close, thought best to meet the arguments so fearfully urged against them from the Apocalyptic Book.

### I. THE PROTESTANT FATHERS.

1. And on this head my illustrations of the history of Apocalyptic interpretation must commence of course with a brief sketch of the views of the great Father of the Reformation, *Luther*.—In my Vol. ii. ch. iv.,<sup>1</sup> I have described the time and the manner in which the idea of the Popes being the Antichrist broke upon his mind; and also in the chapter v., next following,<sup>2</sup> how it was primarily from *Daniel's* prophecies respecting the little horn and the abomination of desolation, that he drew this his conclusion. It was also there intimated that in 1522, at the time of concluding the translation of the New Testament, he had come to doubt of the genuineness of the Apocalypse as an Apostolic or inspired Book.<sup>3</sup> But it would seem from a Latin Treatise of his, now in my hands, “*De Antichristo*,” dated by himself at its ending, Wittenberg, April 1, 1521,<sup>4</sup> (the very day, I believe, before his setting out for Worms,<sup>5</sup>) that the doubt had not *then* fixed itself in his mind: for he not only alludes in more than one place to the Apocalypse,<sup>6</sup> as an inspired prophetic book, but interprets the prophecy of the scorpion-locusts in Apoc. ix. in considerable detail. And other evidence appears to the same effect in the writings of the year 1520 just preceding.<sup>7</sup> A few years later, viz. in 1528, he is stated to have found and republished an Apocalyptic Commentary, expounding the Beast to mean the Popedom; written some hundred years,<sup>8</sup> or rather, as Pareus shows, some 150 years before Luther's time:<sup>9</sup> an evidence of his inclining then again, as at first, to view the Apocalypse as inspired Scripture. Finally, in

<sup>1</sup> Pp. 117 et seq.

<sup>2</sup> Pp. 135 et seq.

<sup>3</sup> *Ib.* p. 135 Note 1.

<sup>4</sup> “Vale in Christo, mi Vincilae! Vvittenbergæ, Anno MDXXI., prima Aprilis.”

<sup>5</sup> So Merle d'Aubigné.

<sup>6</sup> “In nobis impleri oportet quæ Daniel, Christus, Petrus, Paulus, Judas, *Joannes* in *Apocalypsi*, prædixerunt.” E. (The original Edition before me so distinguishes its pages by the letters of the alphabet, four pages to each letter.)

<sup>7</sup> He argues from the Apocalypse in his answer to the Pope's Bull, dated Dec. 1520. See Foxe v. 675, Waddington i. 288.

<sup>8</sup> Such is the general statement.

<sup>9</sup> “The Author disputing on Apoc. xx. touching the 1000 years, testifies that he wrote A.D. 1357; which, saith he, is our present date.” So Pareus, p. 12, English Translation. (Amsterdam, 1644.)—It seems from him that it contains the same Prophecy which Lyra in his *Postill* had noted, and which is prefixed also to Joachim Abbas' Treatise; in which latter it is ascribed to Gilbert of the xiith century.

1534, he prefixed to the Apocalypse in his great Edition of the German Bible a brief explanatory sketch : from which, and from certain notices found elsewhere in his writings,<sup>1</sup> I may give what follows as in the main his views on the subject.

Like most of his predecessors, he judged that the Book must be more or less a prefiguration of the chief events and æras of Church History : the *Seals* chiefly prefiguring the *physical* or *political* evils under which the Church and world connected with it was to suffer, the *Trumpets* the *spiritual* ; and either septenary running on from the commencement of the Christian æra to the consummation.—Thus in the *Seals*, the 1st, or *white horse* and *rider*, indicated (as in Zech. i. 6) the persecutions of tyrants ; the 2nd, or *red horse*, wars and bloodshed ; the 3rd, or *black horse*, famine ; the 4th, or *pale horse*, pestilence and mortality : all to have fulfilment, from time to time, to the last day :—the 5th Seal figuring martyrdoms of the saints, early begun, and ever and anon repeated, even to the end ; the 6th, great political revolutions ; and its sealing and palm-bearing visions, the preservation and ultimate salvation of the saints. The 7th Seal's half-hour's silence he does not explain.—Of the *Trumpets* he makes the 1st to figure the heretic Tatian and his Eneerates, enjoining righteousness by human works of merit, so as did afterwards the Pelagians ; the 2nd, Marcion, and the Manichees and Montanists, exalting their fancies above Scripture ; (so as of late Munzer and his Anabaptists ;) the 3rd, Origen and the false philosophy, revived in our own high schools ; the 4th, Novatus and the Donatists, denying repentance to the lapsed ;<sup>2</sup> the 5th, Arius and the Arians ;<sup>3</sup> the 6th, Mahomet and the Saracens : contemporary with whom was the Woe of the *Papacy* : depicted alike in Apoc. x., xi., and xiii.

And here, on Apoc. x., xi., is the most curious particular explanation in Luther's Commentary. Deeply impressed with the Pope's and Papacy's mock show of Christ and Christianity, and with an impression also, probably, even then, of the resemblance of those *seven*

<sup>1</sup> Where not otherwise stated, the interpretation given will be found in Luther's Preface, or marginal explanatory Notes to the Apocalypse, in his German Bible.

<sup>2</sup> "Among these four," says Luther, "nearly all our clergy may be classed."

<sup>3</sup> So in Luther's Preface to the Apocalypse. In his earlier Treatise "*De Antichristo*," spoken of a little before, he explains the locusts to mean the *Romish Schoolmen*, "*Scotists, Thomists, and Modernists* ;" who, headed by Aristotle, introduced the dogmas of freewill, merits, and the efficacy of good works for salvation. The star that fell from heaven, and opened the pit whence the locusts emerged, he makes to be Alexander de Hales, or Thomas Aquinas himself. G. ii.



*thunders*, which sounded in sequence to the rainbow-crowned Angel's cry, to the *Papal mandates and thunders*,<sup>1</sup> he was led to explain the whole vision, including the Angel himself, of the Popes and Popedom. "The mighty Angel," he says, "with a rainbow and a little bitter book, is Popery;" Popery in the speciousness of its spiritual forms and pretensions. So the Popes, he thinks, are figured as a mock Christ on the scene of vision; the opened book being that of Papal laws, given the Evangelist to eat, as representative of the Church visible; the lion-like voice and *seven thunders*, the great swelling words and thunders of the Popedom.—Moreover, it is the Popes that are still symbolized<sup>2</sup> at the commencement of Apoc. xi. as measuring the temple, or Church, with their laws and regulations; casting out the court without; (in the sense, I presume, of anti-papal heretics;) and establishing a mere formal kind of Church, with outward show of holiness.—The subject having to be renewed and more fully developed in the vision of the *two Beasts*, Apoc. xiii., Luther speaks of the interposition, for the comfort of God's people, of two intermediate and very different visions: viz. 1st, of the *two Witness-preachers*, signifying a succession of faithful witnesses kept up for Christ; 2ndly, of the *Woman with child*, meant of Christ's true Church, and God's provision for her, during the Beast's reign, in the

<sup>1</sup> A remarkable explanation of the *seven thunders*; and which I have already cited in my Vol. ii. p. 122. "Great was the tyranny of the Pontiff: who, without law, to gratify his own arrogance, has ever lightened and thundered with ample puffed-out cheeks. It was all in vain for a man to give credence to the four Gospels, if he did not receive the Decretals of the Romish Church. These are the great swelling and loud-trumpeted words of which St. Peter speaks: these the *seven thunders* of Papal intimidation in Apoc. x."—The fact of Luther's having so explained the symbol, was of course the more interesting to me, when brought to my knowledge, from the circumstance of my having long previously arrived at the same understanding of it; though with quite a different view of the context from that which Luther took; and without an idea that such a view had been taken of the symbol by any previous expositor. The citation is given by the Rev. C. Smith from Luther's *Treatise on the Keys*, and also from the *Frankfort Edition* of his *Tischreden*, or *Table Talk*. In my *English Editions* of the *Tischreden* it does not appear.

The *Table Talk* exhibits Luther's views generally as expressed in later life. That he had some such idea however of the Apocalyptic symbol here referred to when he wrote the "De Antichristo" in 1521, seems to me probable from his so explaining the *seven trumpet-angels'* voices,\* as well as for other reasons.

<sup>2</sup> So the *Tischreden*, or *Table Talk*.

\* Illud angelorum genus quod tubâ canit, quorum sunt *septem* Apoc. viii., non nisi Romano Episcopo convenire potest. Tubâ enim canere e textis consequentiâ, et effectibus secutis, aliud esse non potest quàm Decreta condere, id quod nullus præter Romanæ ecclesiæ Episcopus sibi unquam arrogavit." So page G. ii; just after speaking of the Pope's "*larcalem faciem.*"

wilderness.—In Apoc. xiii., Luther explains the *first Beast* to mean the Papistic secular revived Roman empire, the *second Beast* the Pope's ecclesiastical or spiritual empire: Popery now ruling by the sword, as before by the book; and constituting the third and last Woe, proclaimed by the seventh Angel. Of the *seven heads* of the Beast the five that have fallen are, he says, those in Greek Christendom; the sixth, "which *is*," that of Papal Germany: (the head wounded to death, or old Roman empire, having been thus revived:) the seventh, or "that which *is to come*," he considers to be Spain; the eighth, ("which is of the seven,") Rome or Italy. The *ten horns* are Hungary, Bohemia, Poland, France, England, &c.; which, though Popery's profest defenders, are sometimes to attack and desolate it. The *Beast's* image is the new empire, which is but the shadow of the old.<sup>1</sup>—The *number of the Beast*, 666, Luther explains to signify the number of years that the Beast may be destined to endure; measured, he says in his Table Talk, from Gregory, or perhaps Phocas.<sup>2</sup>—The *seven Vial-Angels* he interprets of the gospel-preachers of the latter days: the *seat of the Beast* being thereby darkened; and the *Euphratean drying up*, under the sixth Vial, also figuring the exhaustion of the wealth and power of Papal Rome, the modern Babylon: while the three frog-like spirits depicted Papal sophists, like Faber, Eck, and Emser, stirring up opposition to the Gospel.—Finally, the *millennium* is the 1000 years between St. John and the issuing forth of the Turks: (these latter being the antitype to the Apocalyptic Gog and Magog;) Satan's incarceration and binding meaning only that Christianity and Christians will, during that whole period, subsist in spite of him.—I may add that he in various places notes his view of the predicted *Antichrist* as one that should be an ecclesiastical person. So in his "De Antichristo;"<sup>3</sup> saying, "The *Turk* cannot be Antichrist, because he is not *in the Church of God*." And again, "Who ever so came *in Christ's name* as did the Pope?"<sup>4</sup>

On the whole it will be seen that Luther did not advance far towards the solution of Apocalyptic mysteries. His explanation of Apoc. x.—xi. 2, seems to me the most observable of what is peculiar to him; and that of the two Beasts of Apoc. xiii., as signifying respectively the secular Roman Empire and the ecclesiastical. Of these opinions, the former, about the rainbow-crowned angel and the

<sup>1</sup> So Eberhard, p. 429 *suprà*.

<sup>2</sup> Table Talk, ii. 12. (English Trans.)

<sup>3</sup> P. 10, Smith's Translation.

<sup>4</sup> *Ib.* p. 41.

seven thunders, was never, I believe, adopted by any other expositor of note: <sup>1</sup> the other has had its advocates and followers even to the present day.<sup>2</sup>

2. It will have been observed that Luther does not enter on the question of the meaning of the several *Apocalyptic periods*; more especially the  $3\frac{1}{2}$  times, 42 months, and 1260 days.<sup>3</sup>—But it was quite impossible that Apocalyptic interpretation could go on without that question being considered, and concluded on. Accordingly we find that, almost immediately after Luther's publication of his Bible, it was discussed by the chief Protestant prophetic expositors that followed; and in most cases the *year-day* principle applied to explain them. In my chapter on the year-day question, Vol. iii. p. 284, I have illustrated the somewhat curious ground on which they fancied that this view might be partly based, from *Osiander's* Book entitled "*Conjecturæ de Ultimis Temporibus, ac de Fine Mundi*:" a Book first published at Nuremberg, A.D. 1544, and dedicated to Albert, Marquis of Brandenburg and Prussia. "Sunt duo genera *annorum magnorum* in sacris litteris; unum *Angelicum*, alterum *Mosaicum*. Annus Angelicus constat ex tot annis civilibus nostris ex quot diebus nostris constat annus noster civilis. Nobis enim qui cælo inclusi sumus cursus solis ab occidente ad orientem, et rursus ab oriente ad occidentem, diem absolvit; id quod fit spatio 24 horarum. Angelis autem, qui extrà et suprâ globos æthereos versantur, dies est quem sol in zodiaco ab austro in aquilonem, et ab aquilone rursus in austrum, circumvolvendo conficit." So that to an Angel's view (as outside, I suppose, of our solar system) the only mundane revolution observable would be the annual; and consequently our *year* be to them a *solar day*.<sup>4</sup>—*Aretius* of Berne, who taught theology with much

<sup>1</sup> i. e. till my own unconscious adoption of that part which regards *the seven thunders*. <sup>2</sup> A practical improvement of the whole subject ends Luther's Comment.

<sup>3</sup> Mr. C. Maitland, p. 434, says "that Luther allowed the possibility of 1290 years from A.D. 38 to 1328." He does not give reference or authority; and I have not observed it in the few writings of Luther that I have myself read. But supposing this correct, then Luther may be numbered as among those to whom the application of the *year-day* principle to the great prophetic periods suggested itself, as possibly the true one.

<sup>4</sup> *Osiander* adds that it was of *angelic days* that Christ spake when he sent word to Herod, "Behold, *to-day and to-morrow* I cast out devils, and on *the third day* I shall be perfected." For this, says he, can in no way be explained of natural days; but must be referred to the *three years* in which Christ preached and did miracles, till his crucifixion. He adds, that the angels in Daniel xii. call this *their year* by the same term that we call ours; viz. Hebraicè *בִּינְיָר*.

reputation at Marburg, and died A.D. 1574, urged the same explanation a little after Osiander:<sup>1</sup> and so too *Chytræus*, in his Apocalyptic Exposition published in 1571, of which more presently. And, advanced so far as they now were in the Christian æra, it became a primary element with all such expositors, in calculations of the probabilities of the future, to consider what the probable *commencing date* of these same fateful prophetic periods: as the lapse of 1260 years from it might be supposed to fix the epoch of the consummation; except, indeed, in so far as the Lord might in mercy shorten the days. By help of the last consideration the earliest Reformers, German, Swiss, and English, even though taking the *year-day* view, might yet hope for a speedy consummation to the world; as I have already shown in my Part iii. Chap. v.<sup>2</sup> Others looked to an epoch further forward, as supposable. Said Aretius; “We may reckon Antichrist’s beginning from Constantine’s establishment of Christianity, A.D. 312; 1260 years from which end in 1572.”—Said Chytræus; “If numbered from A.D. 412, when Alaric took Rome, and overthrew its empire, the end will be in 1672: or, if from the time of Phocas, A.D. 606, when the Pope’s supremacy began, (I beg the reader’s attention to this,) then the end may be expected A.D. 1866.”<sup>3</sup>—Other Protestant Expositors however of this æra construed the prophetic periods less definitely.

3. Reverting to the more general subject of Apocalyptic interpretation, I shall select *Bullinger* and *Bale*, as two of the more eminent and characteristic of the Apocalyptic Expositors of the *middle* of the period under review, in German Switzerland and England respectively.<sup>4</sup>

*Bullinger’s* work, which is in Latin, is made up of the Conciones delivered by him at Zurich; and dedicated, as a book well fitted to furnish them with consolation, to all the exiles from France, England, Italy, and other kingdoms, taking refuge in Germany and Switzerland. The date of the Preface is Jan. 1557: a date during

<sup>1</sup> So Foxe reports of Aretius: “Vaticinium hoc (de Testibus) non de communibus, sed de angelicis mensibus et diebus, interpretatur.”

<sup>2</sup> Vol. ii. pp. 137—145.

<sup>3</sup> How this epoch of Phocas’ Decree was referred to by others of the Reformers has been noted already, Vol. iii. p. 302.

<sup>4</sup> For a brief notice of *Leo Juda*, another contemporary Protestant expositor, see my Vol. ii. p. 141.



the reign of our Popish Queen Mary ; which explains those terms in the dedication, and adds to the Book's interest.<sup>1</sup> The following are in brief the heads of his exposition.

Of the *Seals* he makes the *first* to signify the triumphant progress of the Gospel, even under suffering, whether from Pagan or Papal powers, from its beginning to the end :—the *second*, wars, including alike the Roman civil contests, the Gothic and Saracenic desolations, the *Bellum Sacrum* begun in the xith century, and then the Turkish Othman wars :—the *third*, scarcities, inflicted from time to time, from that mentioned in the Acts under Claudius the Roman emperor, even till now ; e. g. that in 1529 :—the *fourth*, pestilence, as under Decius, Justinian, Gregory, &c. &c. :—the *fifth*, martyrdoms of the saints, begun by the Roman Pagan emperors, continued by the Arians, and then for above 500 years by Antichrist, even until now, and which must be expected till the completion of the elect :—the *sixth*, “*corruptela doctrinæ sanæ in ecclesiâ,*” from the heresies of Valentinus down to those of Mahomet and the Papal Antichrist : heresies whereby men's minds had been agitated, the Sun of righteousness been obscured, the doctors of the Church fallen, like falling stars, by apostasy, and the heaven of Christ's true Church been withdrawn.<sup>2</sup>—In the *Sealing Vision* there was figured the hindrance of the breathing of God's Spirit in gospel-preachings and Bible-reading ; a hindrance enacted by Pagan Roman emperors first, then by Popes : while the sealing itself told of the multitudes saved all along, even in Papal Anti-Christendom ;<sup>3</sup> and the palm-bearing, of the saints' ultimate blessedness in heaven.

<sup>1</sup> “*Ad omnes per Germaniam et Helvetiam Galliæ Angliæ Italiæ aliorumque regnorum vel nationum Christi nomine exules, atque adeo ad universos ubique fideles, Christi Domini Judicisque adventum expectantes.*” The reader will I think feel with me the interest of this touching dedication. The last clause, in italics, is a further illustration of my view of the Angel's oath made before St. John, Apoc. x. 5—7. (My Edition of Bullinger is that of Basle 1557.)

<sup>2</sup> The *true Church* contradistinctively to the *Roman*.—In reference to a different view of this Seal, as figuring the *last judgments*, he observes that while not objecting to it, yet in the immediate sequel (*viz.* in the sealing vision) some of the Apocalyptic details were such as to make the application inadmissible.

<sup>3</sup> “*Etiam in Anti-Christianismo.*” This is stated broadly and strongly, p. 99.

As to the *Jews' restoration*, which was urged by some from this figuration of the sealing of the tribes of Israel, he says, *ibid.* ; We must take care lest we fall into *chiliasm*, so as Papias, Irenæus, &c. He adds : “*I believe that the predicted restoration of the Jews is threefold : 1. historical and national, as begun by Cyrus, and continued to the Maccabees ; 2. spiritual, of the election (chiefly Gentile election, adopted into the true Israel) from Christ even to Antichrist's destruction ; 3. that which “incipiat*

Proceeding to the *Trumpets*, (the *silence in heaven* having been explained simply of the waiting on God's revelations in admiration, and the *Incense-Angel* as Christ the intercessor, the great remedial object in all the heresies and troubles about to be noted under the Trumpets,) he thus expounds them; premising that the use of trumpets in Israel was for convoking assemblies, moving the camp, and war.—The 1st was the Trumpet of alarm, as sounded by the apostles and early Christians, against *Judaizers* and *pseudo-Christian philosophers*: the 2nd, that against Valentinus, the Manichees, and Montanists:—3. against the star fallen from heaven, or Arius:—4. against Pelagius and Pelagianism:—5. against the first Woe, Popery: Gregory the Great's successor, Boniface, having, under Phocas, opened the pit of the abyss, with his Papal keys, by becoming Universal Bishop: the locusts figuring the Papal clergy, the king of the locusts the Pope; the time mentioned (five months) having reference to that brief duration of the natural locusts; and indicating that the time of the plagues figured was defined and limited by God. In Trumpet 6, the *second Woe*, or Mahommedan Saracens and Turks, was figured with reference to their course of universal desolation: <sup>1</sup> the Euphrates being taken literally; and the four angels loosed explained as Arabs, Saracens, Turks, Tartars; the previous four great Euphratean powers of Assyrians, Babylonians, Medes, Persians, having had their power long bound.

After a curious interpretation of "*the rest of men non-repenting*," in Apoc. ix. 20, as if meaning people, both nationally and individually, that were *spiritually* killed neither by the Papal nor Mahommedan plague, i.e. who, though neither Mahommedans nor Pagans, had yet not given themselves to God,<sup>2</sup> and must consequently not expect to escape God's judgment, Bullinger proceeds to Apoc. x., xi., a part relating (as I believe in common with him and other Reformers) to his own times; and which he appears to me to have explained better

à restituto evangelio, et extremo judicio, et progrediatur usque in secula seculorum." Which last is to be the most absolute restoration: and is the same that was meant by Peter in Acts iii. 19—21, speaking of the restitution of all things; and by Christ when he said, "Then lift up your heads, for your redemption draweth nigh." A passage very observable.

<sup>1</sup> He quotes Nicephorus; *Τότε οἱ Σαρακηνοὶ ἠρξάντο τῆς τοῦ παντός ἐρημώσεως.* p. 120.

<sup>2</sup> "Colligimus ex his non sufficere ad vitam piam et beatam ne quis sit Papista aut Mahumedicus, &c." p. 123. He explains the various sins specified in their spiritual fulness, as against the first or second code.

than all else in his Commentary. The *Angel-vision* in Apoc. x. he explains of Christ's intervention through the Reformers,<sup>1</sup> against the Papal Antichrist and Mahommedans; the antithesis between Christ, as here figured, and the Papal Antichrist, being drawn out in detail. The book opened is the Gospel, opened to men by gospel-preachers, and with the aid of printing, in spite of the Pope: the seven thunders, the gospel-preaching by Christ's faithful servants, as by men with the spirit of those two apostles who were called sons of thunder; the sealing them being meant in the sense of *authentication* to the good, and that of *being hidden* to the wicked: the oath (one deeply to be noted<sup>2</sup>) alluding to the 3½ times of Dan. xii.; and showing to Christians at that time living that their redemption, as to be effected at Christ's coming and the resurrection, was even then drawing nigh: the charge, "Thou must prophesy again," meant of preachers of St. John's spirit and doctrine against Antichrist and Mahommedanism in the last times;<sup>3</sup> and showing (I beg attention to this, as a point in which I now first see that Bullinger anticipated me) that God's own legitimate commission attached to the ministers of the reformed Protestant Churches, although not ordained by bishops.<sup>4</sup> He notes how by translation of the SS into German, Spanish, French, Italian, English, besides sundry Eastern languages, John's doctrine might be said to be preached by faithful ministers over a large part of the world. This is the case even now; says he: "Hodiè ista et audimus et videmus."<sup>5</sup> Finally, "the court *within*"<sup>6</sup> cast out, he takes to be the Roman Pontifex and Pontificii, "excommunicated *by God*;" but does not apparently follow up his own principles by explaining it, in the manner I have done, of the excommunication as acted out *by the Doctors of the Reformation*.<sup>7</sup>

So Bullinger comes to the *Witnesses*.—The number *two* indicated these Witnesses for Christ to be but few, yet sufficient. The 1260 days of their witnessing in sackcloth, and of the Gentiles treading the Holy

<sup>1</sup> As beginning however before Luther.

<sup>2</sup> "Est enim res maximi momenti, consolatione plenissima, omnibusque omnino salutaris et necessaria hominibus." p. 129. See my Vol. ii. p. 142. Another passage to the same effect occurs a little before in Bullinger, on his p. 126, ad init.

<sup>3</sup> John bearing here a *symbolic* or *representative* character. So, Bullinger says, the Gloss and T. Aquinas: the latter thus; "In ipso Joanne intelliguntur alii prædicatores, quos Dominus ad tempus Antiehristi vult instanter prædicare." p. 133. So also others.

<sup>4</sup> p. 134.

<sup>5</sup> pp. 135, 136.

<sup>6</sup> Bullinger takes first the reading *εσωθεν*; but refers to *εξωθεν* also.

<sup>7</sup> p. 137.

City, are an uncertain, yet, in God's purpose, definite time. For above 700 years we know that there have existed such, who opposed themselves to Papal abominations.—The statement, "When they shall have completed their testimony the Beast shall kill them," he applies individually; in the sense that none shall be cut off till they have done their appointed work. The great city of their slaughter is the empire of Papal Rome, spread over the world: analogously with the fact of their Lord's place of crucifixion having been within the old Roman Pagan empire:—the Papists' prefigured joy at Christ's Witnesses' death being ever notorious; and just recently illustrated from the rejoicings of the Romanists, even then when Bullinger wrote, at the news of Queen Mary's persecutions of the Protestants in England:<sup>1</sup> the  $3\frac{1}{2}$  days of their lying dead, the short time before their revival in others; so as Huss and Jerome, for example, killed at Constance, were quickly revived first in the Bohemians, then in Laurentius Valla, Savanarola, Luther.<sup>2</sup> The Witnesses' ascent to heaven he makes that of their departed spirits entering Paradise; and the falling of the tenth of the city, and killing of the 7000, to mean the mighty defections already begun from the Papal Church and empire. He notes too the taking and sack of Rome itself in 1527, by the Constable Bourbon.<sup>3</sup>—On the 7th Trumpet he says, "It must come soon: therefore our redemption draweth nigh."

Passing on to Apoc. xii., Bullinger explains the *travailing Woman*, like most of his predecessors, of the Church;<sup>4</sup> the triumph and ascent of Christ's members being assured and involved in that of Christ himself: who is here figured not merely as the Child caught up to God's throne, but also as Michael the Church's protecting Angel. But he gives a new interpretation to the Woman's *flight into the wilderness*; as meaning that of the Church from *Judæa and the Jews*, (who of old constituted God's enclosed vineyard,) to *the Gentiles*.<sup>5</sup> The  $3\frac{1}{2}$  times are expounded *generally*, as before. And so too, in a general sense, the Dragon's seven heads and ten horns; as indicating that the Devil "præfuit omnium seculorum monarchis impiis, et omnium cornuum vel regnorum sanguinolentorum præsulor fuit."<sup>6</sup>—Then, in Apoc. xiii., the *first Beast* is rather remarkably made by him the *old Pagan Roman empire*; remarkably, I mean, for Bullinger,

<sup>1</sup> p. 146.<sup>2</sup> p. 148.<sup>3</sup> p. 149.<sup>4</sup> The Church "of all times." p. 156. He hints an allusion also to the Virgin Mary, in the passage on the child-bearing.<sup>5</sup> p. 158. Compare W. Brute, p. 432 *suprà*.<sup>6</sup> p. 157.



a *Protestant*. (As offered by Papal expositors, e. g. Bossuet, the explanation was quite natural.) The seven heads had allusion to Rome's seven hills: and also to seven of its kings; whether the seven earliest kings, or the seven Julian Emperors, ending with Nero: in whom (sc. Nero) the Beast suffered a *deadly wound*; which however was healed by Vespasian.<sup>1</sup> The ten horns might indicate that Rome's empire was then made up of many kingdoms, or perhaps that it at last was to be dissolved into many: viz. under the desolation of the Goth and Vandal invaders of the 5th century; as it was said in the prophecy, "He that killeth with the sword shall be killed with the sword," &c.<sup>2</sup>

The *second Beast* is explained to be the Papal Antichrist, (being the same as Daniel's *little horn* and St. Paul's *Man of Sin*,) rising up under Gregory I, and his successor Boniface, to be Universal Bishop, soon after Totilas' utter destruction of old Rome; just as this *second Beast* was seen to rise *after* the *first*. The Beast's two lamb-like horns indicated his claims to both *sacerdotal* and *royal* supremacy, in heaven too and on earth: agreeably with which the Pope has the two swords, and Boniface VIII, at the first Jubilee, A.D. 1300, appeared one day in the pontifical habit, another in the imperial purple. Bullinger draws out here a contrast of this Antichrist and Christ: and notes his changing times as well as laws; substituting his feriæ for Christ's sabbaths, his traditions for Christ's written Scripture. In short, one must be blinder than Tiresias, he says, not to see in the Popes the great predicted Antichrist.<sup>3</sup>—The *image of the Beast* is the *new Roman or Western Secular Empire*: which is, indeed, says he, but the *shadow* of the old one.<sup>4</sup> The explanation of the second Beast's giving breath to the image is, on this hypothesis, obvious. Unless the Pope confirm the new emperor's election, his election is invalid; and in the ceremony of his confirmation he has to take an oath of allegiance to the Pope. So is the emperor in a manner the Pope's creature; and in case of Councils alike, general or national, (so Bullinger all but touches on what I believe the true explanation,) the Council "Papæ spiritu regitur."<sup>5</sup>—But already he has had to meet difficulties from his explanation of the first Beast.

<sup>1</sup> p. 166.<sup>2</sup> pp. 171, 172.<sup>3</sup> p. 174.<sup>4</sup> Very much as Luther. See p. 410 *suprà*. Compare too Hippolytus, p. 285 *suprà*.<sup>5</sup> p. 181.

The second was to exercise all his power *ενωπιον*, *before*, or *in presence of*, the first. How does Bullinger get over the difficulty? He refers to Aretas, saying, that it might be in the sense of *following* and *imitating*.<sup>1</sup> I need not say how incorrectly. Again, it was to make the earth adore the first Beast. How so? By making men regard *the Roman empire*, says Bullinger, as something divine. Further, the miracles of the second Beast, said to be done *in sight of the Beast*, meant in sight of the *first Beast's image*, or *ghost*. And his causing that all who adored not the Beast should be killed, was meant of not adoring the decrees (the *Conciliar* decrees) of the *new Roman empire*, as inspired by the Pope. On the name and number he prefers Irenæus' solution of *Λαρευος*: dwelling on the *Latinism* of the Papacy, much like Dr. More afterwards.<sup>2</sup>

Proceeding onward through the next three chapters, it may suffice to observe that he interprets the Angel with the everlasting Gospel in Apoc. xiv., and also the two Angels following him, of gospel-preachers then in existence; the invention of printing aiding their progress:<sup>3</sup>—that the *Vials* of Apoc. xvi. are explained as the closing judicial plagues on the Papal Egypt: the 1st being the “*posca Gallica*,” which first broke out, he says, A.D. 1494, in the Neapolitan war between French and Spaniards, and was rife especially in the Romish convents;<sup>4</sup> the 2nd, pestilences generally; the 3rd, Popes and Papal princes, stirring up bloody wars in which themselves were slain; the 4th (on the sun), heat and drought; the 5th (that on the Beast's seat), the darkening of Rome's majesty through the progress of the Reformation; the 6th, on the Euphrates, the drying up of the resources and powers of the Papal Babylon; while the three frogs consequent thereon were the Papal legates *e latere*, issuing forth to the kings of the earth, (and so, like the frogs of Egypt, even in king's houses,) to stir them up to war against Christ's gospel-ministers. The 7th, or Vial on the air, meant elemental convulsions, like those predicted by Christ, Matt. xxiv., as to precede his coming: and the three parts into which the great city would fall in consequence, those of true Christians, Papists, and “*neutrals*.”—Further, on Apoc. xvii.,

<sup>1</sup> p. 175.

<sup>2</sup> See my Vol. iii. p. 253.—On the number 666 Bullinger further intimates a chronological solution. It was about 666 years from the revelation of the Apocalypse to Pepin's endowment of the Papal See. p. 193.—Under the witnesses he says; How long the duration of the Pope is to be from the fated 666 God only knows

<sup>3</sup> p. 199.

<sup>4</sup> p. 215. Compare my solution Vol. iii. pp. 358, 363, 374.

feeling the difficulty of his original solution of the first Beast as the *old Roman empire*, he speaks of the Apocalypse as here conjoining in the figured Beast, whereon the Woman sate, both the *Beast and Beast's image, old and new Rome*, the empire and the Papacy.<sup>1</sup> The "*was and is not*" he thus explains. The old empire *was* from Julius to Nero, in the Julian Cæsars; then, after a while, became great again under Trajan.<sup>2</sup> The "*five heads that have fallen*," were the five emperors that had followed after the deadly wound under Nero; viz. Galba, Otho, Vitellius, Vespasian, Titus: the one "*that is*," Domitian; the 7th, that was to last but a short time, Nerva; (so does Bullinger unconsciously fall in with Victorinus;) the 8th, Trajan: which last might be called *of the seven*, as having been adopted by Nerva.<sup>3</sup>—The statement that the ten kings received power *at one hour with the Beast*, he makes to have reference to the *second* Beast, or Popes, not the *first*; (so again showing, indeed now confessing, the difficulty from his solution of the first Beast;) these being the ten horns, among which the Papacy was as the dominant little horn; also, while explaining the ten kings desolating Rome primarily of old Rome's desolation in the days of the Goths and Vandals, he suggests (after Luther) that there may not improbably be a second and future sense, as well as the primary one; and that these kings may be ultimately instruments for *desolating* Papal Rome too, though none but Christ will *destroy* it.—Finally, the *bridal* in Apoc. xix. Bullinger makes to coincide with the saints' resurrection;<sup>5</sup> the vision of *Christ and his army on white horses* to symbolize the last judgment; the *Beast* then taken with the *False Prophet* to be the *Papal Roman Empire*:<sup>6</sup> (mark again this necessary inconsistency resulting from his former explanation of the seven-headed Beast:)—also the *millennium* to be the 1000 years either from Christ's ascension to A.D. 1034, when under the pontificate of Benedict IX Satan seemed loosed to deceive the nations; or from A.D. 60, when Paul speaks of the Gospel having been preached over the whole world, to the pontificate of Nicholas II, A.D. 1060; or from A.D. 73, the date of the destruction of Jerusa-

<sup>1</sup> "Conjungit Bestiam et imaginem Bestiæ, Bestiam et insidentem Bestiæ, superbum scortum, ut dirimere non liceat. De utroque ergo imperio locus est exponendus." p. 225.

<sup>2</sup> Or perhaps, he says, (we must mark this his aliter,) it *was* as the old Roman empire; and "*is not, and yet is*," as the new western empire, which is of the old but the shadow and image.

<sup>3</sup> p. 230.

<sup>4</sup> p. 231.

<sup>5</sup> p. 252.

<sup>6</sup> p. 261.

lem, to the pontificate of Gregory VII, A.D. 1073. At the same time he objects not, he says, if any prefer to follow the *chiliasm* of Papias.<sup>1</sup>—The *Gog and Magog* loosed he of course interprets of the Turks: makes the *first resurrection* to be that from sin, the *second* that from the grave: and in the figured *new heaven and earth* recognizes the renovation of this our world.<sup>2</sup>

*Bale*, Bishop of Ossory under Edward VI, and twice an exile from England, viz. in 1540 under Henry VIII, and in 1553 under Mary,<sup>3</sup> next calls for our notice.—He published his Apocalyptic Commentary, under the significant title “*Image of both Churches,*” i. e. of the true and the false, shortly, as it would seem, before Bullinger’s.<sup>4</sup> It consists of three Parts, published at three different times, and paged as separate volumes: the first with frequent marginal references to previous authors, of the incorrect printing of which he complains grievously;<sup>5</sup> the other two, in consequence, without. His first Preface gives a very copious list of Apocalyptic expositors, from the earliest period; which I think it may be well to abstract below.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> p. 265.

<sup>2</sup> pp. 280, 282.

<sup>3</sup> So Part i. B<sub>1</sub>; “John Bale, an exyle also in this lyfe for the testimoyne of Jesu.” See Bale’s Life, prefixt to the Parker Edition of his works.

<sup>4</sup> He alludes frequently to the persecutions of Protestants in England at the time when he wrote; and this in his first Volume and Part, as well as the others. So in the primary Preface; “The boystuous tyrauntes of Sodoma, with theyr great Nemroth Wynchester, (i. e. Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester, mentioned Part 2, § 6, on Apoc. 13,) . . . have of long tyme taken much payne; and many have they cruelly burned; as was sene of late years in Coventrie, London, and other places.” Of these Anne Askew is mentioned, p. 170, who was martyred in London under Bonner, in 1546. Again, at the conclusion of the whole work, on the last page, there occurs the following passage, as written while Henry VIII was still living. “In the which dayly prayer is that most worthy minister of God Kyng Henry the 8, afore all other to be remembred; which hath so sore wounded the Beast that he may before his departure, or Prynce Edward after him, throw all his supersticions into the bottomlesse lake agayne.” Hence it is evident that the English persecutions and martyrdoms of Protestants that Bale refers to are those of the later years of Henry VIII, after Cromwell’s fall.\*

In the Parker Edition the allusion to Henry VIII is omitted; being copied from some later Edition than mine.

<sup>5</sup> “Two cruell enymies have my just labours had . . . The Printers are the fyrst; whose headie hast negligence and covetousnesse commonly corrupteth all bookes. These have both dysplaced them; (se. my many allegacions, both of the Scriptures and doctors, in the mergent of the first Part or Volume;) and also changed their numbers, to the truthes derogacion.” Preface to the 2nd Part.—Bale was of a rather choleric temperament.

<sup>6</sup> 1. *Patristics*.—Justin Martyr, Melito, Irenæus, Hippolytus, Victorinus, Tichonius,

\* As regards Bullinger his Treatise is dated, we saw, 1557: but Bale does not mention it in his list of *neoteric* Apocalyptic Expositors, given in my Note <sup>6</sup> above.



The *Seals* he explains, much like other Reformers, to prefigure, as they were opened, the mysteries of the seven ages of Christ's Church, though not without certain peculiarities in the details:—1. Christ and his apostles' triumphant progress: 2. the earlier heretics figured by the red horse, and Pagan Roman persecutors figured by its rider with the great sword: 3. the Arians, Pelagians, and all false Prelates; with the Devil, holding his deceitful pair of balances, for their rider: 4. Popery as commencing with Boniface I, and Mahommedism with Mahomet; the horse symbolizing "the universal synagogue of hypocrites, or dissembling Church of Antichrist; pale as men without health," and ridden by "Death and Damnation:"<sup>1</sup> 5. the martyrdom of Christ's saints, specially by the Papal Antichrist; e. g. those of the Publicans,<sup>2</sup> Albigenses, and Waldenses: 6. the con-

Jerome, Augustine, Primasius, ("which volume I have redde,") Aprigius, Cassiodore, Isidore.—(The Aprigius spoken of was, he says, Bishop of Pace in Spain, and made a notable work on the Apocalypse, A.D. 530.)

2. *Benedictines*.—Bede, Alcuin, Haymo, Strabus Fuldensis, Rabanus Maurus, (qu. Adso?) Ambrose Ansbert, Robert of Tuy, Joachim Abbas, a certain Benedictine monk of Canterbury, and Easterton, also Anglus.

3. *Regular Canons*.—Ricardus de Sancto Victore, Gaufrerus Antisiodorensis.

4. *Carthusians*.—Henricus de Hassia, Dionysius Rikel.

5. *Secular Priests*.—Ambrose on the seven Trumpets, Berenger, Gilbert, an English "Auctor à centum annis," John Huss, Paulus Burgensis, Mathias Dorinck, Jacobus Stralen.

6. *Carmêlites*.—Baconthorpe, Tytleshale, Thomas de Ylleya, John Barath, John de Vernone, Nicholas of Alsace, Bloxam, Elyne, Tilneye, Winchingham, Thorpe, Egidius, Haynton.

7. *Augustinians*.—Augustin de Anchona, Jordanes Saxo, Bertrand of Toulouse, Augustin of Rome, Philip of Mantua, John Capgrave, Sylvester Meoccius of Venice.

8. *Dominicans*.—Jordanes Botergius, Hugo Barchinonensis, Albertus Magnus, Stephanus Bisuntinus, Nicholas Gorham, Bernard de Trilia, Paganus Bergomensis, Alvarus de Catureo, Frederic of Veniee, John Annius of Viterbo, Savanarola.

9. *Franciscans*.—Alexander de Hales, Helias de Hanibalis, Petrus J. Cathalanus, John Walleys, Petrus Aureolus of Toulouse, Nicholas Lyranus, Astesanus Astensis, Bernardinus Senensis, Theodorie Andree of Thoulouse, Franciscus Titelman.

10. *Neoterici*.—Luther, Sebastian Meyer, George Æmilius, Francis Lambert, (died 1530,) Zwingle, John Brencius, Calvin, Melchior Hofman, "and many other more."

In this long list not merely direct Apocalyptic Expositors are included, but those also that have in works on other subjects commented indirectly on any part of the Apocalypse.

<sup>1</sup> Compare Bishop Hooper, p. 158. "Read the 6th of Apoc. and ye shall perceive that at the opening of the 4th Seal there came out a pale horse, and he that sat on it was called Death. . . This horse is the time wherein hypocrites and dissemblers entered into the Church, under pretence of true religion, as monks, friars, nuns, massing priests, etc.: that have killed more souls with heresy and superstition than all the tyrants that ever were have killed bodies." <sup>2</sup> i. e. the Paulikians.

Later, however, in the Work he refers to Bullinger himself as a contemporary. See p. 457, Note <sup>1</sup>, *infra*.

vulsions of Antichrist's kingdom, now at length revealed in its real character: convulsions begun under Wicliff,<sup>1</sup> continued under Huss, and now experienced yet more: the true sun Christ eclipsed in it; the moon-figured Church, once fair, now taught only of flesh and blood; the stars, or doctors, fallen from Christ's heavenly doctrine, &c.; the heaven of true doctrine past away; their mountains too of strength passing from before them, under the preaching of the Word and with a fearful looking-for of judgment.<sup>2</sup>—In the *Sealing Vision* the Angels of the winds are explained to mean Antichrist and his agents, seeking to withhold the Holy Spirit: and the sealing of the 144,000 as figuring Christ's intervention to mark and seal his true Church; an intervention specially evident at the time then present.—In the 7th Seal the *half-hour's silence* betokened the peace then to be given to the Christian Church, when Babylon shall have fallen, the Beast been slain, and the Dragon tied for 1000 years. For, as all the age after Christ is called by John "the last hour,"<sup>3</sup> this *half-hour* may well mean the 1000 years of Apoc. xx. "In the time of which

<sup>1</sup> "Anon I behelde a merveyulous earthquake arise. Most lively was this fulfilled such tyme as William Courteney the Archbishoppe of Caunterbury, with Antichrist's sinagoge of sorcerers, sate in consistorie against Christes doctrine in John Wycleve. Mark the yeare month day and houre; and ye shall wonder at it." This was in 1382. During the sitting of the Synod, held at Greyfriars in London, an earthquake shook the city, and alarmed some of the members of the Synod. Wicliff, who did not attend, used to call it afterwards, in irony, "*the earthquake Synod.*"

<sup>2</sup> Let me here give a specimen of Bale's style and Commentary. "When they have done all mischief, . . . and can doe no more, then run they to those hipocrites [the Papal priests], then seeke they up those Antichristes. There must they be confessed; there must they hide their sinnes. They must be covered with hys dyrtty merites, and with hys holy whoredome. And, to be prayed for, that monastery must be builded; that prebendary or chauntry must be founded. There must be masses and dyrges; there must be anuaries and beadmen. He must be buried in S. Frauncis' gray coate; and he in our Ladie's holy habite. He must have S. Dominike's hoode: and he S. Augustine's girdle.—And thus they cry to those earthly hils and rocks, to those filthy dunge heaps, . . . Fall on us with such stuffe as ye have! Cover us with your works more than need! Pray, pray, pray; sing, sing, sing; say, say, say; ring, ring, ring! Give us of your oyle, for our lampes are out! Helpe us with your Latyne Psalmes! Releeve us with your lippe labour; though all be but dunge and earth! Comfort us with *Placebo!* Help us with *Requiem eternam!* Poure out your Trentall masses! Spew out your commendations! Sing us out of that hotte ferie Purgatorie, before we come there!"

The reader will see in the above a characteristic sketch of Bale's own style, and also his hot temperament. But let the passage also further bring home to his mind the wretched delusions, under the name of Christ's religion, which prevailed for ages in England: and from which, in God's mercy, the glorious Reformation was our deliverance. For Bale's sketch is a sketch from the life.

<sup>3</sup> 1 John ii. 18. A passage often alluded to, we have seen, by the earlier fathers Jerome, Augustine, &c.: see my Vol. i. pp. 396, 397: and also by later expositors: see my Vol. ii. pp. 365, 391, and p. 416, Note<sup>5</sup>, *suprà*.

sweete silence shall Israell be revyved, the Jewes be converted, the heathen come in agayne; and Christ seeke up his lost sheepe, and bryng hym agayne to hys folde; that they maye appeare one flock, lyke as they have one shepcherde."

The æras of the *Trumpets Bale*, like others before him, identifies with those of the *Seals*:<sup>1</sup>—the 1st being figurative of the wicked Jews and Gentiles, opposed to and persecuting the Christians in the apostolic æra; the 2nd of false brethren, inciting the Roman emperors against Christians; the 3rd of heretics, such as Arius, Eutyches, Valens, that fell by apostasy from Christ's Church, and poisoned by their heresies the streams of religious doctrine; the 4th of the progress of superstition, image-worship, and hypocrisy, obscuring the light of truth, and ending in Popery and Mahommedism.—Then the *Woe-denouncing Angel* he makes to be men like *Joachim Abbas*, raising their warning-voice; followed afterwards by such as *Arnold* and *Savanarola*. The fallen star of the 5th Trumpet Bale explains as "the shyning multitude of prelates, pastours, and religious fathers, fallen away from the doctryne of the Spyrite" in the middle age: darkening the light by false teachers, as by smoke from hell: and from which came swarms of Cardinals, Popes, Abbots, monks of every order, schoolmen, &c., like beasts. The 6th Trumpet's horsemen from the Euphrates (the river of Babylon) he expounds to mean the Antichristian Papists, ever prepared for evil, whether at the hour, day, month, or year: many, however, from among the four angels (whom he pretty much identifies with the horsemen) "that were sometime Antichristes, hypocrites, tyrauntes, and murtherers, having been loosened from Euphrates by the present age's gospel-Trumpet's sounding;" "the Lord having anoynted many with his Spirit in this age to preache delyveraunce to the captive, and to open the pryson to them that were in bondage."<sup>2</sup>

The Vision of Apoc. x. Bale explains clearly and strikingly, just as Bullinger, of the Reformation: the *book opened* being the Scriptures; the *Angel*, the gospel-preachers of the Reformation, whose light is to be seen alike in the isles and on the continent; the *seven thunders*, God's fearful coming judgments: which fact was to be noted, though the mysteries were sealed up and hid; such as about the hour and day of judgment, of which knoweth no man. As to

<sup>1</sup> p. 109<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>2</sup> p. 129.

the *time*, *times*, and *half a time* of Daniel, which seemed alluded to in the Angel's oath, the *time* was that from Daniel to Christ; the *times*, the ages from Christ to the 7th Seal's opening, and 7th Trumpet's sounding; the *half-time*, that from thenceforth, wherein the days shall be shortened for the elect's sake. Of which 7th Trumpet the sounding must be near, though *when* we know not. And then in that 7th age of the Church all shall be finished. So "are the faithful to be asserted that their final redemption is at hand."<sup>1</sup>

In Apoc. xi. (which begins his second Part and Volume) Bale makes the *measuring-rod* to be God's word, "now graciously sent us out of Zion, by men having his special grace, as by John, to have dominion heere in the midst of his enemies:"<sup>2</sup> the *temple*, God's congregation or Church, defined and discriminated by his word from the synagogue of Satan; the *altar*, Christ; the Gentiles cast out, Popish prelates and priests that forsake Christ; the Holy City, "the living generation of them that fear and love God;" the two Witnesses, faithful protesters for Christ, that continue with God's people all through the time of the Church's oppression by the Gentiles; and that were never in more power than now, in this sixth age of the Church.—Of the Witnesses' *slaughter by the Beast Antichrist*, when they have individually finished their testimony, and their reviving *in others*, much, says he, has been already fulfilled, though something remains to be accomplished yet. The 3½ days of their exposure, or 7 half-days, he supposes to be the seven ages of the Church. The Witnesses being *seen by their enemies to ascend to heaven*, is illustrated from the acknowledgment often made even here by Romanists, to their having been godly men. The "tenth part of the city falling," is the decay of the riches of the Papal Church.—"Thus," says Bale, in concluding this subject, "have we heere what is done already; and what is to come under this sixth Trumpet, whereunder we are now, which all belongeth to the second wo."<sup>3</sup> The 7th Trumpet, he adds, is to introduce the full declaration of God's word, and peaceable time figured by the half-hour's silence. Which, however, will not always continue; as there is to follow in that last age the outbreak of Gog and Magog, and the last judgment.<sup>4</sup>

Passing to Apoc. xii., Bale interprets the vision of the *Woman* and *Dragon* much as others before him. The *woman* is the Church bring-

<sup>1</sup> p. 147. A passage cited by me more fully, Vol. ii. p. 144.

<sup>2</sup> Part ii. p. 7.

<sup>3</sup> p. 252.

<sup>4</sup> p. 272, 26.



ing forth Christ in his members; the Dragon, the Devil; the Dragon's *seven heads* having a probable reference, he says, to the world's seven ages; and their likeness respectively, he conjectures, 1st, (and before the flood,) to the serpent, in which form he first tempted man; 2. to the calf, as the early object of idolatry; 3. 4. 5. 6. to Daniel's lion, bear, leopard, and terrible Beast; 7. to man; this last figuring the Papacy.—In Apoc. xiii. he makes the *first Beast* to be “the universal or whole Antichrist;” including all Antichrist's members, from the beginning of the Christian æra. And thus “none other is this Beast, here described, than was the pale horse in the 4th age, the cruel multitude of locustes in the fifth age, and the horses of incomparable lewdness for the sixth.” His *seven heads* he makes the same as the Dragon's; the *deadly wound* of the 7th head, that by the Reformation;<sup>1</sup> the *healing of it* accomplished by the partial re-establishment of Popery, as now in England under Bishops Bonner and Gardiner, “with authority to hang and burn at pleasure, by act of Parliament:”<sup>2</sup> the duration of which healed head however will be but short, as shown us in Apoc. xvii.—As to the *second Beast*, it figures false prophets and teachers, such as have been even from the world's beginning; the lamb's horns indicating their counterfeit-ing of Christ and Christianity: the *Beast's image*, Popish emperors and kings,<sup>3</sup> now especially, speaking as dictated by their Confessors: the *Beast's name and number* perhaps (as earlier Expositors suggest) the names *αρτεμος, αρουμει*, (this Bale specially affects,)<sup>4</sup> *τειταν*, or *Die Lux*: or perhaps *Diabolus Incarnatus*, or *Filius Perditionis*; which two last want but 4 and 6 respectively of the fated number 666. Bale also adds, as adopted from “a certain unnamed disciple of Wiclif,” (he should have rather said from Joachim Abbas,<sup>5</sup>) a suggestion of the 600 indicating the world's 6 ages till Christ's coming, the 60 the 6 æras since Christ to the ending sabbath, the 6 that ending sabbath itself.

In Apoc. xiv. he explains the 144,000 as “the universal congregation of Christ, (contradistinctively to that of Antichrist,) all clear from the superstitions of men:” their song of harmonious voice, of God's holy word. The *three flying Angels*, next following, he in-

<sup>1</sup> “If this be not a deadly wounding of one of the Beastes heads, I think there is none.”

<sup>2</sup> Both Bonner and Gardiner are named by Bale.

<sup>3</sup> Somewhat like Bullinger; but in a larger and more general sense of Popish princes.

<sup>4</sup> Like Mr. C. Maitland, p. 149.

<sup>5</sup> See p. 400, 410 *suprà*.

terprets very much as Bullinger, and with special reference to the time of the Reformation: also the earth's *harvest* and *vintage* as close at hand. The *seven Vials* Bale makes to synchronize with the seven æras of the Seals and Trumpets. Passing over the rest, the drying up of the Euphrates in the 6th, under which Bale supposed men then were, was the drying up of the *worldly spirit*; "pompes, possessions, and pleasures of the Antichristian church of Babylon:" not till the completion of which will the way of the kings from the sun-rising be prepared, or "governors rule according to Christ's doctrine." Also the *three frogs* he explains as the spirits of idolatry, filthy superstition, and hypocrisy; even then gathering the Antichristian powers to battle against Christ and Christ's ministers.—In Apoc. xvii. John's being carried by the Spirit into the wilderness, to behold the vision of the Harlot, is resembled to the then recent escape of many of the Reformers out of Babylon:<sup>1</sup> that the Beast "*was*" is explained of the Antichristianism of the pre-Judaic and Judaic times: that *it is not* refers to the destruction in St. John's time of the Antichristian Judaic power; and *yet is*, was meant of its revival in the Popes and Mahomet. Also its *seven heads* meant alike the seven hills of Rome, and the seven monarchies of the seven climates of the world: 5 heads having fallen from Rome's universal monarchy, viz. all in Africa, Asia, and part of Europe; the 6th being the feeble Roman Western Empire remaining; the 7th the spiritual empire of the Popedom raised by Phocas.<sup>2</sup> As to the ten kings (which, says he, some think to be England, France, Spain, Portugal, Castile, Denmark, Scotland, Hungary, Bohemia, and Naples,) they received authority at one hour with the Beast, when at the 4th Lateran Council they were allied together for a crusade, and had Papal confession enjoined on them. And, while omitting all primary reference of the statement about the ten horns tearing the whore to the Gothic and Vandal desolations of old Rome, he anticipates Bullin-

<sup>1</sup> "Blessed be the Lord whose word in this age hath admonished many, as the Angell did John, and brought them also cleane from his abominations into a seeret consideration of the Spirit, unknowen to the world, where both to see hir pride, and to understand hir judgments. For it followeth in the text that the Angel conveyed John away into the wilderness in the Spirite."

A little before Bale, speaking of John's exile to Patmos, had said: "And so did I, poore creature, with my poore wife and children, at the gatheringe of this present Commentary; flyinge into Germany for the same testimony of Jesu."

<sup>2</sup> The reader will again observe how often this epoch of Phocas' decree is referred to by the early Protestant expositors.

ger's other view of the prophecy's reference also to the time of the end: saying that it is reserved as their destiny to tear and desolate the harlot Rome: a thing already indeed begun, not only by secular rulers, but even ecclesiastical; as Cranmer, Latimer, Luther, Zuingle, Calvin, Bullinger,<sup>1</sup> &c.

In Apoc. xix., Bale says, on the *Lamb's bridal*; "Sence the begynning of the world have the faithfule prepared for this heavenly marriage; and in the resurrection of the righteous shall it be perfectly solemnized, celebrated, and magnified; such time as they shall appear in full glory with Christ. In this latter time will the true Christian Church be of her perfect age, when all the world shall confesse his name in peace, and apte unto this spousage."—Yet on the *millennium*, Apoc. xx., contrary to his previous identification of it with this coming period of rest and evangelization of the world,<sup>2</sup> a period destined to follow on the destruction of the Popedom, he reverts to the old Augustinian solution: making it the 1000 years from Christ's ascension to Pope Sylvester II: so Wicliff, says he, in his book *De Solutione Sathanæ*. Then was the Devil loosed in the Papal supremacy; and the Turks also, as Gog and Magog; though no doubt the foundations of the Popedom were laid 400 years earlier by Phocas. It was now at length a plenary loosing; but only "for a little while:" as Berenger, and then the Waldenses, Wicliffites, &c., very soon after opposed the Papacy; and subsequently, yet more, the Reformers Luther, &c. "And I doubt not but within few dayes the mightie breath of Christ's mouth, which is his lyving gospele, shall utterly distroye hym."

On the *new heaven and earth* Bale professes to look for an earth purified and renovated by the fire of judgment, "goyng before the Judge;" very much as in King Edward's Catechism, cited by me at p. 204 of this Volume.

4. A brief notice may suffice of the two interpreters *Chytræus* and *Marlorat*, who published some twenty years later, in the *middle era* of the Reformation; for they both very much followed in the track of their predecessors.

Thus in *David Chytræus' Explicatio Apocalypsis*, published Wit-

<sup>1</sup> Mark this notice of Bullinger.

<sup>2</sup> See p. 452, 453 *suprà*.

tenberg 1571, the *six first Seals* are made to depict the gospel-progress, wars, famines, pestilences, persecutions, and political commotions, &c., as from time to time repeated, or continued, throughout the whole time of the Church; and the *Sealing Vision* the multitudes sealed and saved through all this same period. Of the *Trumpets* the four first Chytræus interprets of the heresies of Tatian, Marcion, Origen, and Novatus; so as Luther, says he, in his Bible, “ad marginem Editionis Germanicæ:” the 5th, of the Papacy, as established by Gregory and Phocas’ Decree; the 6th, of the Saracens and Turks; the *Euphrates* being specified, says Chytræus, with a more specific *geographical* reference than others, because of the Saracen capital Bagdad being situated by it.—The *Angel vision* in Apoc. x. is Christ’s succouring the Church in those times of darkness, by opening the Scriptures and raising up true preachers: <sup>1</sup> John’s charge to *prophecy again* being given him, not so much in his personal as in his representative character: the office assigned to these gospel preachers being to attack the Papal and Mahometan errors, till the 7th Trumpet’s sounding, or end of the world.—In Apoc. xi. the figuration of the *temple* showed that even in the worst times, under Popery and Mahomedanism, there would be a Church of God, recognizing the true *altar*, or Christ in his characters of Priest and Mediator; and the *exclusion* directed of the *outer court* meant God’s own exclusion of Papists; boasting themselves to be the true Church, but rejected by the *measuring rod* of God’s law. The *1260 days* of the Gentiles treading the holy city are to be explained, Chytræus adds, as *angelic days*, i. e. as *1260 years*: and to be calculated (I noted this a little previously <sup>2</sup>) perhaps from Alaric’s taking Rome, A.D. 412, perhaps from Phocas’ Decree, A.D. 606; on the former of which suppositions the date of ending would be A.D. 1672; on the latter, 1866. Correspondently with which view of that mystic period the *two Witnesses* signified all Christ’s successive witnesses during the 42 months of Antichrist’s reign; such, says he, as have been recently detailed in the “*Catalogus Testium*.” <sup>3</sup> Their *death* and *speedy revival* he explains, like Bullinger and others, to signify the speedy revival of other witnessing and witnesses, on each individual occasion of their temporary suppression by Antichrist.—In Apoc. xiii. he follows

<sup>1</sup> The *seven thunders* Chytræus makes the seven-fold gifts of the Holy Spirit.

<sup>2</sup> p. 441, 442 *suprà*.

<sup>3</sup> Compare my notice of this *Catalogue*, Vol. ii. p. 204.



Bullinger in making the *first Beast* the old Pagan Roman Empire ; explaining too its seven heads after him : only he makes the wounding of the seventh head to be that by the Goths. I should have observed that he notes on the 1260 days, how some had explained them of the *Interim*, from May 15, 1548 to the beginning of 1552 :—the first introduction this, I believe, of the *Interim* into Protestant Apocalyptic interpretation. The *second Beast* is Rome Pontifical ; the *image of the Beast* the Western Empire, the shadow of the old one.—The *Beast's name and number* some, he says, explained as a title, e. g. *Ααρειος* ; some as chronologically marking the time from Christ to Phocas or Pepin.—The *millennium* is the 1000 years from Christ to Gregory VII and the Turks.

*Augustin Marlorat's* Exposition of the Revelation of St. John, published A.D. 1574, with a dedication to Sir W. Mildmay, Chancellor of the Exchequer under Queen Elizabeth, is professedly collected out of divers notable writers of the Protestant Churches ; viz. Bullinger, Calvin, Gaspar Meyander, Justus Jonas, Lambertus, Musculus, Æcolampadius, Pellicanus, Meyer, Viret.—The first novelty that I observe in it is on the *2nd Trumpet* ; where the figure of the burning mountain cast into the sea is explained of the Roman empire swallowed up, as in the sea, by Christ's kingdom. The *5th Trumpet* is applied to Mahomet and the Pope ; the *6th* to the Papal Antichrist yet more strongly.—On Apoc. x. I mark the clear decisive explanation of its *Angel-Vision* usual among the Reformers, as figuring the opening of the Scriptures, and revived gospel-preaching at the Reformation : also the exclusion of the outer court in Apoc. xi., as signifying the exclusion of Papists : there being here, however, in Marlorat this variation, that on the Angel's oath, living securely as as he did under the Protestant Queen Elizabeth, he not unnaturally expresses a strong opinion that the *2nd Woe* had past in his time, even though the *7th Trumpet* might not have sounded.—In Apoc. xii. he interprets the *Dragon's seven heads* like *Bale* : in Apoc. xiii., the *first Beast* as Antichrist and his kingdom : (the *deadly wound*, made by Mahomet, being healed by the Popes :) the *second Beast* as monks and priests supporting the Papacy : the *Beast's image* as the images of saints ; the *Beast's name and number*, much as Chytræus. Finally, in Apoc. xx. he explains the *millennium* as the period from Christ to Antichrist ; during which Satan, he says, was re-

strained: and he takes occasion on it to reprobate the errors of the Chiliasts.

A word, ere I pass to the last quarter of this century, on *Bibliander*: an expositor contemporary with the two former; and who, in his exposition of the Seals, as I learn from Foxe,<sup>1</sup> offered certain noticeable novelties. Like Berengaud he supposed them to symbolize successive ages of the world from its beginning: but not the same as Berengaud. According to Bibliander the 1st Seal figures the age from the Creation to the Flood; the 2nd from the Flood to Moses; the 3rd from Moses to Christ; the 4th from Christ to Constantine; the 5th from Constantine to the commencement of Papal supremacy by Phocas' grant, and of Mahommedanism by Mahomet about A.D. 606; the 6th (including Pepin and Charlemagne's acts of aggrandizement to the Roman Church) from Phocas to the Councils of Constance and Basle A.D. 1431;<sup>2</sup> the 7th from thence to the consummation.

5. In conclusion of my Historic Sketch of Protestant Apocalyptic Expositors of the century and æra of the Reformation, I shall now briefly state the opinions of *Foxe*, *Brightman*, and *Pareus*; expositors who published in the *last quarter* of that century, as dated from A.D. 1517.

. The Exposition by *Foxe*, our venerable English Martyrologist, was written (as appears by two chronological notices in the book) in the year 1586;<sup>3</sup> and had been only advanced to Apoc. xvii., when the work was interrupted by his death.<sup>4</sup> The next year it was published by his son, under the modest title of *Eicasmii in Apocalypsin*; (*Conjectures* on the Apocalypse;) with a Dedication to Archbishop Whitgift; in size making a thin folio of about 400 pages. It seems to me to deserve attention, not merely from the venerable character of the writer; but also from the learning and original thought and views manifest in the Commentary itself.

<sup>1</sup> Foxe, pp. 43, 44.

<sup>2</sup> There is a little obscurity here; but I think this is Bibliander's meaning. Compare what Foxe says, p. 60, on the 7th Seal's not figuring the events of the 7th millenary, but rather of the 6th.

<sup>3</sup> First, on the 6th Seal, where he speaks of the current year as A.D. 1586: secondly, where he states it as 286 years from A.D. 1300, on Apoc. xi.—*Eicasmii*, pp. 60, 123. (My Edition is the original Edition of 1587.)

<sup>4</sup> See the notice at the conclusion of the Commentary, p. 396.

Thus, to begin,<sup>1</sup> he makes the *horses* and *horsemen* of the *four first Seals* to signify the same four great empires of the world that were previously symbolized by Daniel's four beasts, the Assyrian, Persian, Greek, and Roman:<sup>2</sup> the *fifth* picturing primarily the Christian martyrdoms under Pagan Rome, from Nero to Diocletian: secondarily, and by the intimation added, "till their brethren should be killed even as they," the later succession of martyrs also, slain under Antichrist, whereby was to be made up the Christian martyrs' complement: which later succession, having commenced from the time of Satan's loosing 1000 years after Constantine,<sup>3</sup> or near about the æra of Wicliff, had when Foxe wrote amounted to the same number ten,<sup>4</sup> as the successive persecutions of the Christian Church under Rome Pagan.—On the *sixth* he compares its symbols of the earthquake and the elemental convulsions with similar ones in Isaiah and Joel, denoting Babylon's overthrow and Jerusalem's respectively; as well as

<sup>1</sup> Let me premise that just before beginning the Seals (p. 46) he has some excellent observations on the careful use necessary of the *allegorical* meaning, so as not to set aside the *historical*. "Non me fugit istud, nullo modo fastidiendas esse omnes in Scripturis allegorias." Both Christ and Paul, he says, uses them; "at maximè in exhortando, consolando, docendo." "In *prophetando* non ita propriè luditur allegoriis; aut, si in prophetiis usu ita veniat quandoque, ut per similitudinem collationem parabola adhibeantur, at non ideo tamen sensus historicus per allegorismos et tropologias everteendus est; præsertim ubi res ipsa ad historias nos mittit, non ad allegorias."

<sup>2</sup> The same view that Mr. Faber has in our own days advocated; whether as an original idea, or adopted from Foxe. See his Sacred Calendar of Prophecy. It seems from Foxe that Petrus Artopæus had so construed the 1st Seal before him.

Foxe (pp. 46—50) criticises, and shows the inconsistency and untenableness of, the old Church-schemes of the Seals at some length. How is Christ the rider of the 1st horse, when represented otherwise as on the throne, opening the Seals? How on a war-horse, and with bow in hand, as a warrior; when going forth (according to those expositors), not to inflict judgment, but simply in the peaceful progress of the gospel? How in the 2nd, 3rd, and 4th Seals one and the same rider, the Devil, when the different horses, with different colours and characteristics, might seem to require different riders to each? Moreover, how could the Devil be supposed the rider, when the time at which he would be so riding forth was that at which in the millennial vision [such being Foxe's idea of Apoc. xx.] he was figured as bound in the abyss?—Again, in the 2nd Seal, "the killing one another" could only be applied to civil wars and slaughter, not to dissensions of Christians.—And, as to the 3rd Seal, the small price\* of a denarius for the measure of wheat and three measures of barley, conjoined with the intimated abundance also of wine and oil, might rather signify a dearth of men to buy, than a dearth of the provisions to be bought.

<sup>3</sup> Such will be seen to be Foxe's view, p. 55.

<sup>4</sup> Viz. 1. under Henry IV and V in England; 2. in the Council of Constance, and in Bohemia; 3. under the Roman Pontiffs in Italy; 4. under the Emperor Charles V in Germany; 5. under Henry VIII in England; 6. under Henry II in Gaul; 7. under James II in Scotland; 8. under Charles IX in France; 9. under Mary in England; 10. under Philip II in Spain and Flanders. p. 55.

\* Foxe does not enter on the question of the size of the *chanix* measure.

others figuring the last judgment. And he thence infers that it may signify *primarily* the overthrow, following on the completion of the first set of martyrs, of the Roman Pagan persecuting emperors and empire accomplished by Constantine: yet so as to symbolize also, *secondarily* and *chiefly*, the greater day of judgment; on the completion of the second and final set of Christian martyrs, slain by Antichrist. Which judgment, Foxe thought, might be regarded as very near at hand.

The *Sealing Vision*, included in the same sixth Seal, showed the preservation of the saints at this period of the judgment, amidst the physical disturbances of the mundane system, (for the stagnation of the winds, the *literal* winds, indicated a stop in the usual course of nature,)<sup>1</sup> and conflagration of the world; just as the fate of the antichristian and wicked had been depicted in the previous figuration: the 144,000 sealed, whom Foxe identifies with the innumerable body of the palm-bearers, being the universal church of the redeemed.—Then the *half-hour's silence in heaven*, Foxe, dissatisfied with other views, conjectures to mean the peace of the world under Augustus, preceding Christ's birth: and that the prayers of all saints that followed, being prayers of the saints after Christ's death and ascension, while under persecution from Jews and Romans, brought down on their persecutors the judgments symbolized in the Trumpets. Thus Trumpet 1 was the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans; Trumpet 2 the plague and other troubles under Aurelius, after the fourth Pagan persecution: Trumpet 3 the plague under Decius of which Cyprian wrote, and that far greater one, together with all the other troubles, under Gallienus; Trumpet 4 the convulsions and quenching of the political lights of the Roman empire by Goths, Vandals, and Lombards;<sup>2</sup> Trumpet 5 the woes possibly of the Papacy, but more probably in Foxe's opinion of Mahommedanism, the one from Phocas, the other from Mahomet;<sup>3</sup> (the five months specified having reference simply to the time of the natural locusts, that constituted the figure, making *their* ravages;)<sup>4</sup> Trumpet 6 the Turks. On which

<sup>1</sup> If any preferred to take it metaphorically, then the winds might mean the gospel-preaching stopt by four evil angels, chiefly the Papal agencies.

<sup>2</sup> So falling on what I believe the right interpretation of this 4th Trumpet. He adds, as an alternative, that if any prefer to understand the obscuration of the firmamental luminaries ecclesiastically, it may be explained of the darkening of heaven by Mahommedanism.

<sup>3</sup> Here again, I conceive, Foxe is in the right.

<sup>4</sup> p. 90.



last point Foxe is very strong. "It is clearer than the light itself," he says, "that this is the main intent of the Trumpet."<sup>1</sup> He dates the Turks' power in Asia from A.D. 1051, when the alliance was formed by them with the Caliph of Bagdad;<sup>2</sup> and traces their history thence downward to A.D. 1573.

"And the rest," it is said, Apoc. ix. 20, "repented not of worshipping idols, &c." The Anglo-Rhemenses, observes Foxe,<sup>3</sup> explain this of *heathen* idols. But were the Greeks that have been slain and enslaved by the Turks, worshippers of *such* idols?—Then he proceeds to the vision of Apoc. x., xi.; all under the same sixth Trumpet, "in quâ hactenus versamur."<sup>4</sup> In Apoc. x. the magnificent vision of Christ, there given, signified chiefly two things:—1st, the restoration of gospel-preaching, "Thou must prophesy again;" the book in the Angel's hand figuring God's word, and John being a representative person on the scene of vision: 2nd, a declaration of the surely approaching judgment under the seventh Trumpet.<sup>5</sup> He explains both these of his own æra, though as *begun* indeed earlier, even from the time of Wicliff; (times included likewise in the Turkish woe-period, or 6th Trumpet;) and he refers in one place, as illustrative, to the wonderful discovery of printing.—Mark specially, he observes more than once, the word "Prophesy *again*."<sup>6</sup> It implies there having been previously a cessation of it; so as in fact for centuries under the Papacy.—Then, preparatorily to the next vision, Foxe has a dissertation to show that the great Antichrist of Scripture prophecy is the Pope, not the Turk; and the temple he was to sit in, the Christian Church. Accordingly in Apoc. xi. the *temple* is the Church; its *inner* court true worshippers, its *outer* false: also the measuring it indicated its reparation and *reformation*, during the then current woe of the sixth Trumpet, "*as in our day*." This reformation implied a previous corruption of it, he adds, by Antichrist: the progress of which he traces.—As to the 42 months, during which the Holy City was to be trodden down, it was no doubt the same as the 42 months of Apoc. xii., xiii. And this, arguing from the length of the Jewish and Roman Pagan persecutions of the Church, from Herod's behead-

<sup>1</sup> p. 98. Rightly, I doubt not, again. I have noticed this in my Vol. ii. p. 145, on the Angel's oath.

<sup>2</sup> p. 94. So Mede afterwards.

<sup>3</sup> p. 99.

<sup>4</sup> pp. 99, 100.

<sup>5</sup> pp. 102, 105. See the joyous citation given from Foxe in my Vol. ii. p. 144.

<sup>6</sup> p. 107, &c.

ing of St. John to Constantine, and which he computed at 294 years,<sup>1</sup> he deemed to be on the scale of *one month to seven years*; a singular scale, applied however by him to the number in Daniel also! This then would be the duration of the Turks and Pope jointly oppressing the Church; a term equal to that of the Jews and Pagans' oppression of it, till Constantine. And as from Satan's loosing, and the rise of the Ottomans, A.D. 1300, 286 years of the term had, when Foxe wrote, elapsed, there would now remain of it but eight years more.—Similarly the Witnesses' 1260 days of prophesying in sackcloth, dated by Foxe from A.D. 1300, would [on the scale before mentioned have to end in 1594. At the same time he mentions Aretius' and Chytræus' view of the period, as one of *angelic days*, i. e. of *years*: ending, if measured from Constantine, in 1572; if from Alaric, (A.D. 412,) in 1672; if from Phocas, in the year 1866.<sup>2</sup>—The witnesses prophesying 1260 days in sackcloth, and then being *killed by the Beast*, he explains of the proceedings of the Council of Constance in the condemnation of Huss and Jerome: (so too, he says, Bibliander:) its first Session having been Dec. 8, 1414; the last, May 22, 1418, just  $3\frac{1}{2}$  years after. After which time their principles, thought to have been suppressed, soon revived. Foxe dwells long and minutely on this history; deeming it evidently a very remarkable fulfilment of the prophecy.<sup>3</sup>—Since which time the revived Witnesses had come down to the time of Luther and the Reformers.—All this had been under the sixth or Turkish Trumpet; which Foxe regarded as then, when he wrote, near its end: the 7th Trumpet being thus close at hand; when the Church would have its time of blessedness accomplished, in Christ's coming and the saints' resurrection.

In Apoc. xii. the *Woman travailing* was God's true Church,—that same of which David in his 87th Psalm described the glory:<sup>4</sup> the *Dragon*, the Devil; seeking through Herod to destroy Christ at his birth, and persecuting him afterwards till his death and ascension. After which event the Woman flying into the wilderness, which

<sup>1</sup> See on Apoc. xii., next page.

<sup>2</sup> pp. 144, 145.

<sup>3</sup> At p. 180 Foxe briefly notices Huss's dream and prophecy, as I more fully have done, Vol. ii. pp. 459, 460; not aware, when I did so, that any other expositor had noted it before me.

<sup>4</sup> "Glorious things are spoken of thee, thou City of God." p. 197. Foxe contrasts this with the Romish pseudo-Church.

signified a hiding-place from the more immediate observation and fury of the enemy, like the caves and dens of the earth spoken of in Heb. xi. 38,<sup>1</sup> had for 1260 mystic days, meaning 294 years, as stated before, i. e. until the time of Constantine, (and the Devil's coincident millennial binding,) to undergo oppression and persecution.<sup>2</sup>—The *first Beast* of Apoc. xiii. is explained by Foxe, as by Bullinger, of the *heathen* Roman emperors: his *seven heads*, besides their primary signification of Rome's seven hills, meaning either, so as Bullinger had interpreted them, the seven original kings of Rome, or, as Chytræus, the seven Julian emperors to Nero; or perhaps, as Peter Artopæus and D. Fulco, (Foxe should have added the earlier Osiander,) the seven orders of chief ruling magistrates, Kings, Consuls, Decemvirs, Dictators, Triumvirs, Cæsars, and Emperors of foreign ancestry.<sup>3</sup> (Let my readers mark this very important step of progress in Apocalyptic interpretation.) The ten horns Foxe inclines to interpret as the emperors who originated the ten Roman Pagan persecutions of the Church. The 42 mystic months of his ruling as a persecutor were to be taken, as before, to signify  $42 \times 7$ , or 294 years. And here Foxe recounts, somewhat mysteriously, that his secret of the mystic numbers, and true scale of computation intended, had been] revealed to a friend of his, a martyrologist; meaning, I presume, himself.<sup>4</sup>—The Beast's head wounded was fulfilled in the Goths' destruction of old Rome; its healing, in the uprising of the Roman Papal supremacy.—So he comes to the *second Beast*; which he interprets of course as the Popes, or Antichrist: who, while reviving the old Roman Empire that had been wounded to death,<sup>5</sup> fulfilled also the symbol of *two horns like a lamb* by their hypocritical pretensions to Christianity; as also indeed, agreeably with the Apocalyptic sketch, to *miracles*. It had in Hebrew the name רומניש (Romanus) = 666; a name which Foxe preferred to others of the same numeral value in Greek or Latin: and in the oaths of fealty to the Romish Church, imposed on all functionaries,

<sup>1</sup> p. 205.

<sup>2</sup> p. 206. Foxe here hints that "the little season" of the Devil's loosing may indicate a *second* 294 years of oppression from after the end of that millennium; or epoch of the Turks loosing against Christendom about A.D. 1300.

<sup>3</sup> p. 214. Osiander published A.D. 1544. See my Vol. iii. p. 116, Note <sup>2</sup>.

<sup>4</sup> p. 216.

<sup>5</sup> The *Beast's image* he seems at p. 263 to make the restored greatness of the old Roman Empire. But he does not enter on the point distinctly.

secular and ecclesiastical, stamped them as it were with the Papal character or mark.<sup>1</sup>

Of the Apocalyptic *Vials* the five first were explained by Foxe as woes poured out on the old Roman empire; the other two on that of Papal Rome: viz. 1. Gallienus' ελκος or plague; 2. and 3. the bloodshed in the civil and foreign wars of the persecuting emperors; 4. the plagues of drought and famine about that same æra; <sup>2</sup> 5. Rome's destruction (the seat of the Beast) by the Goths; 6. the Turkish plague from the Euphrates, the same as in the 6th Trumpet.<sup>3</sup>

The *millennium*, or 1000 years of Satan's binding, he explains, as I before observed, of the 1000 years from Constantine to the acme of Papal supremacy, and the outbreak of Ottoman Turks, about 1300, A.D.

On the whole, the following points seem to me chiefly notable in Foxe's very valuable and interesting Commentary: viz. his reference of the fifth and sixth Seals, partially at least, to Diocletian's persecution and the revolution under Constantine; his strong and distinctive application of the 6th Trumpet to prefigure the Turks; his application of the visions in Apoc. x., xi., of the Angel's descent, John's prophesying, and the measuring of the temple, to the Church's revival in the Reformation; and his explanation, after Fulco and Artopæus, of the seven heads of the Beast; all advances in the right path, I conceive, if not altogether correct:—also his date of Satan's binding, as one to be computed from Constantine; Foxe being, I believe, the first so to compute it. He was followed *herein* soon after by the Romanist *Alcasar*. Here I conceive him to have been quite in error; as also in that on which he thought himself favoured with peculiar discernment; viz. the scale on which the prophetic periods were to be calculated.

Passing over *Junius*, as an Apocalyptic expositor not so important as to call for any detailed notice,<sup>4</sup> I proceed to one of whom it is my

<sup>1</sup> pp. 269, 270. In his discussion of Apoc. xiii. Foxe devotes some 40 pages, or more, (from p. 224 to 268) to a controversial discussion with Romanists on the great subject of the Antichrist and Apocalyptic Beast.

<sup>2</sup> So very similarly, says Foxe, p. 362, the expositor Fulco.

<sup>3</sup> p. 373.

<sup>4</sup> *Francis Junius*, or *Du Jou*, was professor of divinity at Leyden, and joint translator of the Old Testament with Tremellius. He was born of a noble family at Bourges, A.D. 1545, and died of the plague at Leyden, A.D. 1602. In 1592 he published a Latin treatise on the Apocalypse, which was dedicated to Henry IV.,



duty to speak fully and particularly, I mean *Brightman*. His Commentary, which is dedicated to "the holy reformed Churches of Britany, Germany, and France," appears to have been written and first published in the year A.D. 1600, or 1601, before the death of Queen Elizabeth.<sup>1</sup> It is one of great vigour both in thought and language; and deservedly one of the most popular with the Protestant Churches of the time. He himself gives a brief summary of it; which I here subjoin, with a few illustrative Notes.<sup>2</sup>

"Apoc. vi. The *Seals*. 1. The truth is first of all opened, and overcometh, [this is the *white horse*,] under Trajan, Hadrian, and Antoninus Pius;<sup>3</sup> at the voice of the first Beast, Quadratus, Aristides, and Justin Martyr. 3. At the voice of the second Beast, (viz. the same Justin Melito of Sardis, and Apollinarius,) cometh forth the *red horse* under Marcus Antonius Verus, confounding all things with wars.<sup>4</sup> 5. The third seal being opened, the third Beast, Tertullian, crieth out under Severus the emperor, when the *black horse* scourgeth the world with famine and barrenness. 7. The fourth seal is opened; and then speaks the fourth Beast Cyprian, Decius being emperor; when the *pale horse* wasted all with war, famine, pestilence, and wild beasts. 9. The fifth is opened,<sup>5</sup> and

King of France and Navarre, and of which an English translation was printed and reprinted in 1592, 1594, 1596, 1616. The Edition of 1596 has pp. 286.\*

I will just note from it the following particulars. He makes the 1260 *years* range from Christ's death to Pope Boniface, A.D. 1294; the millenium of Satan's binding being reckoned from the time of his casting down by Christ. The woman of Apoc. xii. he makes the early Judæo-Christian Church; and her hiding in the wilderness to have been partly fulfilled in the Church's safe refuge at Pella during the 3½ years of the Jewish war. The remnant of her seed was the faithful Christian Church afterwards; and the witnessing of her children in sackcloth prolonged to Boniface. Then, at Boniface's Jubilee, the people from the Papal nations having gathered at Rome, certain Christian witnesses were hanged there; and the Papists rejoiced over them as in Apoc. xi. 10. But, 3½ years after, Boniface was made prisoner by a French general, and soon died. In 1301 a great earthquake happened at Rome: and the witnesses rose to heaven by the gathering of converts to the true Church;—the Apocalyptic heaven.

<sup>1</sup> See e. g. p. 525; also the 2nd page of the Preface. My Edition is the 4th, London, 1644. *Brightman*.

<sup>2</sup> In Apoc. iv. the Book with seven seals is supposed to have been the whole Apocalyptic Book.

<sup>3</sup> The triumph of Christ's truth *Brightman* illustrates from Hadrian's Edict, that no Christian should be condemned unless found guilty of some violation of the civil laws. Euseb. iv. 3.

<sup>4</sup> Especially the wars with the Parthians and the Marcomanni.

<sup>5</sup> The *opening* epoch of the fifth Seal is, according to *Brightman*, the persecution

\* He had a son of the same name, famous especially for his Gothic lore, born at Heidelberg 1589, died at Windsor, 1677.

some intermission of the public persecution given under Claudius, Quintilius, Aurelian, and the rest, till the 19th year of Diocletian. 12. The sixth is opened, when Diocletian and Maximian Hercules rage: till at length they were cast out of their empire by the power of the Lamb; for fear of whom those tyrants fled, and hid themselves.<sup>1</sup>

“Apoc. vii. The seventh seal offereth first a general type of all the ages following. 1. When wicked men were ready to trouble all the world with contention, ambition, heresy, war, they are restrained by Constantine the Great; till he had sealed the elect, by providing for the faithful (who were few and living in obscurity) in that great calamity of the Church which straightway followed. 9. Which rueful time being at last passed over, the prosperity and happiness of the faithful grew great.<sup>2</sup>

“Apoc. viii. Secondly, to this seventh seal belongeth the silence that was in heaven: i. e. peace procured by Constantine. 2. The trumpets are prepared, and Constantine calleth the Nicene Council to cut off troubles, which yet by it are more increased. 6. The Angels sound the trumpets; at the sound of the first whereof the contentions of the Arians about the word *co-essential* arose. 8. At the sound of the second, the burning mountain of ambition is cast into the sea, by the decree concerning the primacy and dignity of bishops. 10. At the third the star falleth from heaven; the Arian

under Gallienus: the *white robes* given being an emblem of the temporary respite for 40 years; and the intimation about *other martyrs to be sacrificed*, before God's promised vengeance, having reference to the martyrdoms of the next and last Pagan persecution under Diocletian.

<sup>1</sup> The elemental convulsions of the 6th Seal are supposed to be those of Diocletian's persecution, when the very Church itself seemed to be blotted out of the visible heaven; the kings' subsequently figured flight and terror, on the other hand, the overthrow of the Pagan emperors by Constantine, and their awful deaths.

<sup>2</sup> Brightman places the Sealing Vision distinctly under the 6th Seal; but makes its figured symbolization to give an *anticipative* view of what was to happen afterwards under the Trumpets and Vials. (p. 240.) The *contention, ambition, heresy, and war*, specified in his summary, are made by him the *four evil angels* of the sealing vision: the same, he says, that were developed in the four first Trumpets; and arrested all four by *Constantine*, the sealing angel. The sealing was by means chiefly of the Council of Nice; into the spirit of which, however, few entered; so that the true Church, or number really sealed, was small. The 144,000, depicted as the first sealed, were the *first-fruits* and representatives of a true church of the elect, similarly sealed, down to A.D. 1300; (p. 251;) when the *palm-bearing vision* began to have fulfilment, in the ingathering of a larger multitude of Gentile converts, after the Waldenses, &c.; it being intended to include ultimately also the converted *Jews*, restored to the *privileges of Christ's Church*, (not *Jewish temple*, as of old,) after their great tribulation.

heresy being defended by Constantius and Valens. 12. At the fourth, the third part of the sun (*the Church of Africa*) is smitten by the Vandals. 13. The world is warned concerning more grievous Trumpets to ensue by Gregory the Great.

“Apoc. ix. 1. At the fifth sounding the bottomless pit is opened,<sup>1</sup> and swarms of locusts crawl out: that is, of religious persons in the West, of Saracens in the East.<sup>2</sup> 13. At the sixth the Turks invade the world, which is punished for the Romish idolatry.<sup>3</sup>

“Apoc. x. 1. At what time the Turks rise up, the study of the truth<sup>4</sup> in many in the Western parts is kindled. 9. By whose endeavour the interpretation of Scripture is restored again to the earth.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The key-bearing opener of the pit is, according to Brightman, the *Pope*. “Doth not the Pope worthily boast of his keys, and carrieth them instead of an ensign?” p. 289.

<sup>2</sup> The five months, or 150 days of the locusts, he explains of two or three different periods of that duration, marked in the Saracen ravages; such as that from their first ravages of Syria, about A.D. 630, to their overthrow by the Emperor Leo, A.D. 780. “We define this first overrunning of the earth by the Saracens in 150 years, not because at the end of these years they were straightway cast out of those countries which they had conquered; but because they had ill success afterwards in their battles against the Romans; being often conquered, put to flight, and slain, hardly holding that which they had gotten, much less getting any more.” p. 300. This resembles the view afterwards given by Daubuz; and adopted by myself from him, as well as by many others.

<sup>3</sup> “The hour, day, month, and year,” Brightman reckons on the year-day principle to be the 396 years of the Turks’ duration, measured from their revival under the Othmans, A.D. 1300; and thus that the year 1696 would see their destruction. (Compare, at p. 463 *supra*, Foxe’s commencing date, A.D. 1051.) This anticipation was naturally called to mind on Prince Eugene’s victories about that same year; (indeed one of our Bishops had repeated Brightman’s prediction previously;) and the overthrow of Turkish supremacy consequent.

<sup>4</sup> This prefigured revival of the study of the truth is supposed to date from the times of the Waldenses; the little book opened being the Scriptures, especially the Apocalypse: a book now *little*, because so much of the whole *seven-sealed Apocalyptic Book* had been already developed. This is notable, as the first step, if I mistake not, towards Mede’s remarkable and I doubt not erroneous view of the *little book*, as a separate and detached Part of the Apocalyptic prophecy, of which more in the next Section. The main and most important idea, however, of the symbol figuring the opening of the Scriptures at the particular time figured, viz. under the 6th Trumpet, Brightman, unlike Mede, loses not. The seven thunders Brightman explains as the voices of the three angels flying through mid-heaven, and the others after them, in Apoc. xiv. 6, &c.; \* of which the mysteries were for a while to be kept secret.—“There shall be time no more,” he construes as, “There shall be no more *delay*.”

<sup>5</sup> He allots 200 years to the Waldensian and Wickliffite time of preparation, as included in this chapter x., their earnest desire of spiritual learning being figured in the eating of the book by John: (for John was a type of Christ’s ministers;) and that then a fuller prophecy was given; and through the unfolding of history by Luther,

\* But, says Pareus (p. 202), with reference to this idea of Brightman’s, “there (viz. in Apoc. xiv.) only six angels are mentioned.” Brightman includes, I conceive, the one like the Son of man on the bright cloud of xiv. 14: which included, there are four mentioned in the closing part of that chapter, to be added to the three before.

“Apoc. xi. 1. Prophecy being restored, there was a more full knowledge of the age past: namely, that the Church from Constantine’s time for 1260 years was hidden in the secret part of the temple;<sup>1</sup> the Romans in the mean time boasting of the holy city and outmost court. 7. And that, at the end of those years,<sup>2</sup> the Bishop of Rome shall wage war against the Church, cut the throat of the Scriptures with his Council of Trent, yea, make very carcasses of them, and triumph over them for three years and a half; and should also, by the help of force and arms from Charles the Fifth, tread upon the saints in Germany: who yet, after three years and a half, lived again in the men of Magdeburg and Mauritius;<sup>3</sup> struck the enemies with a great fear; and overthrew the tenth part of the empire of Rome. 15. The seventh Angel soundeth; and, about the year 1558, Christ getteth himself new kingdoms; England, Ireland, Scotland embracing the Gospel.<sup>4</sup>

“Apoc. xii. The first part of the seventh trumpet giveth yet a more full light into the state of the age past; the century-writers of Magdeburg being raised up by God.<sup>5</sup> The whole matter is repeated from the beginning: and we are taught;—1. that the first Church

Melancthon, Guicciardini, &c., the faithful were prepared for understanding the state of the church and of Christian witnesses in former times, as figured in the next chapter, ‘Apoc. xi. (p. 345.)—All this too seems to me very observable.

<sup>1</sup> Retrospectively Brightman supposes the subject figured in the temple-measuring to join on to the time of Apoc. vii. So the reed like a *rod* had reference to Constantine’s *rod* of authority; by whom there was the first defining of the temple. Another point observable. “The reed’s being like a *rod* teacheth us that the truth was to be greatly helped and underpropped with the authority of princes: for a rod is often put for a sceptre . . . that sceptre which kings carry.” (p. 347.) I was quite unacquainted with Brightman when I first took a similar view of this point in the symbol.

Brightman’s “church hidden in the secret part of the temple,” may have furnished Mede perhaps with the first hint of his *atrium interius* and *exterius*.

<sup>2</sup> The *two witnesses* Brightman makes to be the *Scriptures*, and the *assemblies of the faithful*. (p. 356.)—Their 1260 *lunar* years he explains as but 1242 *Julian* years. These, measured from Constantine’s accession A.D. 304, ended in 1546, (pp. 353, 364,) the year of the assembling of the Council of Trent; which in its third Session *slew the Scriptures*, by making the *Vulgate* the only standard, and the authority of tradition equal to that of Scripture. The slaying of the *assemblies of the faithful* was by Charles the Vth’s victory over the Protestants, April 22, 1547: against whom the Protestants of Magdeburgh rose in Oct. 1550, 3½ years from the former date; and in 1555, having united with Maurice, overthrew Charles’s anti-Protestant plans, and procured freedom to the Reformed religion. (pp. 366, 375, 376.)

<sup>3</sup> So Cuninghame, afterwards.

<sup>4</sup> p. 381. This view of the epoch of the 7th Trumpet’s sounding was peculiar, I believe, to Brightman.

<sup>5</sup> p. 389. Mark this reference to the Centuriators of Magdeburgh, and their “Catalogue of Witnesses;” noted also p. 458 *suprà*.



of the Apostles was most pure, yet most of all afflicted by the Dragon,<sup>1</sup> i. e. the Roman heathenish emperors, who endeavoured with all their might that no way might be given to any Christian to the highest empire:—5. at length that Constantine the Great was born, the male child of the Church; at whose birth, though the first purity fled into the wilderness from the eyes of men, yet this Constantine threw down the Dragon from heaven, the heathenish emperors being driven out, and put from ever reigning again in or against the Church:—13. that, all hostile power being taken from the Dragon, he persecuted the Church under the Christian name by Constantius and Valens:—15. and that he sought to overwhelm her, fleeing from him, with an inundation of barbarians rushing in upon the West; 17. which flood being dried up, he stirred up the war of the Saracens.

“Apoc. xiii. 1. The Dragon being cast out of heaven by Constantine, he substituted the Beast to be his Vicar there; which Beast is the Pope of Rome, who sprung up at once with Constantine, was made great by the Nicene Council, was wounded by the Goths invading Italy, was healed by Justinian and Phocas, and thenceforth made greater than ever before. 11. The second Beast is the same Pope of Rome, enlarged in his dimensions by Pepin and Charles the Great; who gave him a new kind of springing up, whence he grew extremely wicked.<sup>2</sup>

“Apoc. xiv. For 1000 years from Constantine, the Church abiding in most secret places, was hidden together with Christ, but did no great matter famous and remarkable by the world. 6. Those 1000

<sup>1</sup> The Dragon's ten horns are explained as alluding to the Roman ten Prætorian or imperial Provinces.

<sup>2</sup> Mark here, 1st, Brightman's singular distinction of the *two Beasts*, as each alike the Popes and their empire, only at two successive times; the earlier from Constantine to Pepin, the second from Pepin and Charlemagne; the one being the *primary seventh head*, the other the *secondary seventh, or eighth*: 2ndly, the notice (the first I have observed) of *Justinian's Decree* as an epoch of Papal greatness: (p. 433:) 3. that Brightman makes the Beast's *ten horns* here to be the ten Christian emperors, on the Beast's seventh head, from Constantine to Theodosius the 2nd that gave power to the Pope: whereas those that would in God's time *hate the whore and tear her*, as he considers foretold in Apoc. xvii. 16, were *a later succession of them*, on the Beast's eighth head; the first being Charles V. (pp. 605, 609.)

As regards the Beast's seven heads, besides the sense of Rome's seven hills, Brightman, like Foxe and others, supposes them to signify Kings, Consuls, Dictators, Decemvirs, Tribunes, Emperors, Popes: the Popes reigning on Rome's seven hills for “a little while,” viz. 100 years from Constantine's removal to Constantinople; then being overthrown by the Goths; then restored again as Popes in the time of Phocas, or Pepin: so being the 8th head, and yet one of the seven. pp. 539, 590.

years being ended, Wickliff preached the Gospel in the world. 8. John Huss and Jerome of Prague succeeded him, who threatened the fall of Rome. 9. After these followeth Martin Luther, inveighing most bitterly against the Pope of Rome. 14. After that there is a harvest made in Germany by Frederic of Saxony, the rest of the Protestant Princes, and the free cities. 17. After that a vintage in England by Thomas Cromwell and Thomas Cranmer.

“ Apoc. xv. Hitherto reacheth the first part of the 7th Trumpet concerning *things past*. 1. A preparation of *things to come* is of the seven Angels with their Vials. 2. The reformed Churches dissent amongst themselves; yet all triumph over the Pope of Rome, he being vanquished. 5. The temple is opened, and knowledge increaseth, and the citizens of the Church are made the ministers of the last plagues; the issue whereof the new people of the Jews expect, before they come to the faith.

“ Apoc. xvi. The Vials are poured out. The first, by our most gracious Queen Elizabeth, and other Protestant princes; by means whereof the Popish crew are filled full of ulcerous envy. 3. The second by Martin Chemnitius upon the Council of Trent; whereby the sea of Popish doctrine was made full of filthy matter, and carrion-like contagion, by the Jesuits, the masters of controversies. 4. The third by William Cecil upon the Jesuits, who are the fountains of Popish doctrine; until when our times proceed.—The rest of the Vials are to come; yet shortly to be poured out. 8. The fourth upon the sun, i. e. the Scriptures; with the light whereof men shall be tormented, and shall break out into great anger and contentions. 10. The fifth upon the city of Rome, the throne of the Beast. 12. The sixth upon Euphrates; whereby a way shall be prepared for the Jews of the East, that, after they have embraced the faith of the Gospel, they should return into their own country: when there shall be a great preparation of war; partly by the Turk against these new Christians in the East, partly by the Pope in the West. 17. The seventh upon the air, whereby the mystery shall be made perfect: the Turkish and Popish name being both quite destroyed; and the Church also being established in as great happiness as can be looked for upon the earth.

“ Apoc. xvii. 1. The first execution of the fifth Vial upon the throne of the Beast; wherein it shall be demonstrated by most cer-

tain arguments, *by some man of no great account in the world,*<sup>1</sup> both that Rome is the seat of Antichrist, and that it became that seat since the Roman emperors were banished thence.

“Apoc. xviii. The second execution of the fifth Vial is the final destruction of the city of Rome by three angels:—1. the first descending out of heaven; 4. the second exhorting the Romans to fight, [qu. flight?] and describing both the lamentations of the wicked, as also the joy of the faithful; 21. the third confirming this everlasting destruction by a great millstone cast into the sea.

“Apoc. xix. The joy of the saints is described because of the destruction of Rome. The sixth Vial is explained, and the calling of the Jews is taught. A preparation likewise of war: partly in respect of Christ the captain, and soldiers; partly in respect of the enemies. 20. The seventh Vial is declared by the destruction of the false prophet, the Pope of Rome, the Western enemy and his armies.

“Apoc. xx. 1. The whole history of the Dragon is repeated, such as he was in the heathen emperors before his imprisonment: 2. such as he was in prison, wherinto he was cast by Constantine, and bound for 1000 years; all which space there was a contention between the elect and the Pope of Rome: and after that was at length ended, the first resurrection is brought to pass; many from all places in the West, with all their endeavour, seeking to attain to the sincere religion.<sup>2</sup> 7. Together with this resurrection Satan is loosed, and the Turk, with the Scythians Gog and Magog: who now, destroying a great part of the earth, shall at length turn their forces against the holy city, i. e. the Jews that shall believe; in which battle the Turkish name shall be quite defaced. 11. The second resurrection is brought to pass by the second and full calling of the Jews.<sup>3</sup>

“Apoc. xxi. The last part of the seventh Vial describeth the happiness of the Church after all the enemies of it be vanquished; by the new Jerusalem descending out of Heaven, being of a most glorious workmanship.

“Apoc. xxii. 1. It is declared how this happiness shall abound

<sup>1</sup> Meaning himself, I suppose; for between Apoc. xvii. and xviii. Brightman inserts an admirable Treatise on Antichrist against Bellarmine. If so, a little time is allowed by him for the Treatise having its effect; the 4th and 5th Vials being, he says, “shortly to come.” See my p. 472.

<sup>2</sup> Mark this.

<sup>3</sup> An explanation of the rising of the dead, small and great, and the judgment of the great white throne, in which Brightman, I believe, stands alone.

both with drink and with meat, to the use of others, and shall remain for ever.<sup>1</sup> 6. The conclusion confirmeth the whole prophecy, with many most effectual arguments.”

*Pareus'* Commentary followed not long after Brightman's. It was the substance of Lectures, delivered in the year 1608<sup>2</sup> to the Academy of Heidelberg, over which he presided; but seems not to have been published till the year 1615.<sup>3</sup>—My own edition is an English translation by Elias Arnold; printed Amsterdam, 1644.

In the *four first Seals* he makes the *horse* the Church, Christ being its *riders*:—first *white*, with reference to its primitive purity; chiefly for the first 200 or 300 years:<sup>4</sup>—next *red*, with reference to its persecutions and blood-shedding of martyrs by the Pagan emperors, early begun, and running on to Constantine; indeed beyond him to the Arians Constantius, Valens, &c.:—thirdly *black*, with reference to the heresies that soon darkened it; Christ holding the *balance* of his word with which to try them, and the words about *corn, wine, &c.* indicating a spiritual scarcity:—fourthly *pale*, as with the deadly disease of the hypocrisy and apostasy of Antichristianism: a disease prepared in the clerical and prelatical luxury and pride consequent on the Constantinian revolution; and developed, as having then taken hold of the whole body ecclesiastical, in the time of Gregory and Boniface III; the latter made Universal Bishop by Phocas, and so sitting in the chair of “universal pestilence.”<sup>5</sup>—The *fifth Seal* depicts the blessedness of the martyrs slain in Christ's cause “from Nero unto Boniface, the first Antichrist;” with intimation added of another set of martyrs to be slain under Antichrist before the time of vengeance: the *sixth Seal*, 1. the horrible confusions and calamities from which the Church was to suffer, for 1000 years and more, under the reign of Antichrist; 2. the day of the Lamb's wrath and judg-

<sup>1</sup> i. e. as he explains, all the time the world shall last after this.

<sup>2</sup> Pareus' Preface notes the date, being thus headed; “The Author's Preface on the Revelation of St. John, happily begun and propounded unto his auditory in the University, Anno 1608.”—It was the result of *thirty years'* thought, he tells us, Pref. p. 20.

<sup>3</sup> At p. 18 of the Preface, (English Edition,) Pareus gives an extract from a letter received by him, apparently while preparing the work for publication, or while passing it through the press, dated March, 1615.

<sup>4</sup> In a measure, he says, the time might be extended to Gregory I; though before that time “the whiteness was somewhat changed, and black spots began to appear.” p. 108.

<sup>5</sup> p. 118.



ment against the Antichristians; 3. the preservation meanwhile of a true Church to himself during Antichrist's reign, viz. "the Church militant," figured under the 144,000 sealed ones; 4. their ultimate blessedness and songs of victory, "as the Church triumphant," in heaven.—On the *seventh Seal's* opening, Pareus explains the *half-hour's silence* to be merely a break and pause, during which St. John rested from the contemplation; a new series of visions being then marked as commencing.

For he makes these visions to retrogress to the times of the beginning of the Christian Church. First, Christ, as having ascended, is seen acting as the High Priest for his people; and sends down the fire of the Holy Ghost on his disciples, in answer to their prayers:—consequent on which are the *voices, thunderings, and lightnings*; typifying what before was typified under the red, black, and pale horses; and an *earthquake*, moreover, answering to the revolution in the church and world, caused by the rise of the Papal Antichrist and of Mahomet.

The *Trumpets* Pareus refers to the same time respectively as the corresponding Seals: the 1st being significant of the injuries to the faithful, from the time of Nero to Domitian; the 2nd, of the bloodshed of the subsequent fiery Pagan persecutions to Constantine; the 3rd, of the preparation for Antichrist, in the rapidly-developed ecclesiastical apostasy; an apostasy fitly figured as *a star falling from heaven*, and embittering the streams of Church doctrine: the 4th being the darkening of the Church for some 300 years, from Silvester to Gregory I, under the advancing apostasy; the 5th and 6th, the rising of the Western and Eastern Antichrist, or the Popes and Mahomet: the desolations by the former of whom were depicted under the figure of *locusts*; (the time *five months* having only reference to the usual time of locusts making their ravages;) those by the latter under that of *horses and horsemen* from the Euphrates. In the case of the Euphratean horsemen *the four angels bound* were Arabians, Saracens, Tartars, Turks: the "hour, day, month, and year," for which they were prepared, designating only their preparation at any day that the Lord should send them. For Pareus, while noticing Brightman's notable view of this clause, as meaning a period of 396 years from A.D. 1300, measuring the Turkish empire's duration, hesitates to admit it.—The *non-repenting remnant*, Apoc. ix. 20, is explained (quite rightly I con-

ceive) of the Papists still persisting in idolatry, after all the Turkish desolations of Christendom.

In Apoc. x. the vision of the *Covenant-Angel* shows Christ's provisions for the preservation of a Christian ministry, and for the opening of his word,<sup>1</sup> during *all* the long times of opposition, especially that under Antichrist. (So that Pareus, like Brightman before him, made a less definite application of this prophecy to the times of the great Lutheran Reformation than some of his Protestant predecessors had done.)—By the seven thunders were meant the thunders of Christ's servants against tyrants and Antichrist, during the time spoken of.<sup>2</sup> By the Angel's *oath* it appeared, he says, that but one Trumpet more remained after the Turkish woe to the consummation. "*Thou must prophesy again,*" is applied by him to all the preachers of truth who lived near the end of the 5th and 6th Trumpets; a reformation of the Church being thereby promised, to take place in the last time, so as stated in the next vision of Apoc. xi. Accordingly the *temple-measuring* he explains of the Church's reformation, (Antichrist's followers being excommunicated,) as begun about the time of Huss, continued A.D. 1517. The 1260 days of the *Gentiles treading the Holy City* he *inclines* to reckon as 1260 *years*, beginning from Boniface's grant of the title of universal Bishop to the Roman Pope, A.D. 606; a period ending, says he, A.D. 1866.<sup>3</sup> But he leaves the *decision* of this point with God. The *two Witnesses* he understands indefinitely for all true Christian witnesses: their anti-Papal witness being developed more and more clearly as Antichrist's tyranny and iniquity was more and more manifested.<sup>4</sup> Their symbolized slaughter, when individually they had completed their testimony, and the 3½ days' exposure of their dead bodies in the great city of the Papal empire, had respect to the repeated slaughter, and as repeated revival very speedily, of Christ's witnessing servants: Foxe's particular case of Huss and Jerome at Constance, and Brightman's case of the Council of Trent's temporary triumph over Protestantism till its revival

<sup>1</sup> Pareus (p. 199) explains the Book in the Angel's hand as both the Apocalyptic seven-sealed book and the gospel.

<sup>2</sup> He notices the emphasis in the expression, *τας ἑαυτων φωνας*. p. 202.

<sup>3</sup> Again my reader will mark how the early Protestant expositors referred to this epoch. But, adds Pareus, for the elect's sake the Lord will shorten the time. p. 220.

<sup>4</sup> p. 225. A just view of the thing in my opinion; and which I have myself urged. See my Vol. ii. pp. 423, 424.

through Prince Maurice, both included. The Witnesses' resurrection he explains of the martyred saints' resurrection literally: and makes the *tenth part of the city*, that fell, to be the part that fell off from the great city of Papal Christendom at the time of the Reformation.

In Apoc. xii. the *Woman* (as usual) he makes to be chiefly the Church bringing forth Christ in his members; though the literal view of Christ's birth of the Virgin Mary might be also in St. John's mind: the Dragon, the Devil; his seven heads and ten horns symbolizing indefinitely the multitude of earthly powers under him. The battle, or rather war in heaven, is explained 1st *spiritually* and *literally*, of the conflict of Christ and Satan; 2nd *historically*, of Constantine's being advanced to the throne of the Roman Empire.—The waters cast after the Woman are both heresies, such as the Arian; and also the flood of invading barbarians. The Woman's 1260 days in the wilderness are to be dated from the Papal Antichrist's constitution by Phocas, as before; she having been for 300 years, from Constantine to Phocas, in movement thitherward.—In Apoc. xiii. Pareus considers and rejects the idea of the *first Beast* out of the *sea* symbolizing the Old Roman Pagan empire; and applies it to the Popedom, with reference to the Pope's asserted *imperial* power and authority; his *deadly wound* being that of the 40 years' Papal schism, begun A.D. 1378, and healed at Constance. The *second Beast* was the Papal Antichrist in his character of a seducing *Prelate*; the head with the members, or whole crew of his seducing priests. The *image of the Beast* Pareus deems to be one image for many; meaning the *images of saints*, which the Papal Beast requires men to worship. The name and number he makes with Irenæus and Foxe, respectively, to be *Δαρειος* and רמעיניש.—In Apoc. xiv. the *first preaching Angel* is explained as Wicliffe and Huss; the *second* as Luther; the *third* all faithful preachers since Luther.—In Apoc. xvi. the *seven last plagues* are the plagues under the last of the four periods into which the Christian æra is divided: viz. 1. that to Constantine; 2. that to Phocas; 3. that to Leo and Luther; 4. and last, that after Luther. The first *Vial* is the ulcerous sores that fell on the Papists from Luther's Reformation; the 2nd, the deadly decrees of the Council of Trent; the 3rd, the persecuting Papal Bishops and Doctors becoming blood for having shed the saints' blood,—a plague yet future; the 4th, a

fresh heat and light from the Scriptures opened by Christ, yet with the result of only the more enraging the Papists; the 5th, the darkening of Rome from its former lustre; the 6th, the drying up of the resources of the Antichristian Babylon or Rome; the 7th, the smiting of the air or natural atmosphere with pestilence, and the universal destruction thence following.

On Apoc. xvii. Pareus explains *the Beast* to designate Antichrist not simply, but as clothed with the skin of the Roman empire: an empire which “*was*” under the old government of kings, consuls, &c.; which “*is not*” because of the Roman ecclesiastical hierarchy not having begun in St. John’s time; and which “*is to ascend out of the bottomless pit*” at the time of Phocas. Further the *seven kings*, answering to the *seven hills*, are construed by him, after Aretius Napier and Brightman,<sup>1</sup> to signify Kings, Consuls, Dictators, Decemvirs, Military Tribunes, and Emperors, according to the enumeration of Rome’s ruling magistrates given in Tacitus; *five* having passed away, and the *sixth*, or Pagan Emperors, holding rule at the time when St. John saw the vision: the *seventh* head being the Roman *Christian Emperors* from Constantine, and the *eighth* the Popes or Antichrist. “*And is of the seven,*” Pareus understands to mean that this eighth would have the same ruling power as the seven previous. (He notes, in passing, that other Protestant expositors made the eighth to be the *French and German Emperors of the West.*) With regard to the *ten horns* symbolized, he supposes them to have sprung out of the 7th head, or that of the *Christian Cæsars*. The statement that the ten kings, after rising *at one and the same time with* the Beast, are to strip and make bare the Woman, or Rome, he speaks of as a thing still future.<sup>2</sup> But they are not, he adds, therewith to *destroy* the

<sup>1</sup> This explanation has been ascribed to James I. (So Daubuz, p. 514, on Apoc. xii. 3.) In King James’s comment I find the explanation stands thus: “The seven heads of the Beast signify as well seven material hills, whereupon the seat of this monarchy is situated; as also seven kings, or *divers forms of magistrates*, that this empire hath had, and is to have hereafter.” He is said by the Editor of the Edition of his Works in 1616, the then Bishop of Winchester, to have written this commentary on the Revelations before he was twenty years old; which would be A.D. 1586. And I see in Watts’s Bibliotheca that 1588 is put down as the date of its first publication. Now this was the same year that Foxe’s *Eieasmi* was published, giving the same solution; and giving it as from Peter Artopæus and Dr. Fulke, both some years King James’s seniors. See my p. 465 *surpâ*. Fulke published on the Apocalypse A.D. 1573, and died 1589; Artopæus earlier. And, as I observed at p. 465, Oslander suggested nearly the same solution yet earlier.

<sup>2</sup> On this passage Pareus strongly insists that the right reading is *ἐπι το θηριον*; not, what Bellarmine would have, *και το θηριον*.



Papal Antichrist: he being destined to survive Rome's destruction, and to be destroyed only by the brightness of Christ's coming.

On Apoc. xx. the *millennium* is explained nearly on the Augustinian principle; Satan having no power, says Pareus, after Christ's first advent and ministry effectually *to maintain Paganism*: and that his destined post-millennial loosing was at the time of Antichrist's full development in Gregory VII; i. e. A. D. 1073. Meanwhile the saints and martyrs did all *reign with Christ in heaven after death*, during that earlier part of Antichrist's reign which lasted from 606 to 1073; in which, although he was not then fully developed, they had yet to encounter and resist him. (Pareus here takes occasion to controvert the Chiliasts; the *first resurrection* being *spiritual*, he says, not *corporal*.)—Then Gog and Magog are explained as the *Turks* loosed about the time of Gregory VII.; and finally that it was the heavenly glory of the redeemed that was typified under the figure of the *New Jerusalem*.

There is much that is valuable in Pareus' exposition. One point in it that specially deserves notice is his explanation of the *two Beasts*; distinguishing between them, as he does, as symbolizing the Papal Antichrist the one in his *imperial* supremacy, the other in his *ecclesiastical* and *prelatic* supremacy. He seems however to have overlooked the agreement of the Papal pretensions as *Christ's Vicar* with the character of the *Antichrist* of prophecy: on which pretensions in fact the Pope's grand *super-imperial* supremacy was wholly grounded. Nor was he more successful than his predecessors, as I think, in solving the difficulties of the Beast's *seventh* head; though clear as to the *eighth*. On certain other points he appears to me to have retrogressed, rather than advanced.

The reader has now before him pretty much the state in which Apocalyptic interpretation was left *among the Protestants*, at the close of the *era and century of the Reformation*. The advance made by them in it seems to me to have been very great: at least in those parts of the prophecy with which they were most concerned, respecting the Beast Antichrist, the witnesses, and vision of the rainbow-crowned Angel who held the opened  $\beta\upsilon\beta\lambda\iota\omicron\nu$ , or  $\beta\upsilon\beta\lambda\iota\alpha\rho\iota\delta\iota\omicron\nu$ , in hand, and recommissioned John to prophesy.

But what meanwhile as to the *Romish* divines and expositors? This was to be our *second* head of inquiry in the present Section.

## II. The ROMISH APOCALYPTIC EXPOSITORS of *the æra and Century of the Reformation.*

It seems, as both Foxe and Brightman report to us, that for some time following the Reformation the Romish Doctors were very shy of the subject.<sup>1</sup> At its first outbreak indeed, on Luther's anti-Papal protest, some unguarded Doctors of the Papacy, in the true spirit of the 5th Council of Lateran, just then concluded, which had solemnly identified the then existing Romish Church with the New Jerusalem of the Apocalypse.<sup>2</sup>—I say there were certain Doctors, as *Prierio* and *Eck*, so unguarded as to take up the Lateran theory, and broadly declare the Papal dominion to be Daniel's 5th monarchy, or reign of the saints.<sup>3</sup> But what then of the little horn, or Antichrist, that was to intervene, according to Daniel's declaration, between old Rome's iron empire and the saints' reign? The question was so puzzling that it must have been abundantly palpable to all thoughtful Romanists that such a Danielic theory was untenable; and that some better one must be taken up, if the Papal citadel were to be defended on prophetic grounds. The same of the Apocalypse. So at length, as the century was advancing to a close, two stout Jesuits took up the gauntlet; and published their respective, but quite counter, opinions on the Apocalyptic subject:—the one *Ribera*, a Jesuit Priest of Salamanca, who about A.D. 1585 published an Apocalyptic Commentary, which was on the grand points of Babylon and Antichrist what we now call the *futurist* scheme: the other *Alcasar*, also a Spanish Jesuit, but of Seville, whose scheme was on main points what may be called that of the *wholly præterists*. Either suited the great object of the writers nearly equally well; viz. that of setting aside all application of the prophecies of Antichrist from the existing Church of Rome: the one by making the prophecy stop altogether short of Papal Rome; the other by making it overleap almost altogether the immense interval of time (that of the Popedom's dominancy inclusive) which had elapsed since the prophecy was given, and

<sup>1</sup> "Post Thomam illum haud quisquam fere sit ex totâ illâ cohorte Pontificiâ, infinitâque scribentium multitudine, qui vel verbum in hanc Apocalypsim commentare sit ausus." Præfat.

<sup>2</sup> See my Vol. ii. pp. 442—444.

<sup>3</sup> So Merle d'Aubigne, ii. 138, of *Silvestre Mazzolini de Prierio*, Master of the Sacred Palace at Rome; writing against Luther, "que la domination Papale étoit la cinquième monarchie de Daniel, et la seule véritable." Also of *Eck*, in the Leipsic dispute; *ibid.* 61. (3rd Ed. Paris.)

plunge in its pictures of Antichrist into a yet distant future, just before the consummation. *Ribera's* futurist Commentary, when first published, excited vehemently the indignation of our countryman *Brightman*; and indeed served to hasten on his own antagonistic and masterly exposition of the Apocalypse.<sup>1</sup> Again, *Aleasar's* was published just in time to receive the notice, criticisms, and rebuke of the Protestant expositor *Pareus*.<sup>2</sup> From the notices in which latter author, and a few too that have met my eye elsewhere, I now abstract a brief sketch of either exposition. I so borrow from others because of my not having had access personally to the commentaries themselves.

### 1. *Ribera*.

And let me at the outset beg my readers to observe, respecting this expositor, that he had not the hardihood which has been manifested by modern Futurists, to suppose the plunge into the distant future of the consummation to be made by the Apocalypse *at its outset*. For while, as *Pareus* states, *Ribera* has thought good to explicate the argument of the Apocalypse as if it were nothing else but certain commentaries upon our Lord's prophecy in Matt. xxiv.,<sup>3</sup> he makes it *begin* with the early period of the Church. So his 1st Seal's white horse and rider signify the gospel-triumphs of the apostolic era; his 3rd Seal's black horse and rider, heresies; his 4th Seal, the violence of Trajan's persecutions of the Church, and multitude of deaths of Christians under it, by sword, famine, wild beasts, &c. At length in the 6th Seal *Ribera* explains the phenomena there figured as meant of the signs before Christ's second coming spoken of in Matt. xxiv. and Luke xxi.:<sup>4</sup> and construes the sealing vision

<sup>1</sup> So in the Dedication of his Comment "to the Holy Reformed Churches of Britain, Germany, and France." Says *Brightman*: "But mine anger and indignation burst out against the Jesuits. For when as I had by chance light upon *Ribera*, who had made a Commentary upon this same holy Revelation, Is it even so? said I. Do the Papists take heart again; so as that book, which of a long time before they would scarce suffer any man to touch, they dare now take in hand, to intreat fully upon it? What! was it but a vain image or bug, at the sight whereof they were wont to tremble a few years since, even in the dim light, that now they dare be bold to look wishly upon this glasse in the clear sunshine; and dare proclaime to the world that any other thing rather is poynted at in it than their Pope of Rome?"

<sup>2</sup> *Pareus'* notices appear partly in his Preface, partly in the body of his Commentary.

<sup>3</sup> *Pareus*, Pref. p. 16.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 112, 116, 123.—On the 5th Seal *Ribera* says that the Apocalyptic figure of *souls under the altar* "had respect to the ancient custom of Christians laying up

too, *with all that follows in the Apocalypse*, to have reference to the times of Antichrist: the four winds (life-giving winds) being meant literally; and their restraint by the four *good* Angels indicating the calamities then destined to fall on the persecutors of the saints.<sup>1</sup> The 144,000 of Apoc. vii. he makes to be the Jews converted to Christ at the consummation, though inconsistently afterwards explaining the 144,000 in Apoc. xiv. of both Jews and Gentiles under Antichrist; and taking the number 144,000 literally.

Passing to the 7th Seal Ribera explains the incense-offering Angel to be Gabriel; and the thunders, &c., consequent to signify generally the judgments impending. Which judgments of the four first Trumpets he explains *literally*:—as plagues respectively of hail, of some great fiery globe (qu. as of a comet?) cast into the sea; of a fiery exhalation falling from heaven; and of signs in the sun and moon, such as in Matt xxiv. The locusts of the 5th Trumpet however he expounds figuratively of a woe of cruel and barbarous invading armies, (as barbarous as the Goths and Vandals of old,) with their crowned kings leading them on against the Church. In the 6th Trumpet the four angels are evil angels, bound at Christ's first coming, but now at length let loose to hurt men.<sup>2</sup>—In Apoc. x. the descending angel is the same that proclaimed about the book in Apoc. v.; and who swears that, because of men's not having been led to repent by the six previous Trumpet-plagues, the end of the world and last judgment are now at hand.<sup>3</sup>—St. John's direction to prophesy again meant simply that he had still many things to predict against the Gentiles.—In Apoc. xi. alike the *temple* and *holy city* figured the *Church*: and the city's being given to be trod by Gentiles meant that it would be obtained and occupied by Antichrist with armies consisting of heathenish men.<sup>4</sup> Ribera's slaughter-place for the two witnesses, (I presume, Enoch and Elias,) when slain by Antichrist, or the Beast from the abyss, is the city *Jerusalem*:<sup>5</sup> their  $3\frac{1}{2}$  *days* of death denoting Antichrist's  $3\frac{1}{2}$  *years*.<sup>6</sup> The 7th

the relics of saints under the altar. 'For when,' saith he, 'an altar is builded, there is made under it a sepulchre for to keep the relics: and the priest, dipping his finger in the chrism, makes the sign of the cross upon the four corners of the sepulchre, &c.' But in this, remarks Pareus, 'Ribera is to be hissed at: . . . for this custom is superstitious and gross idolatry, idly invented many years after.' p. 119.

<sup>1</sup> Ib. 137, 138.

<sup>2</sup> Ib. pp. 153, 159, 162, 164, 176, 185.

<sup>3</sup> Ib. 197.

<sup>4</sup> Ib. 212, 215.

<sup>5</sup> Ib. 235.

<sup>6</sup> Cressener, p. 176: who adds that on Apoc. xx. Ribera inconsistently objects to the *year-day* principle.



Trumpet is that of the last judgment: but it is here noted by anticipation; as the prophecy reverts to a description of Antichrist's kingdom and doings.<sup>1</sup>

In Apoc. xii. Ribera acts out the futurist. The Woman is the Church travailing in the last times, just before the 3½ years of Antichrist; seeing that her 3½ years in the wilderness coincides with those of Antichrist's reign: for he identifies the Dragon with the Beast Antichrist.<sup>2</sup> Then, as to the Beast and his great city Babylon, in Apoc. xiii. and xvii., here is the main point in Ribera's system. He admits that the Woman in Apoc. xvii. is Rome, Papal Rome; and argues from xvii. 16, that *shortly before the consummation* the ten kings, figured in the Beast's ten horns, shall overthrow Rome; this being probably before the coming of Antichrist. But how so, seeing that the Woman is seen sitting on the Beast from the abyss, which in Apoc. xi. Ribera had admitted to be Antichrist? Because in this chapter xvii., with marvellous inconsistency, he makes the Beast to be the Devil reigning. Yet in Apoc. xix., just after, when the Beast is taken, (of course the same as in the preceding chapters.) and the Dragon, and False Prophet, he admits the Beast to be Antichrist, just as in Apoc. xi.<sup>3</sup> Elsewhere Ribera doubts whether it will be the ten kings before Antichrist, or Antichrist himself, that will destroy Rome, after having his seat a while there.<sup>4</sup> But what of the Pope when Rome is destroyed? Ribera, admitting that the Papal seat will be destroyed, says that notwithstanding the Pope will still be the Roman Bishop, though he sits not at Rome; just as during the absence of 70 years at Avignon.<sup>5</sup> In Apoc. xvi. the *vial-plagues* are expounded literally, as those on Egypt. In Apoc. xviii. Rome's burning is explained to be in judgment on the sins both of *old Pagan Rome*, and of *Rome apostatized*.<sup>6</sup>

On the *millennium* Ribera follows Augustine. It is the whole time from Christ's resurrection to Antichrist's kingdom: the *new Jerusalem* being viewed by him, Pareus seems to hint, as a figure of the Church of Rome.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Ib. 247.

<sup>2</sup> Ib. 256, 260, 265.

<sup>3</sup> Ib. 438, 441, 450 of Apoc. xvi.

<sup>4</sup> Ib. 441, 442.

<sup>5</sup> Ib. 441.—And so Bellarmine, says Malvenda; i. 350.

<sup>6</sup> Ib. 456.

<sup>7</sup> Ib. 507, 549.—Ribera, says Malvenda, i. 402. contends strongly that it is absurd to suppose that the old Roman empire has not been taken away (defecit), so as the old Fathers expected, because of the German empire being still called the Roman

2. *Alcasar*.

Of this expositor, and his *Præterist* system, Pareus gives a very succinct yet clear sketch, which I cannot do better than copy. Alcasar, he tells us,<sup>1</sup> explained the Revelation of John as teaching, "that Rome, of old the head of Pagan idolatry, by an admirable vicissitude was to be changed into the metropolis of the Catholic Church; that the Roman Church was gloriously to triumph both in respect of the Roman city and the whole empire; and that the sovereign authority of the Romish Pope should always remain in the height of honour." Alcasar exults, and congratulates the Pope, that he first out of the darkness of the Apocalypse should have showed this light. But surely, observes Pareus, this might cause laughter or shame even to the Roman Court itself.

Further, Pareus states that Alcasar's general argument is that the Apocalypse describes a twofold war of the Church; one with the *Synagogue*, the other with *Paganism*; and a twofold victory and triumph over both adversaries. More particularly the development of the subject was thus:—1. from Apoc. i.—xi. the rejection of the Jews, and desolation of Jerusalem by the Romans:<sup>2</sup> 2. from Apoc. xii.—xx., both inclusive, the overthrow of Paganism, and establishment of the empire of the Roman Church over Rome and the whole world; the judgment of the great Whore, and destruction of Babylon, being effected by Constantine and his successors: 3. in Apoc. xxi., xxii., under the type of the Lamb's Bride, the New Jerusalem, a description of the glorious and triumphant state of the *Roman Church in heaven*.<sup>3</sup>

empire. This is but, says he, in rather curious accord with Luther, the *simulacrum* or *ghost* of the old empire.

Let me here add that *Bellarmino* closely followed Ribera in time and prophetic views. Only, instead of partially applying the *year-day* principle, as Ribera had done, he declares absolute war against it; anticipating Dr. S. R. Maitland in some of his arguments. So far as I know it was *now for the first time since St. John* that the principle was formally denounced.

<sup>1</sup> Pref. p. 16.

<sup>2</sup> Yet Alcasar confesses the later *Domitianic* date of the Apocalypse. Ib. 17.

<sup>3</sup> Ib. 17.—Alcasar's Commentary was the result, as Malvenda tells us, (i. 333,) of above 40 years' study. It was the prototype of the *Præterist* system of Grotius, and the more modern German rationalistic expositors.

The general character of Alcasar's Commentary is given in the text. It may be well perhaps to add one or two less important particulars here.—And 1st, let me state, with reference to the  $3\frac{1}{2}$  *days* of the witnesses lying dead, that Alcasar applies it to the Jewish persecution of Christians; leaving it indifferently to be taken either for so many *years*, or *months*. (Par. 240.) Thus Bellarmine's attack on the *year-day* principle had not convinced Alcasar.—2. He strongly impugns the interpretation of the Beast of Apoc. xiii. as Antichrist: declaring it to be indubitably the Roman

§ VI. FROM THE END OF THE ÆRA AND CENTURY OF THE REFORMATION, ABOUT A.D. 1610, TO THE FRENCH REVOLUTION.

The century and æra of the great Reformation had past:—that Reformation on gospel principles of which Pierre d'Olive had expressed his expectation as a probable final testing to the Romish Church; in order, by her rejection of it, to justify even before men her divinely doomed utter destruction.<sup>1</sup> And so the now separated powers of Protestantism and Popery, in professing Christendom, stood face to face in opposition; with their armoury and weapons of argument, as well as of political force, outdrawn, or preparing against each other. Among which of course was the argument from prophetic SS, specially of the Apocalypse, which both parties professed to receive as divinely inspired: and which, according to its own opening words, as well as according to the early Christian Fathers' acceptance of them, was to be regarded as God's prefiguration of the things destined after St. John's time to befall the Church and the world; and consequently as involving *his* view and judgment respecting them.—Long had this been lost sight of. For 700 or 800 years after the fall of the old Roman empire the Apocalyptic prophecy had been expounded, we have seen, as if little more than a repetition of mere general common-place enunciations respecting the world's wickedness, the Church's sufferings, and God's consequent judgments, under the form of a store-house of figures in which the expositor's fancy might luxuriate without check or limit:<sup>2</sup> without any definite prediction of coming events, anything of chronological order and succession in the predictions; any possibility of a gathering from them of the lessons of real prophecy as to the things which already had been, since St. John's seeing the visions in Patmos, or the things which were still to be thereafter.<sup>3</sup>

Pagan Empire. On this he has a battle with Malvenda; i. 429—431.—3rdly, he has another battle with Malvenda on account of his patronizing in any measure Ribera and Bellarmine's idea that the Babylon of Apoc. xvii. might mean Rome in the last days, becoming heathen again, ejecting the Pope, and persecuting Christians. Ib. 350-4. Alcasar makes the Church's *millennium* of rest to date from the destruction of old Pagan Rome, his Apocalyptic Babel. Ib. 433.

Alcasar's contemporary, the monk *Pinto*, made Daniel's 45 days = 45 years: like Lyranus. So Malvenda ii. 244.

<sup>1</sup> See p. 428 *suprà*.

<sup>2</sup> Compare Apoc. iv. 1.

<sup>3</sup> Let my readers refer back to Tichonius, Primasius, Ambrose Ansbart, &c., in illustration.

So, I say, it was through seven centuries of the middle age; till at length, about A.D. 1200, Joachim Abbas opened the way, however imperfectly, to its explanation, as a foreshadowing, distinctly and definitely, of the history of the Church and world from Apostolic times to the time then present, and still beyond it:—an opening followed up with more light, both spiritual and intellectual, and better advantage, though still very imperfectly, by the expositors of the æra of the Reformation. Very specially those parts of the prophecy had influentially been opened to them which seemed most immediately to regard themselves, and their cause and æra, in its foreshadowings:—I mean, 1st, the glorious sudden light-bearing descent of the covenant-Angel, with the opened gospel in his hand, Apoc. x., just in the deepest and most hopeless state, as prophetically depicted, of Christendom under that 6th Trumpet of the judgment of horsemen from the Euphrates, which they could not but construe very generally of the Euphratean Turks;<sup>1</sup> a vision including the oath that but one more Trumpet remained to be sounded ere the consummation:<sup>2</sup> 2ndly, the predictions concerning the Roman seven-headed Beast, or Papal Antichrist, and Christ's true Church, and its destined persecutions and sufferings under him: 3rdly, concerning the sackcloth-robbed Witnesses raised up to protest against it; all for apparently the same mystic period, however and whencesoever to be measured, of 1260 days, 42 months, or  $3\frac{1}{2}$  times.<sup>3</sup> It was just as Tertullian, in the time of the early Christians' persecution under Pagan Rome, had seized on the true intent of the 5th Seal's vision of the souls under the altar, with a kind of special instinct, as specially concerning *them*; <sup>4</sup> and the Constantinian expositors of the 4th century had specially and instinctively seized on the prophecy of the Dragon's dejection in Apoc. xii., as meant of them and their æra.<sup>5</sup> And this strongly of course helped to strengthen the conviction in the minds of the Reformers of the *whole prophecy* being indeed, when rightly understood, a prophecy *definitely historical*; and, with the master

<sup>1</sup> So Bullinger, Chytræus, Foxe, very decidedly; also, though less definitely, Brightman, Pareus. See p. 445 *suprà*. <sup>2</sup> See the extracts in my Vol. ii. p. 145.

<sup>3</sup> The *year-day* measure of the 1260 *days* being most generally taken; but the *terminus à quo* doubtfully suggested as either the date of Constantine's triumph, that of Alaric's destruction of Rome, or (what has always seemed to me a remarkable choice for Protestant expositors of a time, considering that it necessarily made the ending date as late as 1866) that of the Decree of *Phocas*.

<sup>4</sup> See my Vol. i. p. 232.

<sup>5</sup> See my Vol. iii. p. 34.



hand of divine philosophy, picturing in it the intermixed fortunes of the Church and the world from St. John's time to the consummation.

But much beyond this they progressed not. On the fundamental point of the structure of the Apocalypse, and order and relationship of its several parts, they held the most diverse opinions. Did the seven-sealed Book contain in itself the whole of the Apocalyptic predictions, or but a part? Were the Seals, Trumpets, and Vials chronologically continuous, the one set of figurations chronologically following the other in what they prefigured? or were they of range chronologically parallel; each reaching to the consummation? Had the killing and resurrection of the Witnesses been yet fulfilled; or were they events still future? Were the figurations always definite figurings of the æra symbolized; or sometimes, at least, mere general truths, whether as regards the Church or the world? Were the 1260 days to be taken always literally, or sometimes mystically; and, if so, whether on the year-day principle of measure, or what other; and whence moreover to be measured, and when terminated? Again, finally, what of the 1000 years of Satan's binding, told of in Apoc. xx.; and, if already fulfilled, or fulfilling, how to be reconciled with the other statements in the prophecy? On all these points opinions the most different had been express'd by the Reformers; the questions remained sub judice, the difficulties unsolved.<sup>1</sup> They were problems, apparently, for the Protestant interpreters of the next age; that of which I am now to speak.

Our 6th Section of the History of Apocalyptic Interpretation opens naturally with *Mede* in England, Pareus' immediate successor, and from him passes to *Jurieu* the French Protestant: then (after brief notice of the anti-Protestant expositors, though themselves Protestant, *Hammond* and *Grotius*) to *Cressener*, *Vitringa*, and *Daubuz*, as the next expositors of chief repute among Protestants, and *Bossuet* among Roman Catholics; then next to *Sir Isaac Newton*, *Whiston*, and *Bishop Newton*; the last-mentioned a summarizer of the most generally received Protestant prophetic views at an epoch immediately prior to the French Revolution.

1. *Mede.*—It was in 1627 that *Mede* first published his *Claris Apocalyptica*, in 1632 his *Commentary*; the former laying down from

<sup>1</sup> On all these points it will be useful for the Reader to refer to the sketches of the Reformers' Apocalyptic explanations given in the Section preceding.

*internal evidence* (independent of any particular historic system of explanation) the “*synchronisms*” and *mutual relationships* of the several parts of the prophecy; the latter his *historical explanation*, conformably with those synchronisms. The reputation of these works, especially in England, is well known. He was looked on, and written of, as a man almost inspired for the solution of the Apocalyptic mysteries. And certainly of his general discernment and theological learning, as well as of that which he brought to bear on prophecy, there might well be entertained a high opinion. Yet, if it be permitted to express freely my judgment on so great a man, I must say that I think his success was at first over-estimated as an Apocalyptic Expositor. For if on various points he much advanced the science, especially as regards his principle of inferring the structure of the prophecy from its own internal evidence, prior to any historical application, and thence laying down of its synchronisms and the mutual relationship of its several parts, (the place of the millennium of Satan’s binding inclusive,) and last (scarce least) his appending of a Tabular Scheme of the Prophecy, according to his view of arrangement and connexion of its parts,—an appendage attached by him to his Commentary first I believe of Apocalyptic Expositors, and without which, in my opinion, no Apocalyptic Commentary can be complete,—while, I say, on these points, and certain *historical* illustrations also of the prophecy, he advanced the science of Apocalyptic interpretation, on others I conceive him to have caused it very materially to retrograde. So, above all, in regard of his idea, prominently marked in the Tabular Scheme, of the Apocalypse having been divided into two separate Parts, written respectively in two separate Books; viz. 1st, *the seven-sealed Book* given into the hand of the Lamb to open, Apoc. v. 7; 2ndly, the *Little Book* given opened into the hand of St. John by the Covenant Angel, Apoc. x. 9—11, each having a general parallelism of chronology with the other, and each its own proper synchronisms.<sup>1</sup> On this more as I proceed.

The Tabular Scheme of his views copied from his own Book on my

<sup>1</sup> It may be well to append a list of these his Apocalyptic synchronisms; a notice being added where Mede seems to me to have been in error.

1. The  $3\frac{1}{2}$  times, 42 months, or 1260 days, of the woman’s being in the wilderness, the ten-horned resuscitated Beast’s reigning, the outer court of the temple being trod by Gentiles, and Christ’s two witnesses witnessing in sackcloth.

2. The coincident duration of the ten-horned Beast and the two-horned of Apoc. xiii. (Qu. in Mede’s sense?)

3. Ditto of the ten-horned Beast and mystic Babylon.

next page, (itself, as I said, the first of its kind, and so of the more especial value,) combined and compared with the observations on them scattered through the *Horæ*, will do away with the necessity of entering into them so much in detail as might otherwise have been desirable. In general he considered the 6 first *Seals* to be a figuration of the successive fortunes of heathen Rome, after St. John down to the overthrow of heathenism in it by Constantine; then the *Trumpets* to be the unfolding of the 7th *Seal*, and figuring of the subsequent history of the Roman world and Christian Church to the consummation: a most important, and I doubt not true, view of the structure of that part of the prophecy. More particularly the 1st Seal is supposed by him to depict the early gospel victories; the 2nd, the wars of Trajan and Hadrian; the 3rd, the severe justice, and procurations of corn, notable in the reigns of the two Severi; the 4th, the famine pestilence and murderous wars of the æra of Gallienus; the 5th, Diocletian's persecution; the 6th, the overthrow of Paganism and its empire by Constantine.—Again of the *Trumpets*, the 1st is explained of Alarie; the 2nd of the Gothic and Vandal desolators of the Empire, that followed, down to Genseric; the 3rd of the extinction of the Hesperus, or Western Empire, by Odoacer; the 4th, of the ravages of Totilas, whereby imperial Rome received its last desolations; the 5th, of the Saracens; the 6th, of the Turks.—In most of which particulars I conceive Mede to have made advances to the true interpretation: adjusting the 5th and 6th Seals, as he did, to the times

4. Ditto of the 144,000 of Apoc. vii. and xiv. with the above.

5. Of the time of the inner temple-court's measuring, Apoc. xi., and of the Dragon's War with the travelling woman, Apoc. xii. (Qu.?)

6. Of the Seven Vials, and Babylon's and the Beast's verging to destruction.

7. Of the 7th Seal, and 7 Trumpets evolving it, with the ten-horned and two horned Beasts of Apoc. xiii. (Qu.?) Mede dates the rise of the ten-horned Beast too early, I conceive, viz. from the time of Alarie's capture of Rome, figured in Trumpet 1.

8. Of the measuring of the inner temple Court, (as also, according to synchronism 5, of the Dragon's war with the travelling Woman,) with the six first Seals. In order to this the Dragon's war with Michael and the woman must be regarded as extending to the whole two centuries of the war of Christianity and Heathenism in the Roman empire, between St. John's time and Constantine: not as that of the last crisis of the war.

9. Of the seven vials with Trumpet 6.—A manifest error, I conceive; and in marked inconsistency with Mede's own view of the 7th Seal as unfolded in the 7 Trumpets; a view which suggests the similar evolution of the 7th Trumpet in the 7 Vials.

10. Of the millennium of Satan's binding, Christ's reign, and also of the New Jerusalem, and Palmbearers' ovation, with the 7th Trumpet, after the Beast's destruction: (Rather with the *concluding* æra of the 7th Trumpet.)

11. The speedy sequence of the things figured in the first Seal on, or after, the time of the revelation of the visions to St. John in Patmos. "I will show thee the things which must shortly come to pass."

MEDE'S APOCALYPTIC SCHEME.

THE SEVEN-SEALED BOOK.						
SIX FIRST SEALS.			SEVENTH TRUMPET.			
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Victory; CHRIST.	Slaughter; ABRAM.	Balance; SEVERI.	Death; GALILEUS.	Altar; DIOCETIAN.	Earthquake; CONSTANTINE.	
THE			containing			
THE			SEVENTH TRUMPET.			
1			2		3	
Hall; ALARIC.			Burning Mountain; GOTHs and VANDALS; TO GENSERIC.		Falling Star; ODOACER.	
4			5		6	
Eclipse of Luminaries; TOTILAS.			Locusts; SARACENS.		Euphratean Horsemen; TURKS.	
5			6			
Sealing of 144,000 out of all the tribes of Israel.			7			
7			The MYSTERY OF GOD is finished, as foreshown to the Prophets.			
8			9			
Palmbearing Company out of all nations.			Kingdoms of this World			
10			11			
become the Kingdoms of Christ.			SEVEN VIALS.			
12			13			
Outer Court (or Holy City) unmeasured is given to the Gentiles 42 months.			14			
Christ's two witnesses prophesy 1260 days in sackcloth.			15			
16			17			
Woman is driven by Dragon into the Wilderness; there to be nourished 1260 days.			Satan bound, and Saints reign with Christ, 1000 years.			
18			19			
Seven-headed ten-horned Beast, revived under last head, blasphemous and domineers 42 months.			The Lamb's Wife, NEW JERUSALEM, descends from heaven:			
20			21			
Two-horned Beast, or False Prophet, exercises all the power of First Beast before him.			And the nations walk in her light.			
22			23			
The 144,000, that sing the new song, tell of coming judgments.			RESURRECTION.			
24			25			
Harlot Babylon, on ten-horned Beast, under last head, makes drunk the nations with her poison-cup.			Satan bound, and Saints reign with Christ, 1000 years.			
26			27			
Temple-court and Altar measured.			NEW JERUSALEM, descends from heaven:			
28			29			
War of Michael and Dragon about the childbearing.			And the nations walk in her light.			
30			31			
32			33			
34			35			
36			37			
38			39			
40			41			
42			43			
44			45			
46			47			
48			49			
50			51			
52			53			
54			55			
56			57			
58			59			
60			61			
62			63			
64			65			
66			67			
68			69			
70			71			
72			73			
74			75			
76			77			
78			79			
80			81			
82			83			
84			85			
86			87			
88			89			
90			91			
92			93			
94			95			
96			97			
98			99			
100			101			
102			103			
104			105			
106			107			
108			109			
110			111			
112			113			
114			115			
116			117			
118			119			
120			121			
122			123			
124			125			
126			127			
128			129			
130			131			
132			133			
134			135			
136			137			
138			139			
140			141			
142			143			
144			145			
146			147			
148			149			
150			151			
152			153			
154			155			
156			157			
158			159			
160			161			
162			163			
164			165			
166			167			
168			169			
170			171			
172			173			
174			175			
176			177			
178			179			
180			181			
182			183			
184			185			
186			187			
188			189			
190			191			
192			193			
194			195			
196			197			
198			199			
200			201			
202			203			
204			205			
206			207			
208			209			
210			211			
212			213			
214			215			
216			217			
218			219			
220			221			
222			223			
224			225			
226			227			
228			229			
230			231			
232			233			
234			235			
236			237			
238			239			
240			241			
242			243			
244			245			
246			247			
248			249			
250			251			
252			253			
254			255			
256			257			
258			259			
260			261			
262			263			
264			265			
266			267			
268			269			
270			271			
272			273			
274			275			
276			277			
278			279			
280			281			
282			283			
284			285			
286			287			
288			289			
290			291			
292			293			
294			295			
296			297			
298			299			
300			301			
302			303			
304			305			
306			307			
308			309			
310			311			
312			313			
314			315			
316			317			
318			319			
320			321			
322			323			
324			325			
326			327			
328			329			
330			331			
332			333			
334			335			
336			337			
338			339			
340			341			
342			343			
344			345			
346			347			
348			349			
350			351			
352			353			
354			355			
356			357			
358			359			
360			361			
362			363			
364			365			
366			367			
368			369			
370			371			
372			373			
374			375			
376			377			
378			379			
380			381			
382			383			
384			385			
386			387			
388			389			
390			391			
392			393			
394			395			
396			397			
398			399			
400			401			
402			403			
404			405			
406			407			
408			409			
410			411			
412			413			
414			415			
416			417			
418			419			
420			421			
422			423			
424			425			
426			427			
428			429			
430			431			
432			433			
434			435			
436			437			
438			439			
440			441			
442			443			
444			445			
446			447			
448			449			
450			451			
452			453			
454			455			
456			457			
458			459			
460			461			
462			463			
464			465			
466			467			
468			469			
470			471			
472			473			
474			475			
476			477			
478			479			
480			481			
482			483			
484			485			
486			487			
488			489			
490			491			
492			493			
494			495			
496			497			
498			499			
500			501			
502			503			
504			505			
506			507			
508			509			
510			511			
512			513			
514			515			
516			517			
518			519			
520			521			
522			523			
524			525			
526			527			
528			529			
530			531			
532			533			
534			535			
536			537			
538			539			
540			541			
542			543			
544			545			
546			547			
548			549			
550			551			
552			553			
554			555			
556			557			
558			559			
560			561			
562			563			
564			565			
566			567			
568			569			
570			571			
572			573			
574			575			
576			577			
578			579			
580			581			
582			583			
584			585			
586			587			
588			589			
590			591			
592			593			
594			595			
596			597			
598			599			
600			601			
602			603			
604			605			
606			607			
608			609			
610			611			
612			613			
614			615			
616			617			
618			619			
620			621			
622			623			
624			625			
626			627			
628			629			
630			631			
632			633			
634			635			
636			637			
638			639			
640			641			
642			643			
644			645			
646			647			
648			649			
650			651			
652			653			
654			655			
656			657			
658			659			
660			661			
662			663			
664			665			
666			667			
668			669			
670			671			
672			673			
674			675			
676			677			
678			679			
680			681			
682			683			
684			685			
686			687			
688			689			
690			691			
692			693			
694			695			
696			697			
698			699			
700			701			
702			703			
704			705			
706			707			
708			709			
710			711			
712			713			
714			715			
716			717			
718			719			
720			721			
722			723			
724			725			
726			727			
728			729			
730			731			
732			733			
734			735			
736			737</			



respectively of Diocletian and Constantine, not of Claudius and Diocletian like Brightman; while following Brightman mainly in the exposition (the *heathen Rome-referring* exposition) of the four Seals previous:<sup>1</sup> also in the four earlier Trumpets, instead of Brightman's "*contention, ambition, heresy, and war,*" his applying the emblems to prefigure the successive epochs in the Goths' desolations and overthrow of the Western Empire. In the evolution, however, of the particular details he seems to me unsuccessful: the *one third* of the four first Trumpets having no definite explanation; and the *land, sea, and rivers* being expounded loosely and figuratively, so as I have stated in my Vol. i. pp. 354, 355. The two *prophetic periods* in the fifth and sixth Trumpets are explained by him, as are all the other prophetic periods, consistently on the *year-day* principle:—the locusts' 150 *days* of the ravages of the Saracens on the Italian coast from A.D. 830—980: (a solution certainly anything but happy; forasmuch as all the main strength of the Saracens had in 830 past away:<sup>2</sup>) the Enphratean horsemen's *hour day month and year*, more happily, of the 396 years' interval, from the Turkman's investiture with the sword by the Caliph at Bagdad, A.D. 1057, to the destruction of Constantinople, A.D. 1453.<sup>3</sup> In his reference of the smoke and sulphur of the sixth Trumpet to the 'Turkish cannon, he well, in my judgment, follows Brightman: explaining the figures *definitely*, and according to the analogy of Scripture prophecies, from *visible appearances*: and he adds too, as confirmative of the meaning of the emblem in the fifth Trumpet, a notice from Pliny of the flowing hair of the Saracens, on the same interpretative principle;<sup>4</sup> a principle often greatly helpful towards the discovery and confirmation of the truth.

But now comes what seems to me, as before observed, to have been a most unfortunate step of retrogradation in Mede's Commentary;<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> On the third Seal, I should observe, Mede, though explaining it to refer to the times of Severus, yet makes it signify, not, as Brightman, a scarcity then occurring, but the justice and procurations of corn by the Emperor.

<sup>2</sup> So I have shown in my Chapter on the subject.

<sup>3</sup> See my Vol. i. p. 528, Note <sup>2</sup>.

<sup>4</sup> A principle which I have expanded, and copiously illustrated, in justification of my application of the fifth Trumpet to the Saracens.

<sup>5</sup> By the old expositors Victorinus and Andreas, &c., the symbol was explained to indicate St. John's personal prophesying again, after his temporary exile in Patmos, by the publication of his Gospel and Book of Revelation on returning to Ephesus. See pp. 293, 360 *suprà*. This was quite a different thing.

viz. his explanation of the *little book* in Apoc. x., not as *the gospel book* opened to the world, in the times, when somewhat advanced, of the Euphratean or Turkish Woe, so as, according to the earlier reforming Fathers, at the Reformation, but as a book of (somewhat as by Brightman before him) *new and distinct prophecy* from that of the *seven-sealed book*: the Covenant-Angel's descent and lion-like cry, the seven answering thunders, the Angel's oath, and the giving John the book to eat, being acts merely introductory to, and the ushering in of, this new prophecy. "The former prophecy," says Mede, "was of the fates of the *Roman Empire*; this, by far nobler, of the fates of *religion and the Church*." Hence, besides a departure from all simplicity of Apocalyptic arrangement,<sup>1</sup> the setting aside also of that which had been the most striking as well as most true feature in the Protestant Commentaries of the preceding æra; viz. the application of the vision of the Covenant-Angel's descent, with John's prophesying again, and his measuring of the temple, more or less to the great Protestant Reformation. Reasons Mede gives none; except that the charge, "Thou must prophesy again," indicated a new prophecy: that which assuredly the word *prophesy* need not indicate:<sup>2</sup> and which involves too the setting aside of the *representative character* of St. John; a view so early taken, so long cherished, and so excellently applied by the Reformers on this particular passage, though never indeed *fully* carried out. Unfounded, however, as was Mede's view of this vision, and of the little book, it has been repeated and perpetuated by Apocalyptic Expositors, to the great obscuration of the Apocalypse, even to the present day.<sup>3</sup>—The fact was, I little doubt, that Mede saw the need of some Book or Chart, separate from that on which the series of Seals and Trumpets were outstretched, on which to have visibly written the evidently chronological parallel term (in his view) of the 1260 years' visions; and, seeing nothing else in the prophecy that could by any possibility be turned to his purpose, seized on the Little Book of Apoc. x. for it. How was it that he did not see that the very fact of its being given to St. John *opened*, not *to open*, precluded the idea of its being a prophecy to be unfolded in the chapters subsequent; and that to the Lamb alone belonged the honour of unfolding

<sup>1</sup> E. g. mark how the 6th Trumpet, which belongs to the *seven-sealed book*, and occupies from Apoc. ix. 13 to xi. 14, is, on this system, cut in two by the prophecies of the *little book*. See the Tabular Scheme.

<sup>2</sup> See my Vol. ii. p. 149, &c.

<sup>3</sup> Alike Jurieu, Vitranga, Bishop Newton, and in our own days Faber, Frere, &c., have more or less followed Mede in this view of the little book.

the events of the coming future?—I might add, how was it that he overlooked the simple obvious fact of the Apocalyptic prophecy being said to be written *without*, as well as *within*; so offering the exact thing that he wanted. See my own Apocalyptic Chart of the *writing within and without* prefix to this Commentary. But, very strangely, the thought of this seems never to have occurred to any one but myself. The prophecy of the little Book thus introduced, Mede begins its development by the very singular interpretations, first of John's *measuring of the inner court and temple*, then of his *casting out the outer court and not measuring it*, as indicating two chronologically successive states of the Church of *lengths proportional*:<sup>1</sup> the first the more primitive Church of the first three or four centuries, (answering chronologically to the period of the six first seals,) which was conformed to the rule of God's word; the second that which succeeded, and was in character gentitized and apostate. With which latter coincide, according to him, the 1260 *days*, or *years*, of Christ's two Witnesses' prophesying in sackcloth; the *two* signifying *many*, or sufficient at least to keep up a valid testimony.—So Mede comes to the clause, Apoc. xi. 7, "When they shall have completed," or, as he renders it, "*when they shall be about finishing*, their testimony, the Beast shall kill them," &c.: a passage which he construes as predicting what was still in his time future; and that which would immediately precede the fall of Papal Rome. For the *tenth part of the city*, whose fall is mentioned immediately after the Witnesses' resurrection and ascension, (ascent to political eminence, says Mede,) is made by him to mean the *whole* city of *modern Rome*, as being in size but the *tenth part of ancient Rome*. A curious notion; and which he illustrates by an ichnographical plate, exhibiting the comparative local extent of the two cities.

In Apoc. xii. the vision of the *Woman* and *Dragon* is explained (I doubt not truly explained *retrogressively*) of Constantine's war with, and overthrow of, the Roman Pagan Emperors and Paganism.—In Apoc. xiii. and xvii. the *first Beast* is the Papal Secular Empire, or Decem-regal Body of Western Christendom,<sup>2</sup> *under the Pope*, as the

<sup>1</sup> See the Tabular Scheme.

<sup>2</sup> "Bestia decem-cornupeta, seu Secularis, est Universitas illa decem plus minus regnorum in unam denuo Rempublicam Romanam, redintegratà Draconis impietate, coalescentium." He adds that all the horns were on the 7th or last Head. Pp. 498, 499.

Beast's last ruling head:<sup>1</sup> the five heads of the old Roman Empire, that had fallen in St. John's time, being Kings, Consuls, Dictators, Decemvirs, and military Tribunes, so as they had been interpreted by Fulke, Foxe, and others; the 6th, or head reigning when St. John saw the vision, the Imperial Cæsars; (Cæsars then *Pagan*, but destined in time to be changed into *Christian* Cæsars, which last might be reckoned a new head to the Beast, says Mede, or might not;<sup>2</sup>) the seventh the Popes; the Beast's *deadly wound* having remained unhealed in passing from the sixth to the seventh or last head.<sup>3</sup> As to the Beast's destined duration, it was that of 1260 days, or 1260 years, measured from the Gothic desolations of ancient Rome. The *second Beast* was the Pope patriarchally viewed, and Papal clergy:<sup>4</sup> *the image of the Beast* the first Beast itself, or secular decem-regal Empire; as being (if I rightly understand Mede) but the shadow and revived ghost of the old imperial Roman Empire, or Beast under its sixth head.<sup>5</sup> The Beast's *name* and *number* is *Ἀρτεριος*.—In Apoc. xiv. the first flying Angel Mede makes to be Vigilantius and the early iconoclastic Emperors; the second, the Waldenses; the third, Luther.—In Apoc. xvi. the Vials, which he considers to figure the destruction of Antichrist, are, 1st, the wound given to the Popedom by the Waldenses, Wicliffites, and Hussites; 2nd, Luther's secession and protest; 3rd, Queen Elizabeth's secession and protest; these three Vials being past, the rest future. Of which last the fourth, on the *sun*, would be on the German Emperor, as chief luminary in the Papal Imperial system; and, while I write, says Mede, news is brought of a Prince from the north (meaning Gustavus Adolphus) gaining victories over the Emperor, in defence of the afflicted German Protestants: the 5th Vial, that on the *seat of the Beast*, meaning one on Rome; the 6th, that of the drying up of the Euphratean

<sup>1</sup> "Decem illa regna, *Pseudoprophetae capitis sui auspiciis*, cum Agno pugnabunt." So on Apoc. xvii. 16.

<sup>2</sup> See my Vol. iii. p. 120.

<sup>3</sup> "In transitu à sexto capite ad novissimum Bestia lethali vulnere occubuit." P. 501.

<sup>4</sup> "Bestia Bicornis, seu Pseudo-Propheta, Pontifex Romanus eum suo Clero." P. 505.

<sup>5</sup> "Bestia Romana capitis novissimi est imago Bestiæ sexto capite mactatæ." P. 560. And again, p. 505; "Qui" (viz. the Pseudo-Propheta, or Second Beast) "eo sensim reges, ex dissipato Cæsarum Imperio nuper in orbe Romano natos, induxit, ut sibi, cassæque jam alioquin imperio Romæ, colla unanimiter submittentes, pristini jamque demoliti Imperii ethnici imaginem induerent."—See my Vol. iii. p. 220.



flood, the exhaustion of the Turkish Empire;<sup>1</sup> by the which the way of the *Jews* from the East would be prepared: the 7th and last, on the *air*, being one on Satan's power, as the Prince of the power of the air.

Finally, as all know, the *millennium* is construed by Mede, like as by the oldest patristic expositors, Irenæus, Justin Martyr, &c., as a binding of Satan on Christ's second coming:—a mighty step of change this from the long long-continued explanation of the symbol as meant of his 1000 years' binding from Christ's time, or Constantine's:<sup>2</sup> the *first resurrection* being the literal resurrection of the saints, fulfilled also on Christ's coming and Antichrist's destruction before it. As to the *New Jerusalem*, Mede regards it as of millennial chronology; at least in its commencement.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> In the *local* application of the 4th, 5th, and 6th Vials, Mede seems to me to have been correct; though antedating the times of their historical fulfilment.

<sup>2</sup> When first Mede applied himself to the study of the Apocalypse he came, as he told a friend of his, with a mind rather possess against it: (i. e. the *old Chiliastic view* of the 1000 years:) and tried all ways imaginable to place the millennium elsewhere; and, if it were possible, to begin the 1000 years, like Brightman and others, (as a period of the past,) at the reign of Constantine. But after all his strivings he was forced, as he confesses, to yield to the light and evidence of this (the Chiliastic) hypothesis. He was forced to it by the irresistible law of synchronisms, according to which the millennium could not possibly be placed elsewhere than it is by him. . . Besides that the great deceiving of the world by Mahometism (a most vile and yet prevailing imposture) began before less than half of the millennium from Constantine was run out, and strangely prospered in the world for 600 years within that millennium: and not this only, but Antichristian idolatry and cruelty against the faithful servants of Christ fell out within the same millennium: wherein the Devil was so far from being chained and shut up, that he never deceived the world more grossly nor raged more furiously; and consequently was never more loose, and at liberty to do mischief.—So the Life prefixt to his Works by Dr. Worthington, p. 10.

<sup>3</sup> In reference to the New Jerusalem Mede notices with approbation Potter's argument, showing the equal circuit of the Apocalyptic city with Ezekiel's city, described Ezek. xlviii. 16. Of the latter "the north side, we read, was 4500 measures, the south 4500, the east 4500, and the west 4500;" in all 18,000. And these measures appear to be *cubits* from Ezek. xliiii. 13; where the cubit is also described as one larger than the common cubit, it being "a cubit and a hand-breadth:" which common cubit Potter, after Villalpandus, makes to be 2½ feet. This admitted, and that the proportion of the large cubit to the common is as 5 to 4, then the length of each side of Ezekiel's city will be  $4500 \times \frac{5}{4} \times 2\frac{1}{2}$  feet =  $\frac{1125 \times 5 \times 5}{2}$ , or 14,012 feet. On the other hand, as St. John's 12,000 furlongs are to be considered as giving the cubic dimensions of the Apocalyptic New Jerusalem, "its length and breadth and height being equal," therefore the cubic root of 12,000, which is 23 nearly, (for  $23 \times 23 \times 23 = 12,167$ .) gives the length of one of the sides: which 23 furlongs being  $23 \times 625 = 14,375$  feet, this measure will only by a very little exceed the length of one of the sides of the Apocalyptic City.

The coincidence, as thus drawn out, is remarkable. It is noted by Daubuz, p. 990. But there is this objection, that the assumed size of the Jewish common cubit is by no means certain; it being generally deemed of much smaller dimensions. So Calmet; who computes it at 1½ feet instead of 2½.

2. *Jurieu.*

It was in 1685, just after the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, that Jurieu, who was one of the exiled French Calvinist ministers, published his work on the Apocalypse:<sup>1</sup> a work mainly based on Mede's views; but with various new particular applications to his own time and country.<sup>2</sup> A brief notice of these will suffice.

In the *Seals* Jurieu only differs from Mede by expounding the *first* Seal not of Christ, but of a *Roman subject*, and *Roman emperors*;<sup>3</sup> (viz. of Vespasian's and Titus's victories and general prosperity;) this consisting well with Mede's explanation, which Jurieu adopts, of the horses and horsemen of the *three next Seals*, as having reference to the times of the Roman emperors Hadrian, Severus, and Gallienus, respectively. The 5th and 6th Seals are explained by him of the times of Diocletian and Constantine.

In the *Trumpets*, while otherwise following Mede, Jurieu improves on him by expounding the fallen star in the 3rd Trumpet that made bitter the third part of the rivers, not of the extinction of the Western Empire by Odoacer, but of a certain part of the Gothic ravages of Western Christendom: (viz. of those in the *provinces*, which were like the empire's *rivers*; Rome and Italy being as the *sea*;) the extinction of the Western Emperors being symbolized by the darkening of the heavenly lights in the 4th Trumpet.<sup>4</sup> The 5th and 6th Trumpets he explains, after Mede, of the Saracens and Turks.

The *little book*, in the hand of the iris-crowned Angel, Apoc. x., he interprets with Mede as a new prophecy: and adopts the idea

<sup>1</sup> Jurieu's date is given at Vol. ii. p. 254 of my English edition: (London, 1687:) at the latter page as the year of the revocation of the Edict of Nantes.

<sup>2</sup> Jurieu avowedly takes Mede as his master in Apocalyptic interpretation; except in the parts of latest application.

<sup>3</sup> P. 45. On this point Jurieu has the following just and important observations. "I can't be of that opinion (viz. that the horseman of the 1st Seal is the Lord Jesus), 1st, because the equipage of this horseman is not magnificent enough to represent Jesus Christ. . . . In all the places where the prophet makes Jesus Christ to appear. (Apoc. x. 1, xiv. 14, xix. 11,) he is extraordinarily magnificent: clothed with fire, with the light, with the sun, with the rainbow, riding on the clouds, having not one simple crown but many diadems, and his eye casting out flames. Here there is nothing more plain and mean: 'tis a man sitting on a horse, with a bow and crown. That which hath deceived interpreters is the colour of the horse, *white*, which they have taken for an emblem of *holiness*. But white is the emblem of *prosperity* as well as holiness."—Compare Foxe, p. 461 *suprà*; also my own objections as drawn out Vol. i. p. 124, Note 2.

<sup>4</sup> The *third* part he makes the Roman Empire; as mainly in Europe, the 3rd continent.

too thrown out by our English expositor, that as the *unmeasured* state of the court, or Church, was to be for  $3\frac{1}{2}$  times, i. e. 1260 years, so the proportion of the Jewish temple proper to the court indicated the Church's previous better and *measured* state to be about 360 years; an indication agreeable with fact.<sup>1</sup> The *Beast* moreover he explains like Mede: making its 7th head to be the Papal Antichrist; and the possible two-fold division of the 6th or imperial head into Pagan and Christian emperors, to be the solution of the enigma of the last head being both the 8th and the 7th.

In his 12th Chapter, on the *Witnesses*, Jurieu expresses his opinion that the *last* persecution of Christ's people had commenced in the year 1655, "when the Duke of Savoy undertook to destroy the faithful of the valleys of Piedmont;" and which had, when he wrote, "already lasted 30 years." This was followed in 1671 by "the persecution of the Churches of Silesia, Moravia, Hungary;" and then, in 1685, by the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes. In which last act he considers the death of the two Apocalyptic Witnesses to have begun at least to have fulfilment: their prefigured resurrection being anticipated by him either in  $3\frac{1}{2}$  years from that date, or  $3\frac{1}{2}$  years from some further act of the same persecution, as extended perhaps to the Waldenses, or other Protestant Christians:<sup>2</sup> an act such as might furnish a kind of extended commencing date to the  $3\frac{1}{2}$  mystic days of the Witnesses lying 'dead in the *street* of the great Papal city, or empire; i. e. as he judged, in France.<sup>3</sup>—Further, he thought that the *tenth of the great city* destined to fall, on the Witnesses' ascent, meant also France; which would fall from the Popedom by embracing the Reformation. After this, some time might probably elapse in order to the full effect of the exposure of Antichrist: and thus the epoch of the fall of the Popedom might probably occur about A.D. 1710 or 1715; this being the end of the 1260 years, as computed from A.D. 450 or 455.<sup>4</sup>

In the details of the *Vials* Jurieu altogether deserts Mede and

<sup>1</sup> i. 78, 87.

<sup>2</sup> Connected with this is an interesting extract in Evelyn's Memoirs. In June 18, 1690, Mr. E. mentions a visit paid by him to the then Bishop of St. Asaph—Lloyd. Speaking of the death and resurrection of the Apocalyptic Witnesses, the Bishop mentioned how he had persuaded two exiled Vaudois ministers to return home, when there was no apparent ground of hope for them, giving them £20 towards the expenses, and which return was wonderfully accomplished.

<sup>3</sup> ii. 245—250, 254—257.

<sup>4</sup> This subject occupies ch. 13 in Jurieu's 2nd volume. See pp. 260—267, 276.

other preceding expositors; though agreeing with Mede in placing them mainly under the 6th Trumpet.<sup>1</sup> "I am persuaded," he adds, "that God hath heard and answered the very ardent desire which I have had to pierce into these profound mysteries; to the end that I might descry the deliverance of his Church."<sup>2</sup> So, the Vials generally being regarded by him as "the steps by which the Babylonish (or Papal) empire passes to come to its ruin,"<sup>3</sup> the 1st Vial is explained by him as the gross corruption of Popery, and outbreking of its open sores, in the 10th century: Vials 2 and 3 figured the bloodshedding in the earlier and later crusades: Vial 4 was the intolerable scorching of the Papal despotism, from the 11th to the 14th century: Vial 5, on the seat of the Beast, was the transference of the Pope's residence from Rome to Avignon: Vial 6 was the drying up, as it were, of the Bosphorus, before the Turks, and their consequent overthrow of Constantinople and Eastern Christendom which Bosphorus had been previously the Eastern barrier to Greek Christendom, so as had been the Euphrates in old times to the Roman Empire: Vial 7 was the earthquake of the Reformation; the great City, or Papal Christendom, being after it divided into the three divisions of Papists, Lutherans, and Reformed; for as to the English Church, since it was in communion with the Reformed, it could not be considered a fourth division.<sup>4</sup>—As to the time remaining after this, before the final judgment on Babylon, it could not, added Jurieu, be long. "The 7th Vial hath already lasted longer than any of the rest; and it is probable that it must last about 200 years. [i. e. from 1517.] But the reason of this is that this 7th period is itself divided into three other periods, the *harvest*, the *vintage*, and the time that is *betwixt* the harvest and the vintage. The harvest is already past;<sup>5</sup> the time betwixt the harvest and the vintage is almost expired. We are approaching the vintage; and at this day ought to say, Come, Lord Jesus, Come."<sup>6</sup>

On the *millennium* Jurieu, like *Mede*, shows that it never yet had

<sup>1</sup> i. 92.

<sup>2</sup> ii. 67.

<sup>3</sup> i. 92.

<sup>4</sup> ii. 220. The Vials occupy the 6th, 7th, 8th, 9th, and 10th chapters, in Jurieu's 2d volume.

<sup>5</sup> Jurieu explains the *harvest* of the partial destruction of the Papal Empire at the Reformation. "Divide [the Beast's] 1260 into seven parts, and each 7th part is exactly 180 years. If now you reckon these 180 years from A.D. 1517, this brings us to A.D. 1697." So "1690 is about the time that I judge must be the beginning of the *vintage*." ii. 229.

<sup>6</sup> ii. 223, 224.



had fulfilment; and anticipated from it a reign of the saints on earth, the Jews' restoration, and fulfilment concurrently of the prophecies of the blessedness of the latter day in the Old Testament. He also decidedly *inclines* to think that the *first resurrection* is a *literal* resurrection of the departed saints; then at length to take part in the glory of the manifested kingdom of Christ.

### 3. I turn to Jurieu's English contemporary, *Dr. Cressener*.

During the reigns of Charles the 2nd and James the 2nd, now just ended, a mighty change had come over the spirit of the dream, at least among the ministers and adherents of the established Church of England, from that which had rested on the minds, and dictated the acts, of the founders and chief ornaments of that Church in the century of the Reformation. The religion of Rome had become not only fashionable at court, but the religion covertly or avowedly of the reigning kings themselves. Moreover, the sufferings of the episcopal clergy during the 15 years' ascendancy of Cromwell and the Puritans had tended to make them look on the latter as their nearest and chiefest enemy; and, by a consequence not unnatural, to regard Popery with less of disfavour, and sometimes even with the thought and desire for friendly approximation and union. This feeling could not but have its effect on the current view of the prophecies in Daniel and the Apocalypse, which had been hitherto by the Reformers, alike German, Swiss, and English, applied undoubtingly to the Roman Popedom. By the celebrated Dutch scholar and politician *Grotius*, and by our English *Dr. Hammond*, a præterist view was adopted of the Apocalyptic prophecy about the Beast and his great city Babylon, very like *Alcasar's*; <sup>1</sup> referring it all to the old Pagan Roman city and empire. *Dr. Cressener* himself, writing in the year 1690, strongly speaks of the change: (I subjoin the passage, <sup>2</sup> as well

<sup>1</sup> So Bossuet traces the parentage of this view:—"Le savant Jesuite Louis d'Alcasar, qui a fait un grand commentaire sur l'Apocelypse, où Grotius a pris beaucoup de ses idées." He speaks also of its being the view of the learned Romanist *Genebrard*, A.D. 1580, (in his *Chronography*, 5 Sæc. Ann. 415,) as well as of *Grotius* and *Hammond*. Pref. sur l'Apoc. § 11, 13.

<sup>2</sup> After speaking of *Grotius*, *Hammond*, and some other "great names of late among ourselves, who have excused the Church of Rome from any concern in the judgments of this (Apocalyptic) prophecy," and the shifts they had been obliged to resort to, such "that the most skilful of the Romish interpreters themselves had cried out against them," he notes it as the result of a foregone determination so to interpret the prophecy as to set aside the old Protestant views. "Their expedient for

worth perusal :) and tells moreover how the very study of those prophecies had in consequence fallen into disfavour.<sup>1</sup>

His own Book, which was first published in 1690, and is dedicated to the Queen Mary, then reigning with her consort William of Orange, is entitled "A Demonstration of the first Principles of the Protestant Applications of the Apocalypse," and well answers to its title. Its one grand subject is the Apocalyptic Beast of Apoc. xiii. and xvii. And in a series of connected propositions he incontrovertibly establishes, against Alcasar and Bellarmine, that the Apocalyptic Babylon is not *Rome Pagan*, as it existed under the old Pagan Emperors; nor *Rome Paganised at the end of the world*, as Ribera and Malvenda would have it to be; but Rome Papal, as existing from the 6th century. For, he argues, it is Rome idolatrous and anti-christian, as connected with the Beast or Roman Empire in its last form, and under its last head;<sup>2</sup> which last head is the seventh head revived, after its deadly wound with a sword: with and under which the Beast exists all through the time of the Witnesses; in other words, from the date of the breaking up of the old empire into ten kingdoms, until Christ's second coming to take the kingdom. The

Catholic union of all Christian Churches by the compliance of the Roman, their assurance of the necessity of the conveyance of a right succession and ordination by a Church that was not formally idolatrous, &c., were altogether inconsistent with the Protestant sense of the Apocalypse." And then Dr. Cressener goes on to say; "The present age is so generally prepossessed with the interpretations of these learned men, that it is necessary to remind (the approvers) that these are great novelties in the doctrine of the Church of England. . . . It is manifest by the Homilies approved of in our Articles as the faith of our Church, that the charge of *Babylon* upon the *Church of Rome* is the standing profession of the Church of England: \* and it continued to be the current judgment of all the best learned members of it till the end of the reign of King James the 1st." Indeed, "in *his* time it was believed to be so clear and important a part of the faith, that both the Church and the Court did applaud the King in his public defence of it." But, adds Cressener, "after that time this doctrine of the Homilies came to be more out of fashion: either to be civil to the marriages of the succeeding reigns, or to take away all the advantage that the Separatists might have from thence against the necessity of an uninterrupted succession and ordination in every lawfully-constituted Church." Pref. pp. ii.—iv.

<sup>1</sup> "The enquiry into these matters is so out of fashion, and lies under so general a prejudice, that I found the Press everywhere affrighted from undertaking the charge of this publication." Epist. Dedicatory to Queen Mary.

<sup>2</sup> This involves the entire identity, as is stated in his argument, p. 59, of the Beast in Apoc. xiii. and Beast in Apoc. xvii.

---

\* In the Homilies he refers to the 3rd Part of the Sermon against Idolatry, and 6th Part of the Sermon against Rebellion. Of other writers he specifies Bishop Jewel, p. 373; Bishop Abbot, *Antichristi Demonstratio*; Archbishop Whitgift, Tract. 8; Bishop Andrewes, *Tortura torti*; Bishop Bilson, p. 527; Bishop Morton; and Hooker's *Treatise on Justification*, § 10, 57.

6th, or imperial head ruling in St. John's time, must, he argues, have *fallen* at the latest at the time of the Herulian chief Odoacer, and Ostrogothic king Theodoric, reigning in the 5th century.<sup>1</sup> And he concludes (though here, I conceive, exception might be taken against him) that the 7th head was the Herulian and Ostrogothic, which continued but a short time: the 8th being the revived secular imperial, confederated with a Roman ecclesiastical head, somewhat as under the old emperors;<sup>2</sup> i. e. the secular Western emperors combined with the Popes. And he suggests *Justinian's* æra as that of the commencement of the last head.<sup>3</sup> The *image of the Beast* he makes to be the Roman Church, the name *Λατρευς*.<sup>4</sup> The *death of the two Witnesses*, caused by the Beast, he explains, after *Jurieu*, as probably occurring at the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes, and the nearly contemporary expulsion of the Waldenses.<sup>5</sup>

Altogether *Cressener's* book must be regarded as an important accession to the Protestant cause, and Protestant argument, against the Romanists.

#### 4. *Bossuet.*

The Apocalyptic Comment of this Roman Catholic Prelate deserves the more attention from us, as being written by one who is, I believe, confessedly the ablest as well as the most eloquent of controversialists on the Papal side; and written by him, deliberately and avowedly, in order to wrest out of the hands of Protestants a weapon used so often and so powerfully by them against his Church. And when in 1685, just after the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, *M. Jurieu*, one of the exiled French Calvinist Ministers, had published that work on the Apocalyptic prophecy, of which I have just given an abstract, the Bishop of Meaux thought it well to take up the matter; and to apply his great talents to the drawing up of an Exposition, such as might be conformable with the dogmas and requirements of the Romish faith, and sufficiently strong and solid (so he expected) to withstand the criticism of Protestants.<sup>6</sup>—I now proceed to give a sketch of it. It is framed very much more on *Alcasar's* plan, and that of *Grotius* and *Hammond* who had followed *Alcasar*;

<sup>1</sup> p. 160.

<sup>2</sup> The Emperor being *Pontifex* as well as *Imperator*.

<sup>3</sup> p. 192.

<sup>4</sup> p. 274, 275.

<sup>5</sup> Epistle Dedicatory, and Pref. p. xvii.

<sup>6</sup> *Bossuet's* exposition was first published in 1690.

not Ribera's: i. e.<sup>1</sup> on that of the *preterists*, not of the *futurists*. The grand subject of the prophecy he conceives to be the triumph of Christianity over Judaism and Paganism:—i. e. over Paganism as established in the Roman empire; and, in the *Jewish* part, with reference only to the later calamities of the Jews, not to the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus. For as Bossuet judged the Apocalypse to have been written under Domitian, that destruction by Titus had happened, in his opinion, before the giving of the Apocalypse.—The details are as follows.

The *six first Seals* exhibit the subject in the general. There is 1st Christ's moving forth as a conqueror; then, in the 2nd, 3rd, and 4th Seals, his judgments of war, famine, and pestilence, on the enemies of Christianity; then, in the 5th Seal, persecutions of Christians, and the reason of God's delay of judgments, viz. till the number of his martyrs be completed and his elect taken out from the infidels, wherever they might be hid: further, in the 6th, a picture of political convulsion and revolution; applicable, first, to the overthrow of the Jewish people; secondly, to that of the Roman empire; thirdly, to what the others might be considered in a manner typical of, that is, the general judgment.

Then to *particulars*.—After an illustration in the 7th chapter of what was said in Seal 5 of the cause of the delay of God's judgments, by a representation of the sealing of such as were elect unto salvation among the Jews, and also of the salvation of Gentile martyrs innumerable, from out of the empire of Pagan Rome,<sup>2</sup> the *first four*

<sup>1</sup> The date of Grotius' Treatise about Antichrist was A.D. 1640: that of Hammond's on the New Testament, 1653—1656.

<sup>2</sup> The incense-angel of Apoc. viii. 3, I should observe, Bossuet makes to mean a created angel; and speaks of the idea of its meaning Christ as a mere Protestant interpretation. "Les Protestans, offensés de voir l'intercession angelique si clairement établie dans ce passage, voudraient que cet ange fût Jesus Christ même:" and he says that there is nothing of the majesty that distinguishes Jesus Christ in the visions. (How then, we ask, make the rider of the 1st Seal's white horse to be Christ; though surely of no distinguished majesty?) Now how little the interpretation he objects to can be called a mere Protestant interpretation will appear from my remark, p. 349 *suprà*. Bossuet, who frequently refers to Tichonius and Primasius, can hardly but have known that it was the almost universally received interpretation for above 1000 years before the Reformation. In order to discriminate where Christ is meant by an Angel, we must, I think, either look for marks of higher dignity than in a created angel; or else for his having some function assigned him, such as is expressly assigned to Christ, and Christ alone, in Scripture. So here: since Jesus Christ is declared in the Hebrews to be the *one* great High Priest, to offer our offerings before God. And observe it is "the prayers of *all* saints" that the Apocalyptic



*Trumpets*, according to Bossuet, thus depicted the progress of God's judgments against the Jews. Trumpet 1 showed the primary victory over the Jews by Trajan; Trumpet 2, the victories over them by Adrian; Trumpet 3, and its following star, the impostor Barchochebas, ("son of a star,") declaring himself the Messiah, and so stirring up his countrymen to the war; Trumpet 4, the obscuration of the Scriptures, especially of the prophetic Scriptures, (which were as *luminaries* to the Jews,) by the compilation of their Talmud: the subjects particularly obscured being Christ who is the sun, and the Church the moon. In all which Trumpets the *third part*, spoken of as affected, meant that not *all* the Jews would be killed, not *all* the light extinguished, &c.—Then the subject passed from the Jews; the 5th Trumpet being one of transition from the Jews to Jewish heresies and errors. For in Trumpet 5 the *scorpion-locusts* were Judaizing heresies introduced into the Christian Church about 196 A.D., soon after Adrian's destruction of the Jews by Theodotus of Byzantium, and continued onwards to Artemon and Paul of Samosata; heresies concerning the Trinity and Christ's Divinity: the commission not to *kill*, but only to *torment*, showing that this plague was not one of invading warrior-foes.<sup>1</sup> About A.D. 260 or 270 this woe passed away; the Council of Antioch A.D. 264 ending it. Then, just at that time, Trumpet 6 exhibited the woe of an invading enemy of horsemen from the Euphrates: viz. the Persians; who after a while overthrew, and took captive, the emperor Valerian.

In Apoc. x., Bossuet, like Mede, makes the *little book* a prophecy; but only as the remainder of that of the seven-sealed Book, after the 6th Trumpet: the contents being developed in the chapters following.—Thus in Apoc. xi., after the measuring of the temple, or Church, by St. John, indicating that whatever the violence of persecution, there was a temple they could not destroy,—we have then first a general view of Christ's witnesses and martyrs, during the persecutions of Pagan Rome; some (for example that of the emperor Valerian) lasting near about 3½ years:<sup>2</sup> though that particular term of time, or its equivalent 42 months, was used rather by borrowing from

Angel offers; not that of one particular saint, or one particular people: whereas all the functions assigned to *created* angels are *definite* and *limited*.

<sup>1</sup> In illustration of the *scorpion-sting* of the heretics he mentions Tertullian's entitling of his work against heretics *Scorpiace*.

<sup>2</sup> "Précisement trois ans et demi." So, he says, Eusebius.

the history of the persecution of Antiochus Epiphanes, or the drought under Elias ; besides signifying a certain limit of time, ordained by God to one and all of them. Next, and when the Witnesses should have finished their testimony under Pagan Rome, there is the prophecy of Diocletian's persecution of them, (Diocletian *the Beast from the abyss*,) and temporary suppression of the Christian worship, in the great city of Rome and the Roman empire ;<sup>1</sup> followed, however, quickly by a figuration of the revival under Constantine :—the tenth of the great city falling, and 7000 slain, figurative of the overthrow of the Pagan emperors and forces ; and the song in heaven, on the 7th Trumpet's sounding, "The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our God and of his Christ," having reference to the establishment of Christianity *then* effected in the Roman empire. A more particular figuration of which, and of its consequences, followed in the next chapter. For the male-child of the travailing Woman, or Church, was Constantine and other Christian emperors succeeding him : the war of the Dragon against the Woman before her child-birth being that of the Diocletianic persecution ; the war in heaven, immediately afterwards, that which ended in the fall of Paganism under Galerius and Maxentius ; the floods cast out of the Dragon's mouth, when the Woman was fleeing to the desert, that of Maximin ; and the Dragon's next war against the remnant of the Woman's seed that of Licinius against Constantine. Then, in Apoc. xiii., came the figuring of the revival as it were of Diocletian (*the Beast that had killed the Witnesses*) in the apostate Julian ;<sup>2</sup> though the 6th head wounded to death was Maximin ; the *second Beast*, with two lamb-like horns, figuring Julian's Pagan priests and philosophers, pretending to miracles and moral maxims like those of Christianity ; the *image of the Beast*, images of Pagan gods made to

<sup>1</sup> "C'est Rome, et l'empire Romain." So Bossuet on Apoc. xi. 8. Elsewhere, in a notice of Jurieu in his Preface to the Apocalyptic Comment, he strongly insists on this point. The Protestant expositors, says he, "ont bien vu que cela ne se pouvoit dire : " i. e. that *Jerusalem* could not be called *the great city*. And then he thus insists on the point ; " Pour dire quelque chose de plus fort, *la grande cité* est partout dans l'Apocalypse *l'empire Romain*." § 8. I beg my readers to mark this. Christ, he adds, on Apoc. xi. 8, was literally crucified in the Roman empire, and by Roman authority : and he was also spiritually crucified in his persecuted members, during the Roman Pagan persecutions.

<sup>2</sup> Bossuet, on verse 5, says that the Church is not stated to have now retired into the desert, so as in former persecutions ; "parceque du tems de Julien il n'y eut aucune interruption dans son service public."

speak oracles, &c., by the Pagan priesthood: while the Beast's *name and number* (here, we see, Bossuet refers to the *original*, not the *revived* Beast) was *Diocles Augustus*.

Then in Apoc. xiv. the prophecy proceeds to announce the fall of Rome and of the Roman empire, through the Gothic invasion. The *harvest-judgment* is that by *Alaric*; the *vintage* that by *Attila*.—The *Vials* trace out the same subject more particularly, and as beginning from an earlier date. The  $\epsilon\lambda\kappa\omicron\varsigma$  of the 1st Vial was the great plague in the time of Valerian and Gallienus; the 2nd Vial figured the bleeding empire, as if dead; the 3rd, the civil wars and thirty tyrants; the 4th, the drought and famine of that period, commemorated by Cyprian; the 5th, Valerian's defeat by the Persians; the 6th, the drying up of the Euphratean barrier, and opening of a passage into the empire to the kings from the East, i. e. the Persians; the *frogs*, the magicians, &c., who urged on Valerian to his fated Armageddon, i. e. the field of battle where he was captured by the Persians; the 7th, on the air, with its earthquake and hail, the capture of Rome by Alaric.

Yet again, Apoc. xvii. reveals other important points in this subject, more in detail. The Beast's *seven heads* were Diocletian, Galerius, Maximian, Constantius Chlorus, the four emperors in whose joint names the first Edict of persecution went forth; together with Maxentius, Maximin, and Licinius, three persecuting emperors afterwards added. At the precise time to which the vision related, A.D. 312, five of these *had fallen*, viz. the first-mentioned four and Maxentius: one *was*, viz. Maximin: Licinius, the seventh, *had not yet come*; i. e. as a persecuting emperor. It was further said, "the eighth king is of the seven, and goes into perdition." This was *Maximian*; who was of the original four, but had abdicated; and then became emperor again.—(Julian is not here brought forward by Bossuet.) Further, in this chapter, Apoc. xvii. 16, 17, there was the very striking prophecy about the *ten horns on the Beast*. They were to give their power to the Beast till the words of God were fulfilled; yet to hate the Harlot, and tear her. So were the Goths, Vandals, &c., long admitted as soldiers into the Roman armies, and as allies into the Roman territory: (does not Bossuet here make the Beast to be *Rome*?) yet did they afterwards tear and desolate the Woman;

i. e. ravage Rome and its empire.<sup>1</sup>—The *millennium* Bossuet explains as the period of the Church's supremacy<sup>2</sup> until Antichrist's short reign, on Satan's loosing, near the end of the world:<sup>3</sup> the *new heavens, new earth, and new Jerusalem*, as figures of the saints' *heavenly glory*.<sup>4</sup>

3. *Vitringa* is the next Apocalyptic Expositor that calls for our notice. He was Theological Professor in the Academy of Franeker for many years, till his death in 1722: and from that petty Dutch town, near the mouth of the *Zuyder Zee*, sent forth those masterly and learned works on *Isaiah* and the *Apocalypse*, which have always been regarded as placing him on a high rank among Biblical expositors. His Apocalyptic Commentary, under the title of *Ἀνακρισις Ἀποκαλύψεως*, was first published at Franeker, A.D. 1705. My notices of it in the body of my work are frequent. Hence the less need of any extended sketch.

Alike the *seven Epistles, seven Seals, and seven Trumpets*, (though not the *seven Vials*,) were deemed by him to be representations of the successive states and fortunes of the Christian Church, from St. John's time to the consummation: with reference however not to the same, but to very different æras, in the respective septenaries. The Scheme on the opposite page will best exhibit to the eye their mutual relations, in time and subject.<sup>5</sup> It will be seen that though the main

<sup>1</sup> Bossuet hints his opinion that Jerome, in naming *ten Gothic* invading peoples, had Apoc. xvii. 16 in his eye. Pref. to Apoc. § 22. See my p. 324 *suprà*.

<sup>2</sup> On the difference of this from *Augustine's* theory see my p. 137 *suprà*.

<sup>3</sup> I must transcribe Bossuet's short ideal sketch of the future Antichrist: "On doit attendre sous l'Antichrist les signes les plus trompeurs qu'on ait jamais vus; avec la malice la plus cachée, l'hypocrisie la plus fine, et *la peau de loup la mieux couverte de celle des brebis*." (On Apoc. xx. 14.) How different from the Futurists' idea of a supposed future *professedly infidel* Antichrist?

<sup>4</sup> In his *Abregé, or Brief Summary*, appended to the Comment, Bossuet divides the Apocalyptic historic chronology into 3 periods:—1. that of the Church's beginning, and early trials, from Jews and Gentiles: from Apoc. vi. to Apoc. xx.:—2ndly, that of the Church's reign on earth, being the millennial period of Apoc. xx.:—3rdly, that of Satan's loosing, and the future Antichrist.—Thus Bossuet, like Alcasar, makes the Apocalyptic Beast quite a different power from the Antichrist of prophecy. Only in some certain manner, he intimates in his Preface, § 15, the whole *Apocalypse might possibly* have some secondary and mystical reference to the times of Antichrist.

<sup>5</sup> In the *Epistles* it is to be observed that *Vitringa* explains the "*ten days' tribulation*," predicted to the Church of Smyrna, to mean the *ten years* of the Diocletian persecution.—In the *Seals*, the 3rd Seal's subject must be understood to run 100 years and more into the chronology of the 4th; though I could not represent this in the Scheme.



SCHEME OF VITRINGA'S SEVEN EPISTLES, TRUMPETS, AND VIALS.

A.D.	EPISTLES.	SEALS.	TRUMPETS.	A.D.
100	I. <i>Ephesus.</i> From John to the Decian Persecution, A.D. 96—250.	I. The 150 years of partial peace to the Church from Nerva to Decius, A.D. 96—250.	..... I. .... Plague, &c., in R. empire A.D. 250.	100
200	II. <i>Smyrna.</i> Decian to Diocletian Persecution, inclusive, A.D. 311.	II. Persecutions from Decius to Diocletian.	II.	200
300	III. <i>Pergamos.</i> From the Diocletian Persecution to A.D. 700.	III. Church dissensions and corruptions ; especially by the Arians, Pelagians, &c., to A.D. 800.	III. Barbarian Invaders, A. D. 260. IV. Arius, the falling Star.	300
400	IV. <i>Thyatira.</i> From A.D. 700, to the rise of the Waldenses, A. D. 1190.	IV. Desolations of the Church Visible, especially of Greek Christendom, by the Saracens and Turks.	IV. Valens, Defeat and Death. V. Gothic Invasions of Roman Empire, A.D. 400—553, chiefly.	400
500	V. <i>Sardis.</i> From P. Valdensis to the eve of the Great Reformation, A. D. 1517.	V. Persecutions and Martyrdoms of the Waldenses, Bohemians, &c. ; not ended in 1700.	VI. Desolations of the Roman Empire by the Saracens and the Turks.	500
600	VI. <i>Philadelphia.</i> Earlier times of the Reformation, to the establishment of the Protestant Dutch United States.	VI. not ended in 1700.	VI.	600
700	VII. <i>Laodicea.</i> Subsequent lukewarm state of Protestants.	..... VI. .... Judgment on Antichrist.	VII.	700
800				800
900				900
1000				1000
1100				1100
1200				1200
1300				1300
1400				1400
1500				1500
1600				1600
1700				1700

subject of the *Seals* is made by him the external state of the Church, that of the *Trumpets* the fortunes of the Roman world, connected with the Church, yet they sometimes essentially infringe, so as might have been anticipated, on each other. The third Seal, for example, has the *Arian heresy* for one main part of its subject; and so also the third Trumpet. The fourth Seal refers to the desolations of Greek Christendom by the *Saracens* and *Turks*; and so the sixth Trumpet. —Having elsewhere referred to his *Epistles* and *Seals*,<sup>1</sup> let me here only add an observation or two on his *Trumpets*. It seems to me then, 1st, that his *Gothic reference of the 5th Trumpet* was that which very much fixed his general scheme of the *Trumpets*. Mede's chronological application of the *five months*, or *150 years'* period of the emblematical locusts, to designate the *Saracens'* latest and feeblest ravages,<sup>2</sup> justly appeared to Vitringa untenable: nor moreover had any satisfactory solution of the locusts' *not touching the grass and trees* appeared in Mede's Saracenic view. But the Gothic ravages, from Alaric to Totilas, did last nearly 150 years. And, if the grass and trees were *figuratively* construed to mean Christians, (professing Christians,) then Alaric's sparing the Christian Churches at Rome, and those who took refuge in them, might be supposed, Vitringa thought, a sufficient and obvious explanation, on the Gothic view, of that clause also. Which being so, he evidently rests with much confidence on this solution of the 5th Trumpet; more so than on almost any other part of his Trumpet Scheme.<sup>3</sup> And, this point settled, what preceded the Gothic invasion must of course be ascribed to the Trumpets previous; what followed to those subsequent. So the Saracens, as well as Turks, were crowded necessarily into the sixth Trumpet. Yet not without obvious difficulties and inconsistency. For example, in this Gothic application of the 5th Trumpet Vitringa explains the locusts' *hair* being *like women's hair*, with reference to the *personal appearance* of the Goth's yellow hair; (though certainly this was no feminine characteristic among Jews, Greeks, or Romans;) but "the *faces as of men*," he felt unable to explain of personal appearance; and so fell back on the *moral* characteristic, (one surely

<sup>1</sup> On the *Epistles* in my Vol. i. p. 77; on the *Seals* in the Appendix to my Vol. i. pp. 549—553.

<sup>2</sup> See p. 491 *suprà*.

<sup>3</sup> So at p. 485 Vitringa argues from the undoubted Gothic application of the 5th Trumpet, to the right meaning of the 4th: "Gothos enim esse illas locustas quæ sequentis tubicinii viso depinguntur, si Deo placet, clarissimè evincemus." And so previously, p. 455.

scarce applicable to the Goths,) of *humanity*.<sup>1</sup>—2ndly, as regards “*the third part*,” six or seven times noted in the first four Trumpets, he suggests that it might perhaps be intended of one of the three continents of the Roman empire, and so explains it of the *Eastern* or *Asiatic* third in some of the Trumpets: yet in the 4th Trumpet of the *Western* region, and sometimes too rather as meaning *some notable part*:<sup>2</sup> moreover, after throwing out an idea in the first Trumpet, that the “*land*” might be meant (distinctly of the Roman empire, the “*sea*” of the barbarians, construes land, sea, and rivers all alike of Roman Christendom; mainly in a figurative sense, somewhat like Mede.<sup>3</sup>

In Apoc. x. Vitringa so far follows Mede as to make the *little book* opened a *Prophetic Section*: not (so as the earlier Reformers) the opened Bible, or New Testament. The special subject however of the new prophecy (herein differing from Mede) being part, he thinks, of the seven-sealed book, he expounds of the increased corruptions of the Church, and the rise, power, and persecuting acts of the Beast in *Western Christendom*, contemporarily with the Turkish woe of the 6th Trumpet:<sup>4</sup>—the *seven thunders* being significant of the seven Crusades; the charge, “*Thou must prophesy again*,” of the prophetic knowledge imparted to, and taught by, Christian ministers under the sixth Trumpet; the *Witnesses prophesying in sackcloth*, (one grand part of this new prophecy,) of the anti-papal testimony from Peter Valdes to the Reformation; their 42 months or 3½ years, being perhaps, so as Scaliger<sup>1</sup> had suggested, on the scale of a year for a century.<sup>5</sup> As to the Witnesses’ prefigured *death and resurrection*, it had been already *partially* fulfilled in the four cases following:—viz. 1. in the death of Huss and Jerome, and their revival in the Hussites immediately afterwards, about the time of the 3½ years session of the Council of Constance:<sup>6</sup> 2. in the mas-

<sup>1</sup> Vit. pp. 526, 525.—Compare Jerome’s statement on this point, quoted in my Vol. i. p. 436, Note 1.

<sup>2</sup> Vit. pp. 456, 463, 476, 487, 550.

<sup>3</sup> See my Vol. i. p. 355: a passage referred to also by me at p. 491 *suprà*. 4 p. 568.

<sup>5</sup> “*Quàm hoc doctè et piè cogitatum!*” exclaims Vitringa, at p. 620, in reporting this explanation of the 1260 days of the Witnesses prophesying in sackcloth, suggested by Scaliger. He adds, however, that he cannot think of any scriptural justification of it; unless what is said in Gen. xv. 10—13 might be deemed such: where, the sacrifices having been divided into four parts to the four winds, the time prophesied of is stated to be 400 years.—Vitringa seems not to have been aware of Tichonius’ similar idea. See p. 333 *suprà*.

<sup>6</sup> p. 652. So Foxe. See p. 464 *suprà*. Vitringa, p. 657, notices Cocceius as having

sacre of the Waldensic remnant in the Valleys of Cabrieres and Merindol, A.D. 1545 : 3. in the anti-protestant Interim of Charles Vth, and Prince Maurice's quickly-following victory and consequent treaty of Passau :<sup>1</sup> 4. in the massacre of St. Bartholomew, and the Edict of Toleration obtained from Henry III within four years after.<sup>2</sup> Vitringa notices Jurieu's views also ;<sup>3</sup> calculating the slaughter of the Witnesses from the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, or some other persecuting act following it up : which view, however, had not so far been verified by any such rising of the Witnesses, or Protestant revolution in France, as Jurieu had expected. And, on the whole, Vitringa inclined to look to the prophecy as being one up to his own time still mainly unfulfilled.—I may observe that he considered that the *tenth part of the great city*, which fell concurrently with the two witnesses' ascent, ought to be construed to mean one of the ten kingdoms of Papal Christendom. Which being so, how was it that the fall of Papal England did not fix itself more deeply in his mind, as an indication of the intent of the whole prophecy ?<sup>4</sup> After this, and the Witnesses' political ascent, Vitringa expected that the 6th Trumpet's or Turkish woe (in the which all about the rainbow-crowned angel's descent, and witnesses' death and resurrection, had been included) would cease ;<sup>5</sup> and the sounding of the 7th Trumpet introduce God's judgment on the enemies of the Church, and the blessed times predicted by all the prophets.

In Apoc. xii. the vision of the *Dragon and Woman* is expounded, 1. of Diocletian's persecution, followed by Constantine's establishment of Christianity ; the Dragon's seven heads (like those of the

taken this view ; and, in connexion, explaining the tenth of the city falling of France under Henry IV. ; (when however, as Vitringa justly observes, Papal Gaul did not fall, but Henry became a Papist ;) and the 7000 slain of the 7 Belgian states and bishopricks : the latter like myself. See my Vol. ii. p. 481, Note<sup>3</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> Like Brightman. See p. 470 *suprà*.

<sup>2</sup> p. 664.

<sup>3</sup> p. 668. See p. 497 *suprà*.

<sup>4</sup> Vitringa, p. 647. The opinion is thus exprest. "Quid commodius quàm per το δεκατον της πολεως hic intelligere regnum aliquod illustre, quod inter decem regna Europæa, religionis causâ Romæ subjecta, excellebat, ejusque hætenus superstitioni fuerat patrociniatum ? Id hic casurum dicitur mystico sensu, quando per majores illos motus quibus concutiendum erat, avelleretur à corpore Imperii Antichristiani. Caderet sic eorum respectu in quorum gratiam hætenus steterat et floruerat."

I quote this, because, as Vitringa believed the event still future, it gives his *un-biassed* opinion on the real meaning of this prophetic clause : and strikingly confirms my application of it to the fall of Papal England at the Reformation. So too Jurieu, p. 497 *suprà*.

<sup>5</sup> p. 649.



Beast) symbolizing both Rome's seven hills, and the seven persecuting emperors of that period, Diocletian, &c. : (such is his view of the allusion in the clause, "and they are seven kings :") 2. of the Arian persecutions of orthodox Christians after the fall of Paganism:—both explanations very much as in my *Horæ*. But the *wilderness*, into which the Woman then fled, *Vitringa* makes otherwise to mean the barbarous nations of the West;<sup>1</sup> and the *waters east by the Dragon* after the Woman, the Saracen inundation, swallowed up in France on occasion of the victory of Charles Martel.—In Apoc. xiii., after a somewhat elaborate notice and refutation of Bossuet's explanation of the *first Beast*, agreeably with certain Protestants, as meaning *Rome Pagan*, *Vitringa* interprets it of *Rome Papal*: its *seven heads* however not including heads of the old Roman empire as well as of Rome Papal, so as had been generally thought by Protestants; but only heads of it in its last Papal form. So he makes the five first to be five most eminent Popes before the Reformation; (the Reformation æra being the point of time to which the Angel's words, "*five have fallen*," is to be referred;) viz. Gregory VII, Alexander III, (wounded to death by Fred. Barbarossa, but soon revived,) Innocent III, Boniface VIII, (the Beast's middle head,) and John XXII:<sup>2</sup> the sixth and seventh being two Popes after the Reformation, viz. Paul III and Paul V; while the eighth and last was the one that would be ruling at Rome at the time, yet future, of the last persecution. The *second Beast* *Vitringa* explains, after many of the old as well as the then more recent expositors, to signify Papal preachers and doctors, especially the Franciscans and Dominicans: the *Beast's image* as the tribunals of the Inquisition.<sup>3</sup> Of the Beast's name and number *Λατρευος* was deemed by him almost too simple a solution; and he proposes some strange far-fetched Hebrew phrases from Scripture, which it is not worth while to repeat.<sup>4</sup>

I pass to Apoc. xiv. Here the 144,000 are explained of the Waldenses and Albigenes: the *harpers*, next noted as sympathizing with the 144,000, of the Wicliffites and Hussites: the *first flying Angel*, that had the everlasting Gospel, of Luther, Zuingle, and the other

<sup>1</sup> p. 745. The 1260 days, or  $3\frac{1}{2}$  times, of the persecuted Woman's destined seclusion there he does not attempt to explain on Sealiger's measure, previously praised by him, of one time = 100 years; but only as a period borrowed from the  $3\frac{1}{2}$  years of Antiochus Epiphanius' profanation of the temple.

<sup>2</sup> pp. 794, 805.

<sup>3</sup> p. 833.

<sup>4</sup> p. 848.

Fathers of the Reformation: the *second*, of the Reformers' voice of triumph over the Popedom at the time of the Treaty of Passau, in the second period of the Reformation, and the disruption of the English Church from Rome: <sup>1</sup> the *third*, of the Protestant doctors in the third period of the Reformation; at a time of affliction to Christ's Church, such as even then partially existed, especially with reference to France and the French Reformed Churches.—In entering on the *Vials* in Apoc. xvi., Vitringa acknowledges the plausibility of Launeus' opinion, that these Vials were all contained in, and the development of, the 7th Trumpet: Launeus having noted, 1. that these were the *last* plagues, and the 7th Trumpet the *last* and *finishing* woe; 2. the fact of the temple (the heavenly temple, says Launeus, in the same sense of heavenly as when applied to the heavenly Jerusalem) appearing opened introductorily to their effusion, just as it was described in Apoc. xi. 19, as appearing at the sounding of the 7th Trumpet; 3. their answering, on this view, to the type of the seven compassings of Jericho on the 7th day; besides that, 4thly, Launeus thought the 5th Vial on the seat of the Beast looked very much like the blow on the Papacy at the Reformation.<sup>2</sup> But Vitringa could not make up his mind to suppose all these Vials future; so as he felt sure the 7th Trumpet's sounding was. And consequently he explains all the five earlier Vials, if not six, as already fulfilled in certain judgments on the Popedom. Thus the 1st, that of the *grievous sore's* appearing, he traces in the Waldensian exposure of the deep corruption of the Papacy; the 2nd, that of the *sea becoming blood*, in the bloody wars between the Emperors and Popes, more especially from the times of Frederic II and Lewis of Bavaria;<sup>3</sup> the 3rd, that of the *rivers being blood*, in the Hussite and Bohemian wars under Zisca, &c.; the 4th, on *the sun*, (the regal emblem,) in the great heat with which the two French kings Charles VIII and Louis XII had scorched Italy; the 5th, on *the seat of the Beast*, in the darkening of the Popedom by the Reformation, and taking and sack of Rome by the constable Bourbon. In the 6th Vial Vitringa curiously explains the Euphrates' drying up of the exhaustion of the power of France, as the chief bulwark of the Papal Roman empire;<sup>4</sup> an event perhaps even then begun, by the banishment of its multitude of in-

<sup>1</sup> p. 876.<sup>2</sup> pp. 936—938.<sup>3</sup> p. 946. Frederic II. made emperor A.D. 1212; Lewis 1314.<sup>4</sup> p. 973.

dustrious Protestant citizens at the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes. The *three frogs*, issuing forth contemporaneously, he supposes to mean the Jesuits: and expounds the 7th Vial, on the air, as typifying the dissolution of both the political and the ecclesiastical Papal empire.<sup>1</sup>

On the Apocalyptic *millennium* Vitringa adopts the view that had just before for the first time been propounded by his contemporary *Whitby*, to whom indeed he refers;<sup>2</sup> an alternative view to the two between which opinions had been hitherto divided, of the greatest importance; viz. the old chiliastic of the earliest Fathers, and the Augustinian:—a view which regarded it as a *spiritual* millennium, *yet future*; one in which the world would be thoroughly evangelized; and the Church, the bride, assume a character over the whole earth answering to the description of the New Jerusalem.

On the whole, Vitringa seems to me by no means to have contributed *directly* to the solution of the many previously remaining difficulties of the Apocalypse, so much as from his ability and various learning one might have anticipated. Indeed, his explanations are often singularly arbitrary and unsatisfactory. *Indirectly* however the value of his Commentary has doubtless been considerable: illustrating each subject handled, as he has, by a wide-ranging erudition, alike in secular and ecclesiastical, Hebraic and Greek literature; and often applying a just and acute criticism to show the untenableness of opinions, more or less plausible, adopted by expositors of note before him.

4. And it is chiefly in this indirect way also, if I mistake not, that *Daubuz's* almost contemporary, and yet more copious, Comment, contributed to the advancement of the Apocalyptic science. For it is a Commentary quite redundant with multifarious research and learning.<sup>3</sup>—It is to be understood that *Daubuz* was by birth a French Protestant; found refuge in England on the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes; there took orders in the Anglican Church; and, while

<sup>1</sup> See Vitringa's opinion on this point quoted at p. 24 of the present Volume.

<sup>2</sup> "Observavi aliunde cum voluptate nuper hoc argumentum accuratè esse pertractatum ab erudito quodam viro, (sc. Daniele Whitby,) ejus sententiæ à nostris nihil dissident." Vitringa, p. 1141.

<sup>3</sup> There has been published an abridgment of *Daubuz*, I think, by a writer named *Lancaster*: but it can give no idea of the research and learning of the original.

Vicar of Brotherton near Ferrybridge in Yorkshire, wrote his "Perpetual Commentary on the Apocalypse," which was first published in a solid folio, A.D. 1720. The following may serve as an abstract in brief of his opinions. The reader of my *Horæ* must already have formed a measure of acquaintance with him.

The *seven Epistles* then he explains, not like Vitringa as prophetic; but in the natural way, as depicting the actual state of the seven Asiatic Churches respectively: albeit with application to the Church Universal, in its earthly suffering state, to the end of time.

In the *Seals* Daubuz, though admitting A.D. 95 or 96 to be the year of the Revelation's having been given to St. John, yet antedates the subject of the 1st Seal; and makes its *white horse* and *rider* depict the victorious progress of Christ's gospel, even from his ascension. Thus he is enabled to explain the *red horse* in the 2nd Seal of the wars by which Jerusalem and the Jews were destroyed, from A.D. 66 to A.D. 135; including as well the Jewish wars of Vespasian and Titus, as those of Trajan and Adrian. The 3rd Seal, beginning A.D. 202, he expounds of scarcities begun in the reign and æra of Severus,<sup>1</sup> much as Brightman before him; the 4th (like Brightman also) of the Decian and Valerian æra of war, famine, and pestilence; the 5th (as Mede, &c.) of the Diocletian persecution; the 6th of the Constantinian Revolution, and fall of Paganism from its supremacy in the Roman empire.—Then comes the first considerable peculiarity in Daubuz's Commentary. He explains both the Sealing Vision and the Palm-bearing Vision of the happy constitution of the Church under God's sealing Angel, *Constantine*: a Church including both many converted Israelites, and multitudes innumerable of Gentiles; now alike admitted, from out of times of great tribulation, to the peaceful enjoyment of Church-privileges:—a peace and liberty this further indicated by the *half-hour's silence*, or stillness from hostility, at the opening of the 7th Seal; and its accompanying representation of an act of peaceful public worship.

The *Trumpets*, which Daubuz supposes to mark a new period, following on, not contained in, the 7th Seal,<sup>2</sup> are explained by him mainly as by Mede and Jurieu, of the desolations and fall, first of the Western empire, then the Eastern; under the assaults success-

<sup>1</sup> Καὶ τὸ ἐλαίον καὶ τοῦ οἴνου μὴ ἀδικήσῃς he renders, like Mede, Heinrichs, and myself, "Thou shalt not *do wrong* about the oil and wine."

<sup>2</sup> p. 347.



ively of the Goths, Saracens, and Turks. More particularly he thus divides the four first:—1. Alaric's ravages from A.D. 395 to 409: 2. Alaric's capture of Rome, A.D. 410, and the ravages of Gaul and Spain by the Goths and Vandals: 3. Attila's ravages, 442—452, A.D.: 4. the fall of the Western Empire under Genseric and Odoacer, from 454 to 476.—In the 5th Trumpet he made an important step of advance, as I conceive, in true Apocalyptic interpretation, by explaining the locusts' *five months*, or *150 days*, of the 150 years from Mahomet's public opening of his mission, A.D. 612, to the Saracen Caliph's removal to Bagdad, "the City of Peace," A.D. 762. On the other hand, he seems to me to have retrograded by not adopting Mede's definite chronological view of the *hour, day, month, and year*, predicted of the Euphratean horsemen; but explaining it, like some before him, as if only meaning that the four angels were all ready at *one and the same hour, or time*.

The Vision in Apoc. x. he applies, even more distinctly than the early Reforming Expositors themselves, to the great Lutheran Reformation: with the peculiar notion added of its figured Angel signifying *Luther*, as the Angel of the sealing vision had figured Constantine; and the *seven answering thunders* to his voice being those of the seven States that received and established Protestantism within them: viz. 1. the German Protestant States; 2. the Swiss Cantons; 3. Sweden; 4. Denmark; 5. England; 6. Scotland; 7. the Dutch Netherlands: John's sealing up the thunders intimating a *stop* to the progress of the Reformation, soon after the times of Luther, and the first sounding of those thunders.—"Thou must prophesy again," was a charge given to Protestants at the time of the Reformation, as represented by St. John. And so too the *measuring of the temple*:<sup>1</sup> the outer court given to the Gentiles indicating that there would still exist paganized Christians, to tread the holy city: and "both the reformed and the corrupted Christians keeping to their own lots (separately), till the term of the 42 months is lapsed since the Gentiles began."<sup>2</sup> The clause *ὅταν τελεσωσιν*, &c., "when they shall have finished, or completed their testimony," Daubuz construes, "*whilst they shall perform it*:" and so the  $3\frac{1}{2}$  days of their apparent death as equivalent to the 1260 days, or whole period of their prophesying in sackcloth. He cites in illustration

<sup>1</sup> p. 496.<sup>2</sup> p. 501.

Rom. viii. 36; "For thy sake we are killed all the day long; we are accounted as sheep for the slaughter." But the Greek of the original forbids the translation. Construing the passage as he does there is no special historical explanation needed, or offered by him, so as by Foxe, Brightman, or Jurieu, of the Witnesses' death and resurrection.—"And *the same hour* there was a great earthquake, &c.," he interprets to mean the same hour as that of the *measuring the temple*; in other words, that of the Lutheran Reformation. And the predicted fall of a tenth of the great city in it is explained to be the fall of the Greek State under the Ottoman Turks; this having been a part of the old Roman empire for some centuries, and one of the Beast's ten horns in Daubuz' view afterwards:<sup>1</sup> a fall begun indeed A.D. 1453, but advancing to completion by the Turks' subjugation of Rhodes and Cyprus in the years 1522, 1570; not to note that of Candia much later, A.D. 1669. The 7th Trumpet, yet future, Daubuz explains as the signal trumpet of the resurrection of the just; that same that is spoken of by Paul in 1 Cor. xv. 51:—that too which would introduce a time when God's Church would be freed from all idolatry and oppression, and a full accomplishment of all his designs made manifest; the one being symbolized by the opening of the temple in heaven; the other by the ark of the covenant appearing.<sup>2</sup> All evidently with reference to the times of the millennium.

In Apoc. xii. he interprets the vision of the travailing Woman and Dragon, much as others before him; with reference to the crisis of the Diocletian persecution, and Constantine's immediately following elevation to a Christian throne, and casting down of Paganism from its supremacy in the Roman empire.<sup>3</sup> Only of the Dragon's *seven heads* he offers a peculiar solution. These were the *chief subjugated kingdoms*, or rather *their capital cities*, which then constituted the Roman empire: the metropolises of Italy, of the Carthaginian empire, of the kingdom of Greece, of that of Mithridates, of that of Gaul and Britain, of Egypt, and finally Thrace; this last Byzantium, or Constantinople.—The flood out of the Dragon's mouth he explains to be the Goths; the two eagle's wings helping the Woman, the Roman Christianized Eastern and Western empires. Then in Apoc.

<sup>1</sup> pp. 537, 538.

<sup>2</sup> p. 554.

<sup>3</sup> p. 520 on Apoc. xii. (N. B. on Apoc. xii. a wrong paging commences in Daubuz; the first being 481, instead of 565.)

xiii: the *first Beast* is the *decem-regal Republic* of Western Christendom,<sup>1</sup> under *Rome* as its head; Rome the earliest head of the Dragon, excised by the Gothic invaders, but revived under the Popes. The Beast's 42 *months* of supremacy Daubuz reckons from the fall of the Western Emperor, A.D. 476, and consequently as to end in 1736.<sup>2</sup> The *second Beast* is the Beast Ecclesiastical, or False Prophet; its two horns being the Roman Popes, and the Constantinopolitan Patriarchs. The Pope himself is the *Beast's image*,<sup>3</sup> as representing the Beast's power; the *name and number* רומיית, in the feminine; i. e. the Roman Church.<sup>4</sup>

In Apoc. xiv., as in Apoc. vii., Daubuz interprets its primary vision of the 144,000 to mean the *Constantinian Church*, especially as gathered together at Nice in Council: its bishops there gathered being to the exact number of 318, the number answering to IHT, the abbreviation for Jesus Christ crucified, or *mark of the Lamb* on the foreheads of the 144,000 in vision.<sup>5</sup> Further he explains the *1st flying Angel* of Vigilantius' and Augustine's warnings against the increasing superstitions and coming judgments; <sup>6</sup> the *2nd* of the cry on the actual destruction of old Rome (here meant by Babylon) by the Goths; the *3rd* of warnings against the Beast, whose empire was now about to be established, especially that by Gregory I:<sup>7</sup> also the *harvest* as meaning the reformation of the Church, which had separated the good corn from the earth; and the *vintage*, of the wars and victories in Queen Anne's time over the Papists.<sup>8</sup>—Then in the *Vials* there was, he thought, a retrogression again to early times. The plague of *Vial 1* was the noisome sore of outbreking superstition in the image-worship that more and more established itself, from the seventh to the tenth century; *Vial 2* the earlier crusades; *Vial 3* the later; *Vial 4* the wars of Popes and Emperors; *Vial 5* the taking of Constantinople by the Latins, and the Popes' removal from Rome to Avignon; *Vial 6* the drying up of the power of the Eastern or Greek empire, which was, as it were, the Euphratean barrier to Christendom; and thereby a preparation for the kings from the East, or Turks. The *three frogs*, issuing forth coincidently, are explained of the secular Papal clergy, the monks, and

<sup>1</sup> Here, p. 556, Daubuz notes *Whiston's* list of the ten kings, as one that had preceded his.

<sup>2</sup> p. 620.

<sup>3</sup> 592.

<sup>4</sup> 611.

<sup>5</sup> pp. 624, 325. A very curious application of the *σοληφια*! On which see my Vol. iii. p. 243.

<sup>6</sup> p. 630.

<sup>7</sup> p. 637.

<sup>8</sup> pp. 646, 661.

the religious orders of knights of the time. *Vial* 7 on the air, or power of the Devil, depicted the Reformation by Luther: the great city being tripartited about this time into the Greeks, the Latin Papists, and the Protestants.<sup>1</sup>

Finally, in Apoc. xix. Daubuz interprets the hallelujahs and thunderings heard on the fall of Babylon, (i. e. here of *Papal* Rome,) to indicate the conversion of the Jews, and incoming of the fulness of the Gentiles: explains the *first resurrection* in Apoc. xx. literally, of the saints and martyrs rising from the dead, and millennial reign with Christ: also the *New Jerusalem* as the habitation and state of the Church *after the resurrection of the saints*, both during the millenium and afterwards; the Church being in the saints' mortal state *betrothed* to Christ; but after the resurrection his *γυνή*, or *wife*.<sup>2</sup>

5. *Sir I. Newton's* brief Apocalyptic Comment, appended to his Treatise on Daniel, was not published, I believe, till the year 1733; six years after his death. It seems, however, to have been written some considerable time before; his thoughts having been seriously directed to these prophecies as early as 1691.<sup>3</sup> Brief as is the comment, being of not much more than seventy pages, it yet contains much valuable matter, and exhibits much careful and original thought; so as might have been expected from such an author. Alike on the Seals and Trumpets he expresses his *general* agreement with Mede. But certain differences occur. 1st, as regards the Seals, he expounds the rider in the first Seal, as well as in the three next, not of *Christ*, but of *Roman emperors*:<sup>4</sup> (I presume with

<sup>1</sup> p. 733.

<sup>2</sup> p. 967.

<sup>3</sup> In the biographical Notice of Sir I. Newton in the British Cyclopædia, a letter of his is given, dated Cambridge, Feb. 7, 1690-1, containing the following extract: "I should be glad to have your judgment on some of my mystical fancies. The Son of Man, Dan. vii., I take to be the same with the Word of God upon the white horse in heaven, Apoc. xix.; for both are to rule the nations with a rod of iron. But whence are you certain that the Ancient of Days is Christ?"

<sup>4</sup> He says indeed at p. 278 (of Edit. 1733); "The four horsemen, at the opening of the four first seals, have been well explained by Mr. Mede:" who made, we have seen, the first horseman to be *Christ*. But this was a mere lapse of the pen. For Sir I. expressly elsewhere gives to the first Seal, as well as to the other three, a *Roman* solution. So p. 256; "The visions at the opening of these (the first four) Seals relate only to the civil affairs of the heathen Roman empire." At p. 274 he speaks of "the wars of the Roman empire, during the reign of the four horsemen that appeared on the opening the first four Seals:" and at p. 277; "The Dragon's heads are seven successive kings; four of them being the four horsemen, which appeared at the opening



reference to the triumphs of Vespasian and Titus, as I shall have to observe again presently:) also he makes the limits of the 4th Seal to range from Decius to Diocletian's accession. He agrees with Mede in making the sealing of the 144,000 synchronize with the visions that followed on opening the 7th Seal. Again, in regard of Mede's view of the seventh Seal, as comprehending the seven Trumpets, Sir Isaac adds, *and also the half-hour's previous stillness from the threatened four winds of heaven*: (the same that were let loose afterwards under the four first Trumpets:) which stillness he explains *historically* of the respite during Theodosius's reign, from 380 A.D. to 395:<sup>1</sup> an important approximation, I conceive, to the true meaning.<sup>2</sup>—2. Dissatisfied with Mede's particular and somewhat fanciful distribution of the Gothic ravages over the four first Trumpets, he makes the distinction of the four winds the principle of distinction in them; 1st, as figuring Alaric's ravages on the Greek provinces *East* of Rome; 2nd, as the Visigoths' and Vandals' on the *Western* Gallic and Spanish provinces; 3rd, as the desolations of *Southern* Africa by the Vandal wars, from Genseric down to Belisarius; 4th, as the Ostrogothic and Lombard wars in *Northern* Italy.<sup>3</sup>—3. In the 5th Trumpet he thinks the double mention of the locusts' *quinquemensal* period of tormenting, in verses 5 and 10 of Apoc. ix., may be meant to signify two periods of 150 years each, as the times of the Saracens.<sup>4</sup>—4. The Turks' *hour, day, month, and year* he calculates as 390 years; not 396, as Mede: viz. from Alp Arslan's first conquering on the Euphrates, A.D. 1063, to the fall of Constantinople, in 1453.<sup>5</sup>

In Apoc. xii. and xiii. Sir I. Newton generally agrees with Mede; explaining Apoc. xii. of the times of Diocletian and Constantine,<sup>6</sup> Apoc. xiii. of those of the Latin Papal empire: the first Beast being

of the four first seals." So too p. 278. (I cite from the Reprint in the Investigator.)

<sup>1</sup> "These wars [at the beginning of which Valens perished] were not fully stopped on all sides till the beginning of the reign of Theodosius, A.D. 379, 380; but henceforward the empire remained quiet from foreign enemies, till his death A.D. 395. So long the four winds were held; and so long there was silence in heaven." He adds; "And the 7th Seal was opened when this silence began." Pp. 294, 295.

<sup>2</sup> Till my present abstracting of Sir I. Newton's Treatise, I had not been aware of the near resemblance of my own views on the *holding of the winds* and the *half-hour's silence* to Sir I. Newton's. See my Vol. i. pp. 258, 324, 325. Only I judge the time of silence intended to have begun at Theodosius' death, not his accession.

<sup>3</sup> Sir I. Newton, pp. 296—302.

<sup>4</sup> "About five months," he says, "at Damascus, and five at Bagdad;" altogether 300 years, from A. D. 637 to 936 inclusive. Ib. 305. <sup>5</sup> p. 307. <sup>6</sup> 279—281.

this Latin Papal decem-regal empire ; its name and number *Λαττεινος* ;<sup>1</sup> the second Beast however (a singular explanation!) the *Greek Church*.<sup>2</sup>—And then he intimates peculiar structural views on the *seven Epistles, seven Vials, and little Book*. The *Epistles* he adjusts to the states and times of the Church indicated in the figurations of the *Seals* that followed : the particulars being as stated below.<sup>3</sup> The *Vials* ought, he judges, to have been made synchronal with, and explanatory of, the *Trumpets*. The *little Book* he considers, like *Mede*, to be a new prophecy ; the Angel-Vision of Apoc. x. being an introduction to it : but that, as being sweet *when first tasted*, and *afterwards* bitter, its commencement should be considered as agreeing with Apoc. xiii., and the glorious prefiguration there given of the fall of Paganism in the Roman empire ; the sequel of it being the bitter times of the Beast's 1260 years, and the Witnesses' prophesying in sackcloth.<sup>4</sup>

Besides all which, I wish to direct particular attention to two characteristic and important points in this Comment of Sir I. Newton ; the one regarding the distant past, the other the then quickly coming future. 1. He, first of Expositors, if I mistake not, instituted a careful and critical investigation into the evidence external and internal of the *date* of the Apocalypse ;<sup>5</sup> inferring it thence to be coincident with Nero's persecution, not Domitian's : incorrectly,

Pp. 282—284.—Sir I. Newton gives us in his connected Treatise on Daniel historical abstracts illustrating the division of the ten kingdoms, and progress of the Papal power in respect of imperial law and historic fact, so careful and valuable, that no Apocalyptic student should be without them. I have referred to them in my Vol. iii. at pp. 141, 160, and elsewhere.

<sup>2</sup> "The second Beast, which rose up out of the earth, was the Church of the Greek empire." P. 283. In the distinction of *earth* and *sea*, he elsewhere makes the *earth* the Greek empire. So p. 281.

<sup>3</sup> The Epistle to *Ephesus* Sir I. Newton makes to depict the state of the Church previous to the fifth Seal, and before Diocletian's persecution ; when the only "something" of charge against it was, "Thou hast left thy first love :"—that to *Smyrna*, with its *ten days' tribulation*, had reference to Diocletian's persecution, depicted in the 5th Seal :—those to *Pergamos, Thyatira*, and *Sardis*, wherein mention is made of the heresies and evils of Balaam and the woman Jezebel, and of the Church's works not having been found perfect before God, figured the gradual apostasy under Constantine and Constantius :—that to *Philadelphia*, the faithful under Julian's persecution :—that to *Laodicea*, the Church's subsequent lukewarmness, so increased as that God would spue it out of his mouth ; a state answering to the development of the apostasy soon after the opening of the 7th Seal, or at the end of the 4th century.

<sup>4</sup> Pp. 271, 272.

<sup>5</sup> At the beginning of his Apocalyptic Treatise, pp. 236—246. *Grotius*, if I remember right, took Epiphanius' *Claudian* date simply on Epiphanius' authority. *Alcasar* had taken the *Domitianic*.

however, as I think I have proved.<sup>1</sup> Which being supposed, a *Roman* explanation was obvious of the 1st Seal, in harmony with Mede's *Roman* explanation of the 2nd; this latter having reference to the wars of Trajan and Adrian.—2. He insists, with regard to the so far evident imperfection of the understanding of the Apocalypse and of some of Daniel's prophecies, that it was itself a thing foreseen and predicted; Daniel having been directed to *seal up* his last prophecy till *the time of the end*. And he adds that this time of the end was Apocalyptically marked as that of the 7th Trumpet, at whose sounding the mystery of God should be finished: (the preaching of the everlasting Gospel to all nations being further marked, both in the Apocalypse and in Christ's prophecy, as a preliminary sign accompanying it:) and that the measure of success, albeit imperfect, that had crowned the prophetic researches of the immediately preceding age, seemed to him an evidence that the last "main revolution" predicted, when all would be explained, was "near at hand."<sup>2</sup>—I must add, not from his own published Comment, but from Whiston's, the further remarkable fact, that Sir Isaac expressed a strong persuasion, —with reference of course to the expected "main revolution" of the seventh Trumpet, wherein "they were to be destroyed that destroyed or corrupted the earth,"—that the antichristian or persecuting power of the Popedom, which had so long corrupted Christianity, must be put a stop to, and broken to pieces, by the prevalence of *infidelity*, for some time before primitive Christianity could be restored.<sup>3</sup> Which anticipation, fulfilled as it was soon after in the facts and character of the expected great Revolution, when it actually broke out, must surely be deemed not a little remarkable.

<sup>1</sup> Viz. in my opening Treatise on the Date of the Apocalypse, Vol. i. p. 34, and the additional notice on it, p. 533, in the Appendix to that Volume.

<sup>2</sup> "The time is not yet come for understanding the old prophets, (which he that would understand must begin with the Apocalypse,) because the main revolution predicted in them is not yet come to pass. *In the days of the voice of the seventh Angel* the mystery of God shall be finished. . . . Among the interpreters of the last age there is scarce one of note who hath not made some discovery worth knowing; whence I seem to gather that God is about opening these mysteries." Pp. 252, 253.

<sup>3</sup> "Sir I. Newton had a very sagacious conjecture, which he told Dr. Clarke, from whom I received it, that the overbearing tyranny and persecuting power of the Antichristian party, which hath so long corrupted Christianity, and enslaved the Christian world, must be put a stop to, and broken to pieces, by the prevalence of infidelity, for some time before primitive Christianity could be restored:"—which, adds Whiston, writing A.D. 1744, "seems to be the very means that is now working in Europe for the same good and great end of Providence." (2nd Ed. p. 321.)

6. The Apocalyptic "Essay" by *Whiston* (Newton's successor in the Mathematical Professorship at Cambridge) was first published, as appears from the date appended to Whiston's original Preface, in the year 1706: a second Edition followed in 1744, under Whiston's own eye, improved and corrected.<sup>1</sup>—The following points in it appear to me deserving of notice. While strongly contending for the *Domitianic* date of the Apocalypse, he yet explains the 1st *Seal* retrospectively of Christ's triumphing in *Vespasian and Titus' overthrow of Jerusalem*; the other Seals as *Mede, Jurieu, and Newton*.—In the *Trumpets*, dissatisfied like Newton with *Mede's* vague principle of distribution, he takes another, and I think better plan, for giving definiteness and precision to the several shares of the several Trumpets in the Gothic ravages: his principle being drawn from the *third part* said to be affected; which he construes as the *European* part of the empire, (in contrast with the *African* and *Asiatic*,) and the *land, sea, and rivers*, literally taken, that are specified in it. Thus the subjects of Trumpets 1, 2, and 3 are made respectively to be the ravages of *Alaric and Rhadagaisus* in the *landward* interior, those of the *Vandals and Goths* on the *maritime* European parts, and those of *Attila* on the European *rivers*; (the last a real advance, as I conceive, to the truth; <sup>2</sup>) the quenching of the third part of the *sun, i. e. imperial sun, &c.*, being that of *Odoacer*.—In the 5th Trumpet, after other previously given solutions of the locusts' *five months*, he at length concludes on the reading being faulty, and St. John having written *ε μηνας*, not *ε*; i. e. 15, not 5: 450 years measuring the whole duration of the *Saracens*, till their entire supersession by the *Turks*.<sup>3</sup> (*Whiston* does not seem to have been acquainted with *Daubuz's* simple and satisfactory solution of these five months.)<sup>4</sup>—In his exposition of the *Turks' "hour, day, month, and year,"* the exactness of the astronomer appears. Asserting that *Othman* could not be properly recognized as *Sultan* till the *Hutbe* prayers had been put up for him in the mosques, and that this was first done for *Othman* May 19,

<sup>1</sup> Whiston died A.D. 1752.—The title-page of his *Essay's* 2nd Edition bears date, London 1744; Whiston's own conclusion of its 3rd Part, at p. 324, Jan. 20, 1743-4. A little before his death he drew up a brief *Addendum* to his Second Edition, occupying in my copy of that Edition from p. 325 to 332; and bearing date at the end, May 7, 1750.

<sup>2</sup> This view has been followed in the main by *Bicheno* and *Keith*. I have also myself mainly adopted it.

<sup>3</sup> P. 196.

<sup>4</sup> Whiston's 1st Edition, being published in 1706, was before *Daubuz*.



1301, he calculates the prophetic period of an hour, day, month, and year, or 396 years 106 days, as reaching to Sept. 1, 1697, O.S.: the very date of Prince Eugene's great victory over the Turks, which was followed by the peace of Carlowitz.<sup>1</sup>—On the *Beast* of Apoc. xiii. Whiston, after suggesting that the *7th head*, which was to continue for but a short time, might be the *five emperors* noted by Lactantius as reigning over the Roman world just before Constantine's victories, (another approximation, I conceive, towards the truth,) makes the *8th head* to be that of the *ten kings* of the revived Romano-Gothic Empire; these *ten kings* being as it were a revival of the old *decemviral* head:<sup>2</sup>—an original idea this, that I have not seen elsewhere.<sup>3</sup>—The Papal supremacy he dates distinctly (and quotes Archbishop Laud affirming the same) from Phocas's Decree A.D. 606.<sup>4</sup>—Besides all which points what I deem particularly to be noted in Whiston is his strong stand against Mede's classification of the *Vials*: and assertion that on every principle of consistency and congruity of things, as the seven Trumpets are reckoned to be contained in, and the evolution of, the seventh Seal,—so the seven Vials ought to be deemed contained in, and the evolution of, the seventh Trumpet. A very important and surely most obvious step of progress.<sup>5</sup>

7. And so we advance nearer and nearer to the epoch of the great French Revolution.—I do not purpose stopping at the names of *Bengel* and *Bishop Newton*, Whiston's immediate Protestant successors: who, publishing about the middle of the xviii<sup>th</sup> century,<sup>6</sup> served as connecting links in Germany and England, between the generation of Apocalyptic expositors just described, and those on whom the French Revolution broke; that epoch of a new æra. *Bengel's* most characteristic principle, viz. of expounding the prophetic periods in the Apocalypse on the scale of a prophetic day to 15 years,<sup>7</sup> is so totally and plainly arbitrary and groundless, that no one

<sup>1</sup> All this has been closely followed by Mr. Faber in his Sacred Calendar. See his Vol. ii. p. 293—301.

<sup>2</sup> Compare Mr. Cuninghame's View noticed in my Vol. iii. p. 121. <sup>3</sup> P. 126.

<sup>4</sup> P. 275—277. Prof. M. Stuart (i. 469) is thus incorrect in saying that Whiston assigned the year 1766 as that of Christ's second coming.

<sup>5</sup> So Launæus. See p. 512 *suprà*; also p. 494.

<sup>6</sup> *Bengel*, A.D. 1740: (died 1752:); *Bishop Newton*, A.D. 1754.

<sup>7</sup> His fundamental principle, one altogether conjectural, was that the *Beast's* number 666, construed of *years*, must equal the *Beast's* numeral period 42 months;

can now think of attaching weight to it; highly valued though Bengel himself must be for learning and piety. And, as for *Bishop Newton's* Treatise, it is too universally known to need description; besides that, however valuable as a compendium, (and I deem it eminently so,) it does yet scarcely put forth any original thoughts on the subject handled.—Nor again will the *Roman Catholic* Comment of *Bishop Walmsley*, that soon after followed, need any more to detain us; it being already pretty much forgotten by Romanists themselves.<sup>1</sup>—But it does need, I think, that I call attention to the *German Præterist School* that was about this time rising more and more into notice and influence: a School characterized by considerable mental acuteness, research, and philological learning; and at the same time by much of the hardihood and rashness of religious scepticism. I therefore at once proceed to it.

8. As early then as Bengel's time, the celebrated Genevese writer, *Firmin Abauzit*,<sup>2</sup> their precursor and harbinger, had published a work entitled *Discours Historique sur l'Apocalypse*, written to show that the canonical authority of the Apocalypse was doubtful. On reading Dr. Twells' reply to it,<sup>3</sup> however, he was satisfied; and honourably wrote (though in vain) to stop the reprinting of his

in other words, that one prophetic month =  $\frac{666}{42} = 15\frac{6}{7}$  years. Hence, after various calculations, he inferred that the year 1836 would be the year of the final and great crisis; an expectation, I need not observe, never realized.

<sup>1</sup> It was published under the fictitious name of Signor Pastorini in the year 1771: was in 1778 translated into French by a Benedictine of St. Maur, and into Latin and German soon after. Its principle is, that the Seals, Trumpets, and Vials all relate to the same seven ages of the Church: 1. the first 300 years of the Christian æra, to Constantine, the age of Christian purity; 2. the next 100 years, marked by the Arian heresy; 3. from 406 to 620 A.D., marked by God's judgments on ancient Rome and the Western Empire; 4. from 620 to 1520 marked by three great events,—viz. the rise of Mahomet and Mahomedanism, the schism of the Greek Church, and the consequent judgments on it in the fall of Constantinople; whereon, however, the spared *Greek* remnant "did not penance to give God glory," but persisted in their schism; 5. that begun A.D. 1520 in the Lutheran Reformation, which is to last "till the pouring out of the 6th Vial, twice 5 months, or about 300 years:" of which 300 years 250, says Pastorini, are now elapsed; so that the pouring out of that vial seems soon approaching, and the cry heard, "Come out of her, my people." The 6th age is the last of the Church militant on earth; probably till the end of the world's 6000 years: 7. the 7th age, that of eternity.

<sup>2</sup> He was originally French, but became a refugee in Geneva on the revocation of the Edict of Nantes. He was in earlier life a friend of Sir I. Newton; in later life the subject of the eulogies of both Voltaire and Rousseau. His *Apocalyptic Discours* was first published about 1730.

<sup>3</sup> An Answer approved and translated into Latin by *Wolf*, and inserted in his "*Curæ Philologicae*."

work in Holland. But soon after the middle of the century the sceptical spirit broke out more freely. A work by *Oeder*, which *Semler* published after *Oeder*'s death, about the year 1765, entitled "A Free Investigation into the so-called Revelation by John," denied not only its apostolicity, but even its literary beauty; charged it with all the extravagances of its wildest expositors, and maintained that its real author was the heretic *Cerinthus*. So began what has been called the *Semlerian controversy*. *Semler* was replied to, and opposed, by *Reuss* of Tübingen, A.D. 1767, 1772, *Schmidt* of Wittenberg, in his "Vindictio Canonis," A.D. 1775, and *Knittel* of Wolfenbüttel, A.D. 1773; to which works he and his friends made vigorous answer. The controversy lasted to the year 1785.<sup>1</sup> The celebrated *Michaelis* was so far influenced by what had been written by *Abauzit* and *Semler*'s partizans on the canonical question, that he concluded with *Eusebius* on reckoning the Apocalypse not among the undisputed canonical books, but among the *απιλεγόμενα*. The work of *Herder*, published 1779, vindicated with great earnestness and ability the literary merits and beauty of the Apocalypse; indeed, with such ability and enthusiasm as to act strongly on the literary German mind; yet vindicated it only as *Herder* might have vindicated a neglected beautiful Poem of classic origin; not as a work of divine inspiration.<sup>2</sup> In 1786 *Hernschneider* published his Comment on the Apocalypse; explaining it as a Poem describing the three things following;—viz. the overthrow of *Judaism*, the overthrow of *Heathenism*, and the final universal triumph of the *Christian Church*. This was the model, in respect of general plan, of the more celebrated work of *Eichhorn*, published shortly after, viz. A.D. 1791; a work of which Professor M. Stuart, to whom I am indebted for this rapid sketch of the German Apocalyptic Expositors of the last half of the last century, thus reports;—that although not equal to *Herder*'s in respect of the perception or the development of æsthetic beauties, it is yet, in regard of philology, and real explanation of words and phrases, far *Herder*'s superior: adding, moreover,

<sup>1</sup> Professor Stuart particularizes *Corrodi* and *Markel* on *Semler*'s side, against the genuineness and apostolicity of the Apocalypse; *Storr* and *Hartwig* in defence of it.

<sup>2</sup> "Entitled "*Maran Atha, or Book of the Coming of the Lord.*" Professor Stuart almost warms into enthusiasm in speaking of this book; (i. 471;) and at the end of his Second Volume gives a large specimen of it. It seems to me calculated to excite feelings of a very different kind in the devout Christian, for the reason stated above.

that it is substantially *correct* in its exegesis, i. e. in its view of the general tenor and meaning of the Apocalyptic Book; a statement meaning that it is substantially in agreement with Professor Stuart's own views. As this scheme had not only then preponderance in Germany, but is one of the grand rival schemes that still claim acceptance, I think I cannot better conclude the present Section of my Sketch of Apocalyptic interpretation, than by placing it before the reader's eye, as drawn up by *Professor Hug*, professedly from *Hernnschneider* and *Eichhorn*: its characteristic view being this, that the two cities, Rome and Jerusalem, whose fate (as they would have it) constitutes the most considerable part of the Apocalypse, are only symbols of *two religions* whose fall is foretold; and that the third, which appears at the end, viz. the heavenly Jerusalem, signifies Christ's religion and kingdom.

*The Præterist Scheme of Hernnschneider and Eichhorn*, as sketched by *Prof. Hug*.

"There are three cities in this book, on account of which all the terrible preparations above, and here below, and all the commotions of the earthly and heavenly powers, take place. One of them is *Sodom*, called also *Egypt*; the other is *Babylon*; and the third is the *New Jerusalem*, descending from heaven.

"The whole affair of the seven Angels with the seven *Trumpets*, viii.—xii., refers to *Sodom*. But we soon see that this city, long since destroyed, only lends its name to denote another. For in this *Sodom* our Lord was crucified; ὅπου ὁ κυριος ἡμων εσταυρωθη· xi. 8. In this *Sodom* is the Temple; the outer court of which is said to be abandoned to the Gentiles. Thus it is the Holy City itself, *πολις ἁγια*, of which foreign nations will take possession; xi. 1. As two martyrs have perished in it, its destruction is decided; xii. 1. (Josephus the Jew likewise compared Jerusalem to *Sodom* at the same epoch. Bell. Jud. v. 10.)

"After a long episode, in which a matron appears in the pains of child-birth, persecuted by a monster, and after the description of two more monsters, which torment the adherents of this distinguished woman, Apoc. xii., xiii., xiv., the destruction of *Babylon* also is decided in heaven, xiv. 8.

"The seven Angels with the seven *Vials* of wrath are appointed to



execute the decision, xvi. 17—19; although indeed Babylon had stood for centuries before desert, and amidst but half-distinguishable remains of its magnificence. But *this* Babylon is built upon seven hills; ὅπου ὀρη εἰσιν ἑπτὰ xvii. 9—18. It is an *urbs septicollis*; a mark of distinction renowned throughout the world, which renders it easy for us to guess the city which is peculiarly intended. But the other criterion that it possesses, the *imperium orbis terrarum*, βασιλεία ἐπὶ τῶν βασιλευν τῆς γῆς, perfectly assures us, xvii. 18, that this Babylon on the Euphrates is *Rome on the Tiber*.

“Consequently *Jerusalem* and *Rome* are the two cities whose destruction is here seen in the Spirit. These cities, however, do not exist in reality as cities, in the poetical composition; but they are images of other ideas. Rome, or Babylon in particular, is by the author conceived to be opposed to the everlasting gospel, εὐαγγελιον αἰῶνιον, xiv. 6—8. In this opposition to Christianity it could hardly signify anything but Heathenism; to represent which the capital of the heathen world is most eminently and peculiarly qualified. Hence John further also describes it with such phrases as were used by the Prophets to denote false gods and their worship. It is the *habitation of dæmons*; the seducer to infidelity from the true God, i. e. πορνεία: from the cup of whose fornication all nations and kings of the earth drink; xviii. 2, 3; xvii. 1, 2, 5.

“If the capital of the heathen world symbolizes the religion of the heathens, we shall easily ascertain what the *capital of the Jews* represented. What else but the Jewish religion? Therefore Heathenism and Judaism, the two prevailing religions of the ancient world, were destined to perish.

“And what should now succeed to them? A *New Jerusalem*, the kingdom of the blessed, after this life (xxi. xxii. 6.)?—The New Jerusalem is certainly so described: and such is usually considered to be its meaning. But if these cities be religions, and Rome and Jerusalem represent Heathenism and Judaism, the new Sion can only be Christianity; which has an endless dominion, and blesses mankind. This the unity of the whole demands; nor would it be consistent, if the idea of it was compounded of such an unequal representation of its parts, as Heathenism, Judaism, and Eternal Blessedness.

“For what purpose should this kingdom of the blessed afterwards forsake that long-beloved abode in the higher spheres, and in heaven;

and descend among men, unless it were an *earthly institution*? (xxi. 23.) It could only descend upon earth as a religion; for the sake of supplying the place of the two former religions.

“The previous openings of the graves, and the return of the dead, is here only one of those awfully terrible images, which the prophets sometimes used to represent a total change of things; the revival of the national state, and of the religious constitution of the Jews. (Ezek. xxxvii.; Isa. xxvi. 19.)

“And, if a last judgment also be connected with it, we well know that such also is figuratively convoked by the prophets, for the purpose of executing the punishment of those who have oppressed and ill-treated the people of God; or for the purpose of expressing Jehovah’s designs of introducing a new epoch of glory for his religion and his people. (Joel iii. 2; Zeph. iii. 8.) This being admitted, the whole passage of the seven *Seals* is only an introduction to the three principal descriptions:—to the dissolution of Judaism, to the abolition of Heathenism, and the occupation of the dominion of the world by the doctrines of Jesus. (v.—vii. 2.) For a prophecy, according to the ancient prophetic language, is a sealed book (Isa. xxix. 11): of which the mysteries can only be developed by the Lamb, who is on the throne of God; the co-Regent with Jehovah, in whose hands the events are. Terrible plagues, famine, pestilence, war, and an entire revolution of states are impending; from which those however are exempted who belong to the chosen of the Lamb.

“But the *Epistles*, which are preludes to the whole as far as chap. iv., are Dedications or Addresses to those communities which were particularly connected with the author in the district of his ministry.

“Then the Episode (xii., xiii.), which follows the judicial punishment of Jerusalem, the Episode relating to that noble Woman who struggles in the agonies of labour, and who is persecuted by the Dragon, (Isaiah’s ancient metaphor of idolatry,) exhibits to us *Judaism*, which is still in the act of bringing forth Christianity: so as all the circumstances, and the individual traits in the description, prove. But the other monsters which ascend from land and sea, and which are in the service of the Dragon, signify, according to very recognizable criteria, the Roman land and sea forces which protect the dominion of Paganism (xiii. 1—xiv. 6).

“Opposed to this, after the punishment is executed on Rome (xvii.

1—xviii.), another Woman appears on a scarlet Beast. The former Woman, after her new-born child had been taken up to the throne of God, henceforth repaired to the deserts and pathless regions; which is an excellent metaphor of wandering Judaism. But the fate of the latter Woman is not so mild. Her destruction is soon after celebrated in jubilees and triumphant songs. That this typifies *idolatry*, as the former the Jewish religion, is evident from the representation."

PERIOD VII.—FROM THE FRENCH REVOLUTION TO THE PRESENT  
TIME.

Such was the state pretty much of Apocalyptic interpretation among Protestants and Romanists, in England, Germany, and the Papal European States respectively, when the French Revolution burst like a thunderclap upon a startled world. In every way a mighty epoch, whether as regards the world of politics, of society, of religion, or of mind, it could scarcely but constitute an important epoch also in prophetic interpretation.—Among *Protestant* expositors of the historic school, in England more especially, such as followed more or less in the track of their Protestant precursors, of Pareus, Foxe, Mede, Vitringa, Daubuz, and the Newtons, the impression was very strong and general that this was probably the commencement of that selfsame last revolution, or earthquake of the 7th Trumpet, which Sir I. Newton had so confidently anticipated as in his time near at hand:<sup>1</sup> and of which, among other grand results proclaimed by the heavenly voices at the sounding of the Trumpet, one was to be the establishment of Christ's reign on the earth.—As our review of Apocalyptic interpretation in this momentous æra is to be extended in this my 5th Edition as far down as the present epoch of 1862, and, in England at least, very notable points of change and innovation occurred in the more or less current interpretation after its first half had past away, it will be well, I think, to consider it under the division of two separate Sections; the 1st from the epoch of the outbreak of the Revolution in 1789 to the peace of Paris, and cessation of the military occupation of France by the Allies about 1820; the 2nd from 1820 to 1862.

<sup>1</sup> See p. 521 *suprà*.

## § 1. FROM 1789 TO 1820.

I. And, before referring to the English Apocalyptic expositors of this period, I must beg to direct my reader's attention to two expositors of the Romish connexion, on whom, in other countries and under very different circumstances, the *millennial question* had forced itself near about the same time as pre-eminently the important one: not without new views (at least for Romanists) about the predicted apostasy, Antichrist, and Babylon, which made and still make their Treatises doubly remarkable. I allude to the French *Père Lambert*, and the Spanish Jesuit *Lacunza*; the latter better known by his assumed Jewish appellative of *Ben Ezra*.

1. The *Père Lambert* was, I believe, a native of Provence, in the south of France. He belonged to the Dominican Order, and died at Paris in 1813. His prophetic book which I refer to, entitled "*Exposition des Prédications et des Promesses faites à l'Eglise pour les derniers temps de la Gentilité*," appears to have been commenced before the end of the 18th century.<sup>1</sup> But it was not completed till 1804, or a little later;<sup>2</sup> and was at length published in 1806 at Paris, in two small 12mo volumes. It has not, I believe, been reprinted.

The title of the Treatise explains in a measure its main subject and object. Considering attentively what then was, and what had been previously, ever since the first formation of the Christian Church,—the then all general corruption and infidelity, even among profest Catholic Christians, so as to reduce it to a mere "phantom Christianity,"<sup>3</sup> and manuer in which in the ages previous Christianity had been almost ever exhibited in corrupted form by its professors, been conquered and triumphed over moreover in many countries by Ma-

<sup>1</sup> In Vol. i. p. 115 Lambert speaks of the passage there having been written "dans les dernières années du 18me siècle."

<sup>2</sup> Ib. p. 56, Lambert says, "J'écris ceci en 1804."

<sup>3</sup> On this point I have already cited Lambert's language, as singularly illustrative of the symbol of the 1st Vial, in my Vol. iii. p. 373, Note <sup>1</sup>. Besides the direct infidelity and "practical atheism" of many, (*avowed atheism* had just then rather gone out of fashion,) he notices other principles of evil manifest in professing Christendom: the rationalistic Christianity of some, the adoption of it by others as a mere political engine of state, and the pharisaism and "fausse justice" of the more devout. i. 39—43. In the expression *practical atheism*, as applicable to their times, Lambert and Wilberforce agreed. See my Vol. iii. 477, Note <sup>2</sup>.



hommedanism, and in regard of the number of its adherents been ever left by Heathenism in a comparatively small minority,—it was felt by Lambert that a sceptic might well sneer at Christ's mission as a failure, and at the promises of his Church's universal establishment on earth in all purity and blessedness as little better than falsehood: <sup>1</sup> i. e. supposing the Roman Catholics' generally received views of prophecy respecting the millennium, and the only yet remaining future to the Church and to the world, to be correct.<sup>2</sup> For, as to the *millennial* Apocalyptically figured *reign of the saints* it was, according to those views, nothing but the Church's or individual Christians' very partial successes, such as had been accomplished since the apostles' first preaching of the gospel.<sup>3</sup> And, as to the future, all that was anticipated was Antichrist's 3½ years' manifestation and reign on Satan's loosing: and that then, for some very brief term after Antichrist's destruction, just before the world's ending, (a term answering perhaps to Daniel's 45 days,) the conversion of the Jews and whole Gentile world have its fulfilment; but only to come and pass away, (together with the world's destruction and final judgment,) as rapidly almost as a flash of lightning.<sup>4</sup> So the usual process of Scripture investigation was gone through by Lambert, and is in this Treatise set forth before his readers, by which so many both before and after him have been convinced that the Apocalyptic millennium of the saints' reign on earth, and corresponding Old Testament promised times of blessedness, are yet to come:—how that they are to be introduced by Christ's second personal advent; the destruction of Antichrist with his apostate Church and Babylon, and resurrection of Christ's departed saints and martyrs accompanying: and that then, the Jews' conversion having taken place coincidently, the earthly Church now extended over the whole earth is to flourish under the rule of Christ and his saints gloriously; Jerusalem being the new centre of light and unity, accordantly with the multitudinous prophecies of Jerusa-

<sup>1</sup> Vol. i. Pref. ii. pp. 146, 219, 220, 242, &c. Lambert strongly expresses his view of the promises of indefectibility and triumph being made to the *visible earthly* Church, i. 20, 140. "En fuyant cette eglise visible ils fuyent Jesus Christ lui même." In this indiscriminating and exaggerated view of the Church visible we see a weak point in Lambert.

<sup>2</sup> P. 255, &c.

<sup>3</sup> See generally his Ch. xiv. on the Millennium; Vol. ii. p. 89, &c.

<sup>4</sup> "Et que cette grande revolution, si long temps attendue, . . ne seroit qu'un eclair pour ainsi dire:" "un eclair qui brille un instant, et qui disparoit aussitot." i. 233, 223. Also i. 245.

lem's destined future glory and blessedness: and this not for 1000 years only, but a much longer period; the Apocalyptic 1000 years being probably "prophetic years," perhaps sabbatic, perhaps Jubilean, each of 7 or 50 years.<sup>1</sup>—The development of this argument occupies the greater part of Père Lambert's book.<sup>2</sup>

But what the *apostasy*, *Antichrist*, and *Babylon*, so to be destroyed at Christ's second coming, introductory to the promised establishment of the Christian Church in its purity and glory over the earth? Again, how the transference of its centre of unity from *Rome*, St. Peter's see, to *Jerusalem*? On these points Father Lambert propounded views new and strange for a Romanist; except in so far as Lacunza might have anticipated him. The Apocalyptic Babylon, he says, (confessedly the city of the seven hills,) did not symbolize, so as Bossuet would have it, *Pagan Rome*. In such case, besides other objections,<sup>3</sup> what reason was there for St. John to wonder at it with so great amazement? Nor again did it symbolize Rome as falling into some quite new and infidel apostasy, *at the end of the world*, and this after expelling the Pope, so as Ribera and Bellarmine would explain the prophecy.<sup>4</sup> The Apocalyptic symbols sufficiently indicated a professedly Christian body; and history also told too plainly that Papal Rome and the Papal priesthood might well, by only further developing the corruptions which already in part had been, answer to the prophetic indications. It was the conviction on Lambert's mind that the *mystery of iniquity* spoken of by St. Paul was a principle, or principles, of corruption and evil *within the professing Church*, sown even in the apostle's days: that this had gone on ever working more and more influentially within it through the centuries that followed, being nourished by all the abuses, vices, errors, and impieties that were admitted into the Gentile Church, as those centuries went on; and was at length to become the consummated "*apostasy*," by infecting the whole body of Gentile Christendom, headed by a personal and *Papal Antichrist*.<sup>5</sup> But not without a *series of previous*

<sup>1</sup> ii. 67, 80, 139.

<sup>2</sup> Out of its 20 Chapters it occupies from Ch. v. to Ch. xvi. inclusive.

<sup>3</sup> The objections of Lambert I find to be some of those which I have myself made in my criticism on Bossuet, as published in my 2nd and 3rd Editions, before I was acquainted with this Dominican Father. In the criticism, as now republished in the 2nd part of this Appendix, I may note where Lambert had preceded me in the critical objections to Bossuet's theory.

<sup>4</sup> I am not sure whether Lambert mentions Bellarmine anywhere specifically.

<sup>5</sup> "Le mystere d'iniquité, dont parle St. Paul, est comme un abcès qui commençoit

*Popes* having preceded and prepared for him, by exhibiting and acting out gradually more and more the spirit of Antichrist. The Prince of Tyre prophesied of in Ezekiel evidently symbolized this Papal Antichrist; in respect both of his original state, and that into which he would fall by corruption. Endowed with authority at first as one seated in God's seat, and on the holy mountain, (i. e. in the *Church*), anointed too with the holy ointment, and adorned with precious stones, like the Jewish High Priest, this Prince was depicted as at length being seduced to say in heart, "I am God;" to usurp God's honour, worship, and prerogatives; and then, abandoned to avarice, becoming a "marehand," and giving himself up to the amassing of gold and silver. Such precisely had been the case in the Christian Church. "Le roi de Tyre n'est ici qu'un personnage allegorique, l'embleme d'une suite de ministres du Tres-Haut, qui succedent les uns aux autres, mais que le Prophete reunit et represente comme une seule personne morale; qui d'abord fidele à son ministere en viole ensuite tous les devoirs; et dont l'iniquité, montée par degres à son comble, . . . est enfin punie avec eclat aux yeux de toutes les nations."<sup>1</sup> Lambert sketches thereupon the change in the Roman Pontiffs, from the piety of the earlier centuries to their manifold corruptions afterwards;—"the spirit of domination, the outrages often on the chiefest truths of Christianity, the avarice and traffic in holy things:" corruptions that had already taken deep root in the time of St. Bernard;<sup>2</sup> and which would assuredly bring down on the Papacy, as on the Prince of Tyre, God's terrible vengeance. At length, in fine, it would be a *Roman Pope*, at the head of the consummated apostasy of Gentile Christendom; who, in heart an atheist, would as God, or God's delegate, or God's Christ, sit in God's temple, i. e. (so as Hilary has

des son temps à se former dans le corps de l'Eglise, mais d'une maniere peu sensible, qui devoit ensuite recevoir divers accroissemens de siecle en siecle; parvenir enfin à sa consommation, eclater alors . . . d'une maniere effroyable, et couvrir et infecter de son mortel venin toute la Gentilité Chretienne." "Par l'apostasie on doit entendre la multitude des mechans qui abandonneront Jesus Christ et sa religion, qui se moqueront de ses mysteres, fouleront aux pieds son evangile et ses lois, ou aux sentiments d'une pieté humble et reconnoissante substitueront la presumption et l'ingratitude de la fausse justice." "L'apostasie precedera l'Antichrist; et, quand elle sera montée à son comble, l'Homme de péché, ou l'Antichrist, sera manifesté." ii. 318, 271.

<sup>1</sup> ii. 278.

<sup>2</sup> Mark how Lambert makes the Antichristian apostasy to have been already developed in the middle age: and compare my historic comment on Apoc. ix. 20, 21, at the beginning of Vol. ii.; referring at p. 24 to the same St. Bernard, in illustration of the subject.

said) in *professedly Christian Churches*:<sup>1</sup> exacting divine honours from men on pain of death; and so fulfilling alike what was predicted of the Man of Sin, and of the Apocalyptic Beast:<sup>2</sup> all this being done in Babylon, or the Papal Rome; of which Lambert, in a separate Chapter, traces in similar mode the falling away from primitive sanctity into antichristian apostasy.<sup>3</sup> One grand help to this Papal Antichrist's subjection of men's minds would be his false miracles; more especially, Lambert suggests, his apparent resurrection from a state of death: (accordantly both with the symbol of one of his heads being wounded to death, yet reviving; and with his two-fold designation also as the *Beast from the sea* and *Beast from the abyss*, which *was*, and *is not*, and *yet shall be*:) a miracle, observe, apparent, not real; for God cannot do miracles in support of a lie.<sup>4</sup>—Of the near approach of the consummation, and of Antichrist, Lambert says it was to be expected that God would give some signal warning signs; so as he had done before the destruction of Jerusalem, and before the rebellion of Mahomet.<sup>5</sup> And one such striking sign Lambert thought to see in the terrible infidelity of the half century previous, and horrors of the French Revolution.<sup>6</sup> Moreover, besides this, there was to be expected quite another in the coming and preaching of Elijah, to Gentile Christendom as well as Jews: with the result of being rejected and slain (just as Christ had formerly been) by united sentence of ecclesiastical and civil powers; “par tout le corps de la Gentilité, et par la foule des prêtres et des pasteurs, présidés par le premier Pontife de la religion:”<sup>7</sup> this Elias being in fact one of the two Apocalyptic witnesses; and the great city of his death, not Rome, but *Paris*, where the truth and Christ had been so markedly crucified.<sup>8</sup> Thereupon would follow the consummation of judgment: the Gentile Christendom be destroyed by fire;<sup>9</sup> the sceptre revert to

<sup>1</sup> ii. 295, 311.—At p. 270 Lambert says that the statements as to their end, the one destroyed by Christ's coming, the other cast alive into the lake of fire, are not contradictory; *αυλωσει* meaning only *destruire*. He might have referred to the case of Korah in illustration. Was not Korah killed?

<sup>2</sup> See p. 314 *suprà*.

<sup>3</sup> Ch. xviii. See especially p. 334.

<sup>4</sup> Ib. 284—297.

<sup>5</sup> On the sign before Mahomet, and which caused Antichrist to be expected in Phocas' time, see Malv. i. 117.

<sup>6</sup> i. 62—65, 71, 72.

<sup>7</sup> i. 171. On Elias Lambert broaches the curious idea that he is going through a perpetual martyrdom of feeling for his apostate countrymen, indeed a kind of propitiatory holocaust. i. 159, 163.

<sup>8</sup> i. 40, 175, ii. 338. On the “crucifying Christ” Lambert says again, (i. 212,) “nos irreverences, profanations, saerileges, qui ont tant de fois crucifié notre Sauveur.”

<sup>9</sup> So 2 Pet. iii. 10.—How there could be a preservation of any of the living from such a conflagration as Peter foretells God alone knew. i. 100, 101.



Jerusalem; (for the localization of the Church's centre of unity in Rome was but for the Gentile interval;) and in the converted and blessed state of all that is now heathen, connectedly with converted Israel, the magnificent symbolizations of Isaiah's and St. John's new heaven and new earth have their realization.<sup>1</sup>

Such is an abstract of Lambert's main views of prophecy, as unfolded in his Treatise. There are observable further a few individual points of Apocalyptic explanation. In the 6th Seal, Apoc. vi., he would have the *elemental convulsions* to be taken literally, as signs in heaven and earth before the consummation: <sup>2</sup> in Apoc. viii. the *half-hour's silence* is a brief respite before the last fearful Trumpet judgments: <sup>3</sup> in Apoc. x. the *seven thunders* mean the mysteries of Christ's judgments, now secret, but to be revealed during Christ's reign on earth.<sup>4</sup> Again it is to be observed that, though not of the historic school of interpretation, he yet more than once speaks agreeably with it, of the French Revolution as like a trumpet-voice of alarm, "the *last trumpet's alarm*," to Christendom; <sup>5</sup> also of Christians as at the time when he wrote participating in the song of the harpers by the fiery sea, introductorily to the Vials outpouring in Apoc. xv.; <sup>6</sup> and, as elsewhere noted, of the then reigning infidelity as an ulcer in Christendom; <sup>7</sup> all exactly in agreement with the symbols of the 7th Trumpet's Vial-preparation song, and 1st Vial, as explained by me.<sup>8</sup> But the main views are those which I have detailed above:—the terrible approaching destruction of the Gentile Church, as utterly, hopelessly apostate, under the headship of its Papal Antichrist; <sup>9</sup> and its blessed renovation, under Christ's own headship and that of his risen saints, connectedly with converted Israel.

My readers may well wonder with me how, with such views of the Papacy, the Père Lambert could himself have continued in communion with it. It would seem as if he dated its apostasy from the faith somewhat later than prophecy as well as history indicates. Now the prophetic clause, "Only he that letteth shall let until he be taken away," was a prophetic indication, as all the early Fathers

<sup>1</sup> So Lambert's last Chapter.

<sup>2</sup> i. 108, 117.

<sup>3</sup> i. 109.

<sup>4</sup> Apoc. x. 4.

<sup>5</sup> i. 5, 72: "Le signe ctonnant dont il s'agit est comme le dernier coup de trompette qui appelle le saint prophete (Elie)."

<sup>6</sup> i. 13, 14.

<sup>7</sup> Vol. iii. p. 373, Note<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>8</sup> See my Vol. iii. 339, 340; and ib. 464—475.

<sup>9</sup> This, says Lambert (i. 84), was the mystery meant by St. Paul in Rom. xi. 25; not the recovery of the Jews, but the utter destruction of the Gentile Christendom.

explain to us, that the removal and division into ten of the old Roman empire was to be the chronological sign and epoch of the development of the Man of Sin. But Lambert escapes from that chronological indication by a very curious different translation of the clause. *Και νυν το κατεχον οιδατε, εις το αποκαλυφθηναι αυτον . . . μονον ο κατεχων αρτι εως εκ μεσου γενηται.* This, says Lambert of the first clause, means, "Vous savez à *quoi il tient*, ou, *ce qui est necessaire* pour qu'il paroisse dans son temps : " and of the second ; "Que celui qui *sait* (ο κατεχων) maintenant en quoi consiste ce mystere, le *retienne* bien, jusqu'à que ce mystere *sorte de son secret.*"<sup>1</sup> So the *το κατεχον* and *ο κατεχων* are taken in quite different senses ; and the *εκ μεσου γενηται* in a sense the Greek phrase will not bear. It will be felt by my classical readers that Lambert has been but little successful in escaping from the difficulty of this clause.<sup>2</sup>

## 2. *Lacunza.*

Lacunza, as I learn from the Preface to Mr. Irving's Translation of his Book, was born at Santiago in Chili in the year 1731 ; in 1747 became a member of the Jesuit college in that city ; and there continued till the expulsion of the Jesuits from the Spanish South American States : whereupon he came to Europe ; settled finally at Imola, a little south of Bologna in Italy ; and there died suddenly in 1801, while on a solitary walk, according to his habit, by the riverside.<sup>3</sup> His great work on *The coming of Messiah in Glory and Majesty*, (written under the assumed name of *Ben Ezra*, a Jewish convert to Christianity,<sup>4</sup> in consequence probably of the then existing prejudice against his Order,) was written as early as the first out-

<sup>1</sup> ii. 313—318.

<sup>2</sup> I should add that Lambert presses strongly on all the duty of reading and studying the Holy Scriptures.

The *Chanoine of the French Church*, mentioned by me Vol. iii. pp. 347, 373, expresses a similar judgment to his contemporary Lambert's in reference to the nearness of Christ's second coming :—a judgment founded not merely on the then signs of the times, as specified in my notices of him Vol. iii., but on other prophetic considerations also ; especially that of Mahomedanism having the duration of 1260 years, attached to it in Dan. vii. and Apoc. xiii., where, says he, it is figured under the symbol of the Little Horn, and of the Beast from the Sea ; (he is here somewhat fanciful ;) and that those 1260 years, reckoned from the Saracens taking Jerusalem, A.D. 637, if counted as *solar* years, would expire in 1897 ; if as *lunar* years, in 1860. "Then is to come the last judgment ; and the kingdom in which Christ is to reign with his saints for ever."

<sup>3</sup> From Pref. p. xxiii., xxiv.

<sup>4</sup> Ib. xix. In his prayer of dedication to the Messiah Jesus Christ, Vol. i. p. 10, Lacunza says, "my own brethren the Jews." So too p. 29.

break of the great French Revolution. For the Fra 'Pablo de la Concepcion, of the Carmelite Convent in Cadiz, writing a criticism on it in 1812, speaks of having first read the work *in manuscript* about 21 years before, or about the year 1791.<sup>1</sup> Before its completion imperfect copies, or parts of copies, got abroad in manuscript, of which Lacunza complains.<sup>2</sup> Judging from the admiration it at once excited in his mind, Fra Pablo's copy was probably a complete one. And both the fact of the laborious manuscript multiplication of these copies, and the strong statement by the learned critic above referred to as to the impression made by it on his own mind, unite to show that it excited very considerable interest as soon as attention was called to it. When however the Work was first *printed* and *published* does not appear. Lacunza's own observations in the Preface imply an expectation that in its then completed form it would soon come into general circulation; <sup>3</sup> of course, I presume, through the medium of printing. Yet, according to the notices that I find in Irving's translation, it seems to have been first printed and published at Cadiz in 1821; <sup>4</sup> i. e. eleven years after Lacunza's death. Subsequently in 1816 another Edition of 1500 copies in its original Spanish was printed in London, in four 8vo Volumes, under the direction of the Agent for the Buenos Ayres Government; which Edition seems to have been wholly transhipped from England.<sup>5</sup>—At the time of its presumed first printing, in 1812, Cadiz was under the government of the Cortez, and the press *in a measure* free. But, on the dissolution of the Cortez, restoration of Ferdinand, and reinstatement of the Inquisition, intolerance returned: and Lacunza's book was classed among the *Libri prohibiti* in the Roman Index, and the circulation as far as possible suppressed.<sup>6</sup> So the

<sup>1</sup> Vol. i. p. 3. Where it was written does not appear; whether in South America, Spain, or Italy. Mr. Irving, at p. xvii., says, "under the walls of the Vatican:" but I know not on what authority.—The reader will remember the comparative freedom of mind among Roman Catholics in the countries open to French influence from 1790 to 1813.

<sup>2</sup> *Ib.* 11.

<sup>3</sup> "I did not venture to *expose this Treatise to the criticism of every sort of readers* without making trial of it, &c." *Ibid.*

<sup>4</sup> Tournachon Moulin, the Cadiz publisher I presume in 1812, on printing Fra Pablo's criticism, dated Dec. 1812, as a kind of Prefix or Appendix to Lacunza's book, (Vol. i. p. 1,) says that Lacunza's work "was first printed in this city (Cadiz) in the Spanish tongue." At p. xxiv. a Spanish officer's notice to Mr. Irving is given, stating that "an abridgment was published in the Isle of Leon in two small octavo volumes." I suppose this was subsequent to the complete Edition of 1812.

<sup>5</sup> *Ib.* pp. xvi., xxiv.

<sup>6</sup> *Ib.* xv. Compare my brief notices of Spain, Vol. iii. pp. 414, 415, 421.

book became rare. Surreptitiously, however, individual copies were obtained and read in Spain:<sup>1</sup> and moreover an abridgment was made;<sup>2</sup> and whether in the original, or in a French translation, was carried into and much read in France.<sup>3</sup> At length in the year 1826 a copy brought by an English Clergyman from Spain was communicated to the well-known and eloquent minister of the Scotch Church in London, Mr. Irving; and by him a translation made into English, which soon made the work extensively and very influentially known and read in England.<sup>4</sup>

Turning to the Treatise itself, its author's main strength and argument is of course directed to the establishment of his professedly main great subject; viz. Christ's premillennial advent,<sup>5</sup> and subsequent glorious universal reign on earth: the Jews having, he supposed, been previously converted, and brought to recognize the Messiah Jesus. And to the masterly and convincing manner in which he has done this, we have not the testimony of English critics only like Mr. Irving, but that of his learned Spanish critic, Fra Pablo:—"These two points," says he, notwithstanding all a Romanist's natural prejudices, "seem to me to be theologically *demonstrated*."<sup>6</sup> It was by resorting to Holy Scripture itself, when utterly disappointed and disgusted at the absurdities and incongruities of the best known Roman Catholic expositors of the millennial pro-

<sup>1</sup> So Mr. Irving's friend, the Spanish refugee officer. "When the inquiring mind of the Spanish youth was hindered from the food which it desired, and had been entertained with during the Cortez, they formed secret Societies, of which the object was to procure and read those books expressly which were prohibited by the Inquisition. In the number of which, finding the work of Ben Ezra, the Society to which he belonged obtained it, and read it with delight." Ibid. <sup>2</sup> See p. 537 Note <sup>4</sup> *suprà*.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid. xvi. "Among certain of whom (the members of the Gallican Church) I am informed," says Mr. Irving, "it is a common thing under the term of the *apostate Gentility* to express the first of the three positions I have laid down." This phrase is the very one so common and prominent in Lambert; and suggests the question, Had Lambert seen, and been led to his prophetic views by, an early MS. copy of Ben Ezra?

<sup>4</sup> While Mr. Irving was prosecuting his English translation, another Edition in Spanish was being printed in London. Ib. xxi. Hence we may infer the large demand for it, and large circulation of it, among those who spoke the Spanish language.

<sup>5</sup> Not a second *intermediate* advent, before the third and last to final judgment, so as Lambert: but, as Mede, Christ's *one* second advent; continued to the final judgment.

<sup>6</sup> i. 7. In the Section beginning at p. 88 Lacunza anatomizes, and exposes the absurdity of, the received idea of Satan having been bound ever since Christ's ascension. What, bound when Peter says that he goes about as a roaring lion; and moreover when the Church had to exercise its *exorcising* power "*ad fugandos demones!*" Surely the modern followers of this Augustinian solution of the millennial prophecy have not sufficiently weighed these obvious considerations.



phesy, that the view broke upon him in all its grandeur and simplicity: and, like Lambert, he strongly urges investigators, those of the priesthood more especially, to resort as he had himself done to the Book of God, which had so long and so generally been well nigh consigned to oblivion.<sup>1</sup> On this his great subject however there is no need of my sketching his arguments, any more than in the case of Lambert. They are the same that are now well known, and widely received.

But what his views as to *Antichrist*; a subject necessarily connected with the Millennium, as being he whose destruction by Christ's coming was to precede and introduce it? Here Lacunza makes reference to Daniel, as well as to the Apocalypse. And, in commenting on the former, he offers some original and curious views as to the symbols of the quadripartite image, and of the four wild Beasts from the sea. The *image's golden head*, he says, included both the Babylonish and the Persian empires, considered as one, because Babylon was retained as one of the Persian capitals: the *breast of silver* was the Macedonian empire: the *brazen thighs* figured that of the Romans, long since come to an end; the *iron ten-toed legs* the Romano-Gothic professedly Christian kingdoms of Western Europe.<sup>2</sup> At the ending time of these the *stone without hands*, or empire of Christ and his saints, would utterly destroy the image in that its last form; thenceforth itself becoming the universal empire on earth. How near to the generally received Protestant interpretation, and I doubt not the true one, is Lacunza's of the ten toes!—As to the *four Beasts* his idea is as novel as unsatisfactory. They meant four religions; viz. *Idolatry, Mahomedanism, Pseudo-Christianity*, (with its four heads of heresy, schism, hypocrisy, worldly-mindedness,) and the *Antichristian Deism* already then unfolding itself in the world. For *Antichrist* meant, not an *individual*, but that embodied principle, power, or moral body, which "*solvit Christum*," (so the Vulgate of 1 John iv. 3,) dissolves Christ in the Church.<sup>3</sup>—At this point Lacunza stops a while to dissect, and expose the absurdity of,

<sup>1</sup> i. 20—32.

<sup>2</sup> i. 141.—This prophecy is called by Lacunza the 1st *Phænomenon*, i. e. *vision*.

<sup>3</sup> i. 197.—Mr. C. Maitland, p. 392, makes Lacunza, like himself, expect an infidel, Antichrist. This, as his readers must understand him, is a misrepresentation of Lacunza's views. Lacunza's Antichrist is not a *mere* individual, nor *professedly* infidel, but Papal, (like Michelet's Romish "prêtre athée,") nor *wholly* futuro. Mr. C. M. would have done well to read and study this Chapter in Lacunza.

those ideas of Antichrist which were usually received among Romanists; as if he was to be an individual Jew, of the tribe of Dan, born in Babylon, received by the Jews as Messiah, thereupon establishing his kingdom at Jerusalem, and with 10 or 7 kings held subject, in fulfilment of the Beast's 7 heads and 10 horns: an argument well worth perusal and consideration, by all such Protestant expositors as are inclined to adopt the same strange hypothesis. The Antichrist, or Apocalyptic Beast, he then traces from its first existence in the germ, as the mystery of iniquity even in St. Paul's days,<sup>1</sup> *within the Church*, and side by side with Christ's true servants; and which had come down as a body more and more corrupt and apostate, century after century; till now at length perfected in apostasy. The second Apocalyptic Beast has been with great reason, he says, explained as the *false prophet of Antichrist*: with the mistake however of supposing him one *individual* person, perhaps "an apostate bishop;"<sup>2</sup> whereas it is *the body of "our priesthood"* that is meant by the emblem.<sup>3</sup> His *name* and *number* Lacunza inclines to think *απορουμε*:<sup>4</sup> being evidently not so strong in Greek as in Latin. As to the Apocalyptic *Harlot*, ("I would wholly omit this," says he, "did I not fear to commit treason against truth,") it is not Rome *Pagan*, but apostate *Rome Christian and Papal*; drunken at length in vain carnal self-security, when on the very eve (so Lacunza judged) of her utter tremendous destruction. Is it objected that she is the spouse of Christ? So too was old Jerusalem. But, on the consummation of its apostasy, though without a heathen idol in her, she fell, and fell remedilessly.<sup>5</sup>

In his general view of the Apocalypse Lacunza is a futurist. He construes the seven-sealed Book opened by the Lamb as the Book of

<sup>1</sup> Compare Lambert's very similar views p. 532 *suprà*. Only Lambert more correctly makes the Antichrist the *suite*, or *series*, of individual Pontiffs, that had successively headed the ever-growing apostasy.

<sup>2</sup> "Seeming to see," says he, "in the Beast's two horns as of a lamb a proper symbol of the mitre." i. 218, 224. The question is thus suggested, What was the origin of the particular form of the episcopal mitre, with its two apices or horns? and when first introduced? See my Vol. iii. 209.

<sup>3</sup> "Yes, my friend, it is our priesthood, and nothing else, which is here signified, and announced for the last times, under the metaphor of a beast with two horns like a lamb's." i. 220. He strengthens his position by reference to the *Jewish* priesthood; who, though professing God's true religion, and with the Old Testament Scriptures in their hands, did yet reject and crucify Christ: also by reference to the actual corruption of the professedly Christian priesthood, both in earlier times, (as that of the Arians,) and more especially in Lacunza's own time. *ib.* 221.

<sup>4</sup> *ib.* 232.

<sup>5</sup> 248-253.

the Father's Covenant; and the giving it into his hand as the act of investiture, whereby he is constituted King and Lord of all.<sup>1</sup> The visions of the Seals next following are therefore, I presume, understood by him with reference to the times of the consummation. But he does not enter on them particularly. He discusses however the vision of the sun-clothed woman in Apoc. xii., in the same general Jewish and futurist point of view; with much that is ingenious and novel in his exposition. The woman is the Zion of Isaiah, God's ancient spouse, long cast off and sorrowful, but now clothed in beautiful garments; and at the precise crisis described by Old Testament prophets, "like a woman with child drawing near the time of her delivery." She has already in a figurative sense conceived Jesus Christ in her womb; i. e. by believing on him. But something more is needed; viz. to bring him to light, or publicly to manifest this conception by declaring for him; for "with the heart men believe unto righteousness, and with the lips confession is made unto salvation." But difficulties, embarrassments, and persecutions here occur. Besides the world and devil, two-thirds also of the *Jews* probably oppose the believing third. She "cries out in pain." Satan, the red Dragon, unable to prevent the conception, (which may probably have arisen from Elias' preaching,) tries to hinder her delivery: i. e. "to hinder her from publicly professing her faith in Jesus."<sup>2</sup> But in vain. The child is born; the confession is made. And then, so born in figure, he is caught up to God and his throne: a symbol answering to Daniel's symbol of the Son of Man coming to the Ancient of Days to receive investiture of his kingdom; and corresponding too with that of his receiving the seven-sealed book of his investiture from Him that sate on the throne, in the earlier vision of the fifth chapter of the Apocalypse.<sup>3</sup>—But, if so, we must ask, what the *sequel*? And here in truth the weakness of Lacunza's view of the vision appears. Messiah's investiture by the Ancient of Days in Daniel is coincident with, or immediately consequent upon, the doom and destruction of the little horn Antichrist; not at an epoch preceding Antichrist's reign and blasphemies. But in the vision of

<sup>1</sup> I presume Mr. Burgh borrowed the view from Ben Ezra.

<sup>2</sup> ii. 90. Compare Mr. Biley's explanation, noticed by me Vol. iii. pp. 23—26, but with reference to the *Christian Church* of the 4th Century, as the Church and time intended.

<sup>3</sup> See p. 540 just preceding.

Apoc. xii., after the man-child's being caught up to God's throne, there is described a war in heaven as occurring; then the Woman's fleeing into the wilderness, being furiously pursued thither by the Dragon; and then next, but not till then, the raising up by the Dragon of the Antichristian Beast against the remnant of the Woman's children that continue faithful. How can this order of events consist with Lacunza's Judæo-futurist interpretation of the Vision? I see nothing in the details of his exposition to meet the difficulty. For he professedly makes all this persecution subsequent to Christ's receiving investiture of the earth's empire. And his identification of Michael's warring in Apoc. xii. with Michael's standing up for Daniel's people in Dan. xii. only adds to the difficulty.<sup>1</sup>—Proceeding with the vision Lacunza describes the Woman, or Jewish Church, as taken to a quiet and sweet solitude, Moses and Elias furnishing the two wings of her escort; and being there taken care of by God, while the Dragon raises up the Beast against the faithful remnant of her children.<sup>2</sup> These Lacunza seems to identify, like myself, with the witnesses of Apoc. xi. For the two sackcloth-robed witnesses are not Enoch and Elias; but two religious bodies of faithful men protesting against the corruptions of the age,<sup>3</sup> i. e. the latter age, just before the Jews' conversion. As to the place where the Antichristian Beast, after making war against them, kills them, i. e. *the street of the great city*, this is not meant of Jerusalem: (in fact Christ was crucified outside of, not within, the literal Jerusalem:) but of *the whole world*, and specially of *professing Christendom*.<sup>4</sup>

These, I believe, are the chief Apocalyptic explanations given by the soi-disant Ben Ezra, or Lacunza. I may add that, like myself, he considers Peter's conflagration to be one introductory to the millennium, and moreover not universal: also that he explains the new heaven and earth of St. Peter and the Apocalypse (like Lambert and myself) to be millennial in their date of commencement.

<sup>1</sup> Michael's standing up in Dan. xii. is subsequent to Antichrist's rise; in Apoc. xii prior to it.

<sup>2</sup> See p. 541 *suprà*.

<sup>3</sup> ii. 117. So Lacunza of the two Witnesses. And so he seems to identify them with the faithful remnant of the Woman's seed: for *they* "can only mean the remains of true Christianity among the *Gentiles*." ib. 131.—But how could these faithful *Gentiles* be a remnant of the *Jewish* woman's children? Moreover, it is only on her being in the wilderness that the Lord fully accomplishes her conversion, according to Lacunza; "speaking comfortably to her in the wilderness." And yet she will some time before not only have believed, according to him, but made public confession for Christ.

<sup>4</sup> Ib. 118.



Thus, in the Roman Catholic countries of France, Spain, Italy, there had already begun to sound forth a voice answering alike to that on the blast of the 7th Trumpet in the Apocalypse, which proclaimed the commencement of the judgments of the consummation on "those that had corrupted the earth," and imminence of Christ's coming and kingdom: as also to that of the first Angel seen synchronically (as has been shown) flying in mid heaven, with the cry, "Fear God, for the hour of his judgments is come;" and to that recorded in Apoc. xviii., "Come out of her (Babylon), my people, that ye be not partakers of her plagues."<sup>1</sup>

II. I now turn to *England*.—And here the names first of *Galloway* and *Bicheno*, then of *Faber*, *Woodhouse*, *Cuninghame*, and *Frere*, are perhaps the most notable; each one marked by certain peculiarities of exposition. The three last mentioned, having continued publishing from time to time on prophecy till the middle of the present century, constituted a link of connexion between the first and second divisions of the still uncompleted great French Revolutionary æra.

*Mr. Galloway's* book is entitled "Brief Commentaries on such parts of the Revelation and other Prophecies, as immediately refer to the present times;" and was published in London in the year A.D. 1802.<sup>2</sup> He was himself, it seems, one of the Loyalists in our North American Colonies, who was forced to flee that country on the rebel States successfully accomplishing their war of revolution and independence. Nor, probably, was he wholly uninfluenced by this his previous history in regard of the feeling most prominently expressed throughout his Apocalyptic Commentary; viz. that of intense abhorrence of the revolutionary and infidel principles of Republican France. Hence his application to it of the symbol of the most hateful of all the enemies of the Church prefigured in the Apocalypse; viz. that of *the Beast from the Abyss*, the slayer of Christ's two faithful sackcloth-robed witnesses. To bring out this result, he thus in brief explains the structure of the prophecy and history in-

<sup>1</sup> In Germany, throughout the whole of the 25 or 30 years of which I am speaking in this Section, *Eichhorn's* Præterist system continued to reign supreme. So *M. Stuart*, i. 472.

<sup>2</sup> *Bicheno's* first publication was in 1793, before *Galloway*. But, as he continued to write and publish after *Galloway* till 1808, I have noticed *Galloway* first. *Mr. Bicheno* was thus a connecting link between the earlier Apocalyptic students of the Revolutionary æra and the later, such as *Faber*, *Cuninghame*, &c.

tended by it; herein at first following most of his Protestant predecessors. The seven-sealed book contains the history of the Church generally, in its various vicissitudes of fortune; from its first partial triumphs in Apostolic times to its final and complete triumph at the consummation; the 6th seal symbolizing the overthrow of heathenism before it, in the Roman Empire, under the Constantinian Emperors. The seven Trumpets, which are the development of the seventh Seal, represent God's judgments against the then already corrupt and apostatizing Church; the four first depicting that of the Gothic invasions in the West; the 5th and 6th, or two first *Woe-Trumpets*, those of the Saracens and Turks in the East; which last-mentioned woes originated, according to the prophecy, with *the opening of the pit of the abyss*. Then, presently, comes Mr. Galloway's peculiarity of historic application. The "*little book*" opened in the hand of the angel (Apoc. x.) being viewed by him, as in Mede's scheme, as a separate, supplementary prophecy descriptive, for its main subject, of the treading down of the holy city, and history of Christ's two witnesses during their days of sackcloth-robing, he notices the long-continued treading down for 1260 years of the holy city, or faithful Church of the Gentiles, as alike that by the long-dominant Mahometan power in the East, and the dominant Papal idolatrous power in the West; dating these from the nearly synchronic times of Phocas and Mahomet respectively. But the slaying of the two witnesses, which he supposes to symbolize the Old and New Testaments, is, he observes, at a later time, viz. near the end of the Witnesses' 1260 years of sackcloth-robed witnessing; and to be accomplished by another new and more terrible enemy than any before, viz. the *Beast from the Abyss*. This, says he, is the *infidel power of atheistic, revolutionary France*. The street of the great city in which they were slain, he explains to be Paris; the date of their death, about September 1792, when Christianity was abolished, the ignominious expulsion of the Christian clergy from France well-nigh completed, Christ declared an impostor, and atheism publicly professed by the French Government and nation. So for  $3\frac{1}{2}$  years, answering to the  $3\frac{1}{2}$  days of the Apocalyptic prophecy; at the end of which there was predicted the resuscitation of the two witnesses. And this was also fulfilled by the French Government decrees, passed in 1797, which declared free and full toleration thenceforward to all religions, true Protestant Christianity expressly included.

It does not need that I should say more of Mr. Galloway's exposition; save only that, in conformity with the above explanation of the earlier Apocalyptic chapters, he explains the *seven-headed Dragon*, the *Beast from the Sea*, and *Beast from the earth*, in Apoc. xii., xiii., as respectively the earlier *Pagan* persecuting power in the Roman empire, the *Papal* power, and the *French infidel power*; the *Beast from the Sea*, or *Popedom*, being that which had assigned to it the duration of 1260 years, which would be nearly covered by the interval from Phocas to the French Revolution. The name and number of the beast he makes *Ludovicus*, the most common title of Kings of France; the Latin numeral letters in which make up 666.—I must just add that Mr. G. interprets the Millennium as in his days still future; and as to be introduced by, and to synchronize with, the personal reign of Christ and his saints on earth.

Very marked was the contrast of the feeling with which *Mr. Bicheno* marked the progress of the Revolution. His "Signs of the Times" in three parts, first published in 1793, and which came to its 6th edition in 1808, was followed by his "Destiny of the German Empire" in 1800, and his "Restoration of the Jews" in 1806. The title-page on Part i. of "The Signs of the Times" itself tells this feeling:—"Signs of the Times; or, *The overthrow of the Papal tyranny in France, a prelude of destruction to Popery and Despotism*, but of peace to mankind." He looked in fact with something like righteous complacency, from the very first, on the awful judgments that the Revolutionists seemed God's appointed agents for inflicting on that Papal power which had been for ages the bloody persecutor of Christ's saints, and enemy of Christ's truth: judgments inflicted more especially in France on the social orders which had been its chief abettors; viz. the royalty, nobility, and the clergy. The same was his feeling afterwards when, in the course of the next 14 or 15 years, he saw the vials of God's wrath poured out, through the same instrumentality, upon the *German Empire* which had been for many centuries as zealous a co-operator with the Papal Beast in the persecution of Christ's truth and saints as royal Papal France itself. So strongly did Mr. B. feel the righteousness of God's judgments, through the agency of the French Revolutionists, on those saint-persecuting nations of the Continent, that he could not suppress his protest against what he

called "the ravings of Mr. Burke," and the energetic anti-revolutionary course of action of our British Government: the rather as the Papal Antichrist's removal was all that had to intervene before the Jews' conversion, and the establishment of Christ's kingdom on earth.

As it was on these two great subjects, the Papal tyranny of past ages, and the judgments on Popery then passing before the eyes of men, as prefigured in the Apocalypse, that he founded his earnest and heart-stirring appeal to British Christians, (subjects copiously illustrated by him from time to time, alike the one and the other, from past and contemporaneous history,) it was not to be expected that his books would offer any very thoroughly digested scheme of Apocalyptic interpretation. Nor, consequently, do I deem it needful to refer particularly to what we find in them on this head. Suffice it to say that the 1260 destined years of the Papal Beast, prefigured in Apoc. xi., xiii., xvii., he views as beginning from Justinian's decree, A.D. 529; and, consequently, as ending in 1789 at the French Revolution. The killing of Christ's sackcloth-robed witnesses, or faithful saints protesting against Popery, he refers chiefly to the revocation of the Toleration-Edict of Nantes by Louis XIV. in 1685; especially accompanied, as it was, by the nearly contemporary ruin of the cause of Hungarian Protestantism through the persecutions of Papal Austria, and banishment also of the faithful Vaudois from their valleys in Papal Piedmont. But how, then, their resuscitation after  $3\frac{1}{2}$  days? On this point, as no answering event presented itself in French history  $3\frac{1}{2}$  years after that Revocation-Edict, or, indeed, till 100 years later, he suggests the singular notion that, instead of each *day* standing here for one *year*, it may stand for the thirty that make up a *month*; and consequently altogether figure the interval of  $3\frac{1}{2} \times 30 = 105$  years. Then the prophecy would have its fulfilment in the free and full toleration of Protestantism in France, A.D. 1797, of which we have before spoken.—To Mr. B.'s interesting illustrations of the Trumpets, and specially of the 3rd Trumpet in the desolating progress of Attila along the Rhine and Danube, I have had occasion to allude in my 1st Volume.<sup>1</sup> The 5th and 6th Trumpets he explains, like most other Protestant interpreters, of the Saracens and Turks. In the opened book of the light-bearing Angel, Apoc. x., he sees no new and separate book of prophecy; but

<sup>1</sup> See my Vol. i. 385.



only a figuration of the dawning light of the Reformation, as beginning with Wickliff.

Finally, he applied our Lord's prophecy (Matt. xxiv.) to the terrible commotions of those revolutionary times; inferred from the same prophecy, even in 1795, *before Evangelic Missions from England had effectively begun*,<sup>1</sup> that there would speedily follow the preaching of the Gospel throughout the world, even as with the sound of a Trumpet, to gather together Christ's elect from the four winds, and that then the conversion and restoration of the Jews would begin. By the concurrent fulfilment of all which signs of the latter day, and "all those things coming to pass," he judged that yet clearer and clearer light would accrue to show that the consummation, and kingdom of God, were indeed nigh at hand.

Though, as I said, it was scarce to be expected that any well-digested *general* historical scheme of Apocalyptic interpretation would be furnished by Bicheno or Galloway, comparatively absorbed as were their thoughts and interest in that part of the prophecy which more immediately related to the events of the then present awful drama, as gradually unfolded more and more before their eyes, yet certainly it was not unreasonable to expect this (if the *historical* view of the prophecy was the right one) from the three well-known expositors who, as before stated, were their most prominent successors on the field of Apocalyptic interpretation, Messrs. *Faber, Cuninghame, Frere*:—considering, 1st, that they entered on their lucubrations at a later æra in the Revolutionary wars, after the first fury of the tempest had lulled, and the feelings consequently of English observers were less fearfully excited than before: and 2ndly, too, that they actually *profest* each one, after mature study, to give a comprehensive view of the whole Apocalyptic prophecy, including both its internal structure, and its historic explanation; i. e. down to the 7th Trumpet, and its partial evolution in the earlier Vials, which they all, like Galloway and Bicheno, regarded as fulfilled in the events of the Revolution. But, if such his expectation, the prophetic student of the æra under review was doomed to disappointment. In regard both of the fundamental *structure* of the prophecy, and many important details of its supposed previously accomplished fulfilment in *history*, the three expositors were seen to differ most

<sup>1</sup> Compare my sketch of the rise of Evangelic Missions. Vol. iii. p. 483.

widely one from the other. Said *Mr. Faber* of the internal structure of the prophecy :<sup>1</sup>—“The seven Trumpets are the evolution of the 7th Seal, as the seven Vials are of the 7th Trumpet ; these three series constituting the main contents of the *Seven-sealed Book*, Apoc. iv., placed in the hand of the Lamb to open : while the *Little opened Book*, put into St. John’s hand by the heaven-descended Angel of Apoc x., with the charge to prophesy again, is a distinct supplemental prophecy, inclusive of chapters x.—xiv., and containing within it the predictions of the four several great events to which, all alike, was to attach the duration of the 1260 years’ period ; viz. that of the sackcloth-prophesying of Christ’s two witnesses, that of the Gentiles treading the Holy City, that of the Woman (the Church)’s exile in the wilderness, and that of the reign of the ten-horned Beast :<sup>2</sup>—a prophecy this chronologically parallel with the 5th and 6th or two first Woe Trumpets of the Seven-sealed Book, and which needed inscription in the new prophetic Book to show the parallelism.<sup>3</sup> Then further, as regarded the *historic* fulfilment of the Apocalypse, said Mr. F., “The series of the six first Seals carried down the history of the Roman Empire to the Constantinian Revolution, and overthrow of Heathenism in the 4th century ; the six first Trumpets (evolving the 7th Seal) figured its subsequent history under the successive desolations of Goths, Saracens, and Turks ; which last mentioned extended to the times of the 7th Trumpet, or French Revolution.” Besides which, Mr. F., in his Sacred Calendar, insisted on another very important point in the prophecy, viz. that concerning the ten-horned Beast’s two last heads, as historically

<sup>1</sup> What follows, though within inverted commas, is of course only my abstract of Mr. F.’s opinions, as exprest in his Calendar of Prophecy. And the same of what I say of Mr. Cuninghame and Mr. Frere.

It should be observed that I give Mr. F.’s prophetic views, not as exprest in his earliest Dissertation, but as exprest, after more mature reflection, in his Sacred Calendar of Prophecy. The former was published as early as 1806 ; the latter written, as he tells us in the Preface, in 1818, 1819, 1820, though not published till 1827. This he wished to be read as the substitute (a substitution which included many very material alterations of interpretation) for his original Dissertation on the Prophecies.

<sup>2</sup> Indeed, as Mr. F. puts it, *five*, including what is said Apoc. xiv. of the 144,000 contemporarily with the Lamb on Mount Zion. Vol. i. p. 272, 273.

<sup>3</sup> *Ib.* pp. 271—273.

Compare what is said of Mede, the first suggester of the view on this subject, p. 492 *suprà*. Mr. F.’s proof of the 1260 years beginning with the 5th or first Woe Trumpet is anything but satisfactory. How awkwardly, on this view of the Little Book, come the last verses of Apoc. xi. in it, which tell of the 2nd Woe having *past*, and then, after a while, of the 3rd Woe’s announcement by the sounding of the 7th Trumpet ! Ought not the Little Book to have ended with the ending of the 2nd Woe Trumpet ?

elucidated by the concluding events of the great Revolutionary War : i. e. the termination of the sixth or Imperial Headship (which had been perpetuated, he judged, in the Byzantine, Frank, and Austrian dynasties) by the Austrian Monarch's resignation of the Emperorship of the Holy Roman Empire in 1804; and Napoleon Buonaparte's institution into the Beast's 7th headship by his assumption of that Emperorship, until struck down after a little space by the sword at Waterloo. But, as the head thus struck down was prophetically figured as resuscitated, so would the Napoleonic dynasty revive, as a new head of the Beast, or Roman empire : <sup>1</sup> (here Mr. F. indulged in prediction of the future :) no longer however thenceforth as a *Papal* power, but as a professedly *infidel* or *atheistic* power, the same as the "Wilful King" of Dan. xi. 36, and as St. John's *Antichrist*, "denying the Father and the Son;" the destined head of the last antichristian confederacy, and opposer of the Jews' restoration in Palestine; who, as described in Apoc. xix., would be met and destroyed fearfully by Christ in the final war of Armageddon.

So *Mr. Faber*. But by no means so, according to *Mr. Cuninghame*. "The Seals and Trumpets," said he, "are chronologically parallel, each reaching from St. John's time to the great earthquake symbolized alike in the 6th Seal and 7th Trumpet, immediately before the consummation; the Seals prefiguring the history of *the Church*, the Trumpets of the *secular Roman Empire*, including both East and West. As to the *Little Book* of Apoc. x., it is no new and separate book of Apocalyptic prophecy, so as Faber affirms; but only the 7th part of the seven-sealed Book, which at the epoch just preceding the French Revolution (the epoch of the rainbow-vested Angel's descent) <sup>2</sup> might be considered "opened." <sup>3</sup> Moreover, as regards the Roman Beast's 7th and 8th heads, though at first advocating a Napoleonic view of them, Mr. C. had come on fuller reflection to discard it as altogether untenable; and mainly to acquiesce in, and adopt, the earlier received Protestant view of the subject: regarding the old 6th Imperial Head as wounded to death by

<sup>1</sup> So too Mr. Frere. On the origination of this view see Note <sup>2</sup> p 550 *infra*.

<sup>2</sup> So altogether missing the reference of the vision to the Reformation!

<sup>3</sup> See Cuninghame, pp. 89, 90, (4th Edition). To show how all the supposed contents of the Little Book might be arranged, and its chronological parallelisms exhibited in one and the same *seven-sealed Book*, Mr. C. prefixed a diagram of the seven-sealed Book to his Dissertation, arranged according to this his view. But certainly it is a Book of such a form, with its cycles and epicycles, &c., as never Book was formed in, either in ancient or modern times.

the sword of the Heruli, and revived in the decem-regal confederacy of the Roman Popedom.<sup>1</sup>

So *Mr. Cuninghame*. But, "Not so," again replied *Mr. Frere* to both Faber and Cuninghame. "The *Seals* depict the history of the *Western Secular Roman Empire*, from St. John's time to the earthquake before the consummation; the *Trumpets*, in parallel chronology, that of the *Eastern Empire*; while the *Little Book* of Apoc. x., which is a new and supplemental part of the Apocalyptic prophecy, (containing Chap. x. to xiv.,) depicts that of the *Church*, still in chronological parallelism with the former. Once more, as to the Roman Beast's two last heads, *Napoleon* was the 7th head, cut down by the sword at Waterloo; and destined to revive again in some revival of the Napoleonic dynasty; only as a professedly *infidel.atheistic* power, the last headship of the Roman Beast against the Church of Christ."<sup>2</sup>

With such fundamental differences of view between these three expositors, (not to speak of those before them,) and others equally important might be added, (as e. g. concerning the two witnesses, and their death and resurrection,<sup>3</sup>) who could wonder that con-

<sup>1</sup> Cuninghame, p. 149. (4th Ed.)

<sup>2</sup> Who was the first originator of this view I know not. Mr. Cuninghame, in the 1st Edition of his Dissertation on the Seals and Trumpets, which was published in 1813, after the great Russian campaign, but before the battle of Waterloo, went so far as to express his opinion that the Beast's 7th head was "the French Imperial Government of Napoleon Bonaparte, the 8th being still future." *Ib.* 148. Which opinion, as before said, he withdrew in his subsequent Editions as "manifestly erroneous." He had been partially preceded, it has been seen, by Mr. Galloway; who made the *Beast of the Abyss*, the slayer of Christ's two Witnesses, to be the French infidel democratic power. Mr. Frere's view was first published, I believe, in 1815; but with subsequent modifications.

<sup>3</sup> Said Mr. Faber, the two Witnesses are the Waldenses and the Albigenses; and their death and resurrection accomplished in their banishment from the Piedmontese valleys in 1686, and glorious return  $3\frac{1}{2}$  years after.

Said Mr. Cuninghame, they are the protesters generally against Papal superstition; and their death and resurrection accomplished in the defeat of the Protestants by Charles V., A.D. 1547, in the battle of Muhlburg, and the subsequent success of Prince Maurice, which led to the Peace of Passau.

Said Mr. Frere, (following in the wake of Galloway,) they are the two Testaments; and their death and resurrection fulfilled in the French renunciation of Christianity, 1793, and Toleration Edict, 1797.

The comparatively narrow range of original research and learning in the English prophetic writings of this period,—comparatively I mean with reference either to the times previous or time following,—must, to a modern reader, competent to judge on such a subject, appear very striking. Always excepting *Davison's* noble Work on Prophecy, being the substance of his Warburton Lectures, first published soon after 1820; and in which the old Protestant view of the great predicted Apostasy and Antichristian Beast of Daniel and St. John were strongly upheld. The Apocalyptic part however of his Book (Disc. 10.) was but very brief and partial.



siderate students of prophecy at the time should be sorely perplexed; and many prepared in mind not only for distrust of these historic expositors, but distrust too as to the general truth of the *historic* system of interpretation: and this, notwithstanding the agreement of these expositors alike with each other, and with most previous Protestant historic expositors of note, on many most important points of accomplishment of the prophecy; especially as to the Gothic, Saracenic, and Turkish invasions of Roman Christendom, the Papacy as the great Antichristian power prefigured in Apoc. xi., xiii., xvii., and the French Revolution. The universal reception hitherto given to the *historic* system of Apocalyptic interpretation in England just kept back for a while the public development of such doubts. But, as the Continent was now open, and intercourse more and more cultivated with it, and its views in theological and prophetic as well as other literature better known, there could scarce but be soon a strengthening of them. Of all which more in the next Section.

As to the *millennium*, I must not conclude this Section without observing that here too our expositors fundamentally differed: Mr. Faber holding strongly to the truth of Whitby's and Vitringa's view, which till the close of the period now under review was all but universally believed in in England; while Cuninghame and Frere made themselves known as upholders of the newly revived Patristic view of its premillennial Advent. I have already elsewhere noted (and who can wonder at it?) that the wide-spread hopes and expectations of the world's speedy evangelization, which arose at this time out of the institution and progress of the various Bible and Missionary Societies shortly before formed in our own favoured country, contributed powerfully at the time I speak of to make Whitby's *pre-advent* millenary view more and more undoubtingly credited and popular.<sup>1</sup>

## § 2. FRENCH REVOLUTIONARY ÆRA; 2ND PART; FROM 1820 TO 1862.

### CONCLUSION.

On which new æra, extending from about 1820 to the present time, I shall now make a few observations; and with them conclude this my History of Apocalyptic Interpretation.

Near about the same time then the two-fold battle began in Eng-

<sup>1</sup> See the end of my Chapter on the Evangelic Missions, Vol. iii. p. 490.

land, which, I said, a sagacious observer might have already prognosticated :—1st, as to the truth on the great *millennial question* ; 2ndly, as to the truth of the general *Protestant historic principle* of Apocalyptic Interpretation.

1. As to the *former* point, the Treatise of Lacunza had not a little to do in the matter. Mr. Irving, the able and eloquent translator of the Treatise already spoken of, tells us, in his Preface to the Translation, of the circumstances under which he was brought to an acquaintance with it :—how in 1826, after he had been led to the recognition of Christ's premillennial advent, and consequent personal reign on earth, as a great Scriptural truth, and under that impression had been preaching it in London with all earnestness, he found himself painfully insulated thereby from most of his brethren in the ministry, even as if he had been advocating a doctrine not only novel, but foolish, and almost heretical : and then, and in that painful state of insulation, had this elaborate Treatise by a writer of another Church and country brought before him ; showing that he was anything but alone in the view, and so confirming his mind in it, and cheering his heart. And very soon he found that in England too similar convictions had been about the same time wrought upon the minds of one, and another, and another, of the earnest investigators of prophetic Scripture.<sup>1</sup> The then recent reconstruction of the Society for the Conversion of the Jews, upon a more proper Church basis,<sup>2</sup> and with new life and vigour infused into its operations, contributed in no little measure to the promotion of these opinions. For, in searching the Scriptures, with a view to the answering of Jewish arguments against Christianity as a purely spiritual system, and Jewish arguments for the Messiah's personal reign on earth and at Jerusalem, the evidence of Scripture was felt more and more by many to be in favour of the Jewish idea, rather than their own. And thus many of the earliest and warmest friends of the Jews' Society became known, as the next ten years ran on, as premillenarians ; e. g. Marsh, M'Neil, Pym, G. Noel, Lewis Way : more especially the last-mentioned noble-minded man, the munificent patron of the Jews' Society ; and whose often grand, though too discursive, Poem of the "*Palingenesia*," still remains a record of the devotion of his whole mind and heart to the anticipation of his

<sup>1</sup> See Irving's Pref. pp. i—xix.

<sup>2</sup> It was founded originally in 1809 ; but on principles of mixt agency of Churchmen and Dissenters, that rendered it so far little effective.

Master's speedy personal advent, to assume the kingdom of a regenerated world. Then too began Prophetic Journals, mainly on the premillennarian principle: first the *Morning Watch*; then, from 1833 to 1838, the *Investigator*. Individual Treatises moreover, on the same views, more or less influential, began also to multiply: I may specify particularly "Abdiel's Letters," by the Rev. J. W. Brooks, Editor of the *Investigator*; and the Prophetic Treatises of the much-loved Edward Bickersteth.—In fine, in the year 1844, the date of the first publication of my own Work on the Apocalypse, so rapid had been the progress of these views in England, that, instead of its appearing a thing strange and half-heretical to hold them, so as when Irving published his translation of Ben Ezra, the heaven had evidently now deeply penetrated the religious mind; and, from the ineffectiveness of the opposition hitherto formally made to them, they seemed gradually advancing onward to triumph.

So I say in *England*, to which country I have a particular respect in these my closing remarks. But let me not forget to remind my readers that, while such was the progress of the question in England, and while in *France* and *Spain* the works of Père Lambert and Lacunza remained (except in so far as the Inquisition might have suppressed the latter) a testimony each one to the same millennial view, there was one remarkable expression to much the same effect even in rationalistic *Germany*; and from a quarter whence it might little perhaps have been expected. I allude to *Frederic Von Schlegel's* Lectures on the Philosophy of History, delivered in 1828 at Vienna, and soon after published, and most rapidly and widely circulated; the same of which an abstract has been given in the concluding Chapter of my Apocalyptic Commentary. It may be remembered that I there noticed Schlegel's eloquently expressed opinion, as to the *παλιγγενεσία*, and new heavens and earth of Isaiah and the Apocalypse, figuring not any mere Church triumph already accomplished over Roman Paganism, so as the Eichhorn school, and many Romanists too, (the latter with a view to the Papal supremacy in the world,) expounded the prophecy, nor again any heavenly state of blessedness for the saints, so as Bossuet: but a blessed personal reign of Christ on this our renewed earth; a reign future indeed, but probably near at hand: with the completed triumph of good over evil attending it, and to be introduced by his own personal advent.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See p. 249 *suprà*.

2. Next, as to any change or progress of opinion on *the general subject of Apocalyptic interpretation*, more especially in England, in the course of the same 20 or 25 years, from about 1820 to 1844.

It was in 1826, the self-same year as that of Irving's Translation of Ben Ezra, that the first prophetic Pamphlet of the *Rev. S. R. Maitland* (now *Dr. Maitland*) issued from the press; its subject, an "Enquiry" into the truth of the then generally received *year-day* view of the 1260 days of Daniel and the Apocalypse: followed in 1829 and 1830 by "A Second Enquiry" into the same subject; a short Treatise on Antichrist; and a Defence of his former Pamphlets, in reply to the *Morning Watch*. In these, as is well known, he energetically assailed the whole Protestant application of the symbols of Daniel's 4th Beast's little horn, and the Apocalyptic Beast and Babylon, to the Roman Papacy, it being his idea that a quite different personal and avowedly infidel Antichrist was meant; asserted that the prophetic *days* were to be construed simply and only as *literal days*: and advocated an Apocalyptic exegetic scheme even yet more futurist than Ribera's; seeing that he supposed the Evangelist St. John to plunge in spirit even in the very first chapter into "the day of the Lord," or great epoch of judgment at Christ's second coming and the consummation.—Nearly contemporarily with Dr. S. R. Maitland's first Pamphlet Mr. Burgh published in Ireland on the Antichrist, and the Apocalyptic Seals, much to the same general effect: Lacunza's idea being adopted by him of the seven-sealed book being the book of Christ's inheritance; a book now at length opened, and about to have fulfilment.—To a thoughtful reader of Lacunza and Lambert on the one hand, and of Maitland and Burgh on the other, the contrast of the views expressed about Popery must have appeared very strange:—the two Protestant writers excusing the Papacy from any concern with the predicted antichristian Apostasy, or Beast of Daniel and the Apocalypse; the two Romanist writers, alike the Dominican Father and the Jesuit, deeming its resemblance to that Apostasy and Antichristian Beast, for many centuries previous, to have been so marked, that (although some yet further development might be expected of its evil) yet it was manifestly to *Papal Rome*, as it long had been, and *Papal Rome* even as it would be to the last, that the application of the prophecies was due.<sup>1</sup>—One strong point with the new

<sup>1</sup> See pp. 532—535, and 539, 540 in my previous Section.



English futurist school was the great *discrepancy* (already noted) of many chief Protestant expositors of the historical school on sundry points of Apocalyptic interpretation; e. g. on the Seals, the two Witnesses' death and resurrection, &c ;<sup>1</sup> and manifest unsatisfactoriness of the explanation on some of those points, as given alike by one and all. Here Mr. Maitland dashed in, it has been said, like a falcon into a dovecote, and made havoc of them. Another influential argument for a while in its favour was the asserted utter *novelty* of the year-day principle, as if never dreamt of before Wieliff in reference to the prophetic periods; and moreover the asserted utterly *anti-patristic* character of the views held by the Protestants respecting Antichrist.—The progress of pre-millennarian opinions, and great change of view operated in many minds upon *that* great prophetic point, predisposed them doubtless to change in others; and made not a few more ready to abandon the old Protestant theory on the *year-day* question also, and that of Antichrist.—Another and quite different occurrence operated soon after, and with very great power, to spread and give fresh weight to these anti-Protestant opinions. In 1833 began the publication of the Oxford Tracts. One chief object of the chief writers, soon developed, was to unprotestantize the Church of England.<sup>2</sup> How then could they overlook, or help availing themselves of, the assistance of these labourers in the futurist school: whose views set aside all application to the Roman Papacy of the fearful prophecies respecting Antichrist; and left Protestantism consequently all open to the charge of unjustifiable schism; and the Papacy all open to the Catholic desires, and aspirations, of the Tractators for re-union? <sup>3</sup>

So as regards the new English *futurist* school, and its gradual but rapid advance in England in the period spoken of. Nor must I omit to add that in the course of the same 18 or 20 years the gradual influx of German literature into England, including its theology among other branches, began to familiarize the English mind more and more with the most popular German views of Scripture prophecy: i. e. as

<sup>1</sup> Some bringing the 7th Seal only down to the Constantinian revolution, and viewing the seven Trumpets as the 7th Seal's evolution; others making the Seals, Trumpets, and Vials parallel in chronology, and the 7th of each to reach to the end, &c. See, besides what was said in my last Section, Vol. iii. p. 287.

<sup>2</sup> See Part v. Ch. ix. in my 3rd Volume.

<sup>3</sup> On some of these points the reader may remember my notice in the Chapter on the *Year-day*, beginning Vol. iii. p. 260. Others will be noticed in my review of the *futurist* theory in the 2nd and next Part of this Appendix.

Eichhorn's scheme in its main points still had sway,<sup>1</sup> with that *Præterist Apocalyptic Scheme* of which a sketch was set before my readers in the preceding Section.<sup>2</sup> *Professor Lee* at Cambridge adopted a Præterist view (one somewhat like Bossuet's, though with marked peculiarities) quite independently of German theorists, if I mistake not.<sup>3</sup> But many more were directly influenced to the view by German theologians, alike among Germanizing English Churchmen and English Dissenters: until at length in 1845 there came forth the Anglo-American stereotype of the theory in the elaborate Apocalyptic comment of *Professor Moses Stuart*.<sup>4</sup>

It was after perusal of some of the publications of Messrs. Maitland and Burgh that the question first pressed itself on the mind of the writer of the *Horæ*, as one too important to be lightly passed over, whether, in very truth, the long received Protestant anti-papal solutions of Daniel and the Apocalypse were mere total error, or whether the main error lay with the assailants. And this was the result. The fitting of the prophecies of *Daniel's little horn* and the *Apocalyptic Beast* to the Roman Papacy seemed to him (as to Lambert and Lacunza) on main points so striking, as to render it incredible that the agreement could be a mere chance agreement, or anything but what was intended by the Divine Spirit, that indited the prophecies. But, if so, then he felt also persuaded that on sundry points on which the unsatisfactoriness of the Protestant solutions had been proved, (more especially on the Apocalyptic Seals, the Sealing Vision, that of the rainbow-crowned Angel of Apoc. x., and its notification about the two Witnesses' death and resurrection, also on the Beast's 7th head, the image of the Beast, and the Apocalyptic structure itself,) some new and better solutions, accordant with the main Protestant view of the Beast and Babylon, must be intended, and by diligent thought and research discoverable.

For it is to be understood that on these points the modern Interpreters of the Protestant Scheme had, up to the time of the publication of the *Horæ*, added nothing, at least nothing of importance, to

<sup>1</sup> *Ewald, Heinrichs*, and others, had meanwhile written in the same view.

<sup>2</sup> See pp. 526—529 *suprà*.

<sup>3</sup> See my notice of Lee in the next Chapter of this Appendix.

<sup>4</sup> I should add that in Germany a very peculiar *futurist* view of the Apocalypse has been advocated by *Dr. Züllig*. But, after toiling through half a volume of his crabbed German, I must beg to say that, what with its strange conceits, inconclusive conclusions, and neological absurdities, it seems scarce worth the while to present any abstract of it to my readers. And indeed I have not the book, or my notes on it, now by me.

the lucubrations of their predecessors. It seems to me to have been their chief office, and no unimportant one surely, to awaken attention to the fact of the seventh Trumpet's having sounded at the French Revolution; and to arouse and keep up an interest, often too ready to flag, in the great subject of Scripture Prophecy. So in the case of Messrs. *Faber, Cuninghame, and Frere*. So too in that of Messrs. *Bickersteth and Birks*, however fanciful, in my opinion, not a little of their originally joint-propounded Scheme of Apocalyptic Interpretation.<sup>1</sup> More especially, as regards Mr. Birks, not only has he by his masterly work on the First Elements of Prophecy advanced the cause of truth, and shown himself its *martel*, and *hammer*, against what I must beg permission anticipatively to call the reveries of the Futurists: but moreover, by his exquisite description of the City that is to be revealed at Christ's second advent, has done much to enlist each hallowed feeling of the heart on the side he advocates; a description such that one might almost suppose the golden reed to have been given him, with which to delineate it, by the Angel that showed to the beloved disciple the Lamb's bride, the New Jerusalem.

So in 1844 the "*HORÆ APOCALYPTICÆ*" was first published; its four subsequent Editions being sent forth in 1846, 1847, 1851; its 5th now in 1862. The views and anticipations with which I began and prosecuted my researches were more particularly as follows.

1st, I was persuaded that, if the Apocalypse were indeed a *Divine revelation* of the things that were afterwards to come to pass, (i. e. from *after the time of St. John's seeing the vision, or close of Domitian's reign*,<sup>2</sup> to the consummation,) then the intervening *æras and events* prospectively *selected* for prefiguration must necessarily (just as in the case of any judicious historian's retrospective selection) have been those of most importance in the subsequent history of Christendom; and that the *prophetic picturings* in each case, especially if much in detail, must have been such as to be applicable perfectly to those events and *æras* distinctively and alone. If applied, as I saw they had been in previous expositions, to the most different events, *æras*, and subjects, this must have arisen, I felt sure, from the expositors not having explored the peculiarity and force of the prophetic figurations with sufficient research, care, and particularity: whether on

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Birks, as I have had occasion elsewhere to state, has since then abandoned the peculiarities of that scheme, (see my Vol. i. p. 549, and Vol. iii. p. 192,) and united himself very much with myself in the general view of Apocalyptic interpretation.

<sup>2</sup> That this was the date of the Apocalypse I had already well assured myself.

principle, so as in the case of some,<sup>1</sup> or indolence, ignorance, and want of discernment, so as in that of many others. This was a lesson to me of the necessity of noting most carefully every peculiarity of indication in each of the sacred figurations, and of sparing no pains in the investigation of whatever might elucidate it. And certainly a success beyond all that I could have anticipated seemed to myself to result from these researches. First there presented itself to me, in the more perfect elucidation of each and every point of detail in the figuration of the four first Seals,—in part from medallie, in part from other previously unnoticed sources of illustration,—an anticipative prophetic sketch, singularly exact, of the fortunes and phases of the secular Roman empire from St. John's time to near the end of the third century:—then, by the light of similarly new and peculiar evidence, the *fixing* of the long previously suggested application of the 5th and 6th Trumpet symbolization to the Saracenic and Turkish invasions respectively; and *fixing* too, as applicable to the times of the Reformation, of the intent of the rainbow-crowned Angel's descent and doings, and of St. John's measuring of the Apocalyptic temple, and of Christ's two sackcloth-robed witnesses' death, resurrection, and ascent in Apoc. x. and xi., in the æra of the same 6th Trumpet. After which again came up before me the admirable use of medallie monuments of the times in elucidation of the prophecy. In Apoc. xii. the long before supposed application of the symbol of the seven-headed Dragon, with *diadems* on his heads, seeking to devour the sun-clothed Woman's child when born, to Roman Heathendom's last warring against the Christian Church, and Constantine the eldest kingly son of the Church, at the opening of the 4th century, received confirmation from the fact of the *diadem* having just at that very time been adopted as the chief imperial head-badge. Besides which in this my present Edition there will be found similarly illustrated, and confirmed, the truth of the application of the ten *diademed* horns of the Beast from the sea in Apoc. xiii. to the ten Romano-Gothic kings of Western Europe in the 6th century: they having just then adopted the *diadem* as their royal head-badge, as seen in the notable Plate of their barbaric coins of about that date given in my Vol. iii. p. 145.—2ndly, as Scripture prophecy generally, instead of separating what it might have to say on *the Church* (Jew-

<sup>1</sup> So e. g. by Cuninghame, Preface to 1st Edition, p. vi. "I do not attempt to explain every minute part of a symbol, but content myself with endeavouring to seize its great outlines. I consider the symbol of the Apocalypse in the light of *prophetical parables*." And so too Mr. Frere, and others.



ish or Christian), and the *world's secular powers* any way connected with it, was apt to intermingle those sayings, so it seemed to me likely that it would be in Apocalyptic prophecy; however contrary to the expository principles acted on by other prophetic expositors, such as I have lately been speaking of.<sup>1</sup> The fact, which I soon ascertained in my primary Apocalyptic researches, of a *Temple* or *Tabernacle*, with its triple division into *Altar-Court*, *Holy Place*, and *most Holy*, ever standing as the perpetual fore-ground before the Apostle, throughout the revelation of the prophecy, with Mount Zion and the Holy City adjacent, and all in connexion with the pictured world around, this,<sup>2</sup>—suggesting as it did the facility of turning at any time from one to the other, strengthened my à priori expectation, and was in fact found by me afterwards to be so taken advantage of perpetually in the prophetic figurations.—3rdly, the circumstance of the prophecy being written (as is expressly stated) on the seven-sealed scroll's two sides, “*within and without*,” offered, I saw, in the most obvious and simple manner, a form of the prophetic Book in which, side by side, there might be inscribed the chronological parallelisms of parts so parallel, but separated in the prophecy from each other; and consequently that there was no need of seizing on the *Little opened Book* of Apoc. x., so as had been done by Mede, Faber, and many others, without any warrant in the prophecy itself, in order to supply that particular want:<sup>3</sup>—therewith cancelling, as I have more than once observed that they did, that most true application of the inestimably important figurations in Apoc. x. and xi., made by the Protestant Reforming Fathers of the 16th century, to the re-opening of the Gospel in their own times. And indeed in the very remarkable evidence of *allusive contrast*, drawn by me from the history of the times of Leo X and Luther, the truth of the application of the whole prophecy of Apoc. x. to the outburst, and subsequent progress, of the great Protestant Reformation of the 16th century seemed, and still seems, to me to be made certain.

It was to be expected that an exposition in many respects so new and important would be met by adverse criticisms and objections.

<sup>1</sup> E. g. Faber's declaration about the Seals as symbols of the Roman Empire generally, Frere of the Western secular Empire, Cuninghame of the Church. See pp. 545—550 *suprà*.

<sup>2</sup> This is enlarged on in my Preliminary Chapter, Vol. i. pp. 98—101.

<sup>3</sup> See my notice of the point, as first suggested by Mede, p. 492 *suprà*.

And, accordingly, in the course of the three or four years in which the three first Editions of the *Horæ* were published, many adverse strictures appeared: especially those written by the late Rev. T. K. Arnold, by the Rev. W. G. Barker, and by Dr. Keith; each followed, of course, by a reply from me. It does not need here to say more of these controversies than that, while furnishing occasion for the correction of certain smaller errors in detail, the satisfaction was left me by them of seeing, as the result, confirmation of the soundness of the main points in my exposition. In proof of which it may be mentioned that when called upon, after a few years' continuous controversy in the pages of the *British Magazine*, to sum up, so as it had been given me to expect, the result of the controversy, Mr. Arnold declined to do it:<sup>1</sup> and that Dr. Keith, after having advertised in 1848 the speedy publication of a refutation of my very elaborate reply to him in the "*Vindiciæ Horariæ*," has never published it to the present day. Besides which, I am happy to say yet further, that as, in the earlier days of the *Horæ*, it had to undergo the sifting of continuous criticisms, so, quite lately, it has had to meet the continuous criticisms of *Dean Alford* in his *Commentary on the Apocalypse*: criticisms more generally adverse than favourable; but given for the most part as mere *dicta ex cathedrâ*, without any refutation, and very often without any notice, of the proof and evidence on which my opinions were founded. This too has called forth a reply from me,<sup>2</sup> challenging from him a notice and confutation of that evidence, or else a retraction of his adverse criticisms. As to the result of which challenge, it needs no very sanguine temperament on my part to assure me that the Dean will be found just as unable to justify his objections as even Dr. Keith.

Let me add, that on the great *Millenary question* I had the real advantage, before publishing the 4th Edition of the "*Horæ*," of seeing my own views contested, and the Whitbyite hypothesis advocated, by Dr. Brown, of Glasgow. And, certainly, he seems to me to have said all that can be most effectively said against the one, and in support of the other. After most careful consideration, however, of his book, my judgment on the question has remained unchanged. For the strength of his argument consists in the exhibition of the difficulties in detail which encompass the idea of the millennium

<sup>1</sup> See *British Magazine* for 1847.

<sup>2</sup> The "*Apocalypsis Alfordiana*."

such as I suppose prophecy to foretell, under Christ's personal reign on earth; difficulties which (as in the case of the prediction of the Noachic Flood of old), if insoluble by man now, may be left to God in his own time to answer: the strength of my own in the many more or less express declarations asserting or implying it in Holy Scripture.

As might have been expected, various Apocalyptic commentaries have issued from the press since my first publication of the *Horæ*: e. g., among those wholly or mainly dissentient from it, those of *Desprez*, *W. H. Scott*, and, more lately, of the *Rev. Frederick Maurice*, on somewhat of the German wholly *Præterist* system; (including, of course, as one thing of the past, the Apocalyptic millennium;<sup>1</sup>) of which the very basis, being the baseless presumption of a Neronian date attaching to the Revelation in Patmos, would of itself be decisive against them,<sup>2</sup> were other grounds of refutation wanting, such as in fact abound, as we shall see in my next Chapter:—those of *Dr. Wordsworth*, and of *Hengstenberg* in Germany, on more or less of the continuous *historic* system, admitting the Domitianic date, but regarding the millennium as a period of the past, or past and present, not of the future; historic schemes that we may designate as *millenario-præteristic*:—also, on the *Futurist* system, not a few smaller treatises; such, more especially, as “Israel's Future,” by the *Rev. Capel Molyneux*; “Plain Papers on Prophecy,” by *Mr. Trotter* of York; and, quite recently, the Apocalyptic Commentary by *Mr. W. Kelly*, of Guernsey. As I am not aware that they have any one on any point of importance added further light to Apocalyptic ex-

<sup>1</sup> The fact of the millennium having long past involves naturally with it that of the saints' promised *premillenary resurrection* being a thing of the past also. So accordingly Mr. D. boldly states his view. “Why,” argues he, with reference to Christ's personal second coming, and the saints' resurrection and ascension spoken of by St. Paul in 1 Cor. xv., “might it not have taken place at that time when Josephus tells us that heavenly apparitions of chariots and soldiers in armour were seen in the clouds, shortly before the destruction of Jerusalem?” Yet St. John left behind!!

<sup>2</sup> “If the Neronian date be not the true one,” says Mr. Desprez, “the edifice (i. e. of his Exposition) erected at so much cost and care will fall headlong to the ground.” Does Mr. D. then attempt to support the Neronian, and gainsay the Domitianic, with any effect better than his predecessors in the same theory? By no means. In fact he seems unaware of the strength of the argument against him, alike from *internal* and *external* evidence.

Dr. Davidson's final and total renunciation of the Neronian date, (*Biblical Criticism*, Vol. iii. pp. 519—614,) after being committed to it as strongly as man could be, (so it will be seen in my next Chapter,) is a remarkable testimony to this.

position, or suggested new objections of any real weight to my own exposition, I might perhaps fairly be excused the task of dwelling here longer on any of them, and content myself by referring to my notices of several in the Appendix to my Warburton Lectures, and elsewhere.<sup>1</sup> In one or other, however, of the several Chapters devoted to the review, and I trust refutation, of the chief Apocalyptic counter-Schemes to my own, (viz. primarily the wholly *Præteristic* and the *Futuristic*, and further too the *Millenario-Præteristic* of certain of the historic school,) fitting opportunities will occur for noticing both *Mr. W. Kelly's* recent Commentary, on the principle of *Modified Futurism*; and also *Dr. Wordsworth's*, and (more at large) *Hengstenberg's millenario-præteristic* system, conjunctively with the advocacy of it by the respected name of *Bishop Waldegrave*.<sup>2</sup> Finally, as *Dean Alford*, in the Commentary on the Apocalypse in his last Volume, has commented continuously and generally unfavourably on my exposition, I have thought it well, as already said, to publish a reply to him in a separate Pamphlet.

---

For, in conclusion, the readers of this Historic Sketch will see that there are but *three grand Schemes of Apocalyptic interpretation* that can be considered as standing up face to face against each other; with any serious pretensions to truth, or advocacy supporting them of any real literary weight.—The 1st is that of the *Præterists*; restricting the subject of the prophecy, except in its two or three last chapters, to the catastrophes of the Jewish nation and old Roman Empire, one or both, as accomplished in the 1st and 2nd, or 5th and 6th centuries respectively: which Scheme, originally propounded, as we saw, by the Jesuit Alcasar, and then adopted by Grotius, has been *under one modification*, and on the hypothesis of a *Neronic* date of the Apocalypse, urged till quite of late alike by most of the more eminent of the later German prophetic expositors, by Professor Moses Stuart in the United States of America, and by the disciples of the German School in England; also, *under another modification*, and on the hypothesis of a *Domitianic* date, by Bossuet.—The 2nd is

<sup>1</sup> See especially my review Desprez in the Appendix to my Warburton Lectures; and that of the late Mr. Beale's Apocalyptic Commentary called *Armageddon*, in the January No. of the "Christian Observer," 1860.

<sup>2</sup> The bearing of *Professor Fairbairn's* able Book on Prophecy, not long since published, on the point in question will also come under review.



the *Futurists'* Scheme; making the whole of the Apocalyptic Prophecy, (excepting *perhaps* the primary Vision and Letters to the Seven Churches,)<sup>1</sup> to relate to things even now future, viz. the things concerning Christ's second Advent: a Scheme this first set forth, we saw, by the Jesuit Ribera, at the end of the 16th century; and which in its main principle has been urged alike by Dr. S. R. Maitland, Mr. Burgh, the Oxford Tractator on Antichrist, and others, in our own times and æra, not without considerable success: also other expositors of late, but with certain considerable modifications, which too ought not to be past over without notice.—The 3rd is what we may call emphatically the *Protestant continuous Historic Scheme of Interpretation*; that which regards the Apocalypse as a prefiguration in detail of the chief events affecting the Church and Christendom, whether secular or ecclesiastical, from St. John's time to the consummation:—a Scheme this which, in regard of its particular application of the symbols of Babylon and the Beast to Papal Rome and the Popedom, was early embraced, as we saw, by the Waldenses, Wickliffites, and Hussites; then adopted with fuller light by the chief reformers, German, Swiss, French, and English, of the 16th century; and thence transmitted downwards uninterruptedly, even to the present time.

It is this last which I embrace for my own part with a full and ever strengthening conviction of its truth. Of each of the other two counter-Schemes, in each of their two forms, the original unmodified and the modified, there will follow a critical review, and I hope decisive refutation, in my next Part.

<sup>1</sup> Dr. S. R. Maitland, as before observed, and also the Rev. James Kelly and others, would have even the first Chapter refer to the distant and closing future. Others however begin the future only with Ch. iv.

## APPENDIX.

### PART II.

CRITICAL EXAMINATION AND REFUTATION OF THE CHIEF COUNTER-SCHEMES OF APOCALYPTIC INTERPRETATION; AND ALSO OF DR. ARNOLD'S GENERAL PROPHETIC COUNTER-THEORY.

IT was stated at the conclusion of my *Sketch of the History of Apocalyptic Interpretation*, that there are at present *two*, and but two, grand general *counter-Schemes* to what may be called the *historic Protestant* view of the Apocalypse: that view which regards the prophecy as a prefiguration of the great events that were to happen in the Church, and world connected with it, from St. John's time to the consummation; including specially the establishment of the Popedom, and reign of Papal Rome, as in some way or other the fulfilment of the types of the Apocalyptic Beast and Babylon. The *first* of these two counter-Schemes is the *Præterists'*, which would have the prophecy stop altogether short of the Popedom, explaining it of the catastrophes, one or both, of the *Jewish Nation* and *Pagan Rome*; and of which there are two sufficiently distinct varieties: the *second* the *Futurists'*; which in its original form would have it all shoot over the head of the Popedom into times yet future; and refer simply to the events that are immediately to precede, or to accompany, Christ's second Advent; or, in its various modified forms, have them for its chief subject. I shall in this second Part of my Appendix proceed successively to examine these two, or rather four, anti-Protestant counter-Schemes; and show, if I mistake not, the palpable untenableness alike of one and all. Which done,<sup>1</sup> it may perhaps be well,

<sup>1</sup> It would then be my next duty to consider the chief *Protestant* Apocalyptic Scheme, that runs counter in its grand outline of arrangement to the one given in the *Horæ*; (viz. that which, instead of regarding the seven Trumpets in a natural way as the development of the 7th Seal, just as the seven Vials also of the 7th Trumpet, in continuous evolution of the future, would regard the Seals and the Trumpets

from respect to his venerated name, to add an examination of the late *Dr. Arnold's general prophetic counter-theory*. This, together with a notice of certain recent counter-views on the Millennium, will complete our review of counter-prophetic Schemes.

Now with regard to the *Præterist Scheme*, on the review of which we are first to enter, it may be remembered that I stated it to have had its origin with the Jesuit *Alcasar*:<sup>1</sup> and that it was subsequently, and after *Grotius'* and *Hammond's* prior adoption of it, adopted and improved by *Bossuet*, the great Papal champion, under *one* form and modification;<sup>2</sup> then afterwards, under *another* modification, by *Hernnschneider*, *Eichhorn*, and others of the German critical and generally infidel school of the last half-century;<sup>3</sup> followed in our own æra by *Heinrichs*, and by *Moses Stuart* of the United States of America.<sup>4</sup> The two modifications appear to have arisen mainly out of the differences of date assigned to the Apocalypse; whether about the end of Nero's reign or Domitian's.<sup>5</sup> I shall, I think, pretty well exhaust whatever can be thought to call for examination in the system, by considering separately, first the *Neronic*, or favourite *German* form and modification of the Præterist Scheme, as propounded by *Eichhorn*, *Hug*, *Heinrichs*, and *Moses Stuart*; secondly *Bossuet's* Domitianic form, the one most generally approved, I believe, by Roman Catholics.

## CHAPTER I.

### § 1. EXAMINATION AND REFUTATION OF THE GERMAN NERONIC PRÆTERIST APOCALYPTIC COUNTER-SCHEME.

The reader has already been made acquainted with the main common features of this *German* form of the Præterist Apocalyptic Scheme.<sup>6</sup> Differing on points of detail, yet (with the exception that

as chronological parallel lines of prophecy, each reaching to the consummation;) but that, as my review of it refers almost wholly to the *Seals*, I have thought it well on that point to anticipate, and to place my critical notice of *it* in the Appendix to the 1st Volume.

<sup>1</sup> See p. 484 *suprà*.    <sup>2</sup> See *ibid.* p. 501.    <sup>3</sup> *Ib.* pp. 524—529.    <sup>4</sup> See p. 559.

<sup>5</sup> I say *mainly*; because *Eichhorn*, as will be noted presently, adopts the *Neronic* interpretation retrospectively, with the *Domitianic* date. Also I say, *about the end of Nero's reign*, because some of the Germans prefer to date it a year or two after Nero's death. See Note p. 573.

<sup>6</sup> See pp. 526—529.

Hartwig and Herder pretty much confine themselves to the *Jewish catastrophe*, and Ewald, Bleek, and De Wette to that of *heathen Rome*<sup>1</sup>) it may generally be described as embracing *both* catastrophes: the fall of Judaism being signified under that of Jerusalem, the fall of Heathenism under that of Rome; the one as drawn out in symbol from Apoc. vi. to xi. inclusive, the other from Apoc. xii. to xix.: whereupon comes thirdly, in Apoc. xx., a figuration of the triumph of Christianity. So, with certain differences, *Hernnschneider*, *Eichhorn*, *Hug*, *Heinrichs*, &c., in Germany;<sup>2</sup> *M. Stuart* in America; and, in England, *Dr. Davidson*.<sup>3</sup>—In my review of the Scheme each of these two historic catastrophes, as supposed Apocalyptically figured, will of course furnish matter for critical examination; not without reference to the *Apocalyptic date* also, as in fact essentially mixt up with the historic question.—But, before entering on them, I think it may be well to premise a notice,

Ist, ON THE GENERALLY VAGUE LOOSE PRINCIPLE OF PROPHETIC INTERPRETATION professedly followed by the Præterists.

Considering the self-sufficient dogmatism which pre-eminently characterizes the School in question, even as if, à priori to examination; all other schemes were to be deemed totally wrong, and the Præterist Scheme alone conformable to the discoveries and requirements of “*modern exegesis*,”<sup>4</sup> (a dogmatism the more remarkable, when exhibited by a man of calm temperament and unimpassioned style, like Professor Stuart,<sup>5</sup> and which to certain weaker minds

<sup>1</sup> So *M. Stuart*, i. 161.

<sup>2</sup> *Eichhorn* makes his *Judaic* division of the Apocalypse to extend into Apoc. xi.; and the *Roman* division only to begin with the Dragon's going to persecute the remnant of the woman's children, Apoc. xii. 18. And so too *Heinrichs*.

<sup>3</sup> i. e. until the publication of *Hengstenberg's* Apocalyptic Commentary in 1851, insisting on *Domitianic* date: my readers must bear this in mind when reading my notices of *Dr. Davidson* in this paper. What the evidence of common sense and clear historic testimony, as fully set forth by me, could not effect, the fact of a German Professor's advocating the *Domitianic* date sufficed, as by magical effect, to accomplish in *Dr. Davidson*.

<sup>4</sup> A favourite phrase and almost argument with many of this class of interpreters.

<sup>5</sup> i. e. in the body of his Work. His Preface is in the undogmatic style that one might expect from such a man as Professor Stuart. Elsewhere, however, not only does he dogmatically pass sentence of condemnation upon expositions on the usual Protestant exegetic principle, (e. g. i. 161,) “It is time, high time, for *principle* to take the place of *fancy*, for *exegetical proof* to thrust out *assumption*,” but even warms into such a burst as the following:—“In the name of all that is pertinent and congruous in prophecy, what have these (viz. a history of civil commotions, and de-



may seem imposing,) the question is sure to arise, What the grounds of this strange presumptuousness of tone? What the new and overpowering evidence in favour of the modern Præterists? What the discovery of such unthought of coincidence between the prophecy on the one hand, and certain facts of their chosen Neronic æra on the other, as to settle the Apocalyptic controversy in their favour, at once and for ever? And then the surprise is increased by finding that not only has no *such* discovery been made, not only no *such* discovery been even pretended to, but that in fact they put it forward, as the very boast of the Præterist system, that coincidences exact and particular are not to be sought or thought of: that the three main ideas about the three cities, or three antagonist religions represented by them, so as above mentioned, are pretty much all that there is of *fact* to be unfolded; and that, with certain exceptions, (of which exceptions more in a later part of this review,) all else is to be regarded as but the poetic drapery and ornament.<sup>1</sup>—

scription of literal famines, pestilences, &c.) to do with the object John had before him? Are we . . . to regard him as in a state of hallucination when he wrote the Apocalypse? . . . Away with all such surmises: and away too with all the expositions that are built upon them!" i. 208, 209.

In Dr. Davidson, with whom of English expounders of the system I am best acquainted, the same characteristic is prominent. So when he speaks of Protestant Expositors generally, in the *Eclectic Review* for Dec. 1844, p. 649: "That the Revelation exhibits a prophetic view of the Church from the close of the Apostolic age to the end of time, is a position that can never be rendered probable. All who have attempted to expound it on this principle have totally failed." And, again, of myself and the *Horæ*, *ibid.* p. 644; "As an exposition of the Apocalypse it is a total failure; it is essentially and fundamentally erroneous;" yet without the slightest attempt at encountering the evidence and arguments in the *Horæ*. All which is repeated at the close of his article on the "*Revelation*," p. 623, &c., in *Kitto's Cyclopædia*.—On the other hand, on his own German Præterist view he says, *ibid.* 644; "The recent German works on the Apocalypse have served to point out the *true* path of interpretation:" and p. 648; "For the *right* interpretation of the mystical number 666, or 616, see Ewald's Commentary." And so too in the Article in *Kitto* this German Præterist Scheme is given in considerable detail; not as a suggested interpretation, but authoritatively, and ex cathedrâ, as beyond a doubt the true interpretation.

1 *Stuart*, i. 179:—"Substantial facts lie at the *basis* of the Apocalypse. . . But what constitutes the *drapery* or *costume*? . . . All symbol is of course drapery. It is the thing signified which is person; but the way and manner of signifying it . . . is merely the *fashion of the costume*." Then at p. 200 he proceeds to state, with reference to the Apocalypse "as a book of poetry," that "Oriental Poetry, especially the Hebrew, follows out the detail of symbol and allegory, for the sake of verisimilitude, and to give vivacity to the representation, much beyond what we are accustomed to do in the Western world:" and, at p. 203, rebukes those interpreters who "seek for *historical events* and *facts*, in remote ages, as the fulfilment of these so-called predictions." For "what defence can be made for converting *episode* into the main body of the work; or mere symbols of strong assurance that the Beast will be overcome into pictures of veritable historical events?"

Now in mere *rationalists* of the School, like Eichhorn and many others, men professedly disbelieving the inspiration of the Apocalypse, all this is quite natural and consistent: seeing that its author wrote, they take for granted, as a mere dramatist and poet; and, as to details, what the limit ever assigned to *a poet's fancy*, except as his own taste or critical judgment might impose one? But that *Christian expositors*, like Professor Stuart and Dr. Davidson, men professing to believe in St. John's inspiration as a prophet, (and to these I here chiefly refer,) should deliberately so pronounce on the matter, so resolve even what seems most specific into generalizations,<sup>1</sup> and what seems stated as fact into mere poetic drapery, will appear probably to my readers, as to myself, most astonishing.

It is of course due to these writers to mark by what process of thought they arrive at this conclusion; and on what principle, or by what reasons, they have justified it to themselves. And, passing by the negative argument from the *discrepancy and unsatisfactoriness of the historic detailed interpretations* given by expositors who seek in the Apocalypse a prophetic "epitome of the civil and ecclesiastical history of Christendom," (as to which, wherever justly objected to, the remark was obvious that further research might very possibly supply what was wanting, and rectify what was unsatisfactory, so as I hope has been done on various points in the present Commentary,<sup>2</sup>)

Similarly Dr. Davidson in Kitto, p. 627, adopts Hug's remark; "The particular traits and images in the Apocalypse are by no means all significant: many being introduced only to enliven the representation, and for the purpose of ornament."

<sup>1</sup> "Scarcely inferior in importance . . . is the plain and obvious principle that *generic* and not *specific* and *individual*, representations are to be sought for in the Apocalypse." So Professor S. at p. 203, after the extract given in my Note preceding.—As a striking example of the extent to which this is carried by him, I may refer to his, Vol. ii. p. 146: where, after setting forth the destruction of Jerusalem and Judaism as the first grand theme of the Apocalypse, from Apoc. vi. to xi. he says; "If no history by Josephus was in existence, the arch of Titus at Rome would tell the story that Apoc. vi.—xi. had been fulfilled." Nay! "Equally would it have been fulfilled, . . . had the Jewish persecuting power been crushed in *any other way*, or by *any other means*." So too in his Vol. i. p. 205.

<sup>2</sup> My Commentary does not seem to have met Professor Stuart's eye before the publication of his own.

At Vol. i. p. 204, after mention of the *Gothic invasions* of the empire, &c., as subjects supposed to be figured by the Protestant interpreters, he adds; "The misfortune is that what applies to this particular battle, &c., would apply equally well to every battle that has been fought." If this Edition of the *Horæ* fall into his hands, and the Professor test my explanations, he will, if I mistake not, soon find how little the above statement can apply to them. I think I may say, with regard to all the chief and detailed interpretations, that they are shown to be applicable to *nothing else whatsoever*, with at all the same exactitude, as to that which they are applied to by me.

passing this, I say, the *intended use and object of the Apocalypse*, at the presumed time of its writing, will be found to have been that which mainly guided the learned American Professor to the true principle of exegesis, (as he designates it,) whereby to interpret the Book.<sup>1</sup> For, argues he, during a persecution like Nero's, (this being his supposed date of the Apocalypse,) when the Church was "bleeding at every pore,"<sup>2</sup> how could it take interest in information as to what was to happen in distant ages, (excepting of course the final triumph of Christianity,) or indeed as to anything but what concerned their own immediate age and pressure, whether in Judea or at Rome? Hence then to this the subject-matter of the Apocalypse must be regarded as confined.<sup>3</sup> And whereas, *on this exegetic hypothesis*, scarce anything appears in the actual historic facts of the particular period or catastrophe in question, which can be considered as answering to the prophetic figurations in detail, therefore all idea of any such detailed and particular intent and meaning in these prophetic figurations must be set aside; and they must be regarded as the mere drapery and ornament of a poetic *Épopée*, albeit by one inspired. As a Scriptural precedent and justification for this generalizing view of the Apocalyptic imagery, Psalm xviii., which was David's song after his deliverance from Saul, and Isaiah xiii., xiv., on the fall of Babylon, (the former more especially,) are referred to, and insisted on, by the learned Professor.<sup>4</sup>

But (reserving the subject of the *Apocalyptic date* for a remark or two presently under my next head of argument) let me beg here to ask, with reference to *the very limited use and object* so assigned to the Apocalyptic prophecy,—as if only or chiefly meant for the Christians then living, by them to be understood, and by them applied in

<sup>1</sup> So in the Preface p. 4; "I take it for granted that the writer had a *present and immediate* object in view when he wrote the book: and so must regard him as having spoken *intelligibly* to those whom he addressed." And so again and again, i. 126, 159, 163, 197, 208; ii. 310, 472, &c.

<sup>2</sup> A favourite expression of the American Professor. So i. 159, 207, 209, &c.—But how does this idea square with what is intimated of the then state of the Laodicean Church; "Thou sayest, I am rich, and increased with goods," &c? See my Vol. i. p. 44, Note <sup>2</sup>.

<sup>3</sup> Dr. D. ap. Kitto, p. 623, cannot apparently quite agree with this. At least he expresses the just observation; "The Apocalypse was designed to promote the instruction of God's people *in all ages*. It does not belong to the class of ephemeral writings. Its object was not merely a local or partial one." Adding however; "This general characteristic is perfectly consistent with the fact that it arose out of specific circumstances, and was primarily meant to subserve a definite end."

<sup>4</sup> So Stuart, i. 170, &c.

the way of encouragement and comfort, as announcing the issue of the trials in which they were then personally engaged,—what right has Professor Stuart thus to limit it? Was it not accordant with the character of God's revelations, as communicated previously in Scripture, (especially in Daniel's prophecies, which are of all others the most nearly parallel with the Apocalypse,) to foreshow the future *in its continuity* from the time when the prophecy was given, even to the consummation: and this, not with the mere present object of comforting his servants then living, but for a perpetual witness to his truth; to be understood only partially, it might be, for generations, but fully in God's own appointed time? So, for example, in the Old Testament prophecies concerning Christ's first advent; prophecies which not only the Old Testament Jews, but even the disciples of Christ, understood most imperfectly, till Christ himself, after he had actually come, explained them: and so again in Daniel's prophecies extending to the time of the end; which, *until that time of the end*, were expressly ordered to be sealed up.<sup>1</sup>—And then, next, what historic evidence have we of Christians of Nero's time having so understood the Apocalypse, as the American Professor would have it that they *must* have done?<sup>2</sup> Not a vestige of testimony exists to the fact of such an understanding; albeit quite general, according to him, among the more intelligent in the Christian body. On the contrary, the early testimony of Irenæus, disciple to Polycarp, who was himself disciple to St. John, indicates a then totally different view of the Apocalyptic Beast from Professor Stuart's, as if the only one ever known to have been received: a view referring it, not to any previous persecution by Nero and the Roman Empire under him, but to an Antichrist even then future; one that was to arise and persecute the Church not till the breaking up, and reconstruction in another form, of the old Empire.—Moreover the whole that our Professor would have to be shown by the Apocalypse, viz. the assured triumph of Christianity over both Judaism and Paganism,—I say this, instead of being any new revelation specially suited to cheer the Christians of the time, had been communicated

<sup>1</sup> Dan. xii. 9. The sealing was evidently with reference to that part of the prophecy which concerned the distant future.

<sup>2</sup> See the extract from his Preface, Note<sup>1</sup>, p. 569 *suprà*. So again i. 126; "John wrote in order to be read and understood; and therefore intelligent persons of his day might understand him." Also ii. 323, &c.



in part by Daniel, in part by Christ himself, *much more fully and particularly* long before.<sup>1</sup> As to the Professor's grand *precedent of Psalm xviii.*, urged again and again in justification of his explaining away nearly all the more particular symbolizations of the Apocalypse, as if mere poetic drapery and ornament, is the parallel a real one, or the argument from it valid? Says the Professor;<sup>2</sup> See, though the subject of the Psalm be at the heading declared to be David's deliverance from Saul, yet under what varied imagery this is set forth:—how, in depicting them, David makes the earth to shake and tremble, and the smoke to go forth from God's nostrils, and his thunders to be heard in the heaven, and his lightnings shot forth to discomfort the enemy: all mere poetical ornament; not particular circumstantial fact; much less fact in chronological order and development. But, let me ask, does the Psalmist profess, as his very object, to tell the facts that had occurred in the period of David's suffering from Saul, so as the Apocalyptic revealing Angel does to tell the things of the coming future?<sup>3</sup> Or with any such orderly division, and arrangement for chronological development of facts, as in the singularly artificial Apocalyptic division into its three septenaries of Seals, Trumpets, and Vials, (each of the latter subordinate evidently to the former,) and the various chronological periods so carefully interwoven? Again, as to the symbolizations in the Psalm, is Professor Stuart quite sure that they refer only to David and Saul; and that David is not carried forward in the Spirit, beyond his own times and his own experience, to picture forth the future triumphs of a greater David over a greater Saul; triumphs not to be accomplished in fine without very awful elemental convulsions, and the visible and glorious interposition of the Almighty? Surely what is said in verse 43, of his (the *chief*'s intended David's) "being made the head of the heathen," tells with sufficient clearness that such is indeed the true *exegesis* of the Psalm: and so most expositors of repute, I believe, explain it.—If the testing is to be by a real parallel, let Daniel's orderly prophecies of the *quadripartite image* and the *four Beasts* be resorted to, to settle the question of exegesis. Is all *there*

<sup>1</sup> The only new point communicated, I believe, according to Stuart and Davidson, is the enigma about Nero, as a head of the Roman Beast, answering to a certain mystic number: and this indeed no discovery of the future about him, but only a riddle for the time then present.

<sup>2</sup> i. 170; ii. 141, 146.

<sup>3</sup> "Come up, and I will show thee *ἀ μελλει γινεσθαι μετα ταυτα*, the things that are to happen after the things now present." Apoc. iv. 1.

figured relative only to Daniel's own time; and all else mere poetic ornament and drapery?

So much on the *general exegetic principles* of the German Præterist School. Let me now proceed,

IIIndly, to consider these Præterists' HISTORICAL SOLUTION, including especially the *two grand catastrophes* laid down by them, as the two main particulars unfolded in the Apocalypse; and show, as I trust, both in respect of the one and the other, the many and indubitable marks of error stamped upon it.

Of course the *Neronic date* is an essential preliminary to this Scheme, in the minds of all Præterist expositors who, like M. Stuart and Dr. Davidson, admit the apostolicity and inspiration of the Book. And, as I venture to think that I have in my 1st Volume completely proved that the true date is *Domitianic*, agreeably with Irenæus' testimony, not *Neronic* or *Galbaic*,<sup>1</sup> that single fact may in such case be of itself deemed conclusive against the theory.—Nor, let me add, in case of non-infidel Præterists only. For the very strong opinion as to the sublimity and surpassing æsthetic beauty of the Apocalypse admitted by the German Neologians, Eichhorn inclusive, as the result of the Semlerian controversy, compared with the utter inferiority of all Church writers of the nearest later date, does even on rationalistic principles almost involve the inference of *St. John's authorship*; especially as coupled with the fact of the Apocalyptic writer's assumption of authority over the Asiatic Bishops he address, and the air of truth, holiness, and honesty that all through mark his character. Which admitted, and also, as by Eichhorn, the *Domitianic* as the *true date*, even a rationalist like him must, I think, be prepared to admit the high improbability of *such a writer* making pretence to prophesy a certain catastrophe about Nero and Rome, and another certain catastrophe about Jerusalem, as if things then future, when in fact the one had happened 30, the other 25 years before. Whence the baselessness, even on rationalistic principles, of the whole Neronic Præterist Scheme.—But we will now proceed more in detail to the examination of the two catastrophes separately.

<sup>1</sup> Lücke advocating a *Galbaic* date, just after Nero; (see my Vol. i. Appendix;) Heinrichs a *Vespasianic*, but before the fall of Jerusalem. They are all one as regards my argument.

1. And, 1st, as to the catastrophe of *Judaism* and *Jerusalem*, depicted in the figurations from Apoc. vi. to xi. inclusive.

Argues Professor Stuart, as abstracted in brief, thus: <sup>1</sup>—“ It is for some considerable time not unfolded who the enemy is against whom the rider of the white horse in the first Seal has gone forth conquering, followed by his agencies of war, famine,<sup>2</sup> and pestilence; him against whom the cry is raised of the Christian martyrs slain under the 5th Seal, and the revolution of whose political state is evidently the subject of Seal the sixth. But in Apoc. vii. the enemy meant is intimated. For when it is stated that 144,000 are sealed, by way of protection, out of all the tribes of Israel, meaning evidently those that have been converted from among the Jews to Christianity, it follows clearly that it is the unsealed ones of those tribes, or *unconverted Jews*, forming the great body of *Israel*, that are the destined objects of destruction. A view this quite confirmed in Apoc. xi.; where the *inner temple* is measured, as that which is not to be ejected: this meaning, that whatever was spiritual in the Jewish religion was to be preserved in Christianity; <sup>3</sup> while the rest, or mere external parts of the system, as well as the Holy City Jerusalem itself, was to be abandoned and trodden down.” So substantially Professor Stuart: and so too his prototype Eichhorn, and his English follower Dr. Davidson. This is the *strength* of their first Part; the details of Seals and Trumpets being of course little more in this system than intimations of something awful attending or impending, altogether general; or indeed, perhaps, mere “poetic drapery and costume.” Let us then try its strength where it professes to be strongest.

The enemy to be destroyed, it is said, was shown to be *the Jews*: because it was the *Jewish tribes* (all but the sealed few from out of them) that were to have the tempests of the four winds let loose on them; and because it was the *Jewish temple* (all but the inner and measured part of it) that was to be abandoned to the Gentiles. Let us test this conclusion by the *threefold* test of what is shown, *first*,

<sup>1</sup> See the Professor's Introduction to the first Catastrophe, Vol. ii. pp. 138—145.

<sup>2</sup> Let me not omit to remind the reader, in passing, of the proof given under my 3rd Seal (Vol. i. pp. 165—167,) that the symbols of that Seal *cannot* have been meant to figure *famine*. Indeed what is said about the *wine* and *oil* makes Prof. Stuart himself half admit it. The almost yet more conclusive notice to the same effect about the price of *barley* he has, like all other expositors, quite overlooked.

<sup>3</sup> See the extract, p. 576, Note 2.

as to the intent of the Jewish symbolic scenery elsewhere in the Apocalypse; secondly, as to the religious profession of the people actually destroyed in the Trumpet-judgments; thirdly, as to the intended people's previous murder of Christ's two Witnesses, in their thereupon doomed city.

As to the *first*, already in the opening vision a chamber as of the Jewish temple had been revealed; with seven candlesticks like those in the old Jewish temple,<sup>1</sup> and one in the High Priest's robing that walked among them. Was its signification then Jewish or Christian; of Judaism or Christianity? We are not left to conjecture. The High Priest was distinctively the *Christian* High Priest, Christ Jesus; the seven candlesticks the seven Christian Churches. This explanation at the outset is most important to mark; being the fittest key surely to the intent of all that occurs on the scene afterwards of similar imagery.—Further, in Seal 5 a temple like the Jewish, at least the temple-court with its great brazen altar, is again noted as figured on the scene. Now we might anticipate pretty confidently, from the previously given key just alluded to, that the temple was here too symbolic of the *Christian* worship and religion, not the *Jewish*. But there is, over and above this, independent internal evidence to *affix* to it the same meaning. For the souls under the altar, who confessedly depict *Christian martyrs*, appear there of course as sacrifices offered on that altar; their place being where the ashes of the Jewish altar-sacrifices were gathered. Which being so, could *the altar* mean that of the literal Judaism; and the vision signify that the Jews, zealous for their law, and thinking to do God service, had there slain the Christian martyrs, as if heretics? Certainly not; because on their altar the Jews never offered human sacrifices, and would indeed have esteemed it a pollution. Therefore we have independent internal evidence that the Jewish temple and altar, figured on the Apocalyptic scene, had here too a *Christian* meaning; depicting (as both St. Paul, and Polycarp after him, so beautifully applied the figure) the Christian's willing sacrifice of himself and his life for Christ.<sup>2</sup>—Further in Apoc. viii. the temple is

<sup>1</sup> So Stuart allows, ii. 46: saying that "the writer had doubtless in his mind the passage in Zech. iv. 2, where the prophet sees a candelabra of gold, with seven lamps thereon;" with reference to the "light of the (Jewish) temple, its ritual, and services."

<sup>2</sup> See my Vol. i. pp. 206—208, and 222, 223.



again spoken of as apparent; with its brazen sacrificial altar in the altar-court, its golden incense-altar within the temple proper, and one too, habited as a Priest, who received and offered incense, according to the ceremony of the Jewish ritual. Was this meant literally of *Jewish* incense and *Jewish* worship? Assuredly not. For the incense of the offering priest is declared to be “the prayers of *all the saints* ;” i. e. as all admit,<sup>1</sup> of *Christians* distinctively from *literal Jews*. — Again, with reference even to the temple figuration in Apoc. xi. 2, which furnishes his chief *Jewish* proof-text, our Professor himself admits, nay argues, that the inner and most characteristic part of it (the same that was measured by St. John) signified that spiritual part of Judaism *which was to be preserved in Christianity*, as contrasted with the mere externals of Jewish ritualism:<sup>2</sup> thus construing it, not literally, with reference to the worship of the national Israel, but symbolically, with reference to that of the *Christian* Israel:<sup>3</sup> albeit with no little mixture of what is erroneous, and consequently confused and inconsistent in his reasoning.<sup>4</sup>—All which being so, what,

<sup>1</sup> So M. Stuart ii. 182; “It goes up before God, bearing along with it on its fragrant clouds, so to speak, the prayers of persecuted Christians.” So too Eichhorn, Heinrichs, &c.

<sup>2</sup> “The design seems plainly this, viz. to prefigure the *preservation of all that was fundamental and essential in the ancient religion*, notwithstanding the destruction of all that was *external*, in respect to the temple, the city, and the ancient people of God. . . Is not the preservation of the sanctum of *the temple* an appropriate and significant emblem of this?” Stuart ii. 214. “Christians,” he adds, p. 218, “are kings and priests unto God; and to them the inmost recesses of *the temple* are opened.” So too i. 184.

<sup>3</sup> Professor S. seems inclined to view *the altar* here spoken of as the *incense altar*: yet he includes the *priest's court* in the part measured; which court was the one that had the great *brazen altar* in it. And I believe that *the altar*, when thus simply designated, means always in the New Testament the *brazen altar* of sacrifice. See my Paper on the subject in the Appendix to Vol. ii.—I believe, too, there were never said to be worshippers, *προσκυνοῦντες*, at the *incense altar*. Compare Luke i. 10, 11; where the people are spoken of as praying, while the priest at the incense altar offered incense: also 2 Kings xviii. 22. See too my Vol. ii. pp. 183—185.

<sup>4</sup> For he makes the Jewish temple proper, to figure Christianity, simply as being *the inner part*; at the same time that its outer court, *as the outer*, figured Judaism. That is, he makes the connected part of *the same temple* to symbolize two *professedly different and opposed religions*: and moreover makes that part of it which contained all that was visibly and by use ritualistic, (the sacrificial altar, the laver, the incense-altar, the shew-bread, the candlesticks, &c.,) to symbolize the unritualistic religion of the two; while the other part, which had none of the ritualistic material, was to symbolize the religion of ritualism!

Surely St. Paul might have taught the Professor a very different and more consistent mode of interpreting the symbol. According to this apostolic teaching the Jewish temple on the Apocalyptic scene figured the Christian visible worshipping Church and

I ask, must by the plainest requirements of consistency and common sense follow, but that as *the offerers of Jewish worship in the Jewish temple*, depicted on the Apocalyptic scene, meant in fact *Christians*, so they that are called Jews or Israelites in the Apocalyptic context must mean Christians also, at least by profession? A conclusion clenched by the fact which I have elsewhere urged, that the *twelve tribes* of God's Israel in the New Jerusalem of Apoc. xxi. are on all hands admitted to designate *Christians*, mainly *Gentile Christians*; and so surely, in all fair reasoning, the twelve tribes of Israel mentioned in Apoc. vii. also.

*Next*, as to *the religious profession or character* of those that were to suffer through the plagues of the first great act of the Drama, (or rather Epopee, as Stuart would prefer to call it,)<sup>1</sup> their character is most distinctly laid down in Apoc. ix. 20, as *actual idolaters*. For it is there said, "that the rest of the men, which were not killed by these plagues, yet repented not of the works of their hands, that they should not worship dæmons, and idols of gold, and silver, and brass, and stone, and wood:"—a description so diametrically opposed to the character of the *Jews* in Nero's time, and ever afterwards, that one would have thought with *Bossuet*,<sup>2</sup> and indeed *Ewald* too,<sup>3</sup> that it settled the point, if anything *could* settle it, that *Jews* were *not* the parties meant. And how then do the German Præterists, that take the Judaic view, overcome the difficulty? Few and brief

its worship, on the principle of construing the old Jewish *types* to mean their answering spiritual *antitypes*. Which being so, the Gentile outer court figured naturally the professing proselytes of the same Christian worship and religion: whether proselytes consistent in life and doctrine, and who thus worshipped in the altar-worship; or proselytes false at heart, and false to the altar, and so to be at length cast out as apostates and hypocrites. I must again refer the reader to my Paper on the Apocalyptic altar.

Dr. Davidson is as brief here, and shuns the difficulty as much, as in the case of the witness-slaying; of which more under the next head. He only says: "After this the *interior* of the temple is *measured* by the prophet; while the *outer court* is *excepted*, and given over 42 months to the Gentiles."—I suppose however that he means this in Stuart's sense; as I can divine no other.

<sup>1</sup> See Stuart i. 151—155, controverting Eichhorn's view of it as a *Drama*. He dwells on it himself, i. 190, &c., as an *Epopee*. It really seems to me a controversy on matter of little worth, on their theory. In either case there would be the resource of "*drapery*."

<sup>2</sup> "Cela fait voir que le Prophete a passé des Juifs aux idolâtres: car on ne peut assez remarquer, que comme les afflictions des Ch. vii. et viii. regardaient les Juifs, il n'y est point parlé d'idolâtrie." Bossuet ad loc.

<sup>3</sup> I learn this from Professor Stuart. "Ewald considers this as decisive in respect of those who are the objects of attack by the horsemen." ii. 201.

are the words of *Eichhorn's* paraphrase:—"It means that they persevered in *that same obstinate mind*, which *once* showed itself in the worship of *idols!*"<sup>1</sup> says *M. Stuart*:<sup>2</sup> "In the Old Testament Jews that acted in a heathenish way were called heathens: and moreover in the New Testament *covetousness* is called idolatry: and moreover in the time of Herod *theatres*, and other such like heathen customs, had become common in Judea."<sup>3</sup> But surely such observations, when put forward in explanation of the descriptive clause that spoke of men "*worshipping idols of gold, and silver, and brass, and stone, and wood,*" must be felt to be rather an appeal *ad misericordiam* in the Expositor's difficulty, than an argument for the fitness of the descriptive clause, to suit the Jews of the times of Nero and Vespasian: especially when coming from one who is led elsewhere in his comment to state (and state most truly) that the Jews were ready, one and all, rather to submit their necks to the Roman soldiers' swords, than to admit an image that was to be worshipped within their city.<sup>4</sup> Indeed it is notorious that they regarded images altogether as abominations; and that the Roman attempts at erecting them more than once nearly caused desperate rebellions.—As for Dr. Davidson, he here exhibits more at least of discretion than the American Professor. He passes over the difficulty, as if *re desperatâ*, in dead silence.

Try we, *thirdly*, the *Judaic* theory of our German Præterists by the test of the *Witness-slaying* prophecy, including the *place, time, and author of their slaughter*.—This is put forth as one of the strongest points in the *Judaic* part of their view: it being stated to occur in the city "where their Lord was crucified;" i. e., say the Præterists, in *Jerusalem*. But first, we ask, what witnesses? "The Jewish chief priests Ananus and Jesus," answer *Herder* and *Eichhorn*; "mercilessly massacred, as Josephus tells us, by the Zealots."<sup>5</sup> But how so? Must they not rather be *Christ's* witnesses, exclaims *Stuart*; <sup>6</sup> (since it is said, "I will give power to *my* witnesses;")

<sup>1</sup> "Hoc est, perseverarunt in *mente obstinatâ*, quæ olim in Hebræis antiquis in cultu idolorum . . . cernebatur." *Eichhorn*, ii. p. 41. So too *Heinrichs*.

<sup>2</sup> *Stuart*, *ibid.* 201, 202. I compress his statements in brief.

<sup>3</sup> Enough this, says he, "to satisfy the demands of *exegesis*." *ibid.*

<sup>4</sup> When Pontius Pilate undertook to hoist the standard of Tiberius in the city of Jerusalem, the Jews, knowing the obligation that would follow to pay homage to it, one and all remonstrated; and offered their necks to the swords of his soldiers, rather than submit to its erection." *Stuart* ii. 275, from Josephus.

<sup>5</sup> *Stuart* ii. 220.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.* Also *Heinrichs*.

and therefore *Christians*? Of course they must. Which being so, the next question is, Who then the notable *Christians* that Stuart considers to have been slain in Jerusalem, in the witness character, at this epoch; i. e. during the Romans' invasion of Judea? Does he not himself repeat to us the well-known story on record, that the Christians forthwith fled to Pella, agreeably with their Lord's warning and direction, so soon as they saw the Romans approach to beleaguer Jerusalem? "But," says he in reply, "can we imagine that all would be able to make their escape? Would there not be sick and aged and paupers to delay the flight; and faithful teachers too of Christianity, that would choose to remain, to preach repentance and faith to their countrymen? *These* I regard as symbolized by the two Witnesses:"<sup>1</sup> and these therefore as answering in their history at this crisis to St. John's extraordinary and circumstantial prediction about the Witnesses' testimony, miracles, death, resurrection, ascension. But what the historic testimony to support his view? Alas! none! absolutely none! In apology for this total and most unfortunate silence of history he exclaims; "The Jew Josephus is not the historian of *Christians*; and early ecclesiastical historians have perished:" adding however, as if sufficient to justify his hypothesis; "But Christ intimates, in his prophecy of the destruction of Jerusalem, that there would be *persecution of Christians* at the period in question." A statement quite unjustified (if he means persecution to death *in Jerusalem*, and *at the time of the siege*) by the passages he refers to.<sup>2</sup> Does not Christ say, "Not a hair of your heads shall perish?" At last he condescends to this: "At all events it is clear that the Zealots, and other Jews, did not lose *their disposition to persecute* at this period!!"<sup>3</sup> Such is the impotent conclusion of Professor Moses Stuart: such the best explanation he can devise, on his hypothesis, of the wonderful Apocalyptic prophecy respecting the Witnesses.—Nor is his need supplied by Dr. Davidson. "Notwithstanding God's long-suffering mercy," says this latter, "*the Jews continue to persecute the faithful witnesses.*" This, I can assure the Reader, is the *sum total* of his observations on the point before us.<sup>4</sup>—Nor is it here only that the *Judaic* part of the

<sup>1</sup> Stuart ii. 227. So, let me say Miriam, and her Christian friend, in Milman's noble Drama of the Fall of Jerusalem.

<sup>2</sup> Matt. xxiv. 9—13, Mark xiii. 9—13, Luke xxi. 12—16.

<sup>3</sup> Stuart *ibid.* I have used this language above, but slightly compressed.

<sup>4</sup> Ap. Kitto, p. 624.



Præterist Scheme, applied to the Witness-story in the Apocalypse, breaks down. For, further, the *city* where the Witnesses' corpses were to be exposed is declared to be *the city the great one*;<sup>1</sup> that which is the emphatic title of the seven-hilled Babylon or *Rome*, in the Apocalypse; never of *Jerusalem*.<sup>2</sup> (How it might be *Rome*, and yet the city where the Lord Jesus had been crucified, the Reader has long since seen!<sup>3</sup>)—Nor this alone. For the Beast that was to slay them was *το θηριον το αραβαινον εκ της αβυσσου*, the *Beast that was to rise from the abyss*;<sup>4</sup> a Beast which (especially with the distinctive article prefixed so as here to it) cannot but mean one and the same with that which is mentioned under precisely the same designation in Apoc. xvii. 8;<sup>5</sup> and there, as all the Præterists themselves allow, designates a power associated some way with *Rome*. And what Stuart's explanation? Why, that it means in Apoc. xi. simply *Satan*!<sup>6</sup>—Indeed alike the declared fact of the *witness-slaying*, and of the *great city* as *the place of their slaughter*, and of the *Beast from the abyss* as *their slayer*, (as also, let me add, the period of the 1260 *days*, assigned alike to the Witnesses' sackcloth-prophesying first, and to the Beast's reign afterwards,) do so interweave the first half of the Apocalyptic prophecy, from Apoc. vi. to xi., with the part subsequent, that, as to any such total separation, in respect to subject, of the one from the other, as the Præterists urge, on their hypothesis of a double catastrophe, it is, I am well persuaded, and will be so found by one and all who attempt to work it out, an absolute impossibility.<sup>7</sup>

I might add yet a word as to the ill agreeing *times* of the supposed *Jewish* catastrophe and the *Roman*; the former being in the Præter-

<sup>1</sup> *Εν τη πλατεια της πολεως της μεγαλης*. This is given as the best reading by many of the critical Editions.

<sup>2</sup> Five or six times is the phrase used in the Apocalypse, and always with reference to the great Babylon. See Apoc. xiv. 8, xvi. 19, xvii. 18, xviii. 10, 16, 18, 19, 21. So Jerome of old; remarking moreover that Jerusalem is never called Egypt. And so too Bossuet. See pp. 320, 504 *suprà*.

Dr. Davidson, on Apoc. xi. 13, explains the city of which the tenth part fell, as the "*holy city*:" whereas it is evidently the same *great city* (the one last before mentioned, viz. in verse 8) as that where the Witnesses had fallen.

<sup>3</sup> See my Vol. ii. pp. 433, 435—440.

<sup>4</sup> Apoc. xi. 7.

<sup>5</sup> *Θηριον ο ειδες ην, και ουκ εστι και μελλει αναβαινειν εκ της αβυσσου*.

<sup>6</sup> So Ribera. See p. 483 *suprà*. So too apparently Mr. C. Maitland; p. 280.

<sup>7</sup> Strange that in such a case Prof. S. should thus speak, i. 276: "If there be anything certain in hermeneutics," it is "the reference in Apoc. vi.—xi. to Judæa and its capital."

ist Scheme first set forth, and the *Roman* figured afterwards: whereas the chronological order of the two events was in fact just the reverse; the Roman persecution of Christians, and quickly consequent fall of Nero, preceding the fall of Jerusalem. But the argument (which indeed might be spared *ex abundantia*) will occur again, and somewhat more strikingly, under our next Head.—To this let us then now pass onwards; and consider, as proposed,

2ndly, the German Præterists' *second* grand division of the Apocalypse, and *second* grand catastrophe; viz. that affecting *Pagan Rome*.

And here, as before, I shall not stop at minor points; but hasten rapidly to that which is considered by the Præterists as their strongest ground.—It is to be understood that they generally make Apoc. xii. retrogressive in its chronology to Christ's birth, and the Devil's primary attempts to destroy both him, and his religion, and his early Church in Judea; though in vain. Then, after note of the Dragon's dejection from his former eminence, and the song, "Now is come salvation, &c.," we arrive at the Woman's flight into the wilderness, meaning they say the Church's flight to Pella, on the Romans advancing to besiege Jerusalem: some outbreak of Jewish persecution at the time (the same under which the Witnesses were to fall within Jerusalem) answering *probably*<sup>1</sup> to the floods from the Dragon's mouth; and the 3½ years, said of the Woman's time in the wilderness, answering also sufficiently well to the length, not indeed of the siege, but of the Jewish war. (Mark, in passing, how the symbolic *Woman*, first made to be the *Theocratic Church* in its *Jewish* form, travelling with, and bringing forth Christ,<sup>2</sup> has now become, not the *Church Catholic*, which in Nero's time had indeed spread over the Roman world, but the little Section of it which remained stationary in Judea!)—Then the Dragon, being enraged at the Woman, "went away to make war with the remainder of her seed, who keep the commandments of God, and hold fast the testimony of Jesus." That

<sup>1</sup> But what facts to justify this "*probably*?" The answer is; "It is not improbable (so Stuart, ii. 263,) that St. John had in his mind some extraordinary machinations of the persecuting Jews, about the time when the Witnesses were giving their testimony!!" An hypothesis upon an hypothesis!—Further he makes the invading *Romans* answer to the earth helping the Woman, and swallowing up the flood. *Ibid.* But could the earth, or *Romans*, swallow up the flood of Jewish persecution, in so far as the *Witnesses* were concerned, *within Jerusalem?* while they were without besieging it.

<sup>2</sup> Is the Church ever represented in Scripture as Christ's *mother*?

is, enraged that the Jews, his original instrument of persecution, should be destroyed and fail him, he leaves the Jewish scene of his former operations, and goes elsewhere, to stir up a new persecutor against Christians in Nero.—But did not Nero's persecution occur before the Jews' destruction? No doubt! The anachronism is honestly admitted by Professor Stuart.<sup>1</sup> An anachronism the more remarkable, because he makes the vision of the 144,000 in Apoc. xiv. to be a vision of encouragement to Christians, suffering under Nero's persecution; depicting as it did, according to him, the Christian Jews occupying Jerusalem as a now Christian city:<sup>2</sup> an event this which could not have happened till Jerusalem's destruction, about four years after the commencement of Nero's persecution; and did not in fact take place till some years later.<sup>3</sup> "But in an *Epopœe*, like the Apocalypse," says Stuart, "we are surely not bound to the rigid rules of a book of Annals!"<sup>4</sup>

Thus then we come to consider Apoc. xiii., the Chapter on the Beast; and, connectedly with it, (for it does not need to dwell on the intervening Chapters,) the further explanatory symbolizations about the Beast in Apoc. xvii.

Behold us then now before the very citadel of the German Præterists! "And see," they say, "how impregnable it is! For not only is *the Woman that rides the Beast* expressly stated to be the

<sup>1</sup> "Nero began the persecution of Christians A.D. 66. An attack was made on Jerusalem at the same period: but the Jewish war did not really commence until early in the spring of 67. And Jerusalem was taken and destroyed in August A.D. 70." Stuart ii. 250.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. ii. 290, i. 186. At p. 187, after observing that before John wrote the Apocalypse the great body of Christians had probably fled in safety to Pella, he adds; "That he presents them here on *Mount Zion* [the *earthly Mount Zion*] *belongs to the tact of the writer.*"

<sup>3</sup> For the Christians only came to resettle at Jerusalem by degrees, and in small numbers, after its destruction. Several years had past, I believe, before Simeon fixt his Episcopate there.

<sup>4</sup> Ib. ii. 251.

<sup>5</sup> The figurations between Apoc. xiii. and xvii. are thus in brief explained by Stuart. In Apoc. xiv. the visions of the 144,000 on Mount Zion, of the three flying Angels, and of the Harvest and Vintage, are mere general *anticipative* intimations, or "pledges and tokens," (ii. 304,) by way of encouragement, of results of triumph to the Church, that would be depicted more fully afterwards. Also in the Vials outpouring, Apoc. xvi., where one might surely have expected to find specific prophecy of fact, all is still mere generalization: notwithstanding the Professor's singular preliminary remark, that St. John does here not only by "the variety in his composition," satisfy "the demand of *aesthetics*," (p. 309,) but, what is better, communicate also "a sketch [qu. *historic sketch*?] corresponding with a good degree of exactness to the state of facts." Save indeed that the seventh vial (that under which the air is affected, and a third part of the great city seen to fall) is construed to signify that "the power of the Beast is paralyzed; i. e. that persecution is arrested when Nero dies." (ibid.)

*seven-hilled imperial city Rome*, so that the *Beast ridden* must be the persecuting *Roman Empire*; but the *time* intended is also fixed. For it is said that the *Beast's* seven heads, besides figuring seven hills, figured also *seven kings*, or rather *eight*: of whom *five had fallen* at the time of the vision; which must mean the five first emperors, Julius, Augustus, Tiberius, Caligula, Claudius; and one, the sixth, *was*; which of course must be the next after Claudius, i. e. *Nero*. Nay, to make the thing clearer, the *Beast's* name and number 666 are specified; or, as some copies read, 616. And so it is that in Hebrew קסר נרון, *Neron Cæsar*, has the value in numbers of 666, which is one frequent Rabbinical way of writing *Nero's* name; or, "if the Hebrew be that of *Nero Cæsar*, without the *final n*, then it gives the number 616."<sup>1</sup>

No doubt the *numeral* coincidence is worthy of note, and the whole case, so put, quite plausible enough to call for examination. It is indeed obvious to say, as to the *name* and *numeral*, that a *Greek* solution would be preferable to one in *Hebrew*; and a *single* name to a *double* one: principles these recognized, as we have seen, by Irenæus, and all the other early Fathers that commented on the topic.<sup>2</sup> But in this there is of course nothing decisive. A graver objection seems to me however to lie against the suggested numeral solution, in that a part of the name being *official*,—I mean the word *Cæsar*,—this agnomen, though fitly applicable to *Nero while the reigning emperor*, would hardly be applicable to him when *resuscitated* after his death-wound, and so become the *Beast of Apoc. xiii.* of whom the name was predicated. But this involves inquiry into *the Beast's heads*; to which inquiry, as the decisive one, let us now therefore at once pass on.

The *heads* then, as they assert, mean certain *individual kings*. This is not surely according to the precedent of *Daniel vii. 6*, where the third *Beast's four heads* would seem from *Dan. viii. 8* to have signified the *monarchical successions* that governed the four kingdoms into which *Alexander's* empire was divided at his death.—But, not to stop at this, the decisive question next recurs, What the *eighth* head of the *Beast*, on this hypothesis of the *Præterists*: *Nero* being the *sixth*; and, as they generally say, *Galba*, who reigned but a short

<sup>1</sup> So *Moses Stuart* and *Dr. Davidson*, after *Benary*. See the *Excursus iv.* p. 457 in *Professor Stuart's 2nd Volume*.—*Eichhorn*, ii. 134, gives *Irenæus's* old solution, *Λατρευος*.

<sup>2</sup> See my *Vol. iii.* pp. 245—248.



time, the *seventh*? It is admitted (and common sense itself forces the admission) that this *eighth head* is the same which is said in Apoc. xiii. 3, 12, 14, "to have had a wound with a sword and to have revived:" and it is this *revived head*, or *Beast under it*, (let my Readers well mark this,<sup>1</sup>) that is the subject of all the prophecy concerning the first Beast in Apoc. xiii., and all concerning the Beast ridden by the Woman in Apoc. xvii. What then, we ask, this *eighth head* of the Beast? And, in reply, first Eichhorn, and then his copyists Heinrichs, Stuart, Davidson, all four refer us to a rumour prevalent in Nero's time, and believed by many, that after suffering some reverse he would return again to power: a rumour which after his death took the form that he would revive again, and reappear, and retake the empire.<sup>2</sup> Such is their explanation. The *eighth head of the Beast is the imaginary revived Nero*.—But do they not explain the Beast (the revived Beast) in Apoc. xiii., and his blasphemies, and persecution of the saints, and predicated continuance 42 months, of the *real original Nero*, and *his* blasphemies and *his* three or four years' persecution of the Christians, begun November, 64, A.D. and ended with Nero's death, June 9, A.D. 68? Such indeed is the case; and by this palpable self-contradiction, (one which however they cannot do without,) they give to their own solution its death-wound: as much its death-wound, I may say, as that given to the Beast itself to which the solution relates.

So that really, as regards the truth of the solution concerned, it is needless to go further. Nor shall I stop to expose sundry other absurdities that might easily be shown to attach to it: e. g. the supposed figuration of the fall of the *Pagan Roman empire* in the fall of the individual emperor Nero, albeit succeeded by Pagan emperors like himself.<sup>3</sup>—But I cannot feel it right to conclude my critical ex-

<sup>1</sup> For it is said in xvii. 8, "the Beast *thou sawest* (i. e. ridden by the Woman) was, and is not, and is to rise from the abyss:" and in verse 11, "The Beast which was, and is not, he is the *eighth*, and is of the seven." Professor Stuart in his Excursus iii. (Vol. ii. p. 434) admits the identity of the 8th head in Apoc. xvii., and revived head of the Beast in Apoc. xiii.—See my Paper on this in the Appendix to Vol. iii.

<sup>2</sup> Eichhorn, ii. pp. 209—221; Stuart ii. Excursus 3; Davidson, ap. Kitto, p. 621.

<sup>3</sup> Stuart says that John, in Apoc. xvii., xviii., insensibly passes from the *specific* to the *generic*, i. e. from Nero to the Roman Pagan persecuting power; which after Nero's death rose up again from the abyss, and renewed the contest till Constantine. i. 309, 351.

As regards the *second Beast*, with the *lamb-skin covering*, made by these expositors as well Stuart, ii. 283, and Davidson in Kitto, p. 624, as Eichhorn) to be "the *hea-*

amination of the system without a remark as to something on this head far graver, and more to be reprobated, than any mere expository error, however gross or obvious. The reader will have observed that as well Prof. Stuart and Dr. Davidson, as the German Eichhorn, explain the repeated direct statements, "The Beast *had* a wound with the sword, and *lived*," "The Beast that thou sawest is not, and *shall be*, and *is to ascend from the abyss*," &c. &c., to be simply allusions to a *rumour* current in Nero's time, but which in fact was an altogether *false* rumour. That is, *they make St. John tell a direct lie* : and tell it, with all the most flagrant aggravation that fancy itself can suppose to attach to a lie ; viz. under the form of a *solemn prophecy received from heaven* ! Now of Eichhorn, and others of the same German rationalistic school of theology, we must admit that they are here at least open and consistent. Their declared view of the Apocalypse is as of a mere uninspired poem by an uninspired poet. So it was but a recognized poetical license in St. John to tell the falsehood. But that men professing belief in the Christian faith, and in the divine inspiration as well as apostolic origin of this Book, should so represent the matter, is surely as surprising as lamentable. It is but in fact the topstone-crowning to that *explaining away* of the prophetic symbols and statements, as mere *epopee*, of which I spoke before,<sup>1</sup> as characteristic of the system. And how does it show the danger of Christian men indulging in long and friendly familiarity with infidel writings ! For not only are the Scriptural expository principles and views of *Christian men* and *Neologists* so essentially different, that it is impossible for their new wine to be put into our old bottles, without the bottles bursting ; but the receiver himself is led too often heedlessly to sip of the poison, and bethinks him not that death is in the cup.<sup>2</sup>

*then idolatrous priesthood*," the unscripturalness of the interpretation is noted at p. 592 *infra*, in my review of Bossuet.

<sup>1</sup> P. 569.

<sup>2</sup> Let me beg the reader to observe that I have in my examination of the German Preterist Scheme, here concluded, tested it simply by *Apocalyptic* evidence, and shown how little it will bear that testing. The proof is only the stronger against it, if we add the additional tests of the cognate prophecy in *Daniel*. For the identity of the *little horn* of the fourth of Daniel's four Beasts, with the last head of the Apocalyptic Beast, is a point clear and irrefragable. And it is on its destruction that Messiah's universal and everlasting kingdom is declared to be established ; and that " the kingdom and dominion and greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven is given to the people of the saints of the Most High," even " for ever and ever." A prophetic declaration this which is indeed repeated in the Apocalyptic figurations : but which,

§ 2. EXAMINATION OF BOSSUET'S DOMITIANIC, OR CHIEF ROMAN CATHOLIC PRÆTERIST, APOCALYPTIC SCHEME.<sup>1</sup>

It may probably at once strike the reflective reader that if the chronology of Bossuet's scheme, extending as it does from Domitian's time to the fall of the Roman empire in the 5th century, do in regard of the supposed *Roman* catastrophe abundantly better suit with historic fact than the German *Neronic* or *Galbaic* Præterist Scheme, it is on the other hand quite as much at disadvantage in respect of the *other*, or *Jewish* catastrophe. For surely that catastrophe was effected in the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus, above 20 years before Bossuet's Domitianic date of the Apocalypse: and all that past afterwards under Hadrian was a mere rider to the great catastrophe.

But to details. And here at the outset Bossuet's vague generalizing views of the five first *Seals* meet us; as if really little more than the preliminary introduction on the scene of the chief *dramatis personæ*, or *agents*, afterwards to appear in action; viz. *Christ the conqueror, War, Famine, Pestilence, Christian Martyrs*: followed in the 6th by a preliminary representation, still as general, of the impending double, or rather treble catastrophe, that would involve Christ's enemies; whether Jews, Romans, or those that would be destroyed at the last day. A view this that even Bossuet's most ardent disciples will, I am sure, admit to be one not worth detaining us even a moment: seeing that, from its professedly generalizing character, the whole figuration might just as well be explained by Protestants with reference to the overthrow of one kind of enemy, as by Romanists of another.—Nor indeed is there anything more distinctive in his *Trumpets*: with which, however, he tells us, there is to begin the particular development of events. For, having settled that the *Israelitish Tribes* mentioned in Apoc. vii. mean the

on their own mode of reasoning, the Præterists must, I think, find it more difficult to escape from, than even from those to the same effect in the Apocalypse.

I have not spoken in this Section of the *day-day* principle of explaining the Apocalyptic chronological periods; a principle of course espoused by, and essential to, this class of interpreters. In my Chapter on the *year-day* (Vol. iii. Part iv. Chap. ix.) I have, I hope, sufficiently vindicated that principle. An additional remark or two with reference to certain later assailants of it, may be given in a Section following.

<sup>1</sup> See generally, in illustration of the ensuing criticism, my sketch of Bossuet's Apocalyptic Interpretation, beginning p. 501 *suprà*.

Jews literally, (the 144,000 being the Christian converts out of them,) and so furnish indication that they are parties concerned in what follows in the figurations, (though the *temple*, all the while prominent in vision, is both in the 5th Seal before, and in the figuration of the Witnesses afterwards, construed by Bossuet, not of the literal Jewish temple, but of the Christian Church,) he coops up these Jews, and all that is to be developed respecting them, within the four first Trumpets:—the hail-storm of Trumpet 1 being Trajan's victory over them; the burning mountain of Trumpet 2 Adrian's victories; (why the one or the other, or the one more than the other, does not appear;) the falling star of Trumpet 3 figuring their false prophet Barchochebas, "*Son of a star*," who stirred up the Jews to war; (of course however before the war with Adrian, signified in the preceding vision, not after it;) and the obscuration of the third part of sun, moon, and stars, in Trumpet 4, indicating not any national catastrophe or extinction, but the partial obscuration of the scriptural light before enjoyed by the Jews, through Akiba's Rabbinic School then instituted, and the publication of the Talmud. As if forsooth the light of Scripture had shone full upon them previously: and not been long before quenched by their own unbelief; even as St. Paul tells us that the veil was upon their hearts. Did Bossuet really believe in the absurdity that he has thus given us for an Apocalyptic explanation?—In concluding however at this point with the *Jews*, and turning to *Rome Pagan* as the subject of the following symbolizations, he acts at any rate as a reasonable man; giving this very sufficient reason for the transition, that they who were to suffer under the plagues of the 5th and 6th Trumpets are marked in Apoc. ix. 20 as *idol-worshippers*, which certainly the Jews were not. A palpable distinctive this which, but for stubborn fact contradicting our supposition,<sup>1</sup> one might surely have thought that no interpreter of this, or of any other Apocalyptic School, would have had the hardihood even to attempt to set aside. Only does not the statement about the *unslain remnant's non-repenting of them* imply that *the slain part* had previously been guilty of the selfsame sins of idolatry?

So, passing now to the *heathen Romans*, with reference to their his-

<sup>1</sup> See my notice on this point, in the critical examination of the *German* Preterists, just preceding.



tory in the times following on Barchochebas and the Talmud, the *scorpion-locusts* of Trumpet 5 are made by our Expositor to mean poisonous Judaizing heresies, which then infected the Christian Church: (Was it not "a piece of waggery" in Bossuet, exclaims Moses Stuart,<sup>1</sup> so to explain it?) Trumpet 6, somewhat better, the loosing of the Euphratean Persians under Sapor, that defeated and took prisoner the emperor Valerian; though it is to be remarked that Valerian was the aggressor in the war, not Sapor, and his defeat in Mesopotamia some way beyond the Euphrates.—All which of course offers no more pretensions to real evidence than what went before: indeed, its total want of anything like even the semblance of evidence makes it wearisome to notice it. Yet it is by no means unimportant with reference to the point in hand; for it shows, even to demonstration, the utter impossibility of making anything of the Seals and Trumpets on Bossuet's Scheme.—Let us then hasten to what both he and his disciples consider to constitute the real strength of his Apocalyptic Exposition: viz. his interpretation of the *Beast from the abyss*, with its seven heads and ten horns, and of the *Woman riding* on it: as symbolizations respectively of the *Pagan Roman Emperors*, and *Pagan Rome*.

The notices of this *Beast* occur successively in Apoc. xi., xiii., and xvii. First, in Apoc. xi. the *Beast* is mentioned passingly and anticipatively, as *the Beast from the abyss*, the *slayer of Christ's two witnesses*. Next, in Apoc. xiii. it appears figured on the scene as the *Dragon's* successor, bearing seven heads and ten horns; (one head excised with the sword, but healed;) another *Beast*, *two-horned*, accompanying it, as its associate and minister; and its name and number being further noted as 666. Once more, in Apoc. xvii. it appears with a *Woman*, declared to be *Rome*, seated on it: and sundry mysteries are then expounded by the Angel, about its seven heads and ten horns.

Now then for Bossuet's explanation. This *Beast*, says he, is the *Roman Pagan Empire*, at the time of the great Diocletian persecution; its seven heads being the seven emperors engaged in that persecution, or in the Licinian persecution, its speedy sequel: viz. first, Diocletian, Galerius, Maximian, Constantius; then, Maxentius, Maximin, and Licinius. Of which seven "*five had fallen*" at the

<sup>1</sup> Vol. i. p. 467.

time of the vision; “*one was,*” viz. Maximin; another “*had not yet come,*” viz. Licinius; and the eighth, “*which was of the seven,*” was Maximian resuming the emperorship after he had abdicated. As to the *name* and *number*, it was, *Diocles Augustus*; which in Latin gives precisely the number 666. Further, the *revived Beast* of Apoc. xiii. (revived after the fatal sword-wound of the head *that was*) figured the emperor Julian; and the *second Beast*, with two lamb-like horns, the Pagan Platonic priests of the time, that supported him: the stated time of whose reign, 42 months, was simply a term of time borrowed from the duration of the reign of the persecutor Antiochus Epiphanes; signifying that it would, like his, have fixed limits, and be short.—With regard to the *ten horns* that gave their power to the Beast, these signified the Gothic neighbouring powers; which for a while ministered to Imperial Rome, by furnishing soldiers and joining alliance; but which were soon destined to tear and desolate the Woman Rome; as they did in the great Gothic invasions, beginning with Alaric, ending with Totilas. At the time of which last Gothic ravager, Rome’s desolation answered strikingly to the picture of desolated Babylon in Apoc. xviii.—As to the *Woman riding the Beast*, the very fact of her being called a *harlot*, not an *adulteress*, showed that it must mean *heathen*, not *Christian Rome*.

Such is in brief Bossuet’s explanation. Now as regards both the *first Beast*, and the *second Beast*, and the *Woman* too, let it be marked how utterly it fails; and this is not in one particular only, but in multitudes.

Thus as to the *first Beast*.—1. The seven heads, he says, were the seven persecutors of the Diocletianic æra. But the emperor Severus, Galerius’ colleague and co-persecutor, as Bossuet admits, is arbitrarily omitted by him, simply in order not to exceed the seven. 2. The Beast from the abyss, being the Beast that kills the Witnesses, is made in Apoc. xi. to be the Empire under Diocletian: whereas in Apoc. xvii. the Beast from the abyss (and the distinctive article precludes the idea of two such Beasts) is explained of a head that was to come after the head that then was; this latter being Maximin, himself posterior to Diocletian. 3. The head that was wounded with the sword being, according to Bossuet, the sixth head “*that was,*” or Maximin, its healing ought to have been in the next head in order, that is Licinius. But, this not suiting, he oversteps Licinius; and ex-

plains the healed head of one much later, Julian. 4. The Beast with the healed head being Julian, the subject of the description in Apoc. xiii., the Beast's name and number ought of course to be the name and number of Julian. But no solution suitable to this striking him, Bossuet makes it Diocles Augustus; the name of the Beast under a head long previous. 5. As to this name, Diocles Augustus, it is not only in Latin numerals, which on every account are objectionable, and which no early patristic expositor ever thought of;<sup>1</sup> but, in point of fact, is a conjunction of two such titles as never co-existed; Diocletian being never called Diocles when emperor, i. e. when Augustus.<sup>2</sup> 6. The Beast "that was, and is not, and is to go into perdition," being "the eighth, yet one of the seven," Bossuet makes to be Maximian resuming the empire after his abdication. But the prophetic statement requires that this eighth should rise up after that "which was," viz. Maximin; whereas Maximian's resumption of the empire was before Maximin.—7. As to the idea of *Julian's* hatred of, and disfavour to Christianity, answering to what is said in Apoc. xiii. of the *Beast* under his *revived head* making war on the saints, and conquering them,<sup>3</sup> it seems almost too absurd to notice. In proof I need only refer to Julian's own tolerating Decree about Christians;<sup>3</sup> and the behaviour of Bossuet's *saints*, i. e. of the professing Christians of the time, at Antioch towards Julian.<sup>4</sup>—8. The

<sup>1</sup> See my Vol. iii. p. 246, Note 7: and compare the *Greek* patristic explanations of the Beast's name and number there given; and also at pp. 278, 279, 285, 296, 342, 346 *suprà*.—The earliest *Latin* solution that I remember to have seen is that of *Die Lux*, by Ambrose Ansbert in the viii<sup>th</sup> Century. See p. 351 *suprà*.

<sup>2</sup> So Rasche on Diocletianus: "Donec imperium sumeret *Diocles* appellatus: ubi orbis Romani potentiam cepit Græcum nomen in Romanum morem convertit, dictusque est Diocletianus." Even after his abdication he still retained the latter name. *Ibid*.

<sup>3</sup> Οὐδενὰ γωνυ αὐτῶν ἀκούτα πρὸς βωμοὺς ἐωμεν ἔλκεσθαι. It was almost an Edict of toleration. So Gieseler, Second Period, § 74 (Vol. i. p. 184): "He took away the privileges of Christians, [i. e. privileges granted them by former Emperors above Pagans,] and forbade their teaching publicly in the schools; but in all other respects he promised to leave them unmolested." Bossuet indeed (on Apoc. xiii. 5) very much allows this. "Du temps de Julien il n'y eut aucune interruption dans le service public de l'Eglise;" adding however; "Au reste il n'y a rien en de plus dur à l'Eglise que les *insultes* de Julien;" &c.—Gieseler thus represents the worst that Julian did. "Afterwards he was guilty of some acts of injustice towards the Christians; though often, no doubt, provoked by their unseasonable zeal. They suffered most however from the heathen governors and populace." But how little to their destruction, or subjugation, see in the next Note.

<sup>4</sup> "At Antioch he bore the scoffs of the Christian populace with philosophical indifference." Gieseler, *ibid*.—See too the account in Gibbon; who however on subjects connected with Christianity is always to be read with caution.

contrast of the Beast's time of reigning, viz.  $3\frac{1}{2}$  years, with Diocletian's 10 years and Julian's  $1\frac{1}{3}$ , might be also strongly argued from. But I pass it over cursorily; as Bossuet confesses to have no explanation to offer of it, except that it is an allusion to the duration of the perseution of Antiochus Epiphanes!<sup>1</sup>

So as to the Beast's *heads*: and still a similar incongruity strikes one about the Beast's *horns*. Take but two points. *First*, these horns, "having received no kingdom as yet," i. e. at the time of the Revelation, were to receive authority as kings *μὴν ὥραν μετὰ τοῦ θηρίου*, "at one time with the Beast." So the doubtless true reading, and true rendering, as Bossuet allows. But how then applicable to the kings of the ten Gothic kingdoms?—kingdoms founded long subsequent to both Diocletian and Julian; and when the Roman empire under their headships, (which is Bossuet's Beast,) had become a thing of the *past*. To solve the difficulty, Bossuet waves the magician's rod; and, without a word of warning, suddenly makes the Beast to mean something quite different from what it was before: viz. to be *Rome*, or the Roman empire, of a *later headship than the 8th*, or latest specified. Says he "their kingdoms will synchronize with the Beast, that is with *Rome*: because Rome will not all at once [i. e. not immediately on the Goths' first attacks, begun about A.D. 400] have lost its existence, or all its power!"<sup>2</sup>—Yet, again, *secondly*, these horns were with one accord to impart their power and authority to the Beast; of course after themselves receiving this authority: i. e. as the context of the verse demonstrates, after receiving their kingdoms. But how so? Says Bossuet, because of their giving their men to be soldiers of the Roman armies, and of their settling as cultivators in the empire, and making alliances with the Roman emperors. But, as to *time*, could this be said of the reigns of *Diocletian* or *Julian*, when the Gothic ten kings had received no authority *as kings*, in the Apocalyptic sense of the word?<sup>3</sup> And, as to the *character* of the thing, could it be said of the Gothic

<sup>1</sup> See p. 589 *suprà*.

<sup>2</sup> Mr. Miley overcomes the difficulty by silently adopting the reading *μετὰ τοῦ θηρίου*, *after the Beast*; though a reading unauthorized by Greek MSS. and refuted by the very symbol of the horns being *upon the Beast's head*. See, says he, (ii. 122,) the marvellous fulfilment! "The destroyers of the Western Empire of Rome were all adventurer kings, daring chiefs from the wilds of the North and North-East; who all succeeded in erecting certain fabrics of power *upon the ruins of the Empire*."

<sup>3</sup> They were rather as yet undiademed horns. Apoc. xii. 3.



settlements in the empire, when sometimes terrible and destructive, (like that of the Visi-Goths under Valens) that it was a *giving their power with one accord to the Romans!*

Then turn we to the *second Beast*. And let me here simply ask, How could Bossuet's Pagan Philosophers, zealots that blasphemed Christ as the Galilean, answer to the symbol of a Beast with a *lamb-skin* covering: the recognized scriptural emblem under the *Old Testament* of false prophets who yet professed to be prophets of the true God;<sup>1</sup> under the *New Testament* of such as would hypocritically pretend to be Christians?<sup>2</sup>

Once more, as to the *Woman*. And here, 1. instead of the word *πορνῆ*, *harlot*, fixing her to be *Rome Pagan*, so as Bossuet asserts, not *Christian Rome* apostatized, it most fitly suits the latter; being applied in the Septuagint to apostatizing Judah,<sup>3</sup> in Matthew to an unfaithful wife.<sup>4</sup> 2. What the *mystery* to make St. John so marvel with a mighty astonishment, if the emblem meant *Rome Pagan*?<sup>5</sup> Did he not know *Rome Pagan* to be a persecutor; know it alike by his own experience, and that of all his brotherhood? 3. What of the total and eternal destruction predicated of the Apocalyptic Babylon, "*the smoke of it going up even εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰῶνων, for ever and for ever,*"<sup>6</sup> if there was meant merely the brief temporary desolation of *Rome Pagan*, in transitu to *Rome Papal*? 4. What of its being afterwards the abode of all unclean beasts and daemons? Would Bossuet, observes Vitranga, have these to be the Popes and Cardinals of *Papal Rome*? 5. Was it really *Rome Pagan* that was desolated by the Goths; so as Bossuet and his followers would have it? Surely, if there be a fact clear in history, it is this, that it was *Rome Christianized in profession*, I might almost say, *Rome Papal*, that was the subject of these desolations.<sup>7</sup>

As this last point is one which, if proved, utterly overthrows the whole Bossuetan or Roman-Catholic Apocalyptic Præterist Scheme, the Romanists have been at great pains to represent the fact otherwise. So Bossuet in his Chap. iii. 12—16; and Mr. Miley too, just recently, in his *Rome Pagan and Papal*. "It is well nigh a century

<sup>1</sup> Compare Zech. xiii. 4.

<sup>2</sup> Compare Matt. vii. 15, 22.

<sup>3</sup> Isa. i. 21, &c.

<sup>4</sup> Matt. v. 32, xix. 9.

<sup>5</sup> Apoc. xvii. 6.

<sup>6</sup> Apoc. xix. 3.

<sup>7</sup> Of these objections to Bossuet's theory I find 1, 2, 3 are urged by Lambert, ii. 329, 341, 345; and 2, 3, 5 by Lacunza, i. 211—241.

since the triumph of the labarum," says the latter writer in one of his vivid sketches, with reference to the epoch of Alaric's first attack on Rome, "and Rome still wears the aspect of a *Pagan* city:—one hundred and fifty-two temples, and one hundred and eighty smaller shrines, are still sacred to the heathen gods, and *used for their public worship.*"<sup>1</sup> On what authority Mr. M. makes such an assertion I know not. Bossuet takes care not quite so far to commit himself. The facts of the case are, I believe, as follows. Constantine did not authoritatively abolish Paganism: but he so showed disfavour to it that it rapidly sunk into discredit in the empire; less however at Rome than elsewhere. With Julian came a partial and short-lived revival of Paganism; followed on his death by a reaction in favour of Christianity. But "from that period up to the fall of the empire a *hostile sect*, which regarded itself as unjustly stripped of its ancient honours, invoked the vengeance of the gods on the heads of the Government, exulted in the public calamities, and probably hastened them by its intrigues." So Sismondi, with his usual accuracy, as quoted by Mr. Miley.<sup>2</sup> Of this *sect* were various members of the Roman senate. On Theodosius' becoming sole emperor, i. e. emperor of the *West* as well as East, one of his first measures, A.D. 392, was *to forbid the worship of idols on pain of death.*<sup>3</sup> At Rome, however, by a certain tacit license, or connivance, heathen worship was still in a measure permitted: until in 394 himself visiting Rome, and finding a reluctance to abolish what remained of Pagan rites on the part of many of the senators, Theodosius *withdrew the public funds* by which they had been supported. On this the old Pagan worship was discontinued:<sup>4</sup> and, the Pagan temples having in many places soon after been destroyed by the zeal of Christians, the very fact of Pagan *worship* having been discontinued was given by Honorius, the Western Emperor, as a reason for not destroying

<sup>1</sup> Rome Pagan and Papal, Vol. ii. p. 103.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. p. 108.

<sup>3</sup> So Gieseler, Vol. i. p. 187; to whose account, pp. 186—191, I here refer generally.

<sup>4</sup> So Zosimus v. 38: Την δημοσιαν δαπανην τοις ιεροις χορηγειν αρησαμενος, απηλαινωτο μεν ιερεις και ιερεια, κατελιμπανετο δε πασης ιερουργιας τα τεμενη.

Prudentius says, as to 'the number of the *Pagans*, that they were about the year 406, ten years after Theodosius' death, "vix pauca ingenia, et *pars hominum rarissima.*" Compare Baronius' statement of the effect of Theodosius' anti-Pagan edicts and acts, as quoted already by me Vol. iii. p. 128, Note<sup>3</sup>. "Idolatriam, ut percussum multis ietibus anguem, caput rursus extollentem penitus extinguendum curavit Theodosius."

the temple *fabrics*.<sup>1</sup>—Such was the state of things when Alaric first invaded Italy. And it was only in 409, after he had begun the siege of Rome, and *God's judgment began to be felt*, that the Pagan *faction* or *sect*, spoken of by Sismōndi, stirred itself up: and raising the cry that the calamity came *in consequence of the gods of old Rome having been neglected*,<sup>2</sup> prevailed on the authorities, including Pope Innocent himself, to sacrifice to them in the capitol and other temples.<sup>3</sup> But this was a comparatively solitary act. As the judgment of the Gothic desolations went on, it was only *in secret* that the worship of the heathen gods was kept up; and this in reference to such more trivial Pagan rites, as taking auguries.<sup>4</sup> The dominant religion, that which was alone legalized in Rome, as well as elsewhere throughout the empire, and whose worship was alone celebrated openly and with pomp, was the Christian religion with the Pope as its head. Insomuch that in 450, just at the epoch of Genseric and Attila, Pope Leo, in an address to the people of Rome on St. Peter and St. Paul's day, thus characterized Rome and the Roman people:—"These are they that have advanced you to the glory of being a holy nation, a chosen people, a priestly and royal city: so as that thou shouldest be, through the seat of Peter, the head of the world; and with wider rule through religion than by mere earthly domination."<sup>5</sup>

Was it then *Rome Pagan*, or *Rome incipiently Papal*, that was the subject of Alaric's first attack, and of the subsequent ravages of

<sup>1</sup> "Ut profanus ritus jam salubri lege submovimus, ita festos conventus civium . . non patimur submoveri:" and again; "Ædes, illicitis rebus vacuus, nostrarum beneficio sanctionum, ne quis conetur evertere."

<sup>2</sup> So Zosimus iv. 59: Του ἰουηπολικου θεσμου ληξαντος, και των αλλων ὅσα της πατριου παραδοσεως ην εν αμελειᾳ κειμενων, ἡ Ἰρωμαιων επικρατεια . . βαρβαρων οικητηριων γεγονε. So too Augustine in his C. D. v. 23.

<sup>3</sup> Αναγκαιον εδοκει τοις ἑλληνιζουσι της Συγκλητου θθειν εν τῷ Καπιτωλιῳ και τοις αλλοις ναοις. So Sozomen ix. 6. To which Zosimus adds; ὁ δε Ιννοκεντιος, την της πολεως σωτηριαν εμπροσθεν της οικειας ποιησαμενος δοξης, λαθρα εφηκεν αυτοις ποιειν ἀπερ ισασι. v. 14. Where mark the ἑλληνιζουτες, as characterizing those of the Senators who were most bent on sacrificing to the ancient gods; and the εφηκεν, as marking the Pope's authority even at that time in Rome. His consent was needed, asked for, and indeed given.

<sup>4</sup> So Salvian, A.D. 440: "Numquid non consulibus et pulli adhuc gentilium sacrilegiorum more pascuntur, et volantis pennæ auguria quæruntur?"

<sup>5</sup> "Isti sunt qui te ad hanc gloriam provexerunt; ut gens sancta, populus electus, civitas sacerdotalis et regia, per sacram beati Petri sedem caput orbis effecta, latius præsideres religione divinâ quàm dominatione terrenâ." I have quoted this elsewhere; Vol. iii. pp. 154, 155.

Genseric, Odoacer, and Totilas? <sup>1</sup> I think the reader will agree with me that *Pope Leo* himself has pretty well settled that question; and therewith given the *coup de grace* to Bossuet's and Miley's *Roman Catholic Version* of the Præterist Apocalyptic Scheme.

And so I conclude my critique. In concluding, however, I must beg my readers not to forget another and quite different absurdity that attends the Scheme; viz. that of crowding all the magnificent Old Testament promises of the final promised blessedness on earth into some minimum of time after Antichrist's destruction: one Apocalyptically not express at all, according to Bossuet; <sup>2</sup> and in Daniel only perhaps by the 45 days. But on this it will suffice that I refer my readers to the remarks on it of the Roman Catholic writers Père Lambert or Lacunza. <sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Were the continuance of certain old *Pagan rites and customs* by the Roman populace an evidence of Rome's Paganism, Mr. Miley must date its *Christianization* far later than the times of the Goths, or of Pope Gregory. In A.D. 743 we find Boniface writing to the Pope Zachary, (see Maitland's *Dark Ages*, p. 155,) that reports were brought from Rome of *heathenish customs celebrated in Rome hard by the Church of St. Peter*; and that, seeing these things performed at Rome, he could not persuade the Germans or Franks that they were sins, or without ecclesiastical sanction. Zachary acknowledges in his Reply, that "through the Devil's instigation these evils had indeed ever and anon sprouted afresh." 2 See p. 505 *suprà*.

<sup>3</sup> See pp. 531, 539 *suprà*.

I must not omit to add here a passing notice of *Professor Lee's Præterist Scheme*; one on certain main historic points resembling *Bossuet's*, but with very marked peculiarities. The Scheme was originally propounded by him in a work on Prophecy printed in 1830; and to which I referred, under this head, in the 2nd and 3rd Editions of the *Horæ*. In 1849 he published an elaborately revised, corrected, and enlarged Edition of the Work; from which I draw the present brief sketch first given in my 4th Edition.

It is divided by Professor Lee into 3 Parts: the 1st on the *Covenants*; the 2nd on *Daniel's Prophecies*; the 3rd on the *Apocalypse*.

The object of the 1st is to show that the covenant of promise originally made to Adam, then renewed to Noah, and then more particularly to Abraham, had reference to, and was completely fulfilled in, the establishment on earth of the Christian Church, or Church of the New Covenant: it being only the believing "remnant" of the Jews, or true Jewish children of Abraham, that have an interest in it, in common with his adopted children from the Gentiles; and the idea of any future millennial dispensation, in which the converted Jewish people shall have peculiar privileges and honour, altogether a delusion.

As regards the *time* of this establishment of the Christian Church, which is the grand theme of the Old Testament prophecy, Dr. Lee infers it chiefly from the well-known prophecy of the 70 weeks in Daniel ix., compared with our Lord's reference to it in Matt. xxiv. Said Daniel; "Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people, and upon thy holy city, to finish transgression, and to make an end of sins, and to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness, and to seal up vision and prophecy, and to anoint the most holy;" i. e. the new Holy of Holies, or Church of the New Covenant. This 70 weeks was *no definite chronological term*; but an *indefinite* period, borrowed perhaps from the 70 years of the Babylonish captivity, and of which the events would make all sufficiently clear. Which events were



## CHAPTER II.

## EXAMINATION OF THE FUTURISTS' APOCALYPTIC SCHEME.

The *Futurists'* is the *second*, or rather *third*, grand anti-Protestant Apocalyptic Scheme. I might perhaps have thought it sufficient to

four:—in the first 7 weeks Jerusalem to be rebuilt; within the next 62 Messiah to be cut off; in the midst of the last 70th week the Jewish city and temple to be destroyed; and with its end the power of "the desolator" (i. e. the desolating Roman heathen power) to end. So Daniel. Also Christ; "When ye see the abomination of desolation spoken of by Daniel the prophet, &c., then know that *the end thereof* is nigh;" and again, in more general terms, "then shall *the end* come:" and again, "Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles till *the times of the Gentiles* be fulfilled." Comparing this with Daniel it is to be inferred that *the end*, or *time of the end*, or *last days*, as it is called in many other prophecies, is the period coincident with the last of Daniel's 70 mystical weeks: and that it comprehends within it two catastrophes; first that of Jerusalem and the Jewish reprobate nation; then that of the heathen Romans, who were God's instrument in desolating Jerusalem. Out of which latter people other prophecies of Daniel foretold the rising of a special persecutor of God's saints, and special blasphemer of God, with the assigned duration of  $3\frac{1}{2}$  times; that is of the latter half, or latter  $3\frac{1}{2}$  days, of Daniel's 70th week.

Then comes in the *Apocalypse* the development more particularly of the events of this 70th mystic week; including its two catastrophes, and the great persecutor's career that was to signalize its latter half. The seven Seals, seven Trumpets, and seven Vials all synchronize; and in each of them the successive sevens have reference to, and unfold successively, the events of the seven days (= Ezekiel's seven years) of this 70th week.—Thus the 1st *Seal* is Christ and his apostles in their successful gospel-preaching; the 2nd, the martyr-bloodshed, from the first preaching of the apostles to about the beginning of the Jewish war; the 3rd, the dearths preceding the siege, and during the siege of Jerusalem: the 4th, as including the 4th day of Daniel's 70th week, must consequently include and refer to *the fall of Jerusalem*, which was to take place in the *middle* of the last week: the 5th, tells of further persecutions and martyrdoms of the saints, chiefly from the heathen persecutors: the 6th, figures all God's judgments to the end of the 70th week; judgments alike on Jews and Gentiles. Within this 6th Seal there is included the palmbearing vision of the elect out of all nations, singing the song of salvation. This however is an anticipation of the 7th Seal, figuring the sabbath of rest; and of which the half-hour's silence marks the closing end.—As regards the *Trumpets*, without entering into full detail, the three first depict troubles until the bisecting epoch and event of the fall of Jerusalem; while the 4th Trumpet, with its 3rd of the sun smitten, marks the beginning of the distress of nations, the Jews included among the rest. The locusts of the 5th Trumpet are a kind of commencement of the plague of the 6th: in which 6th Satan, let loose in the post-millennial loosing, (his binding having been from the commencement of the apostles' preaching to the fall of Jerusalem,) gathers his powers against Christ's cause and people. Next after this follows a symbolic casting-out of the Jews into the outer-court, as no longer of God's true temple; and also a sketch of Christ's witnesses as, from the time of the 1st Seal, and for all the first  $3\frac{1}{2}$  days of the 70th week, bearing testimony for him in sackcloth and trial, until assailed in the latter  $3\frac{1}{2}$  days of it by the Beast from the abyss, or heathen Roman power; and then being killed, but presently after revived and raised to elevation, under Constantine.—Which retrogressive and supplementary sketch being concluded, the 6th is followed by the 7th Trumpet, and its closing song of triumph.

refer the reader to Mr. Birks' masterly Work in refutation of it,<sup>1</sup> but for the consideration that my own Work would be incomplete without some such examination of this futurist Scheme, as of the Schemes preceding : moreover that on more than one point (chiefly as regards the 6th Seal and the Apocalyptic Beast) Mr. Birks' own views, of some of which I have spoken elsewhere,<sup>2</sup> must necessarily, in my mind, have prevented his doing full justice to the argument.

In the sketch thus given the reader sees pretty much the peculiarities and main points of Dr. Lee's Apocalyptic theory. But it may be well to add a notice of one or two other matters as explained by him ; more especially in Apoc. xii., xiii., and xx. In Apoc. xii. then, the travelling woman is the *true Zion* ; the man child, *Christ*, in his character as the Head of the Church : while the war in heaven symbolizes Satan's wrath and power, as put forth in all its energy against both Christ and Christ's apostles, even to the end of the apostles' lives : a power met however by a still greater power in Christ and his apostles ; (as it was said, " I give you power to tread on all the power of the enemy ; ") until at length in the destruction of the reprobate Jerusalem, till then Satan's high and sacred seat, he was cast as it were to the earth ; and forced to make use of the lower *heathen* agency against the Christian Church. So in Apoc. xiii. he raises up the Beast against the holy remnant of the woman's seed ; in other words, the persecuting Roman heathen power, from Domitian down to Diocletian inclusive : the which synchronizes with the *latter* half of the 70th week ; as his war against Christians through the *Jews* did with the former half of it.—But now turn to Apoc. xx. According to the Professor's millennial view we find that it is during the same first half of the week, and so during all his energetic warring aforesaid against the Church through Jewish agency, from the beginning of the apostles' preaching even to the fall of Jerusalem, that the Devil has been all along bound and sealed up in the abyss, so that he might no more deceive the nations !! As to the Devil's loosing after this, for a little season, it is the time of his opposing and persecuting the Church through the agency of heathen<sup>a</sup> Roman emperors : that same persecution that is meant by the symbols of the 6th Trumpet, as well as by the symbol also of the Beast in Apoc. xiii. For the hour, day, month, and year of the one = the 3½ times, the time, times, and half a time, of the other : = also Ezekiel's 7 years, = the same prophet's 7 months. (Ezek. xxxix. 9, 12.)\* Finally, the destruction of Satan and his hosts, on their compassing the beloved city, signifies the fall of the Pagan Roman power : and the Apocalyptic new heaven and new earth, the Christian Church as established after Constantine.

Dr. Lee has great confidence in these views. " It is as clear," says he, " as words can make it that the *thousand years* (or *millennium*) must have constituted the apostolic period ; and have continued to the fall of the temple, and commencement of the (heathen Roman) persecutions : also that the general encompassing of the camp of the saints, the beloved city, must signify the persecutions generally under the reign of the *little horn* ; and that the fire which consumed the besiegers can be no other than the burning flame of Daniel, to which the body of the Beast was to be consigned : and, lastly, that this destruction by fire should close this warfare, and deliver up the universal and everlasting empire *de facto* to the *Son of Man*." †

My respect for Dr. Lee has induced me not to pass over his Apocalyptic theory without notice. The same respect makes me glad to think that there is no such probability of its ever making way with the public, as to render necessary my criticising it.

<sup>1</sup> The Work referred to at p. 557 *suprà*.

<sup>2</sup> Viz. in my Critique in the Appendix to Vol. i.

\* See Lee's Chart, facing p. 231.

† *Ibid.* p. 472.

—Besides which, there is otherwise abundantly sufficient difference between us to prevent all appearance of my trenching on his ground.<sup>1</sup>

The *futurist* Scheme, as I have elsewhere stated,<sup>2</sup> was first, or nearly first, propounded about the year 1585 by the Jesuit Ribera; as the fittest one whereby to turn aside the Protestant application of the Apocalyptic prophecy from the Church of Rome. In England and Ireland of late years it has been brought into vogue chiefly by Mr. (now Dr.) S. R. Maitland and Mr. Burgh; followed by the writer of four of the Oxford Tracts on *Antichrist*.<sup>3</sup> Its general characteristic is to view the whole Apocalypse, at least from after the Epistles to the Seven Churches, as a representation of *the events of the consummation and second advent*, all still future: the Israel depicted in it being the *literal Israel*; the *temple*, Apoc. xi., a literal rebuilt Jewish temple at Jerusalem; and the Antichrist, or Apocalyptic Beast under his last head, a *personal infidel Antichrist*,<sup>4</sup> fated to reign and triumph over the saints for  $3\frac{1}{2}$  years, (the days in the chronological periods being all *literal days*,) until Christ's coming shall destroy him. Of which advent of Christ, and events immediately precursive to it, the symbols of the six first *Seals* are supposed to exhibit a prefiguration singularly like what is given in Matt. xxiv.; and therefore strongly corroborative of the futurist view of the Seals and the Apocalypse.—Thus, while agreeing fully with the Præterists on the *day-day* principle, and partly with them as to the *literal Israel's* place in the prophecy, they are the direct antipodes of the Præterists in their view of the *time* to which the main part of the Apocalypse relates, and the person or power answering to the symbol of the Apocalyptic Beast: the one assigning all to the long distant past, the other to the yet distant future. And here is in fact a great advantage that they have over the Præterists, that, instead of being *in any measure* chained down by the facts of history, they can draw on the unlimited powers of fancy, wherewith to devise in the dreamy future whatever may seem to them to fit the sacred prophecy.

<sup>1</sup> It may be right to add that the main part of the present Section formed the conclusion of my Chapter on the *Year-day* in the first Edition: (from p. 982 to 1007:) which Edition, though *published* after Mr. Birks' work, was, up to the end of Part V., including the Chapter spoken of, *printed* some considerable time before it; and indeed, in that incomplete state, was in Mr. Birks' hands, as well as Mr. Biekersteth's, while the former was engaged in writing his book.

Mr. Birks however made a point, as he has told me, of not reading that particular Chapter; in order that his testimony and statement might be altogether independent of mine.

<sup>2</sup> See p. 480 *suprà*.

<sup>3</sup> See p. 555 *suprà*.

<sup>4</sup> Mr. Burgh's peculiar way of stating this will be noted presently.

Notwithstanding this we shall, I doubt not, find abundantly sufficient evidence in the sacred prophecy to repel and refute the crude theory; whether in its *more direct and simple form*, or in any such *modified form* as some writers of late have preferred to advocate. The consideration of the *latter* I reserve for another Section. That of the *former* will be the subject of the Section on which we are now entering.

### § 1. ORIGINAL UNMODIFIED FUTURIST SCHEME.

I purpose to discuss it with reference separately to each of the four points just noticed as its most marked characteristics:—*viz.* *the supposed instant plunge of the prophecy into the far distant future of Christ's coming and the consummation;—the supposed parallelism of the subjects of the Apocalyptic Seals with the successive signs specified by Christ in his prophecy on Mount Olivet as what would precede and usher in his coming;—the supposed literal intent of the Israel mentioned in the Apocalyptic prophecy;—and the supposed time, place, and character of its intended Antichrist.*

#### I. THE SUPPOSED INSTANT PLUNGE OF THE APOCALYPTIC PROPHECY INTO THE DISTANT FUTURE OF THE CONSUMMATION.

Now, to begin, there seems here in the very idea of the thing a something so directly contrary to all God's previous dealings with his people, and to all that He has himself led us to expect of Him, as to make it all but incredible, unless some clear and direct evidence be producible in proof of it. We read in Amos (iii. 7), "Surely the Lord God will do nothing, but he revealeth his secret unto his servants the prophets." And of this God's principle of action all Scripture history is but a continued exemplification: his mode having been to give the grand facts of prophecy in the first instance, and then, as time went on, to furnish more and more of particulars and detail: so, gradually but slowly, filling up prophetically that part of the original prophetic outline in which the Church for the time being might have a special interest; but always with the grand main point kept also in view. Thus to *Adam*, after the fall, there was revealed God's mighty purpose of the redemption of our fallen world through the seed of the woman: to *Noah*, together with declaration that this original covenanted promise was renewed to him, the prediction of



the coming judgment of the flood: to *Abraham*, together with similar renewal of the grand covenant respecting Him in whom all the families of the earth should be blessed, the more particular prediction and promise, also, as to his natural seed becoming a nation, and occupying Canaan: to *Moses*, when leading Abraham's family, now become a nation, from Egypt, together with reminiscence of the great Prophet like him, that was to come, sundry predictions also about the several tribes; and further, respecting Israel nationally, the prediction of its apostasy from God in the course of time, and consequent temporary casting off, captivity, and return. So too again, long after, when the time of their first captivity drew near, together with repetition of the same great promise, which in the interim had been ever more and more particularly dwelt on, e. g. especially by *David* and *Isaiah*,—I say as the time of Israel's first captivity drew near, then there was predicted by *Jeremiah* its appointed term, 70 years; and then again, just at the close of the 70 years of that captivity, *Daniel's* memorable prophecy of there being appointed yet 70 weeks, or 490 years, until Messiah should come, and be cut off though not for himself, and the Jewish city and sanctuary be destroyed by a Prince that should arise: a prophecy this last which *Christ himself*, after coming at the time so defined, expanded, when speaking to his disciples on Mount Olivet, into the full and detailed prediction of the destruction of Jerusalem. Such, I say, had been the method pursued by God for above 4000 years, in the prophetic communications to his people, through all the Old Testament history. And now then when the prophetic Spirit spoke again, and for the last time, by the mouth of his apostles, more especially of the apostle St. John, what do the Futurists contend for, but that God's whole system is to be supposed reversed; that in regard, not of smaller events, or events in which the Church was but slightly concerned, but of events in which it was essentially and most intimately concerned, and of magnitude such as to blazon the page of each history of Christendom, the whole 1800 years that have passed subsequently are to be viewed as a blank in prophecy; the period having been purposely skipped over by the Divine Spirit, in order at once to plunge the reader into the events and times of the consummation.

The case is made stronger against them by comparing more particularly the nearest existing parallels to the Apocalyptic prophecy

in respect of orderly arrangement, I mean the prophecies of Daniel. For we see that they, one and all, prefigured events that were to commence immediately, or very nearly, from the date of the vision. So in that of *the symbolic image*, Dan. ii. ; which began its figurations with the head of gold, or Nebuchadnezzar. So in that of *the four Beasts*, Dan. vii. ; which also began from the Babylonian Empire then regnant. So in that of *the ram and the goat*, Dan. viii., which began from the Persian Empire's greatness ; the vision having been given just immediately before the establishment of the Persian kingdom in power. So, once more, in Dan. xi. : where the commencement is made so regularly from the Persian Prince "Darius the Mede," then reigning, that it is said, "There shall stand up yet three kings in Persia ; and the fourth shall be richer than they all, and shall stir up all against Greece ;" i. e. Xerxes. Strange indeed were there in the Apocalypse such a contrast and contrariety, as the Futurists suppose, to all these Danielic precedents !—Moreover, the fact of its following those precedents seems expressly declared by the revealing Angel, at the opening of the vision in Apoc. iv., "Come up, and I will (now) show thee *what must happen μετὰ ταῦτα, after these things.*" A statement evidently referring to Christ's own original division of the subjects of the revelation into "*the things which St. John had first seen,*" (in the primary vision,) "*the things that then were,*" (viz. the then existing state of the seven Churches,) and "*the things which were to happen after them.*"—Thus our inference as to the speedy sequence of the future first figured in the Apocalypse upon the time when the Apocalypse was actually exhibited, seems to me not only natural, and accordant with all the nearest Scripture precedents, but necessary. And it both agrees with, and is confirmed by, the other divine declarations, made alike at the first commencement and final close of the Apocalypse ; to the effect that the things predicted were *quickly* to come to pass, the time of their fulfilment *near at hand*.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Apoc. i. 1 ; "The revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave him, to show to his servants what must *shortly* come to pass : " Apoc. xxii. 10 ; "Seal not the sayings of the prophecy of this Book, for the time is *at hand.*"

Let me quote the famous critic Michaelis on this point. "If it be objected that the prophecies in the Apocalypse are not yet fulfilled, that they are therefore not fully understood, and that hence arises the difference of opinion in respect to their meaning, I answer, that if these prophecies are not yet fulfilled, it is wholly impossible that the Apocalypse should be a divine work ; since the author expressly declares, Chap. i., that it contains 'things which must shortly come to pass.' Consequently either a great part of them, I will not say all, must have been fulfilled ; or the

And what then the Futurists' escape from such arguments? What the authority for their unnatural Apocalyptic hypothesis? On the argument from the analogy of Scripture, and specially of Daniel, no answer that I know of has been given.<sup>1</sup> With regard however to those statements, "To show to his servants *what must shortly come to pass*," and again, "Seal not the sayings of this Book, *for the time is at hand*," Dr. S. R. Maitland replies that, since *Christ's coming* is often said in Scripture to be *quickly*,<sup>2</sup> and the *day of the Lord* to be *at hand*,<sup>3</sup> albeit very far distant, we may similarly suppose the whole subject of the Apocalyptic predictions to be distant, though prophesied of as "shortly to come to pass."<sup>4</sup> An answer little satisfactory, as it seems to me. For the principle it goes on seems to be this;—that because two particular cognate predictive phrases have the word *quickly*, or its tantamount, attached to them, to each of which phrases a double meaning attaches,—a lesser and a greater,—a nearer and a more distant,<sup>5</sup>—the former typical perhaps of the latter, and

author's declaration that they should shortly be completed is not consistent with matter of fact."—Introduction to the New Testament, Marsh's Edition, Chap. xxxiii. § v. p. 503.

<sup>1</sup> I cannot except Mr. Burgh; though, at p. 431, he seems to refer to Daniel's pre-figurations of the *Image* and the *Four Beasts*, as if almost constituting a precedent for such a mighty prophetic gap, *because of the last empire being most dwelt on in the explanation*. For at p. 248 he admits them to figure the four Antichristian empires that were to last *from Daniel's own time to Messiah*; and consequently that there is in these two prophecies no prophetic gap whatsoever.—As to the longer dwelling on the fourth Empire in Daniel, there is just the same in the Apocalypse; I mean on the usual Protestant explanation of its symbol of the ten-horned Beast figuring that empire in its last and Papal form.

<sup>2</sup> Apoc. iii. 11, xxii. 7, 12, 20.

<sup>3</sup> Dr. M.'s references are to Isa. xiii. 6, Obad. 15, Joel i. 15, ii. 1, Zeph. i. 7, 14. In all these cases "the day of Jehovah" is the phrase used.

<sup>4</sup> Answer to Digby, pp. 46, 47.

<sup>5</sup> In illustration of the *former* of the two phrases being sometimes used in the *nearer* and *lesser* sense of Christ's coming to execute some particular act of judgment, during the world's present existence, I may refer to Apoc. ii. 5; where Christ in his address to the Church at Ephesus says, "Repent, and do thy first works; or else I *will come unto thee quickly*, and will remove thy candlestick out of its place." So again Luke xx. 16; "The Lord of the vineyard *shall come*, and shall destroy those husbandmen, and will give the vineyard to others." Also in Matt. xxiv., and the parallel passages in Mark and Luke, *Christ's coming* seems to be used, *primarily* at least, of his coming to destroy Jerusalem: (see my next head:) and sometimes too, *subordinately*, of Christ's coming to take his saints to himself at death. So (comparing Phil. i. 23) we may perhaps *primarily* construe it in the passage, "Behold I come quickly;" "Amen! Even so! Come, Lord Jesus; come quickly!"

Similarly, as I need hardly remind the reader, *the day of the Lord* is also frequently used in the Old Testament of God's interposition to inflict some particular temporal judgment on a guilty nation: e. g. that of the *locusts*, noted in Joel i. 15, which is one of the passages cited by Maitland.

this latter avowedly veiled in mystery, in order to its being ever looked for by the Church,—that because *these* have the word *quickly* attached in dubious sense to them, therefore events of a quite different character, and that are altogether most distant in time, nay and a long concatenated series of events too, may be also so spoken of:—a principle this on which all direct meaning of such words as *quickly*, or *at hand*, in sacred Scripture might, I conceive, be gainsayed.—Nor indeed is it from these adverbial expressions, insulated and alone, that the whole difficulty arises. For we have further to observe that the events Apocalyptically prefigured to St. John as first and next to happen in the coming future, are connected and linked on in a very marked manner with the then actually existing state of the seven Asiatic Churches, as the *terminus à quo* of all that was to follow: it being said by the Angel, forthwith after the long and detailed description of them in Christ's seven dictated Epistles, to the Churches, "Come up, and I will show thee what events are to happen *after these things*;" ἃ δεῖ γενέσθαι μετὰ ταῦτα—just like the defined present *terminus à quo* in Dan. xi. 2, "There shall stand up *yet* three kings in Persia."

But stop! Are we quite sure of our *terminus*? Behold the futurist critic and expositor, as if by sleight of hand, shifts the scene itself on the seven Asiatic Churches, which I spoke of as constituting the *terminus à quo* of all that followed in the prophecy, some two thousand years, or nearly so, forward in the world's history. "I was in the Spirit on the Lord's day" (Apoc. i. 10), he explains to mean, "I was rapt by the Spirit into the great day of the Lord."<sup>1</sup> And so, instead of merely contesting the direct sequence of what

<sup>1</sup> "In reply to this," (viz. the objection against Dr. M. of making things still future of which it was declared that they should *shortly* come to pass,) "I must say that I believe the great subject of the Apocalypse to be the events of that period which is called in various parts of the Scripture *the day of the Lord*, and by St. John *the Lord's day*; and that the Apostle was carried forward 'in spirit' to that day, and enabled and directed to describe what shall then come to pass."—"Must he not have been carried forward in spirit into the day of the Lord," says Dr. M. elsewhere; "when in the verses preceding he exclaimed, Behold he cometh with clouds?" Jewish Expos. Aug. 1823. So too Todd, p. 59.

R. D., a correspondent of the Dublin Christian Examiner, of this same school, has urged very much the same translation, and same explanation of the Apocalyptic text. See the number for February, 1845, p. 381.—*Mr. Burgh*, too, p. 18, speaks of it approvingly, though doubtfully.—And *Mr. Kelly*, a writer on the Apocalypse subsequent to my 1st Edition, adopts the same view even more strongly; and advertises his Book as an exposition, "not on Mr. Elliott's principle, but in the light of *the day of the Lord*."



was prefigured in the Apocalyptic visions of the future, beginning Apoc. iv. 1, from the definite commencing epoch of St. John and his seven Asiatic Churches,—instead of this, I say, he takes the bolder ground of making the great day of Christ's coming to judgment to be the avowed subject of all that followed St. John's announcement of being in the Spirit; including *first and foremost*, of course, the description in the seven Epistles of the seven Churches themselves. But how so? Is this the first mention of these Churches; so as to leave open the idea of their being Churches non-existent until the supposed prefigured time of the end? Assuredly not. The Apostle's salutation is presented to them in Apoc. i. 4, five verses prior to his announcement of being in the Spirit, in terms just like St. Paul's to the then existing Churches of Thessalonica or Philippi; "John to the seven Churches in Asia, Grace be unto you!"—Besides which who can help being struck with the violence done by Dr. M. to the Greek original, in construing its simple *verb substantive*, with the preposition *in* and *ablative* following, "*I was in the Spirit on (or in) the Lord's day*,"<sup>1</sup> as if it were *a verb of motion*, with *into* and an *accusative* following?<sup>2</sup>—Dr. Maitland argues indeed, as "a sufficient reason" in favour of so rendering the clause, that the *Sunday*, or Christian sabbath, was not in St. John's time, or till two centuries afterwards, called *the Lord's day*, ἡ Κυριακή ἡμέρα.<sup>3</sup> But this will be found on examination to be a statement altogether incorrect.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Ἐγενεομην εν Πνευματι εν τη Κυριακη ἡμέρα. Apoc. i. 10.

<sup>2</sup> Compare Matt. iv. 1; "Then was Jesus led up by the Spirit into the wilderness;" ἀνηχθη ὑπο του Πνευματος εις την ἔρημον' or the parallel passage Luke iv. 1, ηγετο εν τῷ Πνευματι εις την ἔρημον.—also 2 Cor. xii. 4; "He was caught up to Paradise;" ἠρπαγη εις του Παραδεισου. Apoc. xvii. 3; Ἀπηνεγκε με εις ερημον εν Πνευματι. Apoc. xxi. 10; Ἀπηνεγκε με εν Πνευματι επ' ορος μεγα. &c.—Strange that this palpable grammatical difficulty should never have occurred to Dr. M., Todd, or Burgh!—In sequence to Apoc. xvii. 3, argues Dr. M. (ap. Todd, p. 297,) might not John have said, "*I was in the spirit in the wilderness!*" Yes! but only after telling by *a verb of motion*, and the preposition *into*, how he got there.

<sup>3</sup> "A principal, and, as it appears to me, sufficient reason for this opinion is, that this title (*the Lord's day*, ἡ Κυριακή ἡμέρα) is not used for the first day of the week in the New Testament, or in any writer that I can find before the time of Constantine: and in fact Nicephorus tells us that it was he who directed that the day which the Jews considered the first day of the week, and which the Greeks dedicated to the sun, should be called the *Lord's day*." Answer to Digby, p. 46.

<sup>4</sup> *Suicer*, on the word *Κυριακή*, after quoting the passage from Nicephorus to which Dr. M. refers, 'Ἦν Ἑβραῖοι πρώτην εἶχον ἡμέραν, Ἕλληνες δ' ἡλίω ἀνεθεντο, Κυριακήν κατωνομάσαε, (sc. ὁ Κωνσταντῆνιος,) observes; "Hoc falsum esse evincunt testimonia Patrum Constantino antiquiorum." And he adds a suggestion that Nicephorus may perhaps have only meant that Constantine brought the appellation into

Rather it will appear that *the great day of the Lord*, or *judgment day*, to which Dr. M. would apply it, has never, either in the Septuagint or the New Testament, the peculiar appellation *Κυριακη* attached to

public use, and set it apart as a holiday; a fact noted by Sozomen in his Ecclesiastical History, Book I. 8.—Further, in proof of Fathers older than Constantine applying the Apocalyptic appellative to the Sunday, or Christian sabbath, Suicer cites *Ignatius*, calling it in his Epistle to the Magnesians *την κυριακην, την αναστασιμον, την βασιλιδα, την υπατον πασων των ημερων* and also an inscription of the age of Alexander Severus;

Επει Αλεξανδρου Καισαρος  
 Τω Α Αρχη  
 ; Αι Κυριακαι του Πασχα  
 Κατα ετος.

To which I may add, that *Ignatius*, in his Epistle to the Philadelphians, speaks against fasting on *the Lord's day*, *Ει τις Κυριακην η σαββατον υηστευει, πλην εως σαββατου*—that *Irenæus* states, *Το εν τη Κυριακη μη κλινειν γονυ*, the not bending the knee on the *Lord's day*, to be a symbol of the resurrection:—that *Clement of Alexandria* (Strom. vii. 12) speaks of the true Gnostic observing *the Lord's day*; *Κυριακην εκεινην την ημεραν ποιει*—that the Commentary on the Gospels by *Theophilus* (Patriarch of Antioch under the second Antonine, as Jerome informs us) reports the third day from that of Christ's crucifixion to have been, from the resurrection of Christ on it, called *the Lord's day*; “à resurrectione Domini *Dominicus* appellatur:” (I quote from the Latin translation, B. P. M. ii. ii. 171:)—that *Melito*, Bishop of Sardis, a contemporary of Theophilus, is said to have written a Treatise *Περι Κυριακης, on the Lord's day*; (so Euseb. H. E. iv. 26;) and *Origen* (against Celsus, B. viii.): *Εαν δε τις προς ταυτα αυθυποφερητα περι των παρ' ημιν κυριακων, η του πασχα, η της πεντηκοστης*: also Dionysius, Bishop of Corinth, *Την σημερον την Κυριακην αγιαν ημεραν διηγαγομεν* and the Pseudo-Justin Martyr, Quæst. 115.—I may add that *Tertullian* in sundry places, given by Bishop Kaye, p. 408, calls it *Dies Dominicus*; and *Commodian*, a contemporary of Cyprian, or immediate successor, (Lardner iii. 134,) also uses it; “De die *Dominicâ* quid dicis?”—Thus, instead of *no writer before Constantine* calling the first day of the week the *Lord's day*, there is a chain of patristic writers, both Greek and Latin, that do so, from after St. John's time downward, through the second and third centuries.\*—Bingham's view corresponds; xx. 2. 1.

Let me add an illustration that I find in Michaelis on the N. T. Vol. vi. 61, and which seems to me interesting. Speaking of the *κυριακον δειπνον* in 1 Cor. xi. 20, he says, “This may be translated, as in the Syriac version, *a meal which is proper for the Lord's day, or a Sunday meal*.” And he adds; “In the controversy relative to the celebration of *Sunday*, it is extraordinary that this translation of *κυριακον δειπνον* in so ancient a version as the Syriac should never have been quoted.” *How* ancient has not yet, I believe, been exactly settled by Syriac scholars.

\* In turning to Dr. Maitland's Paper in the *Jewish Expositor*, Aug. 1823, to which he refers for a fuller discussion of the subject, I find that he sets aside the quotation from *Ignatius* to the *Magnesians* as not *Ignatius'* own; and probably so far with reason: (see my Vol. i. p. 16:) an exception applicable also to the quotation from the Epistle to the Philadelphians. But we must remember that though not *Ignatius'* own, they were yet probably written in his name by some writer prior to Constantine's time. Dr. M. objects too to the citation from *Irenæus*, under a doubt of the word *κυριακη* being that of *Irenæus* himself: but I conceive without reason. As to *Tertullian's*, *Clement's*, and the other examples unnoticed by Dr. M., they are, I believe, indisputable.—Dr. Todd, I see, pp. 295—303, cites Papers on the point by Dr. M. and others from the *British Magazine* of 1839. They in no wise disturb my argument.

it, in the *adjectival* form ; nor, I believe, in the early Greek Fathers.<sup>1</sup>—Thus the verbal argument too is against, not for, Dr. Maitland. The sleight of hand by which he shifts the seven Churches, and Epistles addrest to them, into a distant future, proves to be one that sets the sense of language, as well as the requirements of grammar and context, at defiance. And the difficulty remains, as it was, a millstone round the neck of the *Futurist* principle of interpretation.

II. THE FUTURISTS' IDENTIFICATION OF THE SUBJECTS OF THE APOCALYPTIC SEALS with THE GOSPEL-PREACHING, WARS, FAMINES, PESTILENCES, PERSECUTIONS, AND REVOLUTION NOTED IN CHRIST'S PROPHECY, Matt. xxiv., as the precursives, they say, of his second coming.

To this subject I have already briefly alluded in my Vol. i.<sup>2</sup> And, as may be remembered, it was there shown that, while there was scarce a point on which the asserted accordance could be made out, there was at least one on which irreconcilable discordance could be demonstrated ; and this one so interlacing with the rest as to involve in its failure the whole theory of parallelism. For while, as regards the *1st Seal*, it appeared that there was nothing in its symbols to identify the rider with Christ, or the rider's progress on the white horse with that of gospel-preaching,—and, as regards the *2nd Seal*, the difference suggested itself between its *civil* wars and the wars of *nation against nation* in St. Matthew,—as regards the *3rd Seal* the utter impossibility was shown of its symbols ever figuring *famine* ; seeing that 5 lbs. of barley was defined in it as procurable for a man's daily wage of a denarius, and with wine and oil in abundance.—Moreover, even supposing that the earlier Seals' symbols were capable of identification with the signs in Matthew, it would remain for the Futurists to prove that the gospel-preaching, wars, famines, pestilences, and persecutions that Christ spoke of were meant as signs immediately precursive of his personal second Advent ; and not rather of the destruction of Jerusalem :—a point this difficult indeed of proof : and of the furnishing of which by any of the School, in

<sup>1</sup> It is called in the Septuagint ἡ ἡμέρα Κυρίου, or ἡ ἡμέρα Κυρίου ἡ μεγάλη, but never, I believe, with the adjective ἡ Κυριακή ἡμέρα. Of the early Fathers I can only say that, in my limited reading of them, I have not met the phrase.

<sup>2</sup> App. p. 609.

contravention of the other more natural interpretation, so given by the best expositors, I must confess myself wholly incredulous.

But, at any rate, they insist on the *6th Seal* prefiguring the consummation; as what may help (though certainly, unless the previous Seals have that reference too, with most insufficient help)<sup>1</sup> the Futurist view.—Says Dr. S. R. Maitland; “Can any unbiassed reader doubt that this passage refers to the *day of judgment?*”<sup>2</sup> And Mr. Burgh: “This Seal so obviously refers to the *second coming of the Lord Jesus Christ*, . . . that I must say there is *no room for difference of opinion.*”<sup>3</sup> So again R. D. in the Dublin Christian Examiner, for December, 1844; (a writer of whom more in my next Section;) “*If there be a day yet future, it is the day of the wrath of the Lamb, [i. e. as in the 6th Seal,] when he shall be revealed from heaven in flaming fire:*” with declaration added of the impossibility of rightly expounding the imagery of the *6th Seal*, where his wrath is spoken of, except with reference to that day. And so too Dr. Todd,<sup>4</sup> and most other Expositors of the School.—Now, in order to understand here the real value of the Futurists’ argument, it is essential to inquire at once, very distinctly, whether by *Christ’s coming* they really mean his *personal visible coming* to judgment; and, if so, on what construction of the imagery of the *6th Seal*, *literal* or *figurative*? R. D., we saw, declares plainly that it is indeed his personal coming, “when he shall be revealed from heaven in flaming fire.” And I presume he would have the elemental convulsions of the Seal construed *literally*, as that which is to attend it. But, if so, does it not seem passing strange that we should have no representation whatsoever of the flaming fire that is to accompany Christ’s second coming; nothing shown, or said, even of his own glorious epiphany; nothing of the rapture of the saints to meet him? So as to the evidence from omission. Besides which may we not say that there seems to be that stated which absolutely forbids the supposition of any literal construction of the figures? For were the stars *literally* to fall to the earth, so as in the Apocalyptic vision they appeared to do, then the earth would not only reel to and fro like a drunkard, but be struck from its orbit into fragments:<sup>5</sup> whereas from the Sealing vision in the second part of the

<sup>1</sup> It only brings the subject soon on the tapis.

<sup>2</sup> On Antichrist, p. 21.

<sup>3</sup> P. 157, 4th ed.

<sup>4</sup> P. 106.

<sup>5</sup> I am glad to see that this argument for the *figurative* intent of what appeared in



same 6th Seal, next following, and which depicts the Angels of the four winds as preparing to blow upon it, it appears that the earth still existed afterwards, and with men still inhabiting it, just as before. What then remains (unless, with Dr. Todd, we boldly eject the Sealing vision from its place in the Apocalyptic Book)<sup>1</sup> but to construe the symbols *figuratively*: and with this, and the consequent reference in them only to some mighty revolution, religious or political, to abandon all argument for the Seal's signifying Christ's personal coming to judgment?—Indeed by some of the best-known advocates of the School (contradictorily to R. D.) this seems to me pretty much admitted. As Dr. Maitland has maintained silence on the point inquired into, we cannot do better, I think, than to look for explanation to Mr. Burgh, the next most popular writer probably on the same side. And, strange as it may seem to my readers, they will find that if the passage quoted a little while since in part from him be completed, and the hiatus represented by the *dots* filled up, it will read thus:—"This Seal so obviously refers to the second coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, containing as it does *the very signs and omens of his coming*,<sup>2</sup>. that there is no room for difference of opinion." Does Mr. Burgh then mean, after all, that instead of depicting Christ's coming itself, this Seal merely depicted certain *signs* and *omens* showing that it was *near*? Such is indeed the case. So at p. 159; "When these several signs of Christ's coming shall have been developed, [viz. in the Seals preceding,] then the sixth Seal opens with *the day itself of his coming*, OR [I pray the reader to mark this significant little word, OR] with *the signs by which it is more immediately announced!!*" And what then, we next ask, as to the precise signs thus *immediately* announcing the advent;—the sun be-

the vision from *the stars falling to the earth*, has been urged also, though on another passage of Scripture, by Olshausen. Contending for the *literal* meaning being intended by Christ in the heavenly signs that he spoke of in Matt. xxiv. 30, 31, Olshausen notices the distinctive point of *the stars* not being there said to *fall on the earth*; which, he considers, would fix their *symbolic* meaning. "Nothing is here said of *stars falling to the earth*, as is said of a star, Rev. viii. 10, [and vi. 13.] in *symbolical* language." Clarke's Ed. p. 268.

<sup>1</sup> "If the 6th Seal be a prediction, as undoubtedly it is, of the day of judgment, it is impossible that the next vision can be a continuance of it." Todd, p. 109. Sound logic would rather have argued thus: "The sealing vision *is*, and *must be*, a continuance of the 6th Seal: therefore the prior figuration cannot be one of the day of judgment."

<sup>2</sup> Viz. says he, those next . . in Matt. xxiv. 29, 30. He means, I presume, only xxiv. 29. Verse 30 mentions *the Son of Man himself coming in the clouds of heaven*, of which the 6th Seal tells nothing.

coming black as sackcloth, the moon like blood, the stars of heaven falling to the earth, and heaven itself removing like a scroll rolled up? Is the description to be taken *literally* or *figuratively*, of *physical* and *elemental*, or only of *political* change? For a direct, straightforward answer to this question I look into Mr. Burgh in vain. In one place he seems to assign a *literal* meaning to the 6th Seal.<sup>1</sup> But, judging from the sequel, this can hardly be. For he considers the Sealing Vision, 7th Seal, Trumpets, &c., all *chronologically to carry on the subject*.<sup>2</sup> And as he makes the Sealing Vision depict the sealing of a Jewish remnant, to be saved from the judgments threatened by the tempest-angels on the godless of the nation, and the other visions similarly to refer to the earth as still existing, and men dwelling on it, I infer that he cannot suppose any physical changes to have been intended by the sixth Seal's vision, such as to have destroyed earth, and sky, and earth's inhabitants. The rather since I observe that he explains the palm-bearing vision next following, as only, at that point of advance in the sacred drama, an *anticipative, prospective* representation of the heavenly blessedness of the saints; and infer consequently that their translation, and therefore Christ's second coming, will not, in Mr. Burgh's opinion, even at this epoch (an epoch *subsequent to the sixth Seal*), have yet taken place: nay that at a much later epoch, that of Apoc. x. 7, the consummation will not have occurred; "judgment having followed on judgment, but *the end not being yet*."<sup>3</sup> Hence it seems evident that Mr. Burgh, like myself, must construe the symbols of the sixth Seal *figuratively*; and if figuratively, then, according as the figure is elsewhere used in Scripture prophecy, of mere *political* or *politico-religious* change and revolution. In which case all argument for having anything to do with Christ's second advent vanishes; and together therewith all aid from it, (if aid it could give,) as well as from the Seals preceding it, to the Futurists' Apocalyptic Scheme.

<sup>1</sup> At p. 186, reprobatng all *figurative* interpretation of the *Trumpets*, he refers to *similar* expositions of the *6th Seal* as "still more needing confirmation."

<sup>2</sup> He says, p. 164; "The remainder of the book must be . . . *subsequent in order of fulfilment to the opening of the Seals*." So too p. 170, &c. He is here at issue with Dr. Todd.

<sup>3</sup> P. 203.—I may add, as an inference from Mr. Burgh's explanation of Apoc. xxi. 1, that the passing away of the heaven as a scroll, and other contemporary elemental changes figured in the 6th Seal, will in his judgment have nothing whatever to do with that passing away of the old earth and heaven which is described Apoc. xxi. 1, as the event that is to be succeeded by a new heaven and new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness.

### III. AS TO THE FUTURISTS' LITERAL CONSTRUCTION OF THE APOCALYPTIC ISRAEL.

A point this quite essential to their system, just as much as to the Præterists'; for it is thereby that they identify, and link on, much of this prophecy with those in the Old Testament respecting the ultimate restoration and conversion of the Jews: inasmuch, I believe, that if the *Apocalyptic* Israel were proved not to be the *literal* Israel, there is not a Futurist but would admit that their cause was lost.

"*The Jew*," says Mr. Burgh, emphatically, (p. 432,) "*is the key to prophecy.*" And again (p. 165) on the same Apoc. vii.; "I can understand (though I do not think an undoubted instance of it exists) how the name *Israel* may be supposed to be figuratively applied to the Gentile Church in Scripture: but to suppose that not merely the name of *Israel* is so applied, but that the names of *every one of the twelve tribes* have also a spiritual meaning, and apply to the Gentile Church," this he would have to be incredible indeed. Again, on Apoc. xi. 1, "Rise and measure *the temple* of God, and *the altar*, and them that worship *therein*, but the court without, measure not, for it is given to the Gentiles, and they shall tread under foot *the holy city* forty and two months," he remarks to the effect that every word marks to an unprejudiced reader that the passage concerns the *Jewish nation*; and that it is matter for astonishment that it should have been so allegorized by most of the English Protestant expositors, as to exclude all reference to the Jewish people.<sup>1</sup> And so too Maitland, Todd,<sup>2</sup> and, I believe, all the chief writers of this school. Now in my Chapter on the *Præterists*<sup>3</sup> I showed, 1st, that a *figurative explanation* of the Jewish Apocalyptic symbols was not only accordant with St. Paul's application of them to the Christian Church, but accordant also with our Lord's own express explanation of the Apocalyptic figure of seven candlesticks, in what seemed like the *holy place* of the *Jewish temple*, to signify the seven Asiatic *Christian churches*: 2ndly, and in objection to their *literal system of explanation* of these Jewish symbols, that the Præterists are forced by it into inconsistency; explaining the temple symbol, as they do, and its adjuncts elsewhere in the Apocalyptic drama, to signify things *Christian*. Just so it is also with the

<sup>1</sup> Pp. 205, 206.

<sup>2</sup> Todd, p. 112.

<sup>3</sup> See pp. 573—576, *suprà*.

*Futurists.*—Let me turn to *Mr. Burgh*, as before, for illustration. And as regards *the Jewish temple*, and *temple-worshippers* on the Apocalyptic scene, I observe, first, that he makes “*all the saints*” that offered incense there in Apoc. viii. 3 to be “the Lord’s people:” not unconverted Jews at all; nor even converted Jews alone, but only in part.<sup>1</sup> Next in Apoc. xi. 1 he explains the *temple*, and *altar*, and *them that worship in it*, to designate a “*converted*” remnant of the Jewish nation;<sup>2</sup> that is, mark, a *Christianized* remnant; and whose *worship* consequently will *not* be *Jewish*,<sup>3</sup> but *Christian*. Further, with regard to the *twelve tribes of Israel*, he makes the *New Jerusalem* of Apoc. xxi.,—that same city “which had twelve gates, and the names written thereon of the twelve tribes of the children of Israel,” viz. of Judah, Reuben, Gad, &c., the very same that were noted in Apoc. vii. originally, and that are here re-mentioned just as fully and as specifically,—he makes it mean—what? “No doubt,” thinks the reader perhaps, “the blessed and glorious state of the *Jewish* nation in the millennium.” Nothing of the kind: (Mr. Burgh well knew certain stringent reasons, of various kinds, against this:<sup>4</sup>) but the polity of *the Christian Church*, completed and beatified: “that same,” he observes, “which St. Paul meant in that magnificent passage addressed to the Hebrew Christians, ‘Ye are come unto *Mount Zion*, and unto the *city of the living God*, the *heavenly Jerusalem*, to the *general assembly*, and *church of the first-born*, which are written in heaven.’ I view it,” says he,<sup>5</sup> “as identical with the final consummated blessedness of *the whole Church*.” I doubt not he is here perfectly correct. But what an astounding exemplification of the inconsistency of the Futurists! Of course, if under the names of the twelve tribes of Israel, written respectively on the gates of the New Jerusalem, there be meant the true Christian Church in its heavenly completeness and beatification, then the 144,000 sealed ones on earth out of all the tribes of Israel must surely mean the completeness at any particular period of

<sup>1</sup> Burgh, 183. Dr. Todd, p. 131, blames Mr. B. for even assigning any prominence to *converted Jews* in this incense-offering body. “It is the prayers of *the universal Church*.”  
<sup>2</sup> Ib. 208.

<sup>3</sup> Mr. Burgh indeed, at p. 183, strangely calls it “a Jewish service;” and, still more strangely, on Apoc. xi., makes Antichrist to be sitting in this temple. But this only the more illustrates the difficulties of his theory.

<sup>4</sup> Specially that the Philadelphian *Gentile* Christians were spoken of as forming part of this Israel and its twelve tribes. Apoc. iii. 12.  
<sup>5</sup> Burgh, p. 380.



God's own Israel, or true Church on earth; and the holy city and the temple still the same mystical body, in regard of its polity and of its worship, respectively.<sup>1</sup>—Such is the general Protestant view. And on it all seems harmonious; as well as all accordant with Christ's own most illustrative explanation of the Jewish symbol of the candlesticks, at the beginning of the Apocalypse. Whereas, on the other hand, enough, I think, has been said to show that in the Futurists' system, let the advocate be able as he may, this its essential characteristic will prove on *real* examination to involve confusion, inconsistency, and self-contradiction.

#### IV. AS TO THE FUTURISTS' SUPPOSED YET FUTURE ANTICHRIST.

Under this head I shall have to remark on the difficulties which beset their theory, and the contrast between it and the Scriptural statements, with reference, 1st, to Antichrist's *time of reign* and *local seat of empire*; 2ndly, to his *religious profession*.

1. Now then, as to the *time* of Antichrist's rising,<sup>2</sup> it was defined as following speedily after the breaking up of the old Roman empire. For, forasmuch as the *let*, or *hindrance*, which in St. Paul's time prevented, and was still for some certain time after to continue to prevent, Antichrist's manifestation, was understood by the early Church to be the then regnant *Roman empire and emperors*,<sup>3</sup> (and for the correctness of this its understanding of the point, as of one avowedly revealed, there was almost apostolic voucher,<sup>4</sup>) the inference might seem sure, and to be depended on, that Antichrist would be a power elevated *on their falling*.—Again, next, as to Antichrist's *local and political relations*, his *Roman* political origin and local connexion is a fact, as I have elsewhere more than once had occasion to observe, strongly and in various ways set forth in prophecy. First, if elevated on the old empire's dissolution, as of that which before hindered his rising, then surely the probability might seem to be that he would rise *in its place*, as well as *on its fall*. Secondly, the *fourth Beast* of Daniel, from whose head in its last or ten-horned state the little horn of Antichrist was seen to sprout, could only

<sup>1</sup> So Hengstenberg, i. 424, &c., strongly.

<sup>2</sup> I assume in all that follows, as a point long since proved, the identity of the Antichrist with the Little Horn of the fourth of Daniel's four Beasts, the eighth or last head of the Apocalyptic Beast, and St. Paul's Man of Sin.

<sup>3</sup> See my Vol. i. pp. 228—231, 234, 388—393.

<sup>4</sup> 2 Thess. ii. 6.

(according either to the facts of history, or the declared judgment alike of the best classical writers and chief of the early Fathers) be construed of the *Roman empire*.<sup>1</sup> Thirdly, the *city of Antichrist*, Apocalyptically called *the great city* and *Babylon*, and which he was depicted as supporting and upbearing, was by the indubitable marks of a seven-hilled locality, and a supremacy in St. John's time over the kings of the earth, signified to be *Rome*; and moreover its transfer marked as all but immediate, from being the seat or capital of Paganism, to being that of Antichrist.<sup>2</sup> Such, I say, was the triple Scriptural foreshadowing of Antichrist's political relations and local connexion with *Rome*, from his first rise on the old Roman empire's falling.

But what when the theory of a still future Antichrist (in opposition to that of the Papal Antichrist) is held at the *present* time? There is nothing, I think, that can more strikingly show the extent and insuperability of the difficulties with which these various prophecies encompass it, than the multiplied inconsistencies and self-contradictions which mark the attempt of him who, of all others of the literalist school, has set himself most fully and elaborately to meet them; and to whom Mr. Burgh refers with satisfaction, as furnishing important corroboration to his Scheme;<sup>3</sup>—I mean the *Oxford Tractator* of the Four Sermons on Antichrist.<sup>4</sup> It may be well to exhibit this at some little length.

To begin then with the Thessalonian prophecy, and the difficulty from the fact of its *let* (which with the Fathers he feels constrained to interpret of the Roman empire)<sup>5</sup> having full 13 centuries ago past away, and so too the time for Antichrist's manifestation,<sup>6</sup> our Tractator's confident answer in his first Sermon is this,—that, whatever the apparent *historic fact*, in the *eye of prophecy* the Roman empire is regarded as not past away, but still existing, and the *let* with it; viz. in its predicted ten horns or kingdoms, the Romano-Gothic constituency of modern Western Christendom.<sup>7</sup> But scarce

<sup>1</sup> See my Vol. i. *ibid.*

<sup>2</sup> See my Vol. iii. pp. 115, 129, 130.

<sup>3</sup> P. 447.

<sup>4</sup> No. 83.

<sup>5</sup> "I grant that he *that withholdeth*, or *letteth*, means *the power of Rome*; for all the ancient writers so speak of it. I grant that as Rome, according to the prophet Daniel's vision, succeeded Greece, so Antichrist succeeds Rome, and our Saviour Christ succeeds Antichrist." p. 5.

<sup>6</sup> "He that letteth shall let until he be taken away: and *then* shall that Wicked One be revealed," &c. 2 Thess. ii. 7, 8.

<sup>7</sup> "But it does not hence follow that Antichrist is come:" [this extract follows

has he made the answer than he contradicts it, forced by the strong facts of history: confessing in his third Sermon that the self-same breaking up of the Roman empire that was foretold *did* take place, at the time of the Gothic irruptions.<sup>1</sup>

Which however being admitted by him, and the admission also made, as we have seen, and must well remark, of the ten Romano-Gothic kingdoms of modern Western Christendom answering to the ten horns of Daniel's and the Apocalyptic prophecy,—not only does the first difficulty from the Thessalonian Epistle remain unanswered, but a new one rises out of these other prophecies before him. For nothing can be clearer from them than that Antichrist was to be a power *contemporary with the ten horns* of the symbolic Beast:—like a *little horn* (of rapid enlargement) ruffling it, as Mede says, among the ten; or a common head supporting, and furnishing a centre of union to them:—that is, according to these admissions, a power contemporary with the Western kingdoms of the middle and the modern age. Our author seems to feel the difficulty; and, reckless of the new contradictions that it involves, casts away both the one and the other of these previously-made admissions: asserts,—on the ground of the Romano-Gothic kingdoms of the 5th and 6th centuries not having been clearly and exactly ten,<sup>2</sup>—that the real decuple division intended by prophecy did not then take place, but is yet future;<sup>3</sup>

continuously, it must be observed, on the one preceding:] “for I do not grant that the Roman empire is gone. Far from it. The Roman empire remains even to this day.”—Then, speaking of the ten horns of the prophetic symbol, he adds: “As the ten horns belonged to the Beast, and were not separate from it, so are the kingdoms into which the Roman empire has been divided part of that empire itself;—a continuation of that empire in the view of *prophecy*, however we decide the *historical* question. And as the horns or kingdoms still exist, we have not yet seen the end of the Roman empire. That which *withholdeth* still exists, though in its ten horns.” pp. 5, 6.

<sup>1</sup> “The Roman empire *did* break up, as foretold.” p. 30. See my Note <sup>3</sup> below. So again Tract No. 90, p. 77; “God promoted in the way of Providence, and *He cast down by the same way*, the Roman empire. . . The Roman power *ceased to be* when the barbarians overthrew it: for it rose by the sword, and it therefore *perished* by the sword.”

<sup>2</sup> So Maitland earlier. Also Burgh, p. 249.—Let me suggest to these Futurists whether it might not be worth their while to take up the question of the phrase *twelve apostles*, as used by St. John Apoc. xxi. 14; and expose its incorrectness, in consequence of St. Paul having before that been called to be an apostle, besides the original *twelve*, and having so made the body *thirteen*. Besides that, after Judas fell, there were for a while only *eleven*.

<sup>3</sup> “The Roman empire *did* break up, as foretold. It divided into a number of separate kingdoms, such as our own, France, and the like. Yet it is difficult to number ten accurately and exactly. . . . We must suppose therefore that it [the decem-

and further, as to the breaking up of the empire, that it was *not* then really effected, but only had a bare beginning :—the commencement of a *long process of dissolution* which has in fact been ever since going on; and which, after full thirteen centuries, is not yet completed.<sup>1</sup>—Is this a thing credible?

And then there is yet another difficulty that here meets him. For both Daniel's and the Apocalyptic symbol depict the Roman empire as a *bestial monster*, as well *until* the precise predicted division into ten, as *under* the ten and Antichrist afterwards. And thus his interpretation seems to involve the consequence of *Papal Rome* (the object in no slight degree of his esteem and reverence) having been a *Beast*, or impious and persecuting Empire, in the view of inspired prophecy, even though not under Antichrist, throughout the long and (as he would have it)<sup>2</sup> still uncompleted period before the grand predicted decem-regal division. As if to get rid of this difficulty, he cites the two Apocalyptic notices of the Beast in its last or anti-

regal division] is yet to come. With this accords the ancient notion that they [the ten kings] were to come at *the end of the world*, and last but a *short time*; Antichrist coming upon them." p. 31.

It is quite curious to observe the differences of Romanist Expositors one from another, as well as of our Tractarian Expositor from himself, on this terribly perplexing difficulty. Thus, while *Bellarmino* stakes his defence of the Popes against the charge of being Antichrist on the fact of *the uninterrupted existence*, even to his own time, of the Roman Empire, it is admitted by *Bossuet* and *Miley*, accordantly with the Tractarian in his *later* mood, as the very principle of their solution of the prophecy, that the Roman power *ceased to be*, and *perished*, when the Gothic barbarians overthrew it. Nay, not these *Præterist* Romanists only, but even the *Futurist* leader *Ribera* (not without others following) confesses to the same fact. "Ribera in Apoc. xii., et Estius et Justinianus in 2 Thess. ii. 3, causati sunt à multis retro annis Imperium Romanum verè defecisse, atque has angustias in quas jam redactum videmus in Germaniâ, indignas esse nomine Romani imperii, quasi putres quasdam tabulas fracti et dilacerati Imperii." Whence *Ribera* argued, "*hujus* (sc. *Romani imperii*) *extinctionem* non posse reputari pro signo adventûs Antichristi." But no, answers *Malvenda*, from whom I cite the above: the extinction of the Roman empire is, and must be, the sign of Antichrist's manifestation: and, *since Antichrist has not yet come*, THEREFORE the Roman empire cannot have past away.—My readers will do well to mark the argument on either side, as well as the dissension. *Malv.* i. 402.

Among the moderns Dr. S. R. Maitland holds strongly on this point with *Ribera* and *Bossuet*; Mr. C. Maitland (in his "Apostolic School of Interpretation") as strongly with *Bellarmino* and *Malvenda*; while the Tractator sides undecided first with one, then with the other. "It is difficult to say whether the Roman empire is gone, or not. In one sense it is; for it is divided into kingdoms: in another sense it is not; for the date cannot be assigned at which it came to an end." p. 31.

<sup>1</sup> "Such were the scourges by which the fourth monster of Daniel's vision was brought low: . . . such the process by which that *which letteth* (in St. Paul's language) *began* to be taken away, though *not altogether removed* even at this day." p. 34.

<sup>2</sup> See the extract Note<sup>3</sup>, p. 613.



christian form, as "the Beast that *was and is not and yet is,*" and as that which had "received a *deadly wound* but revived:" intimating that it is the very interval of the "*is not,*"—the very *death-state* of the Beast from the deadly wound of the Gothic sword,—that has been filled up by the Papacy and its contemporary subject-kingdoms of Western Christendom; the bestial Roman Empire (I presume he means its bestial principle) being all the while *torpid, prostrate, dying*; <sup>1</sup> and the long long protracted parenthesis of Papal rule one in character not bestial but Christian.<sup>2</sup> In answer to any objections that might be raised as to the credibility of this torpor of the Beast's dying, or death, extending through so many ages, he adds that it was *the opinion of the early Church* that the monster *would lie torpid for centuries,* and not revive or wake up again till near the end of the world.<sup>3</sup> But what the authority of the early Church, unsupported

<sup>1</sup> So at pp. 32, 50, &c. Again, p. 26; "The Roman empire, which once was, and now sleeps." So that it has been now sleeping some 1200 years and more: and all that figures on the European page of history, from the time of Charlemagne to that of the Crusades, from that of the Crusades to that of Louis XIV, and from thence to the French Revolution and its wars, ending with the battle of Waterloo, is to be regarded, according to our Tractator, as only the *troublous dreams* of the sleeping empire, in its primary and imperfectly ten-divided state!

So, somewhat similarly, the Lyra Apostolica:

The floodgates open wide;  
And madly rushes in the turbulent tide  
Of lusts and heresies: a motley groupe they come:  
And old imperial Rome  
Looks up, and lifts again *half-dead*  
Her seven-horn'd head:  
And schisms and superstitions near and far,  
Blend in one pestilent star,  
And shake their horrid locks against the saints to war.

<sup>2</sup> At p. 31 the writer says, that with regard to any "seduction or delusion to be practised on the world," it has not been fulfilled in the seven-hilled *Rome*, since the division of the empire or the Gothic invasion: and at p. 45 that Rome has not, since that time, been a persecutor of the Church; for he speaks of "the Church having been sheltered from persecution for 1500 years." Again, at p. 37, after stating the guilt of old *Pagan Rome* in persecuting the saints, and the consequent guilt and doom of the city, he asserts that the only assignable reason why Rome has not thus suffered the fulness of God's wrath, is because "a Christian Church is still in that city, sanctifying it, interceding for it, saving it."—In a Note at p. 38, he intimates indeed that "no opinion, *one way or the other,* is here expressed as to the question how far, as the local Church has saved Rome, so Rome has corrupted the local Church: or whether the local Church in consequence, or, again, whether *other Churches elsewhere,* may or may not be types of Antichrist." But the first clause in italics (and we may shrewdly suspect too the last clause about *other Churches* italicized) will show that there is meant in this Note but little of qualification to the writer's previously quoted statements in favour of Papal Rome.

<sup>3</sup> "Another expectation of the early Church was that the Roman monster, *after*

by Scripture? And where moreover the early patristic authority to any such effect? Instead of *patristic opinion* on the matter being such as he has represented, the reader may sufficiently see, by reference to notices on the subject in other and earlier parts of this work,<sup>1</sup> that, although the primitive Fathers slightly differed among themselves as to the nearness of Antichrist and the consummation,—some few thinking it a century distant, or perhaps two centuries, the rest much closer and even at the doors,—yet that, as to the idea of any *long interval* occurring, between the expected breaking up of the old Roman Empire and Antichrist's revelation, during which the Roman Beast was to be torpid,—the thought seems never to have entered their imagination.<sup>2</sup> And certainly just as little did they anticipate two breakings up of the Roman Empire before Antichrist's coming: the first of their own imperial Rome into something very like ten kingdoms; the other, ages afterwards, of those long-established decem-regal kingdoms into ten other kingdoms still more exactly defined.—As to *Scripture prophecy*, forasmuch as in Daniel the *bestial*

*remaining torpid for centuries*, would wake up at the end of the world, and be restored in all its laws and forms." p. 24. He gives, I observe, *no patristic authority* for this statement. Perhaps he had reference to the idea of Nero's revival mentioned pp. 277, 296, 570 *suprà*: which however implied *Nero's* dormancy, not *the Roman empire's*; and moreover was an idea that gained but little hold on the Christian Church. Our Tractator's own next quotation is from Hippolytus, (the same that I have given in my Vol. i. p. 229,) which says nothing either of the torpor of the Roman Beast for centuries, or of its restoration in *all its* (i. e. according to the Oxford writer's meaning *old Rome's*) *laws and forms*. The purport of Hippolytus' observation is to the effect that Antichrist would be a reviver and restorer of the Roman Empire as notably as Augustus was: not, however, by Augustus' or the old Roman laws; but by *his own new laws*: *δια του υπ' αυτου οριζομενου νομου*.

<sup>1</sup> See my Vol. i. *ibid.*; where the expectations to this effect are set forth of *Justin Martyr, Judas, Tertullian, Cyprian, &c. Hippolytus* too (after Irenæus) thus express the same expectations: "What more remains? what, but the passing of the iron legs of the image into the ten toes; or Roman Empire into ten kingdoms?" They who, like *Lactantius* and *Hilarion*, regarded the consummation as at the distance of a century or two, (induced very much to that opinion by the expectation of the world's seventh millennium being its *sabbatism*, and with notions about the mundane chronology such as to admit of their nevertheless supposing the consummation not very distant,) I say these Fathers seem to have expected that whatever interval of time remained, it would be mainly *before*, not *after*, the breaking up of the old Roman empire.—I reserve for a later Chapter in this Appendix a more direct comparison and contrast between the Patristic views and the Futurists'.

<sup>2</sup> Even *Augustine*, though an innovator to a considerable extent in Apocalyptic interpretation, at the epoch of the Gothic invasion, so as I have shown in an earlier part of my Book, Vol. iii. p. 277, and introducer of the idea of the *Beast* being (secondarily at least) a symbol of the *world* and *its city*, in opposition to the City of God, and likely to last some uncertain time longer, yet never, so far as I know, suggested the probability of any long interval of torpor affecting the *Roman Beast*, before the last paroxysm of persecution and wickedness under Antichrist.

*character* of the fourth Wild Beast, or Roman Empire, is represented symbolically as continuing uninterrupted even to the time of its destruction, and in the Apocalypse the transition-period between the empire in its *Pagan draconic form* and the empire in its *anti-christian and bestial*, (i. e. between the Beast as it “*was*,” and the Beast as it “*is*,”) is both declared to be *brief*,<sup>1</sup> and also described as all filled up by the Pagan Dragon’s still persecuting the woman the Church, (albeit that he was then fallen,) in active hostility, and so driving her into the wilderness,<sup>2</sup>—it is evident that the Tractator’s hypothesis meets from *it* a negative altogether decisive, and one from which there can be no appeal.

Yet once more the difficulty meets him of *Babylon the Great*, the *city of the seven hills*, being the predicted *seat of Antichrist*:—which local connexion of Antichrist with Rome, as his capital, constitutes of course a most strong and palpable corroboration of the Protestant view of the *Roman Pope’s* being Antichrist. And what then our Tractator’s escape from it? Overlooking altogether the decisive fact of the woman sitting on the Beast when in its *last* and *antichristian* form,<sup>3</sup> he first alludes to the circumstance of the Angel’s describing the woman-city symbolized to be one that was *then* in existence and power, as if probable evidence that it was simply *Rome Pagan* to which the guilt attached of the harlotry spoken of, and of being drunk with the blood of the saints,<sup>4</sup>—albeit declared a bloody harlot

<sup>1</sup> See Apoc. xii. 12.

<sup>2</sup> See Apoc. xii.; and my Commentary on it in Chapters 1 and 2 of Part iv.

<sup>3</sup> Compare verses 3, 8, and 11 of Apoc. xvii.; “*I saw a woman sit upon a scarlet-coloured Beast, having seven heads and ten horns:*”—“*The Beast that thou savest was and is not:*”—“*The Beast that was and is not, even he is the eighth, and goeth into perdition.*”

<sup>4</sup> “*This great city (Rome) is described under the image of a woman cruel, profligate, and impious; . . . and is called by the name of Babylon the Great, to signify her power, wealth, profaneness, pride, sensuality, and persecuting spirit. I need not relate how all this answered to the character and history of Rome at the time St. John spoke of it.*” p. 29.—With regard to the Beast ridden by the woman, he says: “*The Beast on which the woman sate is the Roman Empire.*” And this agrees very accurately with the actual position of things in history: for Rome, the mistress of the world, might well be said to sit upon, and be carried about triumphantly on, that world which she had subdued, and made her creature.” Ibid. Of the monster figured being the Beast, not under its *sixth* head,—that which ruled in St. John’s time,—but under *its eighth and last head*, according to the Angel’s explanation, our Tractator says not a word.

Mr. Burgh, I may observe, expressly makes the Rome depicted in vision, and ridden by the Beast, to be Rome ridden by the Beast under its sixth head; in direct contradiction to the Angel’s declaration, that “*the Beast which thou savest . . . is the 8th King.*” Apoc. xvii. 8, 11. See Burgh, pp. 323, 325.

continuously from St. John's time even to the very end of her career;<sup>1</sup> and then passes to the Angel's other statement about the ten kings hating and burning her with fire,<sup>2</sup> as direct evidence that Rome could not be the city of Antichrist: the order of things being this, (so he states the prophecy,) that the ten kings were fated to rise first, and, after rising, to destroy Rome; then Antichrist to appear, and supersede or subdue the ten kings; and so Rome to have fallen before Antichrist's manifestation.<sup>3</sup>—But how could Antichrist be altogether posterior to the ten kings, when they are declared, as the Tractator admits,<sup>4</sup> to receive their power at one and the same time with the Beast Antichrist; and indeed depicted as rising together in the symbolization of Apoc. xiii. 1? Again, how could Antichrist be the restorer of the Roman empire, which the Tractator also confesses him to be, and bearer too of the Roman appella-tive *Latinos*,<sup>5</sup> if locally altogether unconnected with Rome, and only rising after Rome's final destruction? In fact he admits, a little after, both that Rome was to be his local seat;<sup>6</sup> and, as to its final and total destruction, that it would not be by the ten kings' agency, but according both to Scripture prophecy and the expectation of the Fathers, through the agency of earthquakes, lightnings, and the

<sup>1</sup> Apoc. xviii. 24; "In her was found the blood of the prophets and saints, and of all that had been slain on the earth."

<sup>2</sup> Apoc. xvii. 16; "The ten horns which thou sawest on the Beast,\* these shall hate the whore, and shall make her desolate and naked, and shall eat her flesh, and burn her with fire."

<sup>3</sup> "Rome is to fall before Antichrist rises: for the ten kings are to destroy Rome; and Antichrist is then to appear, and supersede the ten kings. As far as we dare judge from the words, this seems clear." p. 20. So again p. 39.

<sup>4</sup> "We are expressly told that the ten kings and Antichrist's empire shall rise together; the kings appearing at the time of the monster's resurrection, not in its languid and torpid state." p. 32.

Let me remind my readers, with regard to Dan. vii. 24, ("The ten horns are ten kings that shall arise, and another shall rise after them,") that the Septuagint translation, in correct rendering of the Hebrew יָרִיס (see Gesenius) reads *οπισω αυτων*, behind, or locally after, the ten. (So in my Vol. iii. p. 91, Note 1.) Thus Daniel's statement needs not be considered at all inconsistent with that of the Apocalypse, xvii. 12, "The ten Horns are ten Kings that receive power as kings at one time with the Beast:" i. e. according to the Angel's explanation, the Beast under its last head.

<sup>5</sup> This is admitted to have been the patristic expectation, p. 25. The writer adds, p. 26, "He will knit the Roman empire into one."

<sup>6</sup> "He will earn the title of the Latin or Roman King, as best expressive of his place and character." p. 26.

---

\* The Tractator reads *επι το θηριον*, as in the English authorized version. See his p. 30.



fury of the elements: <sup>1</sup>—an admission based on prophetic truth; <sup>2</sup> and in which he furnishes his own refutation of his own argument.

Thus, look where he may to escape from the difficulties of his prophetic theory, and substitution of a personal Antichrist yet future for the Papal Antichrist of the old Protestant interpreters, the prophecy meets, and stops, and proves too strong for him. At last, in the spirit of the *ancient Academy*, he takes refuge in doubt and scepticism. Perhaps, he says, after all it may be that not *Rome* literally is intended in the prophecy, but rather *the world*, or *some other great and wicked city*: <sup>3</sup>—or perhaps, if *Rome* be the city intended, her sufferings from the Goths, &c., in time past may be considered sufficient punishment; or the Church within her may prove her preservative, and so the final threatened judgments be averted. <sup>4</sup> Again, as regards Antichrist, and Antichrist's persecution of the saints, Perhaps we may have been wrong in supposing such things to have been foretold; and they may, after all, never arise. <sup>5</sup>—Such I say is the conclusion of the writer;—a not unfit conclusion to a Treatise so marked by inconsistency and self-contradiction. Now it is mainly doubtless to the insuperable difficulties of the

<sup>1</sup> He cites Gregory in particular: "Rome shall not be destroyed by the (barbaric) nations; but shall consume away internally, worn out by storms of lightning, whirlwinds, and earthquakes." p. 35. He might have cited further, to the same effect, Tertullian, Lactantius, and others.

<sup>2</sup> All this will be found explained and illustrated in the last Part of my Commentary. See on the one point of the ten horns tearing and burning the harlot-city in the earlier æra of her imperial history, pp. 31, 32; and on her final and everlasting destruction by volcanic earthquake and fire p. 201 *suprà*.

<sup>3</sup> "As Babylon is a type of Rome, and of the world of sin and vanity, so Rome in her turn may be a type also, whether of some other city [yet to come], or of a proud and deceiving world." p. 38.—See on this point my examination of Dr. Arnold's prophetic theory, in a later Chapter in this Appendix.

<sup>4</sup> "Rome's judgments have come on her in great measure, when her empire was taken from her: her persecutions of the Church have been in great measure judged; and the Scripture predictions concerning her fulfilled. Whether or not she shall be further judged depends on two circumstances:—first, whether the righteous men in the city, who saved her when her judgment first came, [that executed by the Goths,] may not through God's great mercy be allowed to save her still; next, whether the prophecy in its fulness relates to *Rome*, or to some other object, or objects, of which *Rome* is a type." p. 39. "Perchance, through God's mercy, it [Rome's destruction] may be procrastinated even to the end, and never be fulfilled. Of this we can know nothing, one way or the other." p. 38.

<sup>5</sup> "If such a persecution [that of Antichrist] has been foretold, it has not yet come, and therefore is to come. We may be wrong in thinking that Scripture foretells it, though it has been the common belief of all ages: but if there be, it is still future." p. 49; and so too p. 52.

Tractator's anti-protestant futurist theory about Antichrist, that these inconsistencies and self-contradictions with reference to Antichrist's predicted *time of rise after the old Roman Empire's breaking up, and local Roman connexion* afterwards, are to be attributed :<sup>1</sup>—a fact evidenced by the similar or equal inconsistencies, and self-contradictions, of all other expositors of the same school on the same point.<sup>2</sup> And it is in this point of view that I have felt it my

<sup>1</sup> Perhaps in part too from *intentional obscurity*:—for such is avowed by some of the Tractarians. Though surely on important theological questions, if on any other, obscurity is above all things to be deprecated, and light sought :

Εν δὲ φαιεὶ καὶ ὀλεσσοῦν.

<sup>2</sup> In my chapter on the *Year-day*, Vol. iii. p. 298, I have noticed Dr. S. R. Maitland's strange and most untenable theory, after Lacunza, respecting the intent of the *quadripartite Image* in Daniel; as if of the empires symbolized in it, the first of which the Prophet himself defines to be *Babylon*, the *Macedonian empire* (not the *Persian*) was the *second*, the *Roman* the *third*, and *Antichrist's empire* (still future) the intended *fourth*.\* By this singular theory Dr. M. may perhaps hope to escape from the decisive anti-futurist argument of the ten subordinate kingdoms of Antichrist's empire being figured in Daniel as originating out of, and dating from, the breaking up of the old Roman empire: which empire he fully admits to have perished under the Goths' destroying power, and past away.† But, as was there argued by me, the idea of the *Image* having a gap of not less than *thirteen centuries* between its *third* prefigured empire and its *fourth* is really nothing less than absurd.‡ Nor is

\* On Antichrist, p. 5, 6.

† “The Roman empire has long ceased to exist. . . Surely the empire founded by Romulus, and ruled by Augustus and Constantine, has past through a regular decline and fall to absolute extinction.” On Antichrist, p. 6.

‡ Let me add a few further remarks on this singular opinion.

1. As to Dr. Maitland's argument for considering the *Persian empire* as a mere continuation of the *Babylonian under a new dynasty*, because of Babylon not being destroyed on the Persians taking it, but continuing one of the capitals of the Persian empire, the same argument might be used to show the identity of the *Macedonian empire* also with both the Persian and Babylonian. For Alexander, after the conquest of Persia, similarly made Babylon one of its capitals. In fact the Bible itself represents the overthrow of Babylon by Cyrus as the overthrow of its *empire*. (So Is. xiv., Jer. l., li.) And in Dan. viii. it is expressly revealed that the 2nd great empire was *Persian*, the 3rd *Greek*.—2. His statement of the Persian empire being, not inferior to Nebuchadnezzar's, according to the divine description of the *second* empire of the Image, but equal to it or greater, is most questionable: i. e. if we receive the account which *Berosus* gives of the Babylonian kingdom, as extending westward to the Straits of Gades.—3. As to his argument that the *universal* sovereignty ascribed to the *third* empire of the Image was not attributable to *Alexander's* empire, was it in the strictest sense of the word attributable any more to that of Rome? The unquestionable limitation of the meaning of such expressions in Scripture must be taken into the account, of which I have before spoken: (compare the similar statement made respecting Nebuchadnezzar's, Dan. iv. 22, “Thy dominion, O king, reacheth to the end of the earth;” and respecting that of the Persian king Cyrus, Ezra i. 2:) and, as to the *common* use of it, the story of Alexander weeping because he had no more worlds to conquer, sufficiently shows its appropriateness.—See too the confirmatory argument in my Vol. i. pp. 429, 430.

It should be observed that the uninterruptedness of continuity *known* to have existed between the first, second, and third empires symbolized, is of course the

duty thus at length to exhibit them. At the same time, considering that it is no vulgar or inferior hand of the Tractarian school that has penned the Tract, and that the palpable failure of his attempt at diverting the prophecies respecting Antichrist from application to the Roman Papacy involves it in the most conclusive disproof and condemnation of the general Tractarian system of religious doctrine,—allied as it is so closely to that of Rome,—must not the thought also force itself on the mind, Is this

the idea less manifestly absurd, which Dr. M. and Dr. Todd propound, with I presume the same object, of the four Beasts of Dan. vii. being four contemporary empires of the latter day, the 4th and most terrible that of Antichrist.\* Besides which the argument from St. Paul's predicated *hindrance* or *let*, (viz. of the old Roman empire,†) as the hindrance whose removal was to make way for Antichrist's manifestation, and that still stronger one from the Apocalyptic designation of *Rome's seven-hilled city* as Antichrist's own imperial seat, still remain in full force against them.

strongest confirmation of uninterrupted continuity being intended in the symbol between the 3rd and 4th.

\* On Antichrist, p. 9. In this view Dr. Maitland is followed only by Todd; and opposed, I believe, to nearly all the *day-day*, as well as the *year-day* prophetic interpreters.—Its untenableness is evident. In Dan. vii. 7 the other Beasts are spoken of as "*before it*," i. e. prior in time. And how indeed could these other Beasts have had "*dominion*," as the third, or *leopard*, is said to have had, if contemporary with the *fourth*, which brake all other powers in pieces? Dr. M. in his Reply to Mr. Cuninghame (p. 64) says; "Three other kingdoms may be contemporary with a fourth which possesses universal sovereignty, . . . as easily as the kingdoms of Saxony, Wurtemberg, and Holland were contemporary with the French Empire under Napoleon."—Unfortunate parallel! Had those petty dependencies of France *dominion*? Or did they answer to the character of "*great beasts*," so as the three first empires, as well as the 4th, in Daniel? Besides which the correspondence of the 4th Beast's ten horns with the ten toes of the Image seems obvious, and suggests a similar correspondence between the two visions in other points.

† At p. 18 of the same treatise on Antichrist, Dr. M. acknowledges that the meaning of this *let* was revealed to the early Church: and, as I have often said, the early Church understood it of the old Roman empire or emperors.

Dr. Todd at pp. 335—338 of his Treatise on Antichrist thus tries to get rid of the argument against his theory hence arising. "But this opinion, notwithstanding its antiquity, and the great names that have given it their sanction, must now be considered as having long ago been refuted by time. The Roman empire is now extinct; and no potentate possessing the character and marks of Antichrist has as yet been manifested in the earth." An instance of the *petitio principii* sufficiently amusing! The Protestant expositors whom he proposes to refute say that there *has* appeared just such a potentate, and this commencing from the very epoch of the old Roman empire's extinction, agreeably with the Fathers' views of the *let*. "But *I say* such an one has *not* appeared," is substantially Dr. T.'s argument; "and therefore the Fathers' view of the *let* was an error!"

Malvenda, i. 402, adopting the statement of Rabanus on Antichrist, argues differently thus:—"The Fathers rightly judged the *let* to be the old Roman empire; and that Antichrist would follow on its removal. But Antichrist has not yet come. Therefore the Roman empire has not been removed: but continued to exist still, after the Gothic catastrophe, in the Frank or German emperors, *vel si qui alii!*"

the *logic*, this the *theology*, that half Oxford of late has been wondering after? <sup>1</sup>

2ndly, as to the *Antichrist's professed religion*.

The triple Scriptural evidence in proof of the predicted Antichrist being a *great professor of Christianity*,—viz. that of his unrighteous system being defined as *the deceivableness* of unrighteousness, that of his chief agent and minister being figured as a *lamb-like false prophet*, and that of his designation by name as a *Vice-Christ*, (in his own profession, of course, as if of Christ's appointment,)—is what my readers must now be familiar with.

But the Futurists' representations on this head are altogether different from what we might thus have inferred from Scripture. According to them Antichrist's profession is to be that of a downright open *atheist*:—a theory this all but necessary indeed to their system; for why, except on account of some such different and more horrid kind of irreligion, overlook the Papacy, and judge Antichrist? So Maitland; "The blasphemy of the Little Horn seems . . . to be *downright barefaced infidelity*: something more like what was exhibited in France during the Revolution, than like anything ever seen in the Church of Rome."<sup>2</sup> Also Dr. Todd; "We are to look for an individual Antichrist; . . . a power *openly and avowedly professing atheism*; and blaspheming the very name and semblance of Christianity."<sup>3</sup> And so too others.<sup>4</sup> But then what explanation do they give of the passages just referred to, as indicating something so different in the Antichrist's religious profession? In Dr. Maitland I observe no reference to them. As regards Dr. Todd, while

<sup>1</sup> This was written in my first Edition; I think in 1843. What has past since only furnishes reason for my letting it stand as it was. (2nd Ed.)

<sup>2</sup> Second Enquiry, p. 105. So again in his Answer to Cuninghame, p. 57: "I must repeat over and over again, that the spiritual common sense of the Church of God in every age, from the days of Daniel to those of Wicliff, is set in array against the fundamental point of Mr. Cuninghame's system: for it . . . knew nothing, and looked for nothing in the *character of Antichrist*, but an individual *infidel persecutor*."—On the *Fathers'* opinions, see my next Section.

<sup>3</sup> On Antichrist, p. 37. Compare his p. 153.

<sup>4</sup> Mr. Burgh, p. 265, says; "Infidel indeed it will be in one sense; from its marked hostility to the Saviour, and open denial of his having come in the flesh."—So too the Oxford Tractarian on Antichrist, p. 16; "Both St. Paul and St. John describe the enemy as characterized by *open infidelity*, . . . and the *blasphemous denial of God*: and St. Paul adds that he will oppose all existing religion, true or false." He illustrates at p. 21 by reference to the *atheism* professed at the French Revolution.



overlooking that most striking symbol of *the lamb-like two-horned Beast*, that was prophetically set forth as Antichrist's attendant and prime minister,<sup>1</sup> and this down even to Antichrist's last war against the gospel, and consequent destruction by Christ,<sup>2</sup> he however notices, and seeks to set aside, the other two. St. Paul's expression about *the deceivableness of unrighteousness* he explains away, as if meaning merely the deceivableness of false miracles, *externally* supporting the iniquitous moral system; <sup>3</sup> though surely the expression seems to imply a deceivableness by great pretensions to religion in the moral system itself. Again, as to the designative term *Antichrist*, though quoting a criticism of Mr. Gresswell which explains the force of the word almost exactly as I have done, viz. as meaning "*another Christ, a Vice-Christ, a pretender to the name of Christ, who in every circumstance or characteristic of personal distinction . . . appears to be, and sets himself up as, the counterpart of the true,*"—I say, though he thus quotes Mr. Gresswell,<sup>4</sup> defining the term so as to set aside, by the very force of it, all idea of the predicted Antichrist's being an avowed atheist, yea, and confesses that "*this is indeed the strictly etymological meaning of the word,*" yet does he discard it by simply saying, "*It is plain that John applied the name in the looser sense of enemies to Christ by false doctrine.*" But how so? The statement in 1 John ii. 22, "*He is Antichrist that denieth the Father and the Son,*" is the one grand New Testament passage on which his *atheist* counter-theory rests. But mark how the next verse, "*He that denieth the Son hath not the Father,*" shows that the denial of God the Father meant by St. John was only by denying Christ. And how denying Christ? Surely in Paul's language, "*While professing to know God, in works denying him.*" The *Gnostic* application fixes this meaning on it. And so in truth the Oxford Tractator confesses; <sup>5</sup> and gives it as an alternative

<sup>1</sup> How could he have been so short-sighted as to overlook its force and significance, when he had Laeunza in his hand, pointing it out so strikingly, though himself a Romanist? See p. 540 *suprà*. See too my Vol. iii. pp. 195, 201, &c.

<sup>2</sup> Apoc. xix. 20.

<sup>3</sup> Todd on Antichrist, p. 228.—Mr. Burgh adds strangely that it will be a *religious* system, from Antichrist's requiring the *worship of himself*, and from the *counter-Trinity* of the *Dragon, Beast, and False Prophet*. *ibid.*

<sup>4</sup> p. 92.

<sup>5</sup> At p. 15 he thus expresses himself; "*Antichrist will be led on from rejecting the Son of God to the rejection of God altogether, either by implication, or practically;*" and, at p. 18, remarks that he was, according to the Fathers, "*to observe Jewish rites.*"

explanation. How fully an apostle might apply the phrase to professedly Christian teachers appears from Jude 4; where he speaks of false teachers, who had come into the Christian body privily, "*denying the only Master and Lord Jesus Christ*:" men who were "spots in the Christians' feasts of charity." And so too 2 Pet. ii. 1; "There shall be false teachers *among you*, who shall privily bring in damnable heresies, even *denying the Lord that bought them*."<sup>1</sup>

The same general notion about Antichrist that makes the Futurists paint him as *an avowed infidel and atheist*, leads them to paint him also as an *open avowed anti-moralist*: legalizing, and indeed enforcing, men's renunciation of the obligations and restraints of marriage; agreeably, they say, with St. Paul's prophetic notice to Timothy about the apostatizers in the last days, (for they explain this as meant in the way of a *universal* prohibition,) "forbidding to marry."<sup>2</sup> The anti-moral excesses and outrages at the first outbreak of the French Revolution are referred to by way of illustration. So Dr. Maitland:—"The plain language of Scripture warrants us to expect. . . that the same apostate power shall *forbid to marry*: and they who have any acquaintance with the real doctrines of apostates from Christianity, whether French philosophers, German illuminati, or liberal infidels of England, will require no proof that such a law may be expected, if an infidel apostasy should become dominant."<sup>3</sup> So too Dr. Maitland's faithful follower, Dr. Todd: "This much seems beyond a doubt, that a total prohibition of marriage in itself, and not a restriction imposed upon some

<sup>1</sup> On the Old Testament passage from Daniel xi. 36—39, see my pp. 91—100 *suprà*, in proof that it can as little as 1 John ii. 22 help out the Antichrist atheist theory.

I might add that even the Futurists' own fancy that Antichrist is to rebuild, or occupy when rebuilt, the Jewish temple at Jerusalem,\* might have prevented this strange *atheist* theory of Antichrist. For why built except for the Jews' worship: that which implies a recognition of the Old Testament, and consequently a profession against atheism?—But this indeed is but their fancy. The Scriptural notices lately referred to, and which the Oxford Futurist accepts, respecting Antichrist's *Roman* capital and seat, sufficiently refute the Futurists' notion of his having *Jerusalem* and its *temple* as the chief seat of his empire and worship. Their theory on this head, like their Antichrist, would seem between the two seats to fall to the ground.

On the important point of Antichrist's *great city* being simply and only *Rome* see my Vol. ii. pp. 433—439. This is a point *never to be forgotten* by my readers.

<sup>2</sup> 1 Tim. iv. 1, 2.

<sup>3</sup> Second Enquiry, p. 130.

\* Thus on Apoc. xi. Mr. Burgh, p. 209, makes Antichrist to sit in the Jewish temple, and there receive worship.

particular class or order of men, must be intended in the words."<sup>1</sup> And so again the Oxford Tractator.<sup>2</sup>

Now the whole force of this argument, as corroborative of their own Futurist views of an individual Antichrist, and subversive of the common Protestant view explaining it of the Papacy, arises out of the idea just noticed of the predicted prohibition being one of *universal* application. But, to show the utter incorrectness of this idea, notwithstanding the learned Dublin Doctor's declaration of its indubitableness, two considerations will, I believe, suffice: the one a *probable argument* drawn from the *context* of the prediction: the other an *ex-absurdo proof* drawn from the supposed thing predicted.

First then, and as regards *the context* which immediately precedes the verse in question,<sup>3</sup> what find we to have been there St. Paul's subject and argument? We find nearly the whole preceding Chapter occupied with the Apostle's directions to Timothy as to what would be fitting, and should be required, in bishops and deacons:—including the remarkable particular, respecting both bishop and deacon, that each should be the husband of one wife;<sup>4</sup> and also a reference to wine, as that which neither bishop nor deacon should use to *excess*:<sup>5</sup> it being implied that *in moderation* they might both lawfully and properly use it; as he said to Timothy himself a little later,<sup>6</sup> "Drink no longer water, but use a little wine, for thy stomach's sake, and thy often infirmities." Now it is after a prolonged series of directions to Timothy on this subject of the Church ministers and their wives, and next after the injunction, "Let the deacons be husbands of one wife, &c.," that St. Paul digresses momentarily to intimate the necessity of his thus instructing Timothy by letter, (having been prevented from personal conference,) how he ought to act in his responsible office of a presiding bishop in the Church of God; that whose high object it was, like a pillar erect on its basement, to hold

<sup>1</sup> Todd, p. 306. At p. 335 he follows Maitland in illustrating from the French Revolution.

<sup>2</sup> At p. 21 he too illustrates his view of Antichrist's religion on this head by reference to "the annulling of the divine ordinance of marriage," at the French Revolution, and "resolving it into a mere civil contract, to be made and dissolved at pleasure."

<sup>3</sup> I set aside, in order to clearness, the break of a new Chapter-heading at 1 Tim. iv. 1. For it is a break which has of course no authority; and here tends unfortunately to obscure the clear view of the context.

<sup>4</sup> 1 Tim. iii. 2, 4, 12.

<sup>5</sup> Ib. 3, 8. The *meats* and *drinks*, βρωματα and ποματα, are often connected together, as in Heb. ix. 10.

<sup>6</sup> Ib. v. 23.

up and exhibit the great gospel truth of the mystery of godliness, of which the  $\alpha$  and  $\omega$  was God manifest in the flesh : and this the rather because the Spirit told expressly of a coming apostasy from the faith, in which there would be another rule of life and godliness ; with forbidding to marry, and enjoining of abstinence from meats, though God had given them as his good creatures for man's use. This noted he then resumes *the thread* of his general directions at verse 6 ; " Suggesting these things to the brethren, (viz. all that he had previously enjoined,) thou shalt be a *good minister of Jesus Christ*."—Such, I say, is the connexion and context of this brief but memorable prophecy ; and thus does it intervene parenthetically in the course of St. Paul's instructions to Timothy about ministers of the Church ; including that of their being husbands of one wife, and not using wine in excess. All which being so, would it be reasonable to suppose that St. Paul digressed to a prophecy in no wise specially connected with his ministerial subject, but concerning alike *all men* ; or, rather, to one closely connected with it, and having regard specially to ministers and functionaries in the visible Church ? Surely the latter. In which case, and considering the far-famed Papal injunction of celibacy on the priesthood, (not to add also on the monastic orders,) and that of the forbidding of meats also, wine inclusive, to multitudinous ascetic orders, the prophecy becomes, just as Mede in the main expounded it,<sup>1</sup> a prophecy that had most signal fulfilment in the Popedom ; and so, instead of an argument for Futurists, furnishes an argument strong against them.<sup>2</sup>

Secondly, I should be glad to know, were there truth in Drs. Maitland and Todd's universal anti-marriage theory respecting Antichrist,

<sup>1</sup> I do not insist on Mede's exposition of *διδασκαλιαι δαιμονιων*. I have elsewhere spoken on this point. See my Vol. iii. p. 103, and also Vol. ii. pp. 9 and 497. But it does not affect the question we are now discussing.

<sup>2</sup> Let me observe, with reference to Dr. Todd's illustration from Antichristian sects existing in St. Paul's time, or that arose soon after, to whom the description in the prophecy might primarily or partially apply,\* (save only that they were rejected as heretics by the majority of the Church, and so the characteristic of *an apostasy*, in St. Paul's sense, would hardly attach to them,) I say that in regard of those Enekratite Gnostics, and the Manichæans afterwards, it was not upon *all* members of the sect that the injunction was laid of abstinence from marriage and meats. By no means. A person must be but ill informed on the subject if unaware that those Sects had members *perfect* and *imperfect* : and that it was only on the *perfect*, including

\* Todd, p. 306.—I observe that Chrysostom too on this passage illustrates from the Manichees. *Περί Μανιχαίων, και Εγκρατητών, και Μαρκιανιστών, και παντός αυτών του εργαστηρίου, τα τοιαυτα φησιν.*



how it could consist with Christ's own prophetic declaration in Matt. xxiv. 38? For, according to these learned Doctors, the yet future Antichrist's empire over the world is to be universal; and his power such that whosoever refuses to receive his mark, and obey his injunctions, is to be slain.<sup>1</sup> Of course this must apply to the injunction about not marrying and not eating meats, just as well as to other injunctions. And since Antichrist's reign is, as they rightly hold, to be only ended by Christ's coming, this injunction must needs be in force, and acted on, even until then. Yet, behold, Christ tells us that, "as in the days before the flood men were *eating and drinking, marrying, and giving in marriage*, until the day when Noe entered into the ark, so shall also the coming of the Son of Man be."—Just accordant with which is the further fact that on the tremendous destruction of Antichrist's own city, the seven-hilled Babylon, by volcanic earthquake and fire, so as described in Apoc. xviii., among the things mentioned as *only then* ceasing in Babylon is "the voice of the *bridegroom and bride*."

And here I might fitly conclude this part of my critique, since on the only other great point of difference about Antichrist, viz. the *year-day* question, involving that of Antichrist's *duration*, I have written very fully in my Chapter on it in the 3rd Volume.<sup>2</sup>—But I

generally the *ministers* of the Sect, that the restriction was incumbent.\* So that theirs was pretty much as restricted a prohibition as in the case of the Romish Church.

<sup>1</sup> So put by Dr. Maitland, *ibid.* 99.

<sup>2</sup> It was shown in my Chapter on the *year-day* that the *general* principle of figuring the longer times of the things symbolized by correspondent shorter times of the symbol, is one not only suggested by nature, but recognized in Scripture; the longer youth and maturity of Israel, for example, having been beautifully figured by Ezekiel under the shorter youth and maturity of a woman: † and it was shown too that there was almost a necessity for such enigmatic yet definite expression of the great prophetic periods that had reference to the time of Christ's advent, in order to the fulfilment of Christ's apparent double purpose, 1st, of his coming being never regarded by his people as very distant, (though in reality very distant in time,) 2ndly, and as the time drew near, of its approach being evidenced by chronological as well as other proof. ‡—Moreover, as to the *specific year-day* scale of proportion, it appeared that shortly before Daniel was chosen to receive and publish his symbolic prophecies about the great Gentile nations, involving the specific periods of 1260, 1290, 1335, and 2300 days, as attached to the symbols, his brother prophet Ezekiel had been directed to act out a figuration concerning the Jewish nation involving

\* See my Vol. ii. p. 525; and specially what is there said from Mosheim as to the rule of abstinence applying only to the *perfect* and the *ministers* of the Manichees.

† See my Vol. iii. p. 263.

‡ *ib.* 264.

think it well, ere concluding, to add a few remarks in correction of certain representations by Futurists respecting *the Papacy* on the one hand, and *the Antichrist* on the other, on points which bear on my last head, and seem to me too important to pass in silence.

The first is Dr. M.'s representation of *celibacy* under the Popedom as if, *first*, it extended only to the parochial Clergy, and affected one sex only;—*secondly*, as if it was only enforced on the Clergy from the view (perhaps mistaken view, he says) of their so better performing their clerical functions.—This is not the way that Ranke speaks of it, in his History of the Popes.<sup>1</sup> And assuredly that was not the master-motive which induced the Papal determinate enforcement of it at all hazards. In the view of making use of *profest religion* to subserve both *irreligion* and *worldly policy*, it was one of his measures the most characteristic, and most extraordinary. Extending not merely to the parochial clergy of Western Europe, but to the numberless communities of monks and nuns, its first effect was to consecrate, at the same time that with the strong arm of power it enforced upon them, that rule of celibacy which, under the semblance of purity and holiness, opened wide the way, and almost precipitated them into it, of licentiousness.<sup>2</sup> And, when direct Papal rule was established over the convent, (not to speak of the priesthood,) then in those innumerable monasteries, male and female,—containing within their walls members from most of the high and considerable

specific periods of days also; and with the distinct announcement from God that the scale and proportion of time was to be a *day* for a *year*.\* Besides which to Daniel's own prophecy of the 70 weeks the same *year-day* ambiguity attached.† So that of any definite enigmatic scale the *year-day* was of all others the most Scriptural and probable.—It was also shown that, instead of the common sense of the Christian Church having been arrayed against this year-day principle, so that, as Dr. Maitland affirmed, it was unheard of for some thirteen centuries, the principle was recognized by a complete catena of expositors, from Cyprian and Theodoret down to the Reformation: nor in fact ever objected against, as unscriptural or unsound, till the objections, some time after the Reformation, of Cardinal Bellarmine.‡ Thus, if I mistake not, not only was answer given on this point to the *anti-year-day futurists*; but, on their own chosen ground, the argument was shown to be directly against them. Nor has anything subsequently written, by any of the anti-year-day controversialists, seemed to me in the slightest degree to have answered or disturbed my conclusions.

<sup>1</sup> See my Vol. iii. p. 206.

<sup>2</sup> See the historical illustrations given by me, Vol. ii. pp. 12, 28.—When Czersky was hesitating about entering the Romish orders from repugnancy to its law of celibacy, he tells us the reply was made to him, “Non unam (mulierem) habebis, sed mille pro unâ habebis.”

\* Ib. 269.

† Ib. 267.

‡ On this see Vol. iii. pp. 279—282, and p. 484 *suprà*.

families in the several Western kingdoms, and absorbing in their domains no small proportion of the national territory, the accumulated result, it was said, of the piety, or rather of the superstition of successive generations,—I say in these monasteries, thus *as an act of religion* endowed, and thus *as an act of religion* peopled with devotees, it was found that he had formed, and held in his grasp, so many almost inexpugnable fortresses, filled with *hostages* for its fidelity, in the heart of each kingdom of Western Christendom.<sup>1</sup> Was there ever such a “*forbidding to marry,*” in any other Church, or Sect, that Dr. M. has put forward for comparison on this head?—Nor must I omit to except strongly against what Dr. M. says of the abstinence from meats and fastings in the Romish Church, as if, like those in our own Church, good and praiseworthy.<sup>2</sup> By the English Church the doctrine of *justification* through faith in Christ alone is laid down as its very foundation-stone. With the Romish Church the rule of fasting, as of celibacy, is laid down as a principle of merit and self-justification, in opposition to the gospel of Christ.

Next, and with reference to Dr. Todd<sup>3</sup> and other Futurists' view of Antichrist's religious or rather anti-religious profession, as that of *an openly avowed atheist, anti-religionist, and anti-moralist*, let me express my deep conviction, that it is not merely unaccordant with the Apocalyptic and the other cognate prophecies of Antichrist, but appears, even intellectually speaking, a mere rude and common-place conception of Satan's predicted master-piece of opposition to Christ, compared with what has been actually realized and exhibited in the Papacy. My opinion of the Pope's being Antichrist is not indeed *founded* on any such *à priori* notion of the thing; but on the complete identification of the one and the other, after a rigid comparison of the Papal history, seat, character, doctrine, and doings with those of the Antichrist of prophecy. Having however shown this, let me now explain and justify the *superadded* sentiment just expressed respecting the Papal system; as being, beyond anything that the Futurists have imagined, or ever can imagine, the very perfection of anti-christianism. And I will do it by simply putting a case in point. Which then, I ask, Reader, would you view with the deeper

<sup>1</sup> So Sir R. Baker, speaking of Henry VIIIth's dissolution of monasteries: “Thinking the work not sufficiently done, so long as Abbeyes and Priories kept their station: which were as it were the *Pope's fortresses.*” Quoted by Daubuz, p. 733.

<sup>2</sup> So too Todd on Antichrist, p. 310, &c.

<sup>3</sup> See *ibid.* p. 37.

amazement and abhorrence:—an *avowed open desperate enemy*, sworn against your life, family, friends, property:—or one that, *while professing the utmost friendship*, were by some strange *impersonation of you*, in your absence, to insinuate himself into your place in the family; seize your estate, seduce your wife to be as his wife,<sup>1</sup> your children to look to him as their father; and, if yours be a king's dignity, to seize your kingdom for himself; then to make use of his opportunities to train them (wife, children, and subjects) into unfaithfulness and rebellion against all your most solemn and cherished wishes and commands; falsifying your letters and forging your handwriting, in order the more effectually to carry out his plan; and even at length framing an image, and breathing voice into it, and by magic art and strong delusion making men believe that it was your own self speaking, in expression of perfect approval of his proceedings, as those of your chief friend, plenipotentiary, and chosen substitute?—Such is somewhat of the view of Antichrist, sketched in Scripture prophecy: such, what has been realized in the Popes and Popedom. And, horrid as was the atheism of the French revolutionists, yet must I beg leave to doubt whether in God's view it was as horrid an abomination, even at its worst, as the blasphemous hypocrisies and betrayal of Christ in the polished Court and Church Councils of his usurping Vicar and impersonator at Rome. Sharp as were the thorns and nails and spear of the Pagan soldiery, they were surely less painful to the Saviour than the kiss of Judas.<sup>2</sup>

## § 2. ON CERTAIN MODIFIED FUTURIST COUNTER-SCHEMES.

There is something so monstrous in the Futurists' primary and fundamental idea, as described in my preceding Section, of the Apocalyptic prophecy overleaping at once near 2000 years from St. John's time, and plunging instantly, and without notice, into the distant future of the consummation,—something so contrary alike to the general rule of God's prophetic revelations, and to the natural meaning of the revealing Angel's own words to St. John about the commencing chronology of those of the Apocalypse,—that it could hardly be but that some at least among them should seek out for a

<sup>1</sup> See my Vol. ii. pp. 79, 80, and Vol. iii. p. 179.

<sup>2</sup> I have in this Paragraph quoted from my Reply to Mr. Arnold.



way of softening the monstrosity. Moreover, if themselves really of Protestant feeling, the idea of its total overleaping of the great Papal apostasy, without forewarning against or notice of the divine wrath and judgment impending on it, has been a part of the theory painful even to themselves; and from which, if possible, they would fain set it free. So here and there the attempt has been made. Some ten or twelve years ago an imperfectly developed Scheme, partially to that effect, appeared in the *Christian Examiner*, written by R. D., a well-known and much-respected correspondent of the *Journal*; which, however, as being but partially developed, it may seem unfair to criticise.<sup>1</sup> Besides this I may mention the scheme of

<sup>1</sup> The proposed Scheme is developed in a Series of Letters in the *Christian Examiner* for 1839.

It opens by a statement of the opinion that the *little book* in the hand of the rainbow-crowned Angel, in Apoc. x., includes in it all the remainder of the Apocalypse, and that it has for its subject the ultimate restoration of the Jewish people. For in Apoc. xi. John's temple-measuring answers to the prefigurative measuring of Jerusalem, as in the latter day, in *Zech.* ii. 2; and the two witnesses for Christ, whom R. D. hesitates to designate specifically, (witnesses however sent more particularly to the Jews,) are killed, after completing their testimony, in the place where Christ was crucified, i. e. the literal Jerusalem, by the Beast from the *Byss*, or Antichrist. So Antichrist's seat is fixed to that holy city: a local designation previously intimated by the statement as to the Gentiles treading the holy city for 42 months. This Beast is the same with the Beast of Apoc. xiii. and xvii.; also with Daniel's little horn of the 4th great Beast; also with St. Paul's Man of Sin. He unites the Roman power with all that may remain of that of the other three prophetic monarchies, in a great Gentile confederacy against the restoration of God's Israel: so making war with the saints, i. e. with the holy nation of Israel, as for 3½ years he treads their city; of whom however R. D. supposes the great mass, indeed all but the 144,000, or remnant of the election of grace, to be as yet unconverted. The second Beast, attending the first, he expounds to be a priesthood supporting him, from out of the apostate Church of Rome.

And what then of the woman Babylon who rides the Beast? It is the idolatrous Church of Rome, then in intimate alliance with the "infidel" Beast Antichrist, against the restoration of Israel: for which cause specially, (though not without some reference also to her former sins, for the Romish Church is *the apostasy* of St. Paul's prophecy, though its Popes are not the Man of Sin, or Antichrist,) there is denounced against her, and presently executed, the doom of utter destruction by kings from the East. As to the Beast's seven heads, R. D. professes to have no distinct idea; and none moreover about the Beast's ten horns.—So first Rome is destroyed: then in the Jewish battle-field of Armageddon the Antichrist and his associate powers. And then the millennial reign with Christ of the faithful *Jewish* martyrs, killed in Antichrist's persecution, will begin: a new heaven and earth having been created, fit for the risen saints to inhabit; and the New Jerusalem descending from heaven as the glorious city for the inhabitation, not of risen saints, but of the restored and now converted Jews. In fact, this is the same as the city of glory described in *Isa.* liv.; while, as between Ezekiel's temple and the New Jerusalem of the Apocalypse there is this difference, that Ezekiel's temple is to be that of the restored Jews *before* their conversion; the Apocalyptic Jerusalem, where there is no temple, the habitation of the Jews *after*.

Of course, in reference to this, such questions as the following will suggest them-

modification propounded by the *Rev. W. G. Barker*, in a Letter printed in 1850 in the Quarterly Journal of Prophecy;<sup>1</sup> and another, with its own marked peculiarities, published quite recently by *Mr. W. Kelly*, of Guernsey.<sup>2</sup> Of each of these I now proceed to offer a brief notice.

### 1. *Mr. Barker.*

Mr. B.'s Paper, which is written in a kindly spirit, is entitled, "An Apology for *Moderate Futurism.*" After stating at the outset his persuasion that the number of prophetic students who held moderate Futurist views is greatly on the increase, (a persuasion in which I suspect him to be mistaken,) he proceeds to express a hope that they who hold the "Protestant view will be constrained to admit that

selves to the intelligent reader. 1. How could the Apocalyptic temple-measuring, in which the outer part was cast out as given to *the Gentiles*, and moreover the holy city given to be trod by *the Gentiles* for 42 weeks, correspond with the measuring of the city in Zechariah, to the intent and effect of Jerusalem being inhabited as towns without walls by *the restored Jews*: of the which it is said, "for I, saith the Lord, will be unto her a wall of fire round about?"—2. How could the Beast be a Roman power, as R. D. admits it to be, and with a local fixation to the Roman site, by reason of its seven heads signifying the *seven hills of Rome*, and yet have its seat at *Jerusalem*?—3. How, if *the apostasy* of 2 Thess. ii. be the Roman Papacy, such as for ages it has been developed, can the official heads of this apostasy, i. e. the Roman Popes, after manifestation before the world in that character, fail of answering to St. Paul's *Man of Sin*; or how this Man of Sin be meant of a chief not directly heading the apostasy, but only closely allied with its head?—4. How, as regards Ezekiel's temple and city, could that appertain to the Jews when restored but not converted, and when indeed (according to R. D.) Antichrist is to occupy Jerusalem and its temple as his seat, and yet have for its name and title, "*the Lord is there*?"—5. How can the New Jerusalem of Apoc. xxi. be the city simply of the restored *Jewish* nation, when its name is declared to be written on the faithful of *Gentile Asiatic Churches*, such as that of Philadelphia, Apoc. iii. 12?

But, as before said, the Scheme is evidently not digested.—I observe with pleasure, as well as surprise, one point of agreement between us; viz. in that R. D. has anticipated me in making the great white throne of Apoc. xx. 11 synchronize, at its first setting up, with the *commencement*, not the *end*, of the millennium. When I drew out my argument on that point (see pp. 215, 216, *suprà*) I was not aware that the idea had been entertained by any previous expositor. R. D. only states the idea. He does not argue it.

<sup>1</sup> No. VII. for April, 1850.

<sup>2</sup> In my 4th Edition of the *Horæ*, I took Mr. C. Maitland's "Apocalyptical School of Prophetic Interpretation," for my second example of modified Futurist exposition. And, if any of my readers wish to see it fully examined into and criticised, they may there find what they wish. As it is, considering that the Book and its suggested views have now probably past into oblivion, and moreover that I have had occasion again and again to show up Mr. C. M.'s inaccuracies in my *History of Apocalyptic Interpretation*, (see *suprà* pp. 275, 276, 278, 279, 281, 282, 284, 285, 286, 302, 305, 306, 307, 308, 313, 319, 320, 344, 351, 362, 368, 379, 380, 423, 424, 441, 539,) I think it better to take Mr. W. Kelly's more recent book as my second specimen of modified Futurism; especially as I imagine it to give the views of a large Section of "the Brethren" (originally called "Plymouth Brethren") on the Apocalyptic prophecy.

*moderate Futurist views* may be maintained together with the most consistent *Protestantism*: and may even be reconciled with a modified admission of the cherished views of the *historical* interpreters." And then, and in evidence of this, he lays down the following several points on which, in a certain way, the Protestant Futurist and historical expositors have agreement:—viz. 1. in supposing that we are now near the time of the consummation;—2. in supposing the Apocalyptic Babylon to mean the Papacy;—3. in holding Daniel's four great empires to be those of Babylon, Persia, Greece, and Rome;—4. in expecting a national restoration of the Jews to their own land;—besides that, in the 5th place, Moderate Futurists are inclined to admit that the Apocalyptic figures may have been so ordered as to have a resemblance to the various historic realities that historic interpreters have variously applied to them; insomuch that these realities may have been in a manner shadows of a more perfect fulfilment yet to come.—Together with the notices of which several points of agreement, there is insinuated on each topic a notice of the superior strength of the Futurists, where the two schools differ.—It is with the 2nd and 5th of these notices that I am alone directly concerned in this present Paper. On the others however, in consequence of the above-mentioned insinuation, I think it right to add a few remarks in the Note subjoined.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> As regards Mr. B.'s 1st supposed point of agreement between the historical interpreters and the moderate Futurists, viz. as to *the present nearness of the consummation*, the following extract from Mr. C. Maitland's book (p. 404), who is to be classed among the latter, may suffice to show Mr. B.'s error:—"Of the yet remaining length of Rome's career we know nothing certain from prophecy: it may be that the sorceress has still before her *long ages of iniquity*; or it may be that we are now resisting her latest arts."—And certainly, on Futurist principles, Mr. C. M. appears to me to have all the reason on his side, as against Mr. Barker. For putting aside, as Mr. B. does, all evidence derivable from the near expiration of certain long chronological periods, commencing from known historic epochs, and reaching to the consummation, from what can he draw his conclusion but from the now existing signs of the times? And are those signs so decisive and distinctive of *themselves*, especially when compared with what have been in past ages, as to furnish a sufficient warrant for it? For example, one marked sign of the approaching consummation that the Futurists' theory requires is the disruption and division of the Roman empire (hitherto most marvellously supposed by them to be unbroken and undivided) into ten contemporary kingdoms. Compare then the evidence on this head *now* presented to Mr. Barker's eye, with the corresponding evidence about it, that presented itself to the affrighted eye of Jerome, *at the opening of the 5th century*:—then when the Roman empire was inundated by a flood of barbarous nations, among whom he marked and enumerated *ten*, as chief and most eminent,\* God's prepared instruments apparently for breaking

\* See my p. 324, and p. 506 Note <sup>1</sup> *suprà*.

1. Now on Mr. B.'s attempt at *Protestantizing*, in a manner, the Futurist views of the Apocalyptic prophecy, there needs but very

up and then dividing the empire among them: and with every circumstance attendant that could make men's hearts fail for fear, and from looking on the things that were coming on the earth. Which, I ask, from the mere evidence of the *signs of the times* had the greater reason for affirming the nearness of the consummation, Jerome or Mr. Barker? Surely the former. And yet we know that near it certainly then was not.\*

2. "Both parties," says Mr. B., "agree that the vision of Daniel's great image has its fulfilment in the four great empires of Babylon, Persia, Greece, and Rome:" adding, with reference to the fact of some Futurists (e. g. Drs. Maitland and Todd) disputing the last, that Moderate Futurists do not dispute it; "neither is it at all necessary to the consistency of Futurism that they should."

Is it not necessary? Let us consider the case as between these *moderates* of the school, and what Mr. B. would designate as the *extreme* Futurists. It is of course essential to the Futurist system to regard its expected, and still future, Antichrist's empire as the last of the great mundane empires, and to assign it a place in Daniel's image accordingly. Shall it be then *the whole of the iron legs and feet*, or only *the feet and toes*? Say Drs. M. and T., *the whole of the iron legs*. But then Mr. B. and his moderates shrink back (and no wonder) from the idea of that long vacant unrepresented interval which this involves; and of the legs of the image dangling correspondingly by a long thread, as I stated in my Chapter on the year-day, Vol. iii. p. 298. It is *only the feet and toes*, exclaim the Moderates; or, as Mr. B. himself seems to prefer, *the toes themselves only*: all the rest, legs and feet, being that Roman empire which began long before Christ's first coming, and is still (they say) not yet ended. But how? The iron legs represent alike the old Roman empire of Augustus, and the Papal empire of the middle age and modern times, as if all one and the same empire, continued uninterruptedly and in undivided form, even until now? Surely, observes Dr. S. R. Maitland,† it is clear that the old Roman empire, "the empire ruled by Augustus and Constantine," has long ceased to exist: and that nothing but the "exigency of system" can make writers on Prophecy gravely affirm the contrary. Besides which Mr. B.'s system makes Antichrist's empire, which he would have to be the strongest as well as most universal that the world has ever seen, to be represented, not by iron feet wrought into greater density and strength than the common iron of the legs above, but by feet or toes part of iron and part of clay, partly strong and partly brittle, and thus less strong and united than the iron legs of the Roman empire above them!

Mr. Barker passes over these obvious and fatal objections without notice. But, by way of compensation, he calls in the doctrine of arithmetical proportion, as allied with him against the historical expositors. "What disproportionate toes," he argues, "that have to symbolize in their length some 1300 years, while the joint legs and feet of the image have but to symbolize some 700 or less?‡ On the other hand, how just the proportion and scale, if we suppose the ten kings that are to be the future Antichrist's contemporaries and subjects, during the destined  $3\frac{1}{2}$  years of

\* Compare my remarks in Vol. iii. pp. 264—267, on the almost absolute necessity of long chronological periods (albeit with certain ambiguities attendant) in order, concurrently with the signs of the times, to give the warning intended of the near approach of the consummation; and moreover the fact of this being accordant with the precedent of the evidence given by God of the near approach of *Christ's first coming*: which last point will be found illustrated very fully in my concluding Chapter in this Appendix.

† On Antichrist, p. 6.

‡ Mr. B. dates Rome's supremacy from B. C. 197, when Macedon yielded to the ascendant of Rome; whence to the breaking up of the Roman empire on the Gothic invasion, A.D. 476, would be near 700 years. There seems some misprint in Mr. B.'s own numerals.



brief reply to show its futility. Says he; "Both parties admit that the Apocalyptic Babylon signifies the Papacy. If they (the Historicals) think the Woman *has* mounted the Beast, we believe the Woman *will* mount the Beast: so we can both agree that the curse of God rests on that false system of religion." But no! Not so. According to the Futurists (albeit in most manifest contradiction to

his reign, to be figured by the statue's ten toes!"\*—Now *chronological proportion* was evidently no object in the prophetic figuration, as appears from comparing the chronological lengths of the three first empires with the parts of the image symbolizing them; but only a representation of the *succession* of the great empires. But, as Mr. B. will construct an argument from it, let us see how the argument really stands. We may perhaps reckon five toe-lengths for the foot, and between two and three foot-lengths from the foot upward to the knee. Thus the proportionate length of the toe to the conjoined leg and foot may be roughly reckoned at a twelfth. So that if, chronologically applied, the toe represent  $3\frac{1}{2}$  years, so as Mr. B. makes it do, then the leg and foot together ought proportionally to represent  $3\frac{1}{2} \times 12 = 42$  years. Instead of which, however, they are, according to Mr. Barker's scheme, to represent the period from B. C. 197 to A. D. 1850, at the very least; or about 2050 years, i. e. just 50 times 42 years!—But this in fact is an understatement. For it is clear from Dan. ii. 33, 41, that not the *toes* of the image only, but the *feet*, part iron, part clay, in which the toes centred, were the intended symbol of the 4th or Roman empire after its division; just as, in the parallel Apocalyptic figuration of Antichrist's decemregal empire the Beast's *head* was a part of the figuring symbol, as well as the ten horns that grew out of the head. A view this which is further illustrated by the statement that the stone smote the image on the *feet*, not on the *toes*, at the epoch of its final destruction. Which being so, the disproportion on Mr. B.'s futurist view is vastly greater: being that of the foot to figure the  $3\frac{1}{2}$  years, and scarce  $2\frac{1}{2}$  foot-lengths, or from the knee-joint of the image to the ankle, to figure the 2050 years! On the other hand, on the historic principle, we have from the knee to the ankle to correspond with the 700 years of the old Rôman empire; and from the ankle to the end of the toe to correspond with the 1300 years of the Romano-Gothic Papal empire. A chronological disproportion, no doubt; in a figuration however, as before said, in which chronological proportion was not the object. But in this case it would be a disproportion, comparing figure and fact, of only 1 to 4, or 5; whereas in Mr Barker's scheme it is as 1 to above 200!!

3. Says Mr. B., "Both parties agree in expecting a national restoration of the Jews to their own land. But the historical interpreters, while admitting the Israel of the Old Testament prophecy to be the literal Israel, and its participation in the glories of the reign of the coming Messiah, do yet in the *Apocalypse* find no place for the Jew. They say, It is a *Gentile* prophecy." †

In this statement, and the idea of the Jew being "utterly and entirely past over" by historical expositors of the *Apocalypse*, Mr. B. is incorrect. At the precise epoch, to which he makes special reference, of Messiah's assumption of the kingdom, and bridal, I have myself only followed in the wake of many previous expositors of the same school, in supposing the converted Jews' participation and prominence in the song of welcome and joy to be probably indicated by the Hebraic terminology for the song, *Hallelujah*. ‡ But with regard to Mr. B.'s requirement of the twelve tribes of Israel mentioned in Apoc. vii. being recognized as "the restored tribes of the literal Israel," Mr. B., is very well aware of, though he does not notice, the argument

\* I have here compressed, and altered with a view to compression, Mr. B.'s words.

† Again I slightly alter Mr. B.'s phraseology, with a view to brevity.

‡ See pp. 50—52 *suprà*.

Scripture prophecy)<sup>1</sup> the Beast Antichrist's religion (if I may use such a misnomer) is to be *open avowed infidelity*. And, while in such close alliance with Antichrist as the Apocalyptic figure of the Woman sitting on the Beast implies, we cannot suppose *her* avowed religion different: especially since Antichrist, according to all the Futurists, will allow no alternative but that of receiving his mark and worshipping his image, or death. Which being so, Babylon, on the Futurist view, must at the time depicted be professedly infidel: and this indeed not of compulsion, but heartily, and as herself a prime agent in the matter; since, whatever the false religion, she is herself the one to drug the nations with its philtre cup, and this even to the last.<sup>2</sup> Now it is specially for Babylon's sins committed *during the time depicted in the Apocalyptic vision, of her riding the Beast*, that God's judgment is pronounced on her:<sup>3</sup>—i. e. (still on the Futurist hypothesis) for her *final avowed infidelity*, not for any other previously cherished sins. Whence it results that for Rome's *Papal* errors there is no special judgment from God. And if so, and that there is not even a note of Apocalyptic protest or warning on God's part against Rome's previous *Papal* religion, simply and distinctively, what can be the inference but that, after all, in God's eye, Popery is not a thing so very bad?—Thus I find myself forced to regard Mr. Barker's attempt at *Protestantizing* the Futurist Apocalyptic Scheme as an utter failure. And let me farther add on this head, that I think it ought to be viewed as a little suspicious in that system by

(the decisive argument, I may say) against any such allowance; viz. from the *Christian* meaning, as primarily declared by Christ himself, and to a considerable extent admitted by the Futurists themselves, of the chief *Jewish* types and figures in the Apocalypse. On this point I have entered fully in my previous Section.\* And it is an argument which I am persuaded not all the ingenuity of all the Futurists that exist now, or hereafter may exist, will ever be able to overcome. And its effect, even were it by itself, is to leave the whole scheme of Futurism (alike that of the Moderates and the Extremists) a hopeless ruin.

<sup>1</sup> See my p. 623 et seq. *suprà*. Let my readers well mark that *up to the moment of his final destruction*, instead of being depicted as an avowed infidel power, the Apocalyptic Beast, Antichrist, has the lamb-like two-horned Beast, the symbol of a false-professing Christian Hierarchy and priesthood, with him, as his attendant and prime minister.

<sup>2</sup> I beg my readers to mark this; and how in Apoc. xvii., xviii., at the epoch immediately before her destruction, she is depicted, not as a subordinate, but an all-dominant queen.

<sup>3</sup> Her judgment is in Apoc. xviii. 2, 3 declared to be because of her having committed fornication with *the kings of the earth*, (evidently those associated with the Beast,) as well as having with her philtre cup made drunk all the nations.

\* See pp. 610—612 *suprà*.

every really Protestant eye, that three of its chief peculiarities, viz. that of making the Antichrist a single individual infidel man of  $3\frac{1}{2}$  literal years' duration, that of regarding Rome's primary empire as still unended, and that of making the city of the two witnesses' death to be Jérusalem,—are all points borrowed (however vainly, thank God! and ineffectively) from some of the chief Romish antagonists of Protestant prophetic interpretations;—from Ribera, Bellarmine, Malvenda.

2. As to Mr. B.'s plan for mitigating the monstrosity of the Futurists' imagined Apocalyptic *instant plunge into the distant future of the consummation*, viz. by supposing that the prophetic imagery may have been purposely so ordered as to bear a resemblance, though but imperfect, to the various historic facts to which historic expositors have variously applied them, and so, and by these imperfect foreshadowings, not to leave wholly unrepresented the long interval between St. John and the consummation, it must surely be obvious to all intelligent persons that *with such particularity in the prophecy's multitudinous details, and order too in their arrangement*, it is nothing less than impossible for the scheme to be true. What! the most opposite and different events to be all alike foreshadowed by these various and peculiar symbols! There is evidently satire in the very suggestion. No! there can only be *one* true fulfilment; and that one reaching from John's time to the consummation.—As to what that fulfilment is, is another question. But until I see it overthrown I must believe the one given in the Horæ to be the true one. Mr. B. himself has already tried to break it down; but with what result? What, for example, has come of his attempted refutation of my exposition of the *Seals*? I have made a point of exhibiting whatever has appeared to me of force in Mr. B.'s as well as in other critics' objections: and the reader has before him in this present edition a notification of them, and of the answers. Let him judge for himself. But, if unrefuted, can those various and most particular coincidences of fact and symbol shown by me, in regard of the horse, crown, (contradistinguished from diadem,) bow, sword-bearing, balance, notification about wheat, barley, wine, oil, and the price of the two former, with the horse's significant successive colours of the white, red, black, and livid, and yet much more following,—I say, can all this be the mere effect of chance? Or, again, can there be

any human probability of such and so particular a fulfilment ever again occurring; and this in some small fraction of the Futurists' imagined  $3\frac{1}{2}$  years of the last crisis, or a little more, just before Christ's coming? <sup>1</sup>

So much as to the two points now before us.—I observe in his Paper that Mr. B. sagaciously deprecates Futurists conjecturing too particularly about things future; and so exposing themselves to the charge of discrepancies between members of their own body, and other pointed attacks, from “the skilful arrows of their prophetic antagonists.” But is it only in regard of conjectures about the *future* that there have been manifested such discrepancies among Futurists? Is the question whether the Roman empire, once ruled by Augustus and Constantine, has yet come to an ending, or not, a question of the coming future, or of the past? Or, again, whether the 70 weeks of Daniel are to be taken as weeks of years or days: and, further, whether the 70 were all fulfilled about the time of Christ's first coming, or with the 70th (as Mr. B. in fact supposes) still left for fulfilment? And so too of sundry other questions.—While however thus deprecating conjectures about fulfilments of prophecies that are yet future, Mr. B. tells that there is *one* thing that he seems to himself really “to know.” Well! let us test our Futurist on this his own chosen ground. “All I *know* about the *Seals* is that they seem to foretell *God's four sore judgments*, with persecution of his people, and *his coming to judgment*.” But how (as I asked in my preceding Section) the 3rd Seal figure famine with barley at  $7\frac{1}{2}$ d per 5 lb, and wine and oil in abundance, so as is intimated in the Seal? Again, if the 6th Seal be Christ's coming to judgment, where is there a single clear sign of it, supposing the elemental convulsions to be taken otherwise than literally? And, if they be taken literally, and the earth have been literally struck by stars falling from heaven, how in the very next following scene, *under the same Seal*, comes the earth to have its inhabitants upon it, just as before?—Mr. B. must have been perfectly aware of these objections when he wrote his Paper; for I have urged both the one and the other upon him myself.<sup>2</sup> And what his reply? On the former point he has only replied by dead silence. On the latter his reply is

<sup>1</sup> This will be found illustrated in my Review of Mr. W. Kelly, next following.

<sup>2</sup> I have urged these points alike in my *Vindiciæ Horariæ*, in my published Letters in the British Magazine, and in discussions printed, or private, with Mr. Barker.



that, though consecutive in arrangement, yet the second part of the 6th Seal must be considered *prior in point of time* to what precedes it; albeit without a single notification, or sign of any kind, that such is the case. Thus in regard of the former point he virtually allows judgment to go against him by default. In regard of the other he virtually confesses that, unless downright violence be permitted him in dealing with the Apocalyptic context, the Futurist Scheme in his own, as in other hands, must fall.

A *Tabular Schedule* is added on the following page, in illustration of his Scheme, so far as I have been able to make it out; he himself having declined to make one. For indeed such Schedules are most illustrative, and most necessary, in case of *Futuristic Schemes*, as well as of *Historical*.

## 2. *W. Kelly.*

As regards *Mr. Barker*, in 1851, the manner in which he would apply his modifications to the older Maitlandic and Burghite Scheme of *Futurism* "*pure et simple*," is altogether vague and indefinite. But not so,

2ndly, with his modern successor, Mr. W. Kelly, of Guernsey. Distinctly and expressly, and moreover in a certain way authoritatively, as if speaking as the organ of a not unimportant party in the Christian Church,<sup>1</sup> he declares his belief that the protracted Protestant scheme has in it a certain measure of truth: <sup>2</sup> that, in this scheme the seven Trumpets are the evolution of the 7th Seal, though he is not so sure of the Vials being the evolution of the 7th Trumpet: <sup>3</sup> that in the general outline of the prophecy, so considered, God intended that his people should gather light from it in regard of the then future destinies of the Western and Eastern Roman Empire, first in its hostile Pagan state, next in its outwardly Christian profession and revolt against God in opposing Christ in his priestly character: <sup>4</sup> —more particularly, that he does not identify the meaning of the earlier Seals with the details of Christ's prophecy in Matt. xxiv., but would rather explain them of some successive providential judgments, such as the conquests of some hostile conqueror, then a time

<sup>1</sup> He uses the word "we" (e.g. Intr. p. ix.) sufficiently often, as before observed, to leave this impression. If so it is the view of a section of the body calling themselves "The Brethren," once the Plymouth Brethren.

<sup>2</sup> Introd. p. viii.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid. viii., ix.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid.

APPROXIMATE VIEW OF  
BARKER'S MODIFIED FUTURIST APOCALYPTIC SCHEME.

	<p style="text-align: center;">Era just preceding the first 3½ years.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">First 3½ years' period of Dan. ix. 27, and Apocalypse.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Second 3½ years' period of Dan. ix. and Apocalypse.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Time immediately following.</p>
SEALS.	<p>First Seal here? Sealing vision of 144,000 of Israel, here? end.</p>	<p>Qu. Next four seals here?</p>	<p>Or, in part, here? Qu. Palm-bearing vision = manifestation of sons of God, here?</p>	<p>6th Seal, Christ's personal 2nd coming, Or, Palm-bearing vision here?</p>
TRUMPETS.	<p>Four first Trumpets here? Qu. 5th Trumpet, or 1st Woe on unsealed, here?</p>	<p>6th, or 2nd Woe Trumpet, first part, including the Witnesses 3½ years?</p>	<p>6th, or 2nd Woe Trumpet, second part; signifying fall of tenth part of Jerusalem.</p>	<p>7th, or 3rd Woe Trumpet. = Christ's destruction of all enemies.</p>
TWO WITNESSES.		<p>The two Witnesses, viz., Elias and Moses, (or Enoch,) prophesy 1260 days, = first 3½ years, in sackcloth.</p>		
DRAGON and WOMAN.	<p>Qu. War in heaven, and persecution of sun-clothed Woman, by seven-headed Dragon, here? Dragon then transfers power to 2nd Beast from sea.</p>	<p>Qu. Woman in wilderness 1260 days, here?</p>	<p>Or, Woman in wilderness here?</p>	
TWO SEVEN-HEADED BEASTS, from Abyss and Sea.		<p>Beast from abyss, of Apoc. xi., xvii. (Qu. under 6th or original 7th head? and how, and when, ending?) symbolized by his heads as at <i>Rome</i>.</p>	<p>Beast from abyss kills the two Witnesses at <i>Jerusalem</i>.</p>	<p>Beast from Sea, Apoc. xiii., and 1st head, = Antichrist, in temple at Jerusalem. Gentiles tread city and outer court. This cast out as Gentilized by St. John. (N.B. The temple with Antichrist in it, is <i>not</i> cast out.)</p>
BABYLON = ROME PAPAL.		<p>First seated on, and supported by, Beast from abyss; then desolated and burnt by it and its ten kings.</p>		
ISRAEL and JERUSALEM.	<p>Israel returned into Holy Land and Jerusalem; as shown by sealing of the 144,000 of Israel?</p>	<p>Qu. Jerusalem's siege and capture (<i>Zech. xiv</i>) here? or before this? or afterwards?—Or, during part of the time, safe under Antichrist, as being in covenant with him? (Dan. ix. 27.)</p>	<p>Jerusalem trodden down by Gentiles and Antichrist 3½ years.</p>	<p>Jerusalem delivered by Christ's coming.</p>

of bloody warfare, then of dearth, then of pestilence and God's other three sore judgments: (how fulfilled in past history Mr. K. does not say:)<sup>1</sup>—that, as regards the 6th Seal, he entirely repudiates the idea of its figuring the coming of Christ in judgment, or great day of the Lord, at the end of the present dispensation;<sup>2</sup> but rather views it as some great political revolution, involving the overthrow of existing governmental authorities, such as in fact that of the overthrow of Heathenism in the Roman Empire, at the great Constantinian Revolution:<sup>3</sup> and that, as regards the four first Trumpets, he judges them to refer first to the Gothic invasions of *Alaric* and *Rhadagaisus*; secondly, to the depredations of *Genserik* and the *Vandals*; thirdly, to those of *Attila* and his *Huns*; fourthly, to "the memorable era of the *extinction of the Western Roman Empire* in the 5th century."<sup>4</sup> Moreover "he doubts not that the common application of the locusts in the 5th Trumpet to the Saracens, and of the Euphratean horsemen of the sixth to the Turks, is well founded;"<sup>5</sup> nor is disposed to question the general application of the subsequent vision of the light-bearing Angel of Apoc. x., to "that wonderful divine intervention, the Reformation."<sup>6</sup>—Yet, again, he sees not why the two Witnesses, Apoc. xi., may not symbolize many;<sup>7</sup> is inclined to admit a reference in one of the Beasts of Apoc. xiii. to Popery, regarding the great Antichrist of Prophecy as figured in the second Beast from the earth, or False Prophet:<sup>8</sup> as regards this Antichrist agrees with me that "bare infidelity would be a meagre conception of his character, position, and doings;"<sup>9</sup> and, once more, is ready to admit the applicability of the *year-day* scale in the great Apocalyptic periods, when considered thus historically.<sup>10</sup>

It is to be observed, further, that Mr. W. K., like his friend Mr. Trotter of York, explains the seven Epistles to the seven Churches, not only as pictures of the actual state of those Asiatic Churches as existing in St. John's day, but also (though certainly not very successful in answering my objections to Mr. T.'s specific view) as figuring the successive most characteristic phases of the Christian Church from Apostolic times to the consummation.<sup>11</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Lect. p. 108.

<sup>2</sup> Compare the positive affirmations of Dr. R. S. Maitland on this point pp. 604—606 *suprà*.

<sup>3</sup> pp. 115, 116, compared with *Introd.* ix.

<sup>4</sup> p. 143.

<sup>5</sup> p. 153.

<sup>6</sup> p. 169.

<sup>7</sup> p. 185.

<sup>8</sup> *Introd.* p. x.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.* ix.

<sup>11</sup> *Introd.* p. ii.—On Mr. Trotter's view, and my objections to it, especially by reference to his application of the central Epistle, address to the Church at Thyatira, to

In order to the application of which theory of the prophecy in this historical sense to the history of the Church, and of the world as connected with it, there is required of course the use of human learning. And thus Mr. W. K. must be understood as utterly repudiating the axiom so often vaunted, and so much dwelt upon by the earlier Futurists, that human learning is altogether out of place in Apocalyptic interpretation; and that "Scripture is only to be judged of by comparison with Scripture."<sup>1</sup>

But how then, it will be asked, can Mr. W. K. be a Futurist at all? It is by the theory of a most curious double view; such a double view as, I must say, like as in physical cases of double sight, seems to me to imply a somewhat notable imperfection of sobriety in the expositor.

It seems to be a settled point in Mr. W. Kelly's creed, and is continually referred to as such throughout his book, that there is to be some certain considerable interval of time between the rapture of the saints, to meet Christ in the air, and his descent with them, after the closing judgments of the consummation, in the brightness of the New Jerusalem.<sup>2</sup> It is this interval of time that he supposes to be most specially referred to in the heavenly vision represented in Apoc. iv. and v. The 24 crowned elders round the throne, being

Christ's true Church in the midst of the Popery of the dark middle ages, see pp. 77, 78 of my 1st Vol. "Mr. T., by means of what is really nothing less than mutilation,\* explains it to represent the Church's state under the all-dominant Popery of the dark ages, when irreligion prevailed everywhere, and the very witness for Christ was all but extinguished; whereas, the Epistle depicts a high state of piety as prevalent in the general professing body at Thyatira; and with the power in their hands, which it was their grand fault not duly to exercise, of interdicting and stopping the teaching of the woman Jezebel. Mr. T.'s eye has been on the exception Jezebel, not on the Church Thyatira. This is the 4th and central Epistle of the seven. And, if the centre of his Scheme of the Epistles be thus broken, Mr. T. will hardly, I think, be careful to contend for the rest."

How does Mr. W. K. attempt to answer this? By saying that, as the Epistles *primarily* depicted the actual state of the seven Churches, as existing in St. John's time, and only *secondarily* the successive states of the Christian Church from that time to the consummation, what I say of the strength of the Christian element in the Thyatiran Church, as depicted in the Epistle, must be viewed as applicable only in the *primary* sense of the Epistles, not the *secondary*. So pp. iv., v. of his Introduction. This seems to me an admission of what I contended for as against Mr. T.; viz. the impossibility of fairly making out the applicability of the seven Epistles as pictures of the seven chief successive æras and phases of the Christian Church from St. John's time to the consummation.

<sup>1</sup> So Burgh, &c.

<sup>2</sup> So, first, in the Introd. pp. vi.—viii.

\* Not "*intentional*" mutilation; as Mr. W. K. very unwarrantably represents me as saying. I had, and have, too much regard to Mr. T. to entertain such an idea.



a complete number, taken from the 24 courses of the Jewish Priesthood, must figure, he considers, the whole company of the redeemed in their state of glorification <sup>1</sup> *after the resurrection*; at least most properly so. But how then will this suit with what goes before in the seven Epistles to the Churches, and what comes after in the judgments, as successively unfolded of the seven-sealed book? In this way. 1st, the seven Epistles, regarded in their primary sense, as picturing the seven Asiatic Churches in St. John's time, reach of course only to the time of St. John's seeing the visions in Patmos: and consequently imply *that* as the stand-point of time in the heavenly vision of the Divine throne and the elders in chapters iv. and v. immediately following. For so it is said in the 1st verse of chap. iv.; "Come up, and I will now show thee what must happen *after these things*." And, as seen from *this* point of time, the figurations subsequently evolved of the seven-sealed book depicted the subsequent history of the Church, and of the world, according to the more usual Protestant historical view, and very much as in the *Horæ Apocalypticæ*.<sup>2</sup> But this only imperfectly: indeed with imperfection such as to show that some more perfect interpretation was further intended by the Divine Author of the Book.<sup>3</sup>—Which more perfect interpretation, 2ndly, is thus obtainable, in consistency with the other view of the seven Epistles advocated by Mr. K. as depicting the successive æras and phases of the Christian Church from St. John's time to the consummation;—viz. by now regarding the stand-point of time indicated by the opening verse of chap. iv., "Come up, and I will show thee what must happen *after these things*," as the epoch of *the ending of the Christian Church's history and existence on earth*:<sup>4</sup> in other words, the epoch of the rapture of the saints constituting it, and their enthronization in all the Church's completeness, as figured in the 24 crowned elders before the throne of God and of the Lamb. For, viewed from *this* point, all the subsequent visions will depict simply and solely the judgments and other events of the great "day of the Lord," *at the close* of the present dispensation.

A double view truly marvellous! And of which surely my more

<sup>1</sup> Ibid., and Lect. p. 74.

<sup>2</sup> See Mr. W. K.'s Comment throughout for this.

<sup>3</sup> So, first, Introd. p. iv., where he intimates his impression that I would myself be ready to make this admission; which certainly I am not.

<sup>4</sup> So, first, Introd. p. vii.

intelligent readers will think that the simple statement is a sufficient refutation. To make the matter clearer I have endeavoured to represent this double view in a Tabular Apocalyptic scheme. It is very obvious, even *à priori*, and sufficiently illustrated in Mr. W. K.'s Commentary, that the sacred figurations must, from the very nature of things, mean something each one quite different in the *one* view from what they mean in the *other*. And is this credible in Scripture prophecy? in Scripture prophecy, let me add, so full of particularity and detail, and stamped too with such marks of order as that of the Apocalypse? In fine, we may, I think, safely conclude to receive Mr. W. Kelly's judgment, so far as it goes, in favour of the Protestant historical view of the Apocalyptic prophecy, as that forced upon a person originally altogether prejudiced against it; and, in regard of his very original modification of Apocalyptic Futurism, as an additional and very notable illustration of the impossibility of any such modification.

I should add that Mr. W. Kelly, like his friend Mr. Trotter, and like Mr. Molyneux and most other Futurists, explains the last of Daniel's seventy hebdomads as the time of these judgments of consummation; and thereby complicates yet further his modified Futuristic system. So it will appear in the Schedule on the opposite page.

#### ADDENDUM.

In the course of his Work Mr. W. K. has from time to time made sundry strong animadversions on certain points in my Apocalyptic Exposition, by no means altogether in that spirit of fairness and candour which might have been anticipated from the courteous notice of myself and my Commentary in his Introduction. The chief of these it seems to me a duty not to pass over in silence; as he speaks very positively and dogmatically on them, and has moreover made my whole Book evidently a subject of careful study. I may fitly arrange them under the two heads;—1st, of my asserted errors in the adoption of certain *wrong readings of the Apocalyptic Greek Text*, or readings of quite insufficient authority; 2ndly, of asserted errors in certain of my *renderings of the Greek*, and of my *historical applications of the prophecy*.

I. *Asserted erroneous readings of the Greek text* preferred in the Horæ.—Of these there are four that seem chiefly to call for specifica-

## W. KELLY'S DOUBLE OR HISTORICO-FUTURIST APOCALYPTIC SCHEME.

These 7 Epistles, taken *prophetically*, end at the rapture of the saints shortly before the judgments of the consummation; representing a period of about 1800 years; and, as in the next vision of Apoc. iv., v., have, as their immediate sequel, *μετα ταυτα*, (qu. about A. D. 1900?) these saints in heaven, under symbol of

The 7 Epistles, taken *historically*, represent the state of the 7 Asiatic Churches in the year A.D. 96, after which epoch (*μετα ταυτα*) begin the subjects of the Apocalyptic figurations shown, A.D. 96, to

24 Elders crowned.	St. John in Patmos.
I. Do.	I. Conquest.
II. Do.	II. Mutual Slaughter.
III. Do.	III. Famine.
IV. Do.	IV. Four Sore Plagues.
V. Jewish Martyrs.	V. Martyrs.
VI. Fall of Roman Pagan Emp.	VI. Fall of Roman Empire.
{ Parenthetical <i>Sealing</i> <i>Vision.</i> God's provision for Jewish saints now in Judaea during coming Trumpet Judgments. }	{ Parenthetical <i>Seal-</i> <i>ing Vision.</i> God's pro- vision for saints during coming Trumpet Judg- ments. }
I. Divine Judgment on all Human Prosperity.	I. Alarie.
II. Carnage of disorganized Peoples, the falling on them of great volcano-like destroying power.	II. Genserie.
III. River-like sources of pros- perity poisoned by agency of some fallen dignitary.	III. Attila.
IV. World's chief authorities temporarily eclipsed under Divine judgment.	IV. Odoacer, Eclipse of Roman Western Empire.
V. From Abyss, opened by a fallen false Prophet, emerge locust-like Satanic agents of falsehood & destruction, under a King the same as 2nd Apocalyptic Beast, or Spiritual Antichrist.	V. Abyss opened. Saracens and Mahometan- ism invade and darken Eastern Empire.
VI. Judaea's first invasion by Assyrian from Euphrates = last head of reunited Ro- man Empire = King of North (Dan. xi.) = Apo- calypitic Beast from Abyss, or secular Antichrist.	VI. Turks from Euphrates destroy Eastern Roman Empire, A.D. 1453.
VII. Destruction of the two Beasts.	Rainbow-crowned angel of Reformation Apoc. x.
Millennium.	Do.
Great white Throne. 1000 days.	

SEALS on scale of about one year.

VITH SEAL developed in the Seven TRUMPETS.

SEALS A.D. 96—A.D. 306.

VITH SEAL developed in the Seven TRUMPETS.

Antichrist makes & keeps covenants with Jews in Judaea for 3½ years.

Antichrist breaks the covenant.

Witnesses prophesy in sackcloth 3½ days. Killed by Beast from Abyss. Rise & ascend to heaven.

70th week of Dan. ix. = 7 years 2 (1260) days. Temple and altar measured in Judaea. Outer court trodden by 42 months 1260 days.

Scale of 1260 days, as 1260 years.

Beast rises from Abyss.

Christ's 2 witnesses robbed in sackcloth prophesy 1260 years.

Witnesses slain by Beast from Abyss.

Resurrection of witnesses after 3½ days, or years.

tion, as animadverted upon by Mr. Kelly; each having an important bearing on the interpretation, the two last specified most especially.

1. "In Apoc. xi. 8, Mr. E. repeatedly, but incorrectly, of course through oversight, represents the reading in the critical editions as *επι της πλατειας της πολεως της μεγαλης*" (contradistinctively, I presume, to *πλ. πολ. της μεγ.*, without the *της*). So Mr. K., p. 198; referring specially to the H. A. Vol. ii. p. 396, and Vol. iv. p. 543.<sup>1</sup> He seems (if I rightly understand him) to regard this as unduly adding weight to the idea of *Rome* being pointed at as the fated city of the Witnesses' death, not *Jerusalem*.

In reply, I have simply to state that the text is as I give it in four out of the six critical Editions which I possess: viz. in Heinrichs, Tregelles (Ed. 1844), Wordsworth, and Alford. In Griesbach (Ed. 1818) and Scholz, the *της* is wanting before *πολεως*. Bishop Middleton, as I have observed Vol. ii. p. 433, speaks of the Greek as grammatically requiring the *της* prefix.

2. At page 203 Mr. K. animadverts on my preferring the reading, *ηνοιγη ο ναος τε Θεσ εν τω θρανω*, in Apoc. xi. 19, to *ηνοιγη ο ναος τε Θ. ο εν τω θρ.*, which he regards as that of best MS. authority. In reply to which charge I have to say that what I prefer is the reading of Griesbach, Scholz, Heinrichs, Tregelles, Alford; Wordsworth alone of the critical editors by me preferring the other reading.

The importance of this reading, which arises primarily from the fact that the absence of the article precludes the idea of a second and heavenly temple being here indicated, different from that spoken of xi. 1, 2, and elsewhere previously, is doubled by its parallelism (as so given) with the clause in Apoc. xv. 5; *και ηνοιγη ο ναος της σκηνης τε μαρτυριε εν τω θρανω*: where the text, as I have just written it, is given in all the critical editions; alike by Griesbach, Heinrichs, Tregelles, Scholz, Wordsworth, Alford. Mr. Kelly, indeed, would here too read *ο εν τω θρανω*; for he gives, as the English, "the temple of the tabernacle of the testimony *in heaven* was opened;" not "was *opened in heaven*." But altogether, so far as I know, without authority. And why? It seems to be *only* because of its suiting his peculiar interpretation of the passage,

<sup>1</sup> H. A. 4th Ed.—In my present Edition the references will be to Vol. ii. p. 433, and Vol. iv. p. 580. In my citations from Mr. K. I here and there a little abbreviate.



and idea of the Apocalyptic scenery; the very fault he has so often, and wrongly, ascribed to me.

3rdly, comes my adoption in the fourth Seal (H. A., Vol. i. p. 189, 4th Ed., or, in this 5th Ed., p. 201) of a reading correspondent with Jerome's well-known Latin translation in the Vulgate, *super quatuor partes terræ*, "on the *four parts* of the earth;" instead of that found in our Greek MSS. all but universally, *ἐπὶ τὸ τετάρτον τῆς γῆς*, "on the *fourth part* of the earth." In justification of this, in addition to what I have urged in my discussion of the subject in loc.,<sup>1</sup> let me refer to Mr. W. K.'s own principle of applying *considerations of internal evidence* in deciding between doubtful readings, e. g. at his p. 91<sup>2</sup> and elsewhere; and then remind my reader of the strong considerations of internal evidence which have led me to adopt Jerome's in the verse in question: premising, however, that Jerome does not stand quite alone in this matter; but that other Latin versions, independent of the Vulgate, represent by the same translation the same Greek reading.<sup>3</sup>—1st, then, no expositor has ever yet, on *any* system of Apocalyptic interpretation, been able to suggest any at all plausible reason for the limitation of this judgment of the 4th Seal, agreeably with the text of the Greek MSS., to the 4th part of the earth: it being an evidently more aggravated judgment than those of the two Seals preceding, which had attached to them no such local limitation;<sup>4</sup> and, moreover, analogous to that spoken of in the proof-text of Ezek. xiv. 21, where no such local limitation attaches to the selfsame four sore judgments of God.<sup>5</sup>—2ndly, this argument from internal evidence acquires double force, if that be admitted for which I contend, that the *horse* in the four first Seals figures the Roman Empire, and its colours the Empire's successive phases, correspondent with the state depicted in

<sup>1</sup> See my Vol. i. pp. 200, 201.

<sup>2</sup> In the question between the reading *αυτους* and *ημας*, &c., in Apoc. v. 10, says Mr. K. p. 91, "The *internal considerations* I believe to be very weighty in favour of the omission of *ημας*."—In fact, it would be as absurd, as it would all but unprecedented, for any judicious expositor to overlook *internal evidence*.

<sup>3</sup> E. g. Ansbert's. See p. 349 *suprà*.

<sup>4</sup> Take e. g. W. K.'s own account of this and the two or rather three (as he would have it) preceding Seals' judgments. "We know (i. e. from this prophecy) that there is a time of *conquest* coming;—then of *bloody warfare*;—then of *dearth*;—and lastly of the outpouring of *God's four sore plagues*." p. 108. Not one word, observe, on *the fourth part*.

<sup>5</sup> "How much more when I send my four sore judgments on Jerusalem;" or, vv. 15, 17, 19, on "the land."

the Seal; seeing that in the 4th, just as in the three preceding Seals, the colour of the *whole* horse is seen to be that of the livid pallor of death. And against the strength of the evidence for the truth of this symbolization Mr. K.'s assertions and *réchauffée* of objections, borrowed from other and earlier critics, is really worthless.—3rdly, there is the evidence, from comparison of history and prophecy, that the indication in Jerome's reading, when superadded to the 12 or 13 of the preceding Seals, completes, in respect of a very remarkable particular, a most exact and philosophic picturing of the successive phases and fortunes of the Roman Empire in the two centuries intervening between St. John and Diocletian:—and this, 4thly, in perfect consistency with what goes after, as well as with that which goes before, inclusive of that notice of a subsequent *tripartition* of the Empire which is set forth so prominently in the Trumpets; springing as that which was meant by the latter did, (in Mr. K.'s judgment as well as my own,) out of the previous *quadripartition* under Diocletian.

In fine, with *Jerome's* reading all is, on my historic system of interpretation, explicable, consistent, harmonious: while, on the other hand, with the usual Greek reading all is inexplicable on *any* system of interpretation. Have I not then sufficient warrant for adopting it?

4. There is noticed by Mr. K. "the flagrant proof of my proneness to prefer a manifestly spurious reading where my hypothesis requires," in my preference of *επι το θηριον* to *και το θηρ.* in Apoc. xvii. 16. So W. K., p. 304. And no doubt the evidence of Greek MSS. is very strong in favour of the *και*. Moreover, I have, in the course of this last revision of my book, found that I was mistaken in supposing that the early Greek Father *Hippolytus* read *επι*, in common with the early Latin Father *Tertullian*, and also probably with Jerome;<sup>1</sup> being misled by the Latin translation of Hippolytus' "De Christo et Antichristo." Hence my confidence in so decidedly preferring the *επι* is less strong than before. But, admitting this, let me beg to apply considerations of *internal evidence* to the explanation of the passage with the alternative of *either* reading, on the two counter-systems, the *historical* and the *futuristic* respectively. It is as clear, I think, as anything well can be, and absolutely forced upon our minds by

<sup>1</sup> I say *probably* with Jerome: because, though by far the most numerous MSS. of the Vulgate read "in Bestiâ," the copy in the Laurentian Library reads (not, observe, "et Bestiâ," but) "et Bestiam."

the vivid and prolonged pictorial vision of Apoc. xviii., that the ultimate destruction of the Apocalyptic *Babylon*, or (as Mr. K. and I both agree) *Rome*, is to be by direct judgment from Heaven:—a judgment like that of Sodom and Gomorrah, the smoke of which is to go up for ever and ever. This being so, it is equally evident that her destruction and desolation by the human agency specified in Apoc. xvii. 16, must have been only *temporary*; whether that of the Beast's ten horns alone, as the *επι* might rather seem to imply, or that too of the Beast or Beast's last ruling head, so as the *και* would imply, as an ally and co-operator. Mr. K. himself virtually admits this.<sup>1</sup> Now, then, let us, agreeably with Mr. K.'s judgment, suppose the *και* to be the reading adopted; in other words, that the Beast, or its last ruling head, that is, as we are also agreed, the great *Antichrist*, (whether the Roman Pope who long has been, or a personal Antichrist yet to come,) is to be an assisting party in the desolation of Rome, predicted in Apoc. xvii. 16. Then it is necessary that, in order to have become the flourishing city which is described as the object of God's *final* judgment in Apoc. xviii., Rome must have been in a marvellous manner resuscitated, and restored to her ancient power and glory, in the interval between the said Antichrist's rise, with his supposed still future ten subject kings, and the final judgment from God. But, on Mr. K.'s and the Futurists' system, this interval can be only about 3½ years. And really the idea of such a resuscitation in such an interval of time seems to me nothing less than an immense absurdity. On the other hand, even though receiving the reading *και*, let me beg my readers to understand that it is by no means, so as Mr. K. and the Futurists argue, inconsistent with that historical explanation which refers back the judgment of xvii. 16, to the times of the Gothic and Vandal desolations in the 5th and 6th centuries. In so far as the old heathen religion and political rule of *ancient Imperial Rome* were concerned, the Papal Antichrist, who in the 5th and 6th centuries gradually rose up as the city's

<sup>1</sup> So p. 309. "The case of Babylon strikingly illustrates how a judgment said to be God's may yet be executed by men. In Chap. xvii. we see that God will make use of the ten horns, . . . and the Beast, or power that binds together those otherwise broken parts, for inflicting his judgments on Babylon. . . . But in Chap. xviii. not a word of this occurs. And the difference is so obvious and great at first sight that some have laid it down with decision that the judgment in Chap. xvii. is previous to that in Chap. xviii.; and the destruction of Babylon in the former merely a human one; the latter subsequent, and directly from God. I would not dogmatize as to that explanation," &c.

residential governor, did take his part in *its* desolation.<sup>1</sup> After which, in the long 1260 *years*, assigned in Daniel and the Apocalypse, on the *historic year-day* system, Rome had abundant time for resuscitation: and, in fact, became again mother and mistress of the kingdoms and Churches of the Romano-Gothic world in its proud character of the seat of GOD'S VICE-GERENT ON EARTH; Antichrist being, as Hippolytus so strikingly anticipated, its great restorer.<sup>2</sup> To which character it still raises its pretensions, even at this present time; albeit after the primary though imperfect ending of the 1260 years in 1790, and consequent passing away of much of its actual power: and doubtless will continue so to do, not without the ten horns' continued recognition of it} in these its *spiritual* pretensions,<sup>3</sup> even to the consummation. So with the reading *καὶ*. With the reading *ἐπι* the prophecy was of course yet more exactly suited to the history.

In fine, with either reading the historic explanation is justified, consistently with the prefiguration in Apoc. xviii.: with neither reading does the Futurists' seem possible.

II. My asserted errors in certain *renderings of the Greek*, and *historical applications of the prophecy*.

1. Says Mr. Kelly, "Mr. E. contends for the strangest possible version of *εἰς*, as = *after*, or *at the expiration of*, the aggregated period of the hour, day, month, and year in Apoc. ix. 15." So p. 150.—When Mr. K. has shown that the same Greek preposition placed before a time, times, and half a time in Dan. xii., as well as before the 1335 days in a verse immediately following, does not mean *before*, or *at the expiration of*, those aggregated periods,<sup>3</sup> he will be in a better position for so expressing himself about my rendering of the clause in Apoc. ix. 15. But, though he had these parallel passages before his eyes in my Commentary, as very mainly my justification in the rendering of Apoc. ix. 15, Mr. K. makes no allusion to them. Nor does he make the slightest allusion to the extraordinary historical fact of the period hence resulting, when measured from the well-marked epoch of the Turks being loosed

<sup>1</sup> So Irenæus, as to Imperial Rome's idolatrous religion, "idola seponens." Other of the early Fathers' declared expectations referred more to the way in which Antichrist would exalt himself over every *σεβασμα*, the Emperors specially.

<sup>2</sup> Compare on all this my copious illustration of the whole subject, Vol. iii.

<sup>3</sup> See my Vol. i. pp. 517—527.



from Bagdad on the Euphrates, to make invasion of the Greek Empire, ending precisely at that fortieth day of the siege of Constantinople by Mahomet, on which Gibbon says that all hope of saving either city or empire was abandoned. This is just one specimen, out of innumerable others, of the unfairness with which objectors have been too apt to dwell on the supposed objectionable point in a question of *large* evidence; suppressing all notice of the evidence in favour, however remarkable. A plan of proceeding so directly contrary to that of the summing up of evidence by an English Judge, which ought in every such case to be the model remembered and followed by Christian critics.

2. "I utterly reject Mr. E.'s statement that 'at one and the same time' is the true rendering of the Greek phrase in Apoc. xvii., of *μὴν ὥραν μετὰ τὴ θηρίον.*" It should be, he says, *for* the same time; marking *duration*, not *epoch* or *occasion*.—So Mr. K., p. 300. But, as in the preceding case, so here let me say, when Mr. K. has succeeded in setting aside the parallels of John iv. 52, Acts x. 3, and Rev. iii. 3, adduced by me in *loc.*, where the *accusative* of time is unquestionably in the sense of *epoch at which*, it will be time enough to reply to him further on this point.

3. "In Apoc. x., it is a monstrous proposition that *the seven thunders*, which spoke in St. John's ear, and which he was forbidden to write, should be explained as the voice of the Papal Antichrist from Rome's seven hills, not as the voice of Christ." So Mr. K., p. 171. Yet does he expressly shrink from denying that the whole vision of the rainbow-vested Angel in Apoc. x. has an historic reference to the great Protestant Reformation;<sup>1</sup> and moreover once, and again, and again admits that at each point of time prefigured St. John is to be regarded on the Apocalyptic scene as a *representative man*.<sup>2</sup> In which character he would necessarily be the chief Apostle or Prophet of the Reformation, in all that prefiguration of Apoc. x. Which admitted by way of premise, every indication both in the prophecy and in the history (the *fittings* are not less than *ten* or *twelve*) fixes the meaning of the *seven thunders* to be such as I have stated. Explained as Mr. K. would explain them, all would be vague and valueless that is said about them.

4. "When they shall have *perfected* their testimony, &c."—Ad-

<sup>1</sup> So at p. 169.

<sup>2</sup> So pp. 85, 118, and elsewhere.

mitted that the proof in justification of this rendering of *ὅταν τελεσῶσι τὴν μαρτυρίαν αὐτῶν*, in Apoc. xi. 7, was in my former editions unsatisfactory, and, as Mr. K. says p. 197, fairly liable to objection, it will not I trust be found so any longer in the present edition. If I mistake not, the rendering is established on a firm basis. See my Vol. ii. pp. 411—420.

5. On Apoc. xi. 19, Mr. K. speaks of it as “extraordinary that I should say that *ναός*, or *temple*, is sometimes used more largely of the whole, including the altar-court; stranger still that I should cite Apoc. xi. 1, 2 in proof, seeing that the altar and the outer court are so expressly distinguished there,” i. e. from *ναός*. Much more extraordinary surely is it that Mr. K. in so writing should have identified the temple’s *altar-court* with the *Gentile outer-court*; and overlooked the fact that in Apoc. xi. 1, 2, referred to by me, all that is *within* the *ναός* is expressly spoken of as measured including the *altar* and *altar-court*, while the *Gentile court alone* is excluded as *without* the *ναός*.

6. At p. 287, objecting against my statement in reference to Apoc. [xvi. 13, that *three frogs* were the old arms of France, Mr. K. says that “natural history comes in as an awkward witness against my statement; the fact being that the arms of France were, according to the Encyclop. Metropolitana, *three toads*, not *three frogs*.” Now the extract from the Encyclop. Metropolitana, which Mr. K. here cites from my book to justify his objurgation, is only one out of six explanatory and justificatory authorities. In the other four the device is spoken of as *a frog*, or *three frogs*. So Typotius, Upton, Schott, Garençières. Says the last, in explanation of the line, “Roi, rétirant à la *rane* et à l’aigle,” “By the eagle he means the Emperor, by the *frog* the King of France:—for, before he took the *flower de luce*, the French bore *three frogs*.” Elsewhere, I find, (agreeably with the double *generic* value of the Latin *rana*,) it is described indifferently as a *frog*, or *toad*.<sup>1</sup> It is only Court de Gebelin and the Encyclop. Metropol. that speak distinctively of the device as a *toad* or *crapaud*.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> So Jubinal, sur les anciennes Tapisseries. “Sur les bannières Françaises, de même que sur la casaque de Clovis, on voit pour armories des *crapauds*, ou des *Grenouilles*.— Cette dernière circonstance demande une explication. On sait que, selon nos anciens chroniqueurs, avant que les *fleurs de lys* eussent été apportées du ciel à Clovis, *trois crapauds* étaient les armes de nos ancêtres. Voilà pourquoi Nostredamos appelle le roi de France l’héritier des *crapauds*; et pourquoi Jean Naucler a écrit que Clovis portait dans son écusson de *trois grenouilles* de sinople en champ d’argent.”

<sup>2</sup> I observe that Dr. Hales in his Chronology, though not giving authorities for it

7. At p. 246, Mr. K. insists on the right translation of *ενεστηκεν* in 2 Thess. ii. 2 being “*is present* ;” not as in our English authorized version, and as in the Horæ, “*is at hand*.” At p. 92 of my Vol. iii., in this Edition, my readers will find the point more fully argued out than before ; and the latter rendering of the word, I may unhesitatingly say, on the grounds of Greek criticism fully justified. Let me only here ask Mr. K. the question how he supposes the Thessalonian Christians could have believed that the day of the Lord was then *actually present*, when putting together the two facts, 1st, that they knew from St. Paul’s former Epistle that the *primary* event of the day of the Lord would be the gathering of Christ’s saints, both the dead and the living, to meet Christ in the air ; 2ndly, that neither themselves nor even St. Paul had thus far been made the subjects of that promised blessed rapture ? Will Mr. K. be agitated by the idea of the day of Christ having begun, so long as he is conscious that neither on himself, nor any of his most honoured Christian friends, has the change taken place ?

### § 3. THE PATRISTIC VIEWS OF PROPHECY MAINLY NON-FUTURIST.

In all questions as to the intent of Scripture prophecies, the truth must of course be inferred from examination primarily of those prophecies themselves ; and then in comparison, of the historical events to which reference may have been made, as an actual fulfilment of the prophecies. Hence, in my preceding controversial critiques on the views of the various prophetic schools that differ fundamentally from me in the interpretation of the Apocalypse, I have confined my arguments within those limits ; and avoided as much as possible all reference to the early Fathers. The opinions, however, which they held on these subjects cannot but be most interesting to us : and I have therefore from time to time in the earlier parts of my work made passing allusion to them ;<sup>1</sup> and also formally set them forth in the two first Sections of my History of Apocalyptic Interpretation.<sup>2</sup> But it strikes me that it may be well, ere concluding my work, to add yet a few further remarks about them, in sequel to the two last critiques. In discussing the *Futurist*

like myself, speaks of the old French device as *three frogs*, just as I do. So in his Vol. ii. p. 169 and Vol. iii. p. 625.

<sup>1</sup> See especially my Vol. i. pp. 229—233, 389—394.

<sup>2</sup> From p. 276 to 336 *suprà*.

schemes it may have been remarked that the Futurists make appeal to the early Fathers not infrequently, as if of one mind with them in the view of Scripture prophecy; more especially on the prophecies concerning Antichrist. So Drs. Maitland and Todd: so the Oxford Tractator: so last, but not least, Mr. C. Maitland: who, indeed, claims credence for his scheme as “apostolic,” because of its being “primitive;” and affirms its primitiveness, as being that of all the early Fathers. Now in my recently concluded History of Apocalyptic Interpretation I have shown in a *general* way, that the early Fathers, and the modern Futurist School expositors, are by no means so much in accord as the latter would represent to us. But on the Fathers’ view of *Antichrist’s religious character* I have scarcely entered.<sup>1</sup> I purpose therefore now to supply that omission: and, after premising just summarily, and by the way of reminiscence, whatever other main points in the *patristic* views have been already set forth by me in contrast with *futurist* views, then, and in regard of the great subject of *Antichrist’s religion*, to state the early Fathers’ very different notions from those of the school in question, fully and at large.<sup>2</sup>

I. As to the general points of difference in prophetic views between the one and the other, *already stated by me*, let me note *six* more especially.

1. That the early Fathers expected Antichrist’s manifestation to follow speedily after the breaking up of Rome’s empire;—such a breaking up as Jerome thought he saw beginning through the agency of invading Goths: and had no notion whatsoever of ages intervening between that event and Antichrist’s manifestation, during which the symbolic Beast of Daniel and the Apocalypse was to lie dormant; so as the Oxford Tractator would have us believe.<sup>3</sup>

2. That, in referring this event and consequent change to Daniel’s symbolic statue, as prefiguring it, they distinctly expected that there would be an answering therein to the passing of the iron legs of the 4th or Roman empire into its second and last form of the ten-toed feet, part iron, part clay: and had no notion whatsoever, either of those iron and iron-clay legs and feet of the statue not representing the Roman empire in its two successive forms, so as some Futurists

<sup>1</sup> Briefly alone in Vol. iii. Part iv. iii. 2.

<sup>2</sup> I include in this review the Fathers of the 2nd, 3rd, and 4th centuries, down to Jerome and the Goths.

<sup>3</sup> See pp. 615—617 *suprà*.



like Drs. Maitland and Todd would have it, and that there was to be supposed a great break in the statue at the knee-joint between the brazen thighs and iron legs, in token of many unrepresented centuries, from after the great expected disruption of the Roman empire: nor again, in accordance with Bellarmine and Mr. Barker's theory, that the iron legs, distinctively, *above the ankle*, would then still continue to represent it, just as before the disruption; or, as Mr. C. Maitland, the integral part alone of the iron-clay feet, between the ankle and the toes.

3. That, while expecting Antichrist's duration in power, after his manifestation, to be 1260 *days*, literally, they also preserved among them the idea of the *year-day principle* being one legitimately referable to prophetic periods: (so Cyprian, Theodoret, Tichonius:)<sup>1</sup> so that the principle might be considered applicable, not without patristic sanction, to the great prophetic periods of Antichrist, should the course of historic events afterwards furnish occasion for it.

4. That, in explaining the *Apocalyptic* prophecy, such an idea as that of *the Lord's day* in which St. John was in the Spirit meaning *the great future day of judgment*, into which he was then rapt by the Spirit, together with the seven Churches of Asia address by him, seems never to have entered into their imagination; nor that of the *Apocalyptic* prophecy overleaping at once, and altogether, the time of the Christian Church preceding them, and time then present:—that, on the contrary, they expressly explained its earlier figurations as mainly figuring events of the time from St. John to themselves, and of their own times then current;<sup>2</sup> the 1st Seal depicting the progress of the gospel, as it had been progressing from its first promulgation; the 5th Seal the persecutions under which Christians had previously suffered, and were even then suffering; and so on.

5. That a *Christian* sense was generally assigned by the primitive Fathers of the 2nd, 3rd, and 4th centuries, not only to the other *Judaic* symbols of the Apocalypse, but to its *sealed Israel*:<sup>3</sup>—and,

6thly, as to Antichrist's *political origin*, and *seat of empire*, that though in some way Jewish and at Jerusalem, it would yet be some way Roman, and at Rome, also.<sup>4</sup>

## II. Next, as to the patristic views of ANTICHRIST'S RELIGIOUS

<sup>1</sup> See pp. 308, 332 *suprà*.

<sup>2</sup> See *ibid.* Vol. i.; also p. 302 *suprà*.

<sup>3</sup> See p. 308 *suprà*.

<sup>4</sup> pp. 307, 308 *suprà*.

CHARACTER:—and on this, 1st, as regards *the religious apostasy* that was to introduce him; 2ndly, as regards *his religion afterwards*.<sup>1</sup>

1st, then, *the preparatory apostasy*.—I say *preparatory* apostasy; for the Fathers considered the apostasy prophesied of by Paul, not without good reason, to be the *προδρομος* or *preparative* of Antichrist, as well as that which Antichrist on his manifestation would, as it were, sum up in himself, as its professor, inculcator, and head.<sup>2</sup> And as to its *nature*, while preparing for him, instead of anticipating with Dr. Maitland that it would be “a falling away from all profession of Christianity, into open blasphemous and persecuting infidelity,”<sup>3</sup> what find we? I find *Irenæus*, after heading his general sketch of *heretics*, (heretics that were to be regarded as *precursors of Antichrist*,) with note of their wearing the garb of Antichrist’s Apocalyptic associate, the wolf in sheep’s clothing, prominently setting forth their making a Christian profession,<sup>4</sup> and their often inculcating their tenets under falsified words of Scripture; or, where Scripture failed, asserting a *peculiar unwritten tradition* committed to them as their authority.<sup>5</sup> I find *Clement of Alexandria*, about the end of the 2nd century, objecting to Tatian and other heretics of the time, who on principles of *asceticism*, and as a *Christian virtue*, inculcated a *rule of continency and celibacy*, that in *thus* “forbidding to marry,” contrary to the liberty allowed in Holy Scripture, (so entirely does his view of that prophetic clause agree with the common Protestant interpreta-

<sup>1</sup> I here gather up the scattered notices on the subject already given in the two first Sections of my History of Apocalyptic Interpretation.

<sup>2</sup> *Justin Martyr* calls Antichrist ὁ τῆς ἀποστασίας ἀνθρώπος. Op. p. 336. (Ed. Colon.)—*Cyril* (Catech. xv. 9) calls the apostasy *προδρομος Ἀντιχριστοῦ*.—*Irenæus* (v. 25) speaks of Antichrist as “*diabolicam apostasiam in se recapitulans*.”

The Tractator (p. 11) writes on this point in accordance with the Fathers. “The man of sin is born of an apostasy; or, at least, comes into power through an apostasy: or is preceded by an apostasy; or would not be except for an apostasy. So says the inspired text,” i. e. 2 Thess. ii. 3, 7, 8.

<sup>3</sup> “The early Church conceived of the apostasy as an actual departure, not merely from the purity of the Christian faith by professed Christians, but from Christianity itself;—a falling away from all profession of Christianity into open, blasphemous, and persecuting infidelity.” Maitland on Antichrist, p. 2. He had just before said: “The opinions which I here attribute to the early Church were held, I believe, by all Christian writers until the xiiiith century.” Ib. p. 1. And so too the Oxford Tractarian, p. 16; also Todd, Burgh, and others. At p. 623 et seq. *suprà*, I have noted, and tried these views by the test of Scripture.

<sup>4</sup> Lib. i. ad init. “Lupos ob externum ovillæ pellis integumentum haudquaquam, agnoscentes; . . . ut qui eadem loquuntur, sed non eadem sentiunt.” Also i. 13.

<sup>5</sup> “Falsantes verba Domini mendacium abscondunt sub verbis Scripturæ.” So i. 1. 6. And iii. 2; “Non enim per litteras traditam illam, sed per vitam vocem.” So saying, when convicted from the written Scriptures; “cum ex Scripturis arguuntur.”

tion of it,) they answered to the apostates of the last days described by St. Paul, and showed themselves to be of the spirit of *Antichrist*.<sup>1</sup> I find *Cyprian* speaking of separatists that profest the *Christian name*, and appeared *ministers of righteousness*, as on *Antichrist's* side, though *under the name of Christ*.<sup>2</sup> I find *Cyril* insisting on the less palpable heresy of *νοιατρια*, or *Sabellianism*,<sup>3</sup> as well as on the more palpable one of *Arianism*,<sup>4</sup> and on errors secretly admitted in the Christian Church at the time, as well as those that were open and avowed,—moreover, on the then too general departure from the love of truth to the love of oratory and doctrines plausible and pleasing, and from the practice of good works to the mere semblance of goodness,—as altogether of the nature of the great predicted apostasy. “This is the apostasy,” he wrote; “and the enemy (*Antichrist*) is to be expected.”<sup>5</sup>—I find both *Jerome* and *Augustine*

<sup>1</sup> “Adversùs alterum genus hæreticorum, qui speciosè *per continentiam* impiè se gerunt, tùm in creaturam, tùm in sanctum Opificem qui est solus Deus omnipotens, et dicunt non esse admittendum matrimonium et liberorum procreationem, . . hæc sunt opponenda:—primùm quidem illud Joannis; ‘Et nunc *Antichristi* multi facti sunt, unde scimus quòd novissima hora est: ex nobis exierunt, sed non erant ex nobis.’ . . . Jam de iis qui matrimonium abhorrent dicit Paulus, ‘In novissimis diebus deficient quidam à fide, attendentes spiritibus erroris, et doctrinis dæmoniorum, *prohibentium nubere*,’ &c.” Strom. Lib. 3. pp. 125, 127, Ed. Paris, 1842.

Compare *Irenæus* i. 30; also 24: “Per fietam hujusmodi continentiam seducentes multos.” On which *Feuardentius* observes that while thus discrediting marriage, under profession of continence, these heretics allowed “*promiscuos concubitus*.”\*

The reader will contrast *Clement's* exposition of the text “*Forbidding to marry*” with *Maitland's* and *Todd's* given pp. 625, 626 *suprà*.—*Tatian's* austerity of life, and rule of asceticism and celibacy, are noted by *Mosheim* ii. 2. 5. 9. I have referred to him p. 304 *suprà*.

<sup>2</sup> De Unit. Eccl. “Sub ipso Christiani nominis titulo fallit incautos Diabolus, et ministros subornat suos velut ministros justitiæ; *Antichristum* asserentes sub vocabulo *Christi*.”

<sup>3</sup> *Suicer* on *Υιοπατωρ* and *Υιοπατορια* thus observes: “Hæretici quidam in Scripturarum Trinitate Patrem, Filium, et Spiritum Sanctum non tres personas, sed unam duntaxat trinominem, esse docebant. Illis Filius erat *υιοπατωρ*. Sic *Cyril Alexandr.* Lib. ii. in *John's* viii.; *Σημειωτεον* ὅτι κατ' ἰδιαν ὑποστασιν ἄλλος ἐστὶν ὁ Πατήρ παρα τὸν Υἱὸν καὶ οὐχ, ὡσπερ ἐδόξε τισὶ τῶν ἀπαιδέντων αἰρετικῶν, *υιοπατωρ* εἰσφερεται.” In the 7th Canon of Constantinople, he adds, they were called *Σαβελλιανοὶ*.

<sup>4</sup> Noted also by *Athanasius* and *Hilary* as the apostasy that was to precede *Antichrist*. See pp. 312—315 *suprà*. And compare *Ambrose* in *Luc.* xxi.

<sup>5</sup> Catech. xv. 9. *Cyril's* conclusion follows on the enumeration of these various kinds of apostasy, all in the *professing Church*: *Νυνὶ δὲ ἐστὶν ἡ ἀποστασία· ἀπεστήσαν γὰρ οἱ ἀνθρώποι τῆς ὀρθῆς πίστεως. Αὕτη τοίνυν ἐστὶν ἡ ἀποστασία· καὶ μέλλει προσδοκασθαι ὁ ἐχθρὸς.*

\* An observation well illustrated by *Czerski's* notice of the encouragement given to the young man, when invited to become a priest of the Church of Rome, and make his vow of continence; (cited at p. 629 *suprà*;) “Non unam (mulierem) habebis; sed mille pro unâ habebis.”—*Czerski's* Justification, p. 77.

speaking of false teachers, and bad livers, as of Antichrist's spirit, while professing to be servants of Christ: <sup>1</sup> and *Chrysostom* (or a near contemporary who wrote under his name <sup>2</sup>) speaking of false teachers, such as he then discerned in the Church, (teachers with *hidden* deceit in their doctrine,) as forerunners of Antichrist: adding moreover these remarkable warning words; "When thou seest the Holy Scriptures regarded as an abomination by men that outwardly profess to be Christians, and them that teach God's word hated,—when the people rush to hear fable-mongers, and genealogies, and teaching of dæmons, then bethink thee of the saying, 'In the last days there shall be an apostasy from the faith.'"<sup>3</sup>—In addition to all which I may remind the reader also even of *Pope Gregory's* intimation, two centuries later, that in the ambitious pride and rapacity of the established Christian Clergy of his day there were discernible signs of that apostasy which was to be the immediate forerunner of Antichrist.<sup>4</sup>

2. As to *Antichrist's own religion*, after his manifestation,—besides the general fact of his adopting and heading the previously existing apostasy to which I before alluded,<sup>5</sup> I find the following ideas thrown out by the Fathers:—that he would not at first unfold the true diabolical iniquity of his character, but for a while keep up a show of temperance and humility;<sup>6</sup> coming as a lamb, though within a wolf;<sup>7</sup> yea, with semblance of an angel of light;<sup>8</sup> being, said

<sup>1</sup> *Jerome* in Matt. xxiv. after mention of Simon Magus, and of St. John's prophecy of Antichrist, proceeds thus; "Ego recer omnes hæresiarchas Antichristos esse; et sub nomine Christi ea docere quæ contraria sunt Christo."—*Augustine* writes in Epist. Joh. Tract 3; "Invenimus multos Antichristos esse qui confitentur Christum." Both he and *Jerome* must here mean preparatory Antichrists; as they expected the chief Antichrist at the end of the world.

<sup>2</sup> So the Benedictine Editor of *Chrysostom* judges.

<sup>3</sup> Ὅταν ἰδῆς τὴν ἅγιαν γραφὴν βδελυχθεῖσαι ὑπο τῶν εἶναι δοκούντων Χριστιανῶν, καὶ τοὺς λαλοῦντας τοῦ λόγου τοῦ Θεοῦ μισηθέντας, τότε ὑπομνησθητι τοῦ Κυρίου εἰπόντος, Εἰ ὁ κόσμος ὑμᾶς μισεῖ γινώσκετε ὅτι ἐμὲ πρῶτον μεμίσηκεν, &c. Κάν ἐκ τῶν δοκούντων εἶναι ποιμένων ἰδῆς ταῦτα πρᾶσσοντας (viz. hating the Holy Scriptures, and them that teach them, and themselves giving heed to fables, &c.) τότε ὑπομνησθητι, Ἐν ὑσταταῖς ἡμέραις ἀποστήσονται τινες τῆς πίστεως, &c. Homily Περὶ ψευδοπροφητῶν.

<sup>4</sup> See my Vol. i. pp. 401, 402.

<sup>5</sup> See Note <sup>2</sup> p. 656.

<sup>6</sup> So *Cyril* ib. xv. 12: "At first he will put on a show of mildness, as though he were a learned and discreet person (λογίος τις καὶ συνετός), and of soberness and benevolence." Oxford Translation. See too *Victorinus*, as quoted Note <sup>5</sup>, p. 659.

<sup>7</sup> *Hippolytus* de Antichristo, § 6; quoted p. 284 supra.

<sup>8</sup> *Cyril* xv. 4: "Satan is transformed into an Angel of light. Therefore put us on our guard, that we may not worship another instead of thee." This is said introductorily to the notice of Antichrist.



Hilary, in profession a Christian;<sup>1</sup> said Hippolytus, in everything affecting a likeness to our Lord Jesus Christ:—and would be professedly an enemy,<sup>3</sup> not friend, (so as the Oxford Tractator would have it,<sup>4</sup>) to *Paganism* and avowed Pagan idolatry. And then, some thought that, attaching himself rather to *Judaism*, he would appear as a zealous vindicator of the Jewish law; would thus conciliate the Jews; and thereupon, showing himself as THE CHRIST, (a title the very assumption of which implied a recognition of the Old Testament as inspired Scripture,) would in that character sit in the reconstructed Jewish temple, and exact the divine worship due to *the Christ*:<sup>5</sup>—or else (as Jerome, Chrysostom, and others preferred to interpret the prophecies) that his sitting and arrogating divine worship would be *in the Christian Church*:<sup>6</sup> wherein he would claim the *προεδρεια*, or highest rank;<sup>7</sup> and wherein he would show his Christ-superseding authority, by asserting his own voice to be the Word and the Truth,<sup>8</sup> and by changing, too, and adding to the

<sup>1</sup> See p. 315 *suprà*.

<sup>2</sup> Hippolytus, *ibid*.

<sup>3</sup> “*Idola quidem seponens.*” *Irenæus*, *ibid.*, on which see the Note of Feuardenius: also *Cyril*, &c.

<sup>4</sup> On Antichrist, p. 22.—He illustrates the (so represented) patristic idea of Antichrist restoring *Paganism*, from the institution of something very like it at the French Revolution; *Liberty* being then worshipped as a goddess, and a temple dedicated, and incense offered, “*Aux grands hommes.*”

Let me observe in passing, that in my Vol. iii. 235, Note †, the Reader will see how singularly the Pope and his associates in the apostasy, while solemnly sanctioning what was *virtually* a revival of Paganism in the worship of the *images of saints*, made profession as solemnly, at the very time, of detestation of *Pagan idols*.

<sup>5</sup> So *Irenæus*, *Hippolytus*, *Victorinus*, *Cyril*, and other early Fathers. “*Ipse est iniquus iudex,*” says *Irenæus*, “*ad quem fugit vidua terrena Jerusalem, &c.:*” an application to Antichrist and the Jews of the parable of the unjust judge, and the widow calling on him for vengeance, that was made by *Hippolytus*, § 57, also. Again the expositor *Victorinus*, expecting *Nero* to be the Antichrist, thus writes: “*Ilunc suscitatum Deus mittet, regem dignum dignis, et Christum qualem meruerunt Judæi: et, quoniam aliud nomen allaturus est, aliam etiam vitam instituturus, ut sic eum tanquam Christum exceipiant Judæi. Ait enim Daniel, Desideria mulierum non cognoscet, cum prius fuerit impurissimus; \* et Nullum Deum patrum cognoscet. † Non enim seducere populum poterit circumcisionis nisi legis vindicator. Denique et sanctos non ad idola colenda reoveaturus est, sed ad circumcisionem colendam, si quos poterit seducere. Ita demum faciet ut Christus ab eis appelletur.*” B. P. M. iii. 420.

<sup>6</sup> See my Vol. i. pp. 389, 390, 410, 411; also Vol. iii. pp. 98, 99, Note 2.

<sup>7</sup> So *Theodoret*. See my Vol. i. p. 394.

<sup>8</sup> So *Origen*, on St. John, Vol. ii. p. 53. *Επαν δ' ο ύποκρινομενος ειναι λογος, ου λογος ων, και η ουκ Αληθεια τυγχανουσα, αλλα ψευδος, φασκη ειναι εαυτην την Αληθειαν, τοτε καθοπλισαμενος ο λογος κατα του ψευδους, αναλοι αυτο τω πνευματι του στοματος αυτου, και καταργει τη επιφανεια της παρουσιας αυτου.* (Ed. Huet.) Cited a little more fully p. 287 *snprà*.

\* This explanation of a controverted passage deserves observation.

† That is, none of the gods of Pagan Rome.

number of, the sacraments: <sup>1</sup>—that then at length <sup>2</sup> (on either hypothesis of the temple of his enthronization) he would begin to display his real spirit of cruelty, as well as blasphemy; and commence that terrible persecution of the 1260 days against Christ's two witnesses and the saints, which prophecy had so fearfully depicted, and which would be marked with the very energy of Satan.

Such, I believe, is a tolerably correct abstract of the general patristic expectations in regard of *the religion of Antichrist*:—expectations how different from the views of those of the Futurist school who, with Dr. Maitland, would represent it as the openly-avowed and legalized atheism and rejection of Christianity, and the as openly-avowed and legalized licentiousness of the French Revolution. Further,—*after one important and evidently necessary correction*,—how consistent both with Scripture prophecy as predicting, and with the Roman Papacy as fulfilling.

The point on which I conceive correction necessary has reference to the by some expected *connexion of Antichrist with Judaism and the Jews*;—his origin out of, and re-establishment of, it and them. And, considering its importance, it may perhaps be permitted me to deviate a few moments from my immediate controversy with the Futurists, (if indeed it be a deviation,) in order to its explanation.—It is justly observed by the Oxford Tractator, that there seems little in Scripture prophecy to sanction such an idea.<sup>3</sup> In truth the whole tendency of the prophecies concerning Antichrist is to show that he was to be an enemy both springing out of, and reigning within, the pale of the professing Christian Church. For how could he be an *apostate*, and *head of the apostasy*, and *antitype of the apostle Judas*, (not to say how *the Latin man* also, and *horn out of the old Roman*

<sup>1</sup> So *Jerome*; “Mutabit, et augere tentabit (Antichristus), sacramenta ecclesie.” \*

<sup>2</sup> Let me remind my readers that this idea of Antichrist's concealment for a while of his real character descended to a later generation. So e. g. *Bede*, writing on Apoc. xiii., says; “Ante tres semis annos non aperto ore blasphemavit, sed in *mysterio* facinoris; quod, factâ discessione, et revelato homine peccati, nudabitur. Tunc enim dicet, *Ego sum Christus*: nunc vero, *Ecce hîc Christus, et ecce illic.*”

<sup>3</sup> “At first sight we should not consider that there was much evidence from the sacred text for Antichrist taking part with the Jews, or having to do with their temple.” p. 19. Nor does he offer any such evidence: but only refers to the fact of Julian's attempting to rebuild the Jewish temple, as a remarkable coincidence with such patristic notions.

\* I have mislaid the reference.

*Empire*),<sup>1</sup> if by nation and profession a Jew? Or again, as before observed, how with a false prophet for his abettor that had *horns like a lamb's*, unless professedly of *Jesus Christ's* religion; the Messiah of Jewish expectation being the *lion-like* Messiah, and the *lamb-like* Messiah an abomination to them?—It is difficult fully to account for the patristic error on this matter. Did we judge simply from the statements of Irenæus and Hippolytus, it might seem to have originated, in part at least, from a singular misunderstanding of Christ's prophecy respecting the *abomination of desolation* standing in the Holy Place at *Jerusalem*, (a prophecy which doubtless had reference to the time of the consummated iniquity of the Christ-rejecting Jerusalem, or to the Roman besieging army, with its idolatrous standards gathering into the sacred precincts of the Jewish city,<sup>2</sup>) as if intended of Antichrist's later and very different abomination.<sup>3</sup> Hence, it might be, their construction of *the temple* in which St. Paul said that Antichrist would exalt himself, as the Jewish temple: hence perhaps their supposition of his being himself a Jew; and that the exclusion of Dan, as one accursed, from the twelve tribes out of which God's true servants were sealed in the Apocalypse, marked his tribe.—But the reasons for a different view of these prophecies were too strong and obvious to allow of a general concurrence in the misunderstanding of them. By Chrysostom, Jerome, Augustine, and others of the Fathers, the prophecy respecting *the abomination of desolation* was explained to have been then already fulfilled by the *Roman armies* that destroyed Jerusalem; <sup>4</sup> and the *temple* in St. Paul's prophecy construed, as a little while

<sup>1</sup> *Irenæus'* idea seems to have been that, after gaining supremacy in the Roman empire, though a Jew, he would transfer the imperial seat from Rome to Jerusalem; "Transferet regnum in eam (Jerusalem), &c." v. 25. 4. And so too I suppose *Lactantius*; "Nomen imperii sedemque mutabit." B. P. M. iii. 669.—But the incompatibility of the two suppositions is apparent.—Victorinus and others, as we have seen in Note <sup>5</sup> p. 659 *suprà*, expected Antichrist in the first instance to be of *Roman* extraction, being *Nero* raised from the dead; and that his connexion with the *Jews* would follow afterwards.

<sup>2</sup> See Bishop Newton in illustration. I cannot help suspecting, after much consideration, that "*the abomination*" may have been intended of the *Jews' consummated iniquity, within the city*, rather than of the *Roman desolating army without*: dated perhaps from the time when, abandoned by God's Spirit, they turned the temple into a place of war, blasphemy, and murder.

<sup>3</sup> Irenæus v. 25, Hippolytus § 43.

<sup>4</sup> *Chrysostom* on Dan. ix. refers it to the Roman armies of *Adrian*, that effected the ultimate destruction of the Jewish city and nation; *Jerome* and *Augustine* more properly to the Roman besieging army under *Titus*. But see my Notes pp. 304—307 *suprà*.

since said, of the *Christian Church*.<sup>1</sup> Moreover a *Christian* explanation was given by others to the Apocalyptic symbol of the *twelve tribes of Israel*.<sup>2</sup> So that on the whole there appears to have been nothing in these prophecies sufficiently Judaic, according even to patristic views, to account for the first origination of this idea of Antichrist being a Jew.

Which being so, and *conjecture* permissible in the want of a satisfactory explanation on historic testimony, I would venture to suggest one thing, *upon conjecture*, as a *possible, probable*, and I think I may say, *adequate* originating cause of the error. It is well known with how much earnestness and solemnity St. Paul warned the early Church of the *Judaic heresies* that were even then stealing into it; —the Judaist's will-worship of asceticism and abstinence from meats and marriage, their observance of days, undue and erroneous views of the benefit of mere outward circumcision, attachment to the Levitical ritual, and worshipping of angels with voluntary humility; —the latter, I presume, under profession of unworthiness to make direct use of the mediatorship of Christ.<sup>3</sup> Now one can hardly suppose but that St. Paul in all this spoke with reference to more than the dangers of the time then present: and denounced *therein* certain primary elements (*Judaic elements*) of *the great apostasy* of prophecy, and leaven of that *deceivableness of unrighteousness* which was first to *prepare for*, and then to constitute *the religion of, Antichrist*. If so, and this be the right account of the origin of the patristic notion respecting Antichrist's *Judaism*, then there is a residuum of important truth hidden in it. And adopting the notion, so expounded, we shall find it to supply almost all that was wanting of correspondence between the patristic anticipations concerning the apostasy and Antichrist, on the one hand, and on the other the actual religious history and character of the Roman Papacy, as history afterwards evolved it.

<sup>1</sup> See my Vol. i. pp. 389—391; and Vol. iii. p. 98, just before referred to at p. 659. It will be seen that *Chrysostom* asserts unreservedly the fact of Antichrist sitting in *the Christian Church*; and that *Jerome* decidedly prefers that view of the *temple* prophesied of; “Antichristus sedebit in templo Deo: vel Hierosolymis, ut quidam putant; vel in ecclesiâ, ut verius arbitramur.” *Augustine* mentions the two interpretations without deciding between them: and *Cyril* only decides in favour of the literal interpretation from the feeling, “God forbid that it should be the Christian Church!”

<sup>2</sup> See p. 612. Add to the other Fathers referred to, the great *Augustine*.

<sup>3</sup> Col. ii. 16—23. See Macknight ad loc.



For we know,—and indeed have traced in history,<sup>1</sup>—how, after the breaking up of the little Hebræo-Christian Church at Pella and elsewhere, on occasion of the great Jewish wars of Hadrian, these Judaizing errors past over from the platform of the Hebrew-Christian to that of the Gentile-Christian Church; and there increased continually, though under a changed and professedly more Christian form:<sup>2</sup>—including the veneration of that austerity, asceticism of life, and celibacy that Clement objected to Tatian; the corruption of the simplicity of the Christian ministry and service into resemblance to the Levitical priesthood and Levitical ritual; the unscriptural and exaggerated estimate of the sacramental grace and virtue attending outward baptism, just as before the Jews over-estimated that of outward circumcision; the perversion of Scripture, and substitution of the authority of an unwritten tradition in the priest's keeping; and the looking into things unseen, and at length worshipping departed saints as mediators, to the supersession of Christ.—We know how, with all this, there was also more and more a departure on the part of the *people* from the love of gospel truth to the love of exciting pulpit oratory, and then of fables and legends about saints; as also from real holiness of life to a fictitious and mere ceremonial righteousness, somewhat like what Cyril and Chrysostom deprecated; and how a departure, moreover, (according to Chrysostom's forewarning,) on the part of *priests* and *teachers*, from love to neglect and dislike of the written word; together with a spirit of worldliness, lucre-loving, and ambition.<sup>3</sup>—We know once more that then, and thereby, a preparation having been made for him,—viz. by the establishment of this irreligious system of religion, this unchristian kind of Christianity, with all profession of righteousness, and much of the deceptableness of unrighteousness,—the Pope of Rome, at first prudent, respectable in morals, and professedly humble,<sup>4</sup> yet crafty and politic, (e. g. the first Gregory,) adopting this whole system of apostasy as its head and patron, and so gathering round him as subjects the great body of the apostates of Christendom, did, conjointly with them, not

<sup>1</sup> See Vol. i. pp. 287, 330, 404, &c.

<sup>2</sup> I mean that whereas the Judaizers of the first age magnified the outward forms of *Jewish* rites and ceremonies, the successors to their *spirit*, in the next age, magnified the outward forms of *Christian* rites and ceremonies.

<sup>3</sup> See my abstract of patristic views pp. 656—660 *suprà*.

<sup>4</sup> “*Servus servorum Dei*,” was the title of humility adopted by Gregory and transmitted to his successors in the Popedom.—Compare Gregory's character also with Cyril's *λογιος τις και συνετος*.

only *establish* the Apostasy in the new Romano-Gothic kingdoms, which constituted the body of the Apocalyptic Beast, but as it were authoritatively *consecrate* it; <sup>1</sup> proclaiming *it*, with its ceremonies of an almost *Judaic* ritual, to be the only *orthodox Christianity*, and *Rome*, (the Apocalyptic seven-hilled Babylon,) now vacated of its emperors and become the Papal capital, to be the *Jerusalem* of Christianity: <sup>2</sup>—at the same time that he established himself in its temples and churches, as not merely antitype to the High Priest of the Jews, but *Christ's* appointed *representative and Vicar* for the rule of the Church on earth; and in this character claimed to himself, just what Chrysostom had anticipated of the Man of Sin,<sup>3</sup> yea and received too, the fealty due to that King of kings, and worship due to Christ as God.

### CHAPTER III.

#### EXAMINATION AND REFUTATION OF DR. ARNOLD'S PROPHETIC INTERPRETATIVE PRINCIPLE.

IN the two foregoing Chapters I have, I believe, considered all the main counter-systems of Apocalyptic Interpretation that have been actually drawn out, and that have attached to them any considerable number of adherents. It only remains to add a word or two on a *fifth* and different view from any of these, as well as from that given by me in the Horæ: a view not drawn up into detailed exposition, and which cannot consequently be said to advance pretensions to being regarded as an Apocalyptic system; but which, as directly affecting the most prominent point perhaps of all in the figurations of our prophecy, I mean *the Apocalyptic Beast and Babylon*, and as having had for its advocates names of no inconsiderable authority,—among others that of *Tholuck* in Germany,<sup>4</sup> and in England, that of the late admirable though surely sometimes rash and speculative *Dr.*

<sup>1</sup> See on Gregory I, my Vol. i. pp. 399—411.

<sup>2</sup> See this illustrated in my Vol. ii. pp. 441—443, and Vol. iii. pp. 308, 309. In Bonanni's Papal medals too I observe several that are illustrative of the same point. So one with the legend, "Glorious things are spoken of thee, thou city of God;" another with that of, "Her foundations are upon the holy hills;" &c.

<sup>3</sup> ὅταν δὲ αὐτῇ (sc. ἡ ἀρχὴ ἡ Ῥωμαϊκὴ) καταλυθῇ, ἐπιθῆσεται τῇ ἀναρχίᾳ, καὶ τῆν τῶν ἀνθρώπων καὶ τῆν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐπιχειρήσει ἄρπασαι ἀρχὴν. Chrysost. on 2 Thess. ii.

<sup>4</sup> So Dr. Arnold, p. 8; referring to Tholuck's first Appendix to his Edition of the Epistle to the Hebrews.

*Arnold*,<sup>1</sup>—it might seem unwise and wrong to pass over altogether without notice.

The prophetic interpretative principle asserted by these writers, and the declared grounds of it, are, as expounded by Dr. Arnold, to the effect following:—that there attaches uniformly to Prophecy a lower *historical* sense, and a higher *spiritual* sense, the latter only being its full and adequate accomplishment;<sup>2</sup> inasmuch that “it is a very misleading notion to regard Prophecy as an anticipation of History:”<sup>3</sup> the *proof* of this arising out of the fact of many *prophecies of promise*, spoken in the first instance apparently of the national Israel, or of some one of its kings or prophets, e. g. David, being in the New Testament appropriated to Christ and his believing people, as their truest and chief owners;<sup>4</sup> also of certain *prophecies of judgment*, for example those on Amalek, Edom, Moab, and the Chaldean Babylon, appearing from history to have been but inadequately fulfilled in the fortunes of those nations:<sup>5</sup> and the *reason* being that whereas *history* deals with particular *nations* and *persons*, *prophecy* deals with the *idea* itself and *principle* of good and evil; which in either case is represented but imperfectly in any individual man or nation.<sup>6</sup> Hence that, although a nation or individual man may be *imperfectly* the subject of prophetic promise or denunciation, as being imperfectly the representative of the *idea*, the only *adequate* fulfilment of *prophetic promise* is in *Christ*, who was the perfect personification of all good: (albeit embracing his true people, as being *in Him*, for his worthiness-sake, not their own:)<sup>7</sup> while the only full and adequate accomplishment of the threatened *judgments of prophecy* is to be in the final destruction of the world, as opposed to the Church: for “the utter extremity of suffering, which belongs to God’s enemy, must be mitigated for those earthly evil-doers, whom God till the last great day has not yet wholly ceased to regard as his

<sup>1</sup> I refer to his “Two Sermons on the Interpretation of Prophecy.” The references in the Notes that follow are to the Second Edition of the Pamphlet.

<sup>2</sup> So p. 7; “The general principle of interpretation here maintained, that of a uniform historical or lower, and also of a spiritual or higher sense,” &c. :—where mark the word *uniform*. So again, pp. 42, 70, &c. At p. 31 he compares St. Peter’s declaration, 2 Pet. i. 20, 21, as probably of the same purport; “Knowing that all Scripture prophecy *ιδίας επιλυσεως ου γινεται*, is not of *private* interpretation:” i. e. says he, not private, as if relating exclusively or principally to the *historic* subject; but of larger meaning, as referring mainly to that of which the historic subject was but the imperfect representative.

<sup>4</sup> pp. 3, 22, 28.

<sup>5</sup> pp. 49—62.

<sup>3</sup> p. 11.

<sup>6</sup> pp. 12, 13, 19.

<sup>7</sup> *Ib.* pp. 27, 28.

creatures.”<sup>1</sup>—This interpretative principle embraces of course the Apocalypse, as well as other prophecy. And, with respect to *Papal Rome*, since its character is “not one of such unmixed and intense evil,” Dr. A. considers, “as to answer to the features of the mystic Babylon of the Revelation,”<sup>2</sup> he concludes that, as the ancient Chaldean Babylon was only *partially* the subject of the anti-Babylonish Old Testament denunciations of prophecy in the first instance, so *Rome (Papal Rome)* is only *partially* the subject of the Apocalyptic in the second instance; “as other places may be, and I believe are,” adds Dr. Arnold, “in the third instance:” “so that the prophecies will, as I believe, go on continually with the typical and imperfect fulfilment till the time of the end; when they will be fulfilled finally and completely in the destruction of the true prophetic Babylon, *the world* as opposed to the Church.”<sup>3</sup>

It is to be observed that this prophetic view is put forward, not as one true only in certain cases, and of which the application, or non-application, is to be decided in each instance by the particular circumstances of the case; but as the “uniform”<sup>4</sup> and only true general interpretative principle or “great law of prophecy:”<sup>5</sup> insomuch that (notwithstanding certain admissions made here and there which might seem somewhat inconsistent with the statement<sup>6</sup>) Dr. Arnold declares “the tracing out of an historical fulfilment of the language of prophecy, with regard to various nations, to be a thing impossible;”<sup>7</sup> and argues from it, (as well as from the supposed reason of it,) even as from an undoubted and established principle, to prophecies such as that concerning the Apocalyptic Babylon, of the primary and national fulfilment of which the time is even yet future.—This premised, let us proceed to test the soundness of his *general prophetic law*, and of *its application*; its application, 1st, to pro-

<sup>1</sup> p. 14.<sup>2</sup> pp. 21, 22.<sup>3</sup> p. 32.<sup>4</sup> See the extract Note<sup>2</sup>, p. 665.<sup>5</sup> So p. 79.

<sup>6</sup> So p. 33; “I am by no means denying the literal and historical sense of the Prophecies relating to the different cities or nations, but only contending that the historical sense is not the highest sense: and that generally the language of the prophecy will be found to be hyperbolic as far as regards its historical subject; and only corresponding with the truth exactly, if we substitute for the historical subject the idea of which it is the representative.” Again, p. 51: “Nay, if it be edifying to believe that they have in some instances their minute and literal, as well as their large and substantial, fulfilment, this too I do not deny, but fully allow: only it seems to me dangerous to rest on them as on the great fulfilment of Prophecy.” They are, he adds, to be regarded as fulfilments “*ex abundantia*.” On which *ex abundantia* more presently.

<sup>7</sup> pp. 19, 20.



*phesies of promise* ; 2ndly, to *prophecies of judgment* : the one asserted *reason* for it being of course a prominent point for consideration ; and then the bearing of the whole on the particular case with which we are ourselves more immediately concerned, of the *Apocalyptic Babylon*.

And surely, with reference to his *prophetic law, or principle*, it must already have occurred to the more considerate of my readers, that the data from which so important and large an induction has been drawn are quite inadequate. In order to its justification, especially considering how startling its nature, and how contrary to many literal and apparently express declarations of Scripture, it were clearly requisite that the mass of Scripture prophecy, or at least of its national and personal predictions, should have been brought under review ; and the supposed law of interpretation shown to apply to them all, or nearly all : also, in the cases of exception, the cause of exception in such case should be proved such as not to affect the law. Instead of which, we have scarce any prophecies of a more general character set forth, but almost alone such as are directly *prophecies of promise, or of judgment* : and of the *former* those only concerning Israel, David, or some other of the prophets, of the *latter* those respecting Amalek, Moab, Edom, Egypt, the Chaldean Babylon, and Jerusalem ; examples of which I shall have to speak presently, as exhibiting on the whole much more, I think, of exception to Dr. Arnold's law than of exemplification. As to more general prophecies about things, persons, or nations, let but the reader note down such as occur in most of the Books of Scripture,—for example those in Genesis or in Daniel,<sup>1</sup>—and he will, I think, need nothing more to convince him that in the majority of examples the literal historical fulfilment, in-

<sup>1</sup> In *Genesis* I may specify the predictions to Noah, first of the flood ; then, after the flood, of summer and winter, &c., being ever assured to man during the world's continuance, and no second destruction occurring by water ; also his own predictions concerning Shem, Ham, and Japheth ; the promise to Sarah of a son ; and to Abraham of his natural seed, after 400 years of sojourning and suffering, being established in Canaan ; the prophecies of Joseph about his parents and brethren bowing down to him, and about the seven successive years occurring of plenty, and then of famine ; and, once more, those of Jacob respecting the twelve tribes. In Daniel there are the prophecies about the fated succession of four great earthly empires ; which, except as regards the concluding prediction of the destruction of the last of those empires in its last state can scarcely be called either prophecies of *promise* or of *judgment*, but rather merely of *fact*.

stead of being inadequate and partial, is the one and only fulfilment meant by the divine inditing Spirit; and that that which disregards them can by no right be called a "*law of prophecy*," fit to be applied to the solution of predictions as yet confessedly and altogether unfulfilled.

But let us turn to those more direct *prophecies of promise*, or of *judgment*, to which Dr. A.'s theory chiefly refers.

And no doubt, as regards the *former*, in not a few instances where *Israel*, or *David*, or some *Old Testament saint* is the subject of prophetic promise, (whether promise simple and unmixt, or promise associated with the expression of the saints' present suffering or spiritual breathings,) in many such cases there is a higher as well as lower sense; and with reference to some that would more adequately answer to the character of good than the nation Israel, or the individual David: yet not so, surely, as altogether to fall in with and exemplify his prophetic theory; but rather with such peculiarities in his best examples, and exceptions otherwise so obvious, as to show that even here his supposed universal solvent fails, and that other principles of explanation are needed also. Take the case of prophecies that pass onward in their meaning from a prophet or saint like David to Christ. Very true, and very beautiful, is much that Dr. Arnold has written on this head.<sup>1</sup> But if, (to exemplify from the 22nd Psalm,) "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me," might be both primarily said in one of his distresses by David, and secondarily and more perfectly by him, the Son of David,<sup>2</sup> who was a more perfect representative of human suffering,—if too in the same Psalm the hopeful cry, "I will declare thy name unto my brethren, for thou hast not despised the affliction of the afflicted, &c.," might be the language of David, in sure prophetic anticipation of his deliverance, as well as that of Christ afterwards,—yet what of the associated exclamations under suffering, "They pierced my hands and my feet, I may tell all my bones; they parted my garments among them, and cast lots upon my vesture;" or the triumphant anticipa-

<sup>1</sup> I gladly refer to the beautiful Note<sup>2</sup> in his Pamphlet, pp. 37—41.

<sup>2</sup> This circumstance of Christ's relationship to David, as his father after the flesh, is scarce alluded to by Dr. Arnold: but it ought never to be forgotten as one reason of David's so *Christologizing*, if I may use the word. So St. Peter, Acts ii. 30. Hence too, alike in Isaiah and other prophets who lived after David, Christ is sometimes prophesied of under the name of *David*. E. g. Isa. lv. 3, 4.

tion of "all the ends of the world turning to the Lord," as the result of the deliverance? It is of course admitted by Dr. A. that this, and yet more in the Psalm, so exclusively applies to Christ, that the Psalmist was "*in his words* by the power of God's Spirit enabled to be, so to speak, as *Christ himself*:"<sup>1</sup>—that is, that there exist certain prophecies of the class now spoken of wherein the prophet is not the *imperfect type* of the perfect antitype, but his *impersonation*; prophecies to which the spiritual and higher meaning *alone* attaches, and which consequently are not embraced by his law. This exceptional class is one very important to observe: not merely from its having a somewhat wide range, and including prophecies in Isaiah and Zechariah,<sup>2</sup> as well as in David's Psalms; but yet more from its

<sup>1</sup> p. 80.

<sup>2</sup> In Isaiah the many and large passages where the prophet speaks in Messiah's person, "The Spirit of the Lord God is upon me;" "I am found of them that sought me not;" &c. &c. In Zechariah, "And I said, If ye think good give me my price: and they weighed for my price thirty pieces of silver."

In Heb. ii. 11—13 there occur three applications to Christ of citations from the Old Testament Scriptures, of each of which the character seems different and peculiar. The apostle's subject is *Christ's true human nature*. In illustration of this he thus speaks:—"For both he that sanctifieth and they that are sanctified are of one: for which cause he is not ashamed to call them brethren: saying, *I will declare thy name unto my brethren; in the midst of the Church will I sing praise unto thee: and again; I will put my trust in Him: and again; Behold I and the children which God hath given me.*" It may, I think, illustrate our subject to notice them severally, more especially the last.

The 2nd then of these citations is from Ps. xviii. 2, which is David's song of deliverance from all *his* enemies; but, at the end of which, *He hath made me to be the head of the heathen*, shows that David passes into a kind of symbolic impersonation of the greater King David, his son according to the flesh. And the expression, *I will put my trust in him*, when applied to Christ, must necessarily be understood as meant by him of the repose with which *his human nature*, in its weakness and trials, fell back for rest on the Deity.—The 1st is from Ps. xxii. 22, which seems a Psalm in which David speaks almost altogether as a symbolic man and impersonation of the greater King David: for such an expression as *They pierced my hands and my feet*, &c., can have no application whatsoever to the primary David; as observed in my text just above.

As to the 3rd, it is an example very remarkable, and of which a consistent account seems to me to have not yet been given by expositors. It is taken from Isaiah viii. 18; a passage which we must connect, for the history, with all the context preceding, from Isa. vii. 1. It seems the two kings of Syria and Israel had then confederated against Judah. Judah was in consternation. Would God destroy it utterly, and for ever? Isaiah goes to king Ahaz: and first takes his son *Shearjashub* with him; meaning, *The remnant shall return*. On Ahaz asking no sign, in proof of these confederate kings not executing their intended destroying work on Jerusalem, Isaiah, as from God himself, gives a sign; "Behold a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, *Emmanuel*." That was, in fact, the great primary promise concerning *the seed of the woman* that was to bruise the serpent's head, for which Jerusalem must be spared. So to overthrow them the Assyrian king was prepared; though Judæa too would suffer. Then Isaiah takes with him a second son, named *Maher-shal-al-hash-baz*, in further confirmation; signifying, *In making speed to the spoil he hast-*

setting aside even here that essential point in Dr. Arnold's prophetic theory, that it is *because of his being but imperfectly the representative of the idea of good, with which prophetic promise deals*, that the promise or prediction attaches but imperfectly to the historic type or person. The prophet, we see, is here *no historic type*: the promise, or prediction, no *extension* of what primarily and partially belonged to him; but applicable *in kind*, solely and only, to one greater: and the needlessness of Dr. A.'s singular suggestion as to the *ex abundantia* character of the most specific of the prophetic details in this Psalm made, I think, very evident.<sup>1</sup>

Pass we now to the cases where *Israel* is the subject of Scripture promise. And here, as before said, I of course admit that there is often a higher sense in the promised blessing than ever attached to the ancient historic Israel. But wherefore? In great part no doubt, as says Dr. Arnold, to the fact of the ancient Israel having but very imperfectly answered to the *idea* which it should have represented, viz. of *the people of God*; and the fulness of the highest promise having reference to the spiritual blessings of those who (as accepted to the Beloved) more truly represented that idea, viz.

*eneth to the prey*. And then he uses the words cited by St. Paul, "Behold I, and the children whom the Lord hath given me, are for signs and for wonders in Israel, from the Lord of hosts which dwelleth in Zion." By *wonders* is meant *Mophthim*, or *figurative symbolic men*. On this I have already spoken in my Vol. i. pp. 301—303. But how were Isaiah and his two children, *so as here reported of and described*, figurative of *Christ*, and *his* children, under the gospel dispensation? Perhaps thus. First, *Isaiah* himself was a man figurative of the whole line of prophets downwards, till it ended in Christ, the greatest of prophets, who all, one after another, preached to the Jews, but in vain: till, on the great Prophet and his apostles preaching still in vain, the Jews that so hearing heard not, but had their ears dull of hearing, &c., were rejected of God; their city destroyed; and, as said in Isa. vi. 11, "the houses left without men, and the land utterly desolate." But would it ever be so? No! As *Isaiah*, the symbolic head of that long prophetic line, had *children*, so Christ, the great Prophet symbolized, had his redeemed ones for *children* too. Again, as *Isaiah's* children were by their very names symbolic of a *remnant returning*, and in God's time of there being a *hastening to the spoil and to the prey*, by some who should inflict vengeance on Judah's enemies,—so (may we not say?) Christ's redeemed children too under the gospel are a sign that mercy shall at last attend the house of Judah; its enemies be destroyed, its remnant return, and recognize and own the Lord their Saviour. For, says St. Paul, "have they stumbled that they should (finally) fall? God forbid! But rather, through their fall, salvation is come to the Gentiles, to provoke them to jealousy:"—"and so all Israel shall be saved."

<sup>1</sup> At p. 48 Dr. A. quotes that verse from Ps. xxii., "They parted my garments among them, &c.," as an instance of the "*ex abundantia*" exactitude of fulfilment. "Because there were persons who would be more struck by such a minute fulfilment, than by that general fulfilment which to us seems so far more satisfactory, therefore God was pleased they should have the satisfaction; and, *over and above* the great and substantial fulfilment of the prophecy, provided also those instances of minute agreement."



God's spiritual and true Israel. This distinction indeed, as all know, is strongly laid down in Scripture. So, in regard of the ancient Jews, by St. Paul. So, in regard of the Christian Church, (which under the New Testament dispensation very much took the place of the ancient Jewish people,) in the Apocalypse.<sup>1</sup>—Nor let it be forgotten that there seems to have been announced from the very first this double Abrahamic covenant, of higher and of lower blessing, the spiritual and the temporal, due to Abraham's spiritual and natural seed respectively; which centering both alike in his grandson Jacob, surnamed Israel, were through him transmitted, each and either, to the two lines of Israelites severally interested in them.<sup>2</sup> In the further prophetic development of which there is strong intimation, if I mistake not, of the ultimate and fullest fulfilment of both the one and the other chronologically coinciding together; as they also chronologically coincided in the date of their commencement.<sup>3</sup> In which case, the full specific national accomplishment being effected of the specific national promises to the national converted and restored Israel, all argument from Israel's case in favour of Dr. Arnold's "prophetic law" will be set aside:<sup>4</sup> a law which lays down that, however specifically appropriate may be a prophetic promise to any nation or race, the fulfilment is not to be regarded as tied down to that race or nation, but only to *the idea* which it very imperfectly typified. More especially, when applied to scriptural *prophecies of*

<sup>1</sup> I cannot but remark on the accordance of Dr. Arnold's language, as well as views, on this point with the Apocalyptic sketch. It was the result, not of his prophetic theory, but of the spiritual discernment of his own spiritual mind. "Twice has God willed to mark out here the guests to the Lamb's marriage supper; that all who belonged to his Church on earth, all who were circumcised, all who were baptized, should [might?] be the heirs of the promises of Prophecy. But twice man's sin rendered this impossible. The seal of baptism has proved no surer a mark than the seal of circumcision: again have the people whom he brought out of Egypt corrupted themselves. Still there is, and ever has been, a remnant; still there are those whom Christ owns now, and will own for ever. Theirs are the promises in all their fulness: not because their righteousness is proportioned to such blessings; but because they are Christ's, and Christ is God's." p. 27.

<sup>2</sup> See in this Volume pp. 159—163 *suprà*.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, with the sequel.

<sup>4</sup> "Take these promises (*viz.* of Deut. xxx.) in their historical sense, as address to the historical Israel. They are as yet, it is said, unfulfilled, but they will be fulfilled hereafter. But it seems to me that they have been fulfilled already, as far as it was possible that they could be fulfilled to the historical Israel." So p. 45. At p. 47 he adds, that "if any one urge a lower fulfilment again to the historic Israel, on its turning to the Lord, he will not attempt to deny it; provided it be allowed that such a fulfilment is by no means necessary to the truth of the prophecy, but given *ex abundantia*."

*judgment*, it is plain that the supposed law must be left to its own independent evidence in that application to bear it out; above all when applied to the exemption of *Papal Rome* from all proper and peculiar interest in the symbolization of, and the judgments denounced on, the *Apocalyptic Babylon*.

Pass we next then, as proposed, to this second class of prophecies, the *prophecies of judgment*.

And let me here first justify the passing opinion expressed under my former head, to the effect that the very cases selected by Dr. Arnold in proof of his prophetic theory, seem to me rather to disprove it. For, turning to the two most circumstantial of these prophecies, and those consequently which may best serve as tests, the prophecy concerning the *Chaldean Babylon's destruction*, and that concerning *Jerusalem's*, what find we? That the predicted circumstances concerning *Babylon's* fall were with most remarkable particularity historically and nationally accomplished:—her river dried up from its channel, to give the enemy entrance; her gates of brass opened; the time that of a festival night's carousal and drunkenness; the manner a surprise; the instruments the Medes and Persians; the period that of Israel's preparation for returning from captivity; the result, first *Babylon's* utter and final overthrow from her imperial supremacy, next that of her becoming a desolation, and heap, and burnt mountain, and the river-waters coming up and stagnating upon her, and wild beasts becoming her only inhabitants.<sup>1</sup> All which Dr. Arnold allows; though most strangely he would have us regard it as fulfilment altogether *ex abundantia*,<sup>2</sup> and which might have been dispensed with; the simple fact of *Babylon's* fall from supremacy being sufficient to satisfy the requirements of the prophecy. And against it all what has he to except? Only this, that the fulfilment of the latter part of the prediction was delayed for centuries, after other races had mingled among her inhabitants,<sup>3</sup> though then at last accomplished: an exception in regard of which let it be remembered that the time of the *completeness* of *Babylon's* desolation was not a thing predicted.—And so too as to *Jerusalem's* predicted destruction, how striking the fulfilment! The Roman

<sup>1</sup> See especially Jer. li. 1; and Bishop Newton's historical explanation.

<sup>2</sup> p. 56.

<sup>3</sup> Ib. p. 54.

eagles gathered round her, as to the carcase of prey; the abomination of heathen idolatrous standards planted in her holy precincts outside the city, in meet response to the abomination of sin within; the trench cast about her; the fencing her in on every side; the fearful tribulation of the siege; the overthrow of the glorious temple, one stone not left upon another; the dispersion of the Jews into all nations; and Jerusalem having been subsequently (as Christ said it would be until the return of the Jewish captivity, an event as yet unaccomplished) *not* a desolation like Babylon, but a place trodden by Gentiles, a Gentile city. Against all which, if we ask again what Dr. Arnold has to except,—the answer is simply what Origen more early said:<sup>1</sup>—viz. that there had appeared few false Christs up to his time, though some had, he admits; (and indeed the indisputable authority of Josephus assures us of the fact;<sup>2</sup>) that few false prophets had so far risen up in the Church; (whereas the apostles assure us that many had even in their time;<sup>3</sup>) and that the gospel had not even then been preached in all the world; i. e. taking the word *world* in its largest sense: a sense by no means requisite; and in regard of which, construed as elsewhere to mean *the Roman world*, St. Paul is our witness that the prophecy had had its fulfilment even in his time,<sup>4</sup> and so before the fall of Jerusalem. In a noble passage, which I take pleasure in subjoining, Dr. A. argues the fact of Christ's passing from the particular prediction of the judgment on Jerusalem into the prediction of the world's greater judgment.<sup>5</sup> But, instead of this helping Dr. Arnold's prophetic theory, it needs, I think, but attention to two things to see that it has no bearing whatever upon it. The *first* is the fact of a twofold question having been put to Christ by the disciples, as he sat with them on Mount Olivet overlooking

<sup>1</sup> Ib. pp. 82, 83.

<sup>2</sup> See Bishop Newton generally.

<sup>3</sup> 1 John iv. 1.

<sup>4</sup> Col. i. 6.

<sup>5</sup> "It cannot be doubted that it (the prophecy) proceeds from an immediate historical occasion; and speaks of the approaching siege and destruction of Jerusalem. Nor yet can it be doubted that it does not rest long within the narrow limits of its historical subject: that the language rises almost immediately, and the vision magnifies; that the outward and historical framework bursts, as it were, and perishes, while the living spirit which it contained alone supplies its place; that Jerusalem and the Romans become the whole human race, and God's true heavenly ministers of judgment; that the time fixed definitely for the fulfilment of the historical sense of the prophecy melts away, and becomes an ineffable mystery, when it would in fact be no other than the date of time's being swallowed up in eternity; that the coming of the Son of Man, imperfectly shadowed forth in the power which visited Jerusalem with destruction, is in its full verity the end of all prophecy, which can only find its accomplishment when prophecy shall cease." p. 82.

Jerusalem : viz. 1st, "When shall *these things* be?" 2ndly, "What shall be the sign of *thy coming*, and of the *end of the world*?" Questions these about events which *they* supposed to synchronize, but which *Christ* knew to be separated by a large interval of time: though, for reasons elsewhere enlarged on by me,<sup>1</sup> he would not on this point undeceive them. The *second* is St. Luke's distinct separation of Christ's answers to the two questions;<sup>2</sup> by his statement of "Jerusalem's being trodden down by the nations till the times of the Gentiles were fulfilled," as what would mark the interval between the judgment on *Jerusalem*, and that on *the world* at his second coming. Of course, if this be correct, and the two parts of the prophecy be thus distinct, the case has no bearing on Dr. Arnold's prophetic theory: the essence of which consists in the supposition of *the same prediction* having a *lower* historical or national sense, and a *higher* spiritual one.

It is as being *imperfect representatives of certain ideas of evil*, says Dr. A., that the nation on whom judgments are denounced, are *imperfectly* and *partially* to suffer those judgments. Such is his assigned *reason* for their partial inclusion in the denunciations. Accordingly, let me observe in passing, he seeks out the *particular idea of evil* attaching to each of these nations; though not without difficulty, as might be expected. "In the case of Babylon," he says, "it is easy to perceive the *prophetical idea* of which the historical Babylon is made the representative."<sup>3</sup> I presume he means that of the opposing and persecuting of the profest people of God. In the cases of Amalek and Edom he deems it to be that of offending one of Christ's little ones:<sup>4</sup> in that of Egypt, to be the idea of "the world in a milder sense; needing God's grace, but not resisting or opposing it."<sup>5</sup> All which surely is very fanciful.—But I pass from it to something more important. It is because of the nations having *so imperfectly represented the idea of evil*, to which idea, pure and unmixt, the perfection of the judgments alone attaches, that Dr. Arnold judges an imperfect and mitigated national fulfilment of judgment to be in each case alone admissible: and for the same reason the notion to be inadmissible of any perpetual curse attaching to the *locality* and *soil* of the nation's habitation.<sup>6</sup> Let us then consider, what the

<sup>1</sup> Vol. iii. p. 265.

<sup>2</sup> Luke xxi. 24.

<sup>3</sup> p. 32.

<sup>4</sup> pp. 32, 58.

<sup>5</sup> p. 59.

<sup>6</sup> pp. 17, 49.



bearing of this on the *past*, and what on the *future*.—And first the *past*. Man fell under Satan's strong temptations in Paradise; and, we read, the ground was cursed for his sake. Would not Dr. A.'s theory require the fact of man's inexperience and strong temptation to be taken into account? But perhaps, notwithstanding, he might say that there was here pure and unmixed evil. Let us then go on. Before the flood, man's wickedness was great. But was it pure and unmixed evil? Was there at the time no admixture at all of servants of God? nothing of the more amiable and kindly affections in any of the world's myriads? nothing of any mitigating circumstance? but evil only, and evil pure and unmixed, as in Satan's own breast? I know not what Dr. A. would have replied. So it was, however, that there followed no *imperfect fulfilment* of the judgment predicted through Noah. The world, so soon as Noah and his family had been provided for, was overwhelmed with a flood of waters; and the very earth's crust bears still over it the impress of the diluvial judgment. So yet again in the case of Sodom and the cities of the plain; which, one and all, remain to this day covered by the sulphureous waters of the Dead Sea. Surely these past facts do raise no dubious voice of protest against the reasoning in Dr. Arnold's theory.—And then as regards the *future*. Says our expositor; "These several prophecies of judgment are to go on, meeting only a *typical* and *imperfect* fulfilment till the time of the end; when they will be fulfilled finally and completely in the destruction of the true prophetic Babylon (and true apostate Jerusalem also),<sup>1</sup> the world as opposed to the Church."<sup>2</sup> And will the world then, i. e. this our earth's inhabitants, be at that time of a character of evil altogether worse than that which any evil people have ever yet exhibited in the world; so as to be no longer *imperfectly* the representatives of the idea of evil, but its representatives (even as Satan himself might be) *purely* and *perfectly*? I know no Scripture warrant for so supposing; but the contrary.<sup>3</sup> And if mankind are likely to be then very much what we have already seen them, in respect of their devotedness to evil, and moreover then as now to have a seed of true believers among them, it seems to me that they will still be *imperfectly* the representatives of the idea of evil; and, by consequence, such as should only *imper-*

<sup>1</sup> p. 85.<sup>2</sup> p. 32.<sup>3</sup> e. g. compare Matt. xxiv. 38, 39, xxv. 10.

*fectly* (according to Dr. A.'s theory) suffer God's judgment. A conclusion this which, it is evident from these very sermons, Dr. Arnold himself would have repudiated: and yet I know not how he could have escaped it, as a necessary inference from his prophetic theory.

After the observations just made on the *general theory*, it will not, I think, be deemed necessary that much should be added in refutation of his *particular application* of it to the case of *Papal Rome*, the *Apocalyptic Babylon*. "Grant that Rome is in some sense, and in some degree, the Babylon of Christ's prophecy, yet who that knows the history of the Roman Church can pretend that its character is of such unmixed or intense evil as to answer to the features of the mystic Babylon of the Revelation?"<sup>1</sup> So he concludes, as we saw long since, that Rome's part in the Apocalyptically-figured judgment is to be only a *partial, imperfect, and typical* one; partial, because of other places as well as Rome, being equally included; and typical, that is, of the final judgment.<sup>2</sup> A word then on Papal Rome's asserted *mere partial and typical concern* in the judgment: a word too on the *reason* for it; viz. its freedom from the *intense evil* which might alone justify the full judgment.

And 1st, let me observe, that, as if purposely to prevent the prophecy being applied to anything but Papal Rome, Rome is not itself exhibited, as if perhaps a *symbol of something else*: but *another symbol* exhibited, viz. a Woman sitting on a Beast; and this expressly *explained* by the Angel to mean Rome only. So that Dr. A. has to deal not with a symbol, but with the Angel's explanation of a symbol. And if the very thing that a prophetic symbol is explained by an Angel to mean be itself expounded to mean, principally at least, something quite different, then there is really an end to all certainty, I might almost say to all truth, in Scripture. As well might it be said that the seven years of plenty and of famine, which the seven fat and lean kine seen by Pharaoh were declared to signify, was only the symbol's lowest sense, and that something quite different was chiefly meant by it; that the three baskets and three vine branches, seen by Pharaoh's butler and baker, meant mainly something altogether different from the explanation assigned to them by Joseph; and the golden head of the symbolic statue, in its highest sense,

<sup>1</sup> pp. 21, 22.

<sup>2</sup> p. 32.

something quite other than what Daniel explained it to mean, viz. Nebuchadnezzar's empire of the Euphratean Babylon.

2ndly, and with reference to the *ground* of Dr. Arnold's thus excepting Papal Rome from the curse assigned to the Apocalyptic Babylon, viz. that the *intense evil* attached to that Babylon cannot be deemed to have attached to the Romish Church, the question must be asked, Does Dr. A. refer in this his plea of mitigation to *the system* as less evil in itself; or to there being *many individuals of a different spirit* from the system, professedly, included in it? If to the *system*, I think I may say that I have shown from the recognized and most authoritative exponents of Papal doctrine,—its Papal Bulls, Canon Law, Decrees of Councils,—doctrine not proclaimed in idle theory only, but practically acted out, that the system is one marked, so as no other professedly religious system ever has been, by that which must needs be of all things the most hateful to God; I mean the commixture of the foulest corruption of Christ's religion, and blasphemy of Christ himself, with the most systematized hypocrisy.—If, on the other hand, it be because of *individuals* professedly belonging to antichristian Rome who yet partake not of an antichristian spirit, the very voice of the Angel, "Come out of her, my people," just before the destruction of the Apocalyptic Babylon, shows that up to the very eve of her destruction there would also be in what was meant by the Apocalyptic Babylon, just similarly, some of a different spirit, some of God's people. So that the characteristic is one to fit the symbol to, not to separate it from, Papal Rome.

No! the existence of some of his own people in a guilty nation may make the Lord spare it for a while for their sake. But at length their very presence and protest, by life at least, if not profession, but all vainly, will be judged by Him to be only an aggravation. And while He will know how to deliver those godly ones from the judgment, yet it will not then any longer prevent the fate of the guilty people. So it was in the case of the old world, when the destroying flood came, as predicted. So in the case of Sodom and Gomorrah. So again in that of Jerusalem. And so too (may we not undoubtedly anticipate) will it be in the case yet future of Papal Rome, the antitype, the only proper antitype, to the Apocalyptic Babylon. For, as the *symbol* has been so tied to it by God's infinite wisdom, that no human ingenuity can ever put them asunder, so most as-

surely the *fate* predicted on the same Apocalyptic Babylon shall in Papal Rome have its fulfilment. Nor can I see any reason to alter my express conviction, that even when a better state of this earth shall have succeeded to the present, the ruined site of that antichristian city and empire will remain a monument to the future inhabitants of our planet of the most astonishing system of human ingratitude, and perversion of God's best gift, that the old world ever saw : the smoke of its burning going up for ever ; and its volcanic crust resting like an ulcer, agreeably with Isaiah's awful prophecy, on the face of the new creation.<sup>1</sup>

---

Since the above was written I have read Dr. Arnold's very interesting "Life and Correspondence" by Dr. Stanley ; and am thankful to learn from it that on the subject last touched on by me, viz. the measure of evil in the Apocalyptic Babylon, or Romish Church, that that great and good man was by no means consistent with himself in at all extenuating it.

With regard to the *nature* of the *apostasy*, of which the *man of sin* predicted by St. Paul was to be the head, he in the strongest terms, as appears from that Biography, again and again declares it to be just that system of *priestcraft* which was perfected in Popery.<sup>2</sup> The difficulties felt by him in the way of his fully carry-

<sup>1</sup> See my Vol. iv. pp. 221, 222.

<sup>2</sup> "So far as *Popery* is *priestcraft*, I do believe it to be the very *mystery of iniquity*. But then it began in the 1st century ; and had no more to do with *Rome* in the outset than with *Alexandria*, *Antioch*, *Carthage*." So in November, 1836. *Life and Correspondence*, ii. 61.

Again ;—"There is no battle in which I so entirely sympathize as in this against the *priestcraft-Antichrist*." So December, 1837, about the troubles from the Archbishop of Cologne. *Ibid.* p. 99.

Again, in January, 1838 ; "This spirit of *priestcraft*, the root of anarchy, fraud, and idolatry, is the mainspring of all *Popery*, whether *Romish* or *Oxonian*." *Ib.* 105.

Again, October, 1839 ; "I see the *Tractarians* labouring to enthrone the very *mystery of falsehood* and *iniquity* in that neglected and dishonoured temple, the *Church of God*." p. 172.

Again, January, 1840 ; "In one point I think *Antichrist* was in the *Church* from the 1st century : yet God forbid that we call the *Church* *Antichrist*. *Newmanism* is the development of that system which in the early *Church* existed only in the bud ; and which, as being directly opposed to *Christ's* religion, [we see that *Dr. A.*, had not attended to the peculiar force of the word *αντιχριστος*,] I call *Antichrist*." p. 183.

Again, June, 1841 ; "That the great enemy should have turned his very defeat into his greatest victory, and converted the spiritual self-sacrifice, in which each was his own priest, into the carnal and lying sacrifice of the mass, is to my mind, more



ing out the Papal application of the prophecy, alike as regards the *time* of the heading of the apostasy, and the measure of its *universality* when dominant, as if (in the old Protestant view) embracing all but the Waldensian witnesses,<sup>1</sup> were founded on entire mistake.<sup>2</sup> And whereas, in his Sermons on Prophecy, he had argued that in the Romish Church there "is not such *unmixt* or *intense evil* as to answer to the features of the mystic Babylon of the Apocalypse," yet in his Correspondence we find him declaring that he *cannot imagine* to himself *anything more wicked than the Papal system*, at least as exhibited at Rome and in Italy.<sup>3</sup>

I therefore rejoice to appeal on this point from Dr. Arnold to Dr. A. himself; from Arnold under misapprehension to Arnold self-corrected: and to regard him as in reality much more a witness for, than against, the great Protestant view advocated in these Lectures, after Bishop Warburton and all the fathers of the English Reformation; to the effect that the *Pope of Rome* is distinctively the *Antichrist* of prophecy, and *Papal Rome* the *Apocalyptic Babylon*.

than anything else, the exact fulfilment of the apostolic language concerning Antichrist." p. 260.

<sup>1</sup> "But then it (the priestcraft system) began in the 1st century." So in the primary citation given in my Note on p. 679. Again; "To talk of Popery as the great Apostasy, and of the Christian Church as the Vaudois, is absurd." So June, 1831. Vol. i. p. 395.

<sup>2</sup> In fact, what St. Paul's *prophecy* marks is a clearly gradually self-unfolding evil: first existing in the bud, as Dr. A. says; then increasing more and more into a general apostasy; then, when so advanced, to be headed by the *man of sin*, or *Antichrist*. So that the Roman Bishop, if the Antichrist meant, had *then* only, according to the prophecy, to take his part in its fulfilment.

As to God's *Church of the true-hearted* it is represented as hidden in the wilderness, during Antichrist's reign, known to God, but (collectively) not visible by man. Only during direct *witnesses for God's truth*, few in number, were to be visible and active on the scene. See Apoc. xii. 17, and my Comment on it, Vol. iii. p. 68. The Vaudois we look on as some only of those witnesses.

<sup>3</sup> "In Italy it is just the old heathenism; and, I should think, a worse system of deceit." So October, 1825, while in Italy. Life i. 74.

"I saw these two lines painted on the wall in the street to-day, near an image of the Virgin:

Chi vuole in morte aver Gesu per padre,  
Onori in vita la sua santa madre.

I declare I do not know what name of abhorrence can be too strong for a religion which, holding the very bread of life in its hands, thus feeds the people with poison." So May, 1827, at Rome. Ibid. 279.

Again, at p. 385, we find him applying to a statue of the Virgin in the Tyrol, the tales told about it, as the deliverer of the people from the French, and the worship paid it, what Herodotus might narrate of a statue of Minerva *αλεξικακος*.

Yet once more, this is the statement of his final opinion on the subject, and made very shortly before his death; "Undoubtedly I think worse of Roman Catholicism, in itself, than I did some years ago." So October, 1811. Life ii. 287.

## CHAPTER IV.

EXAMINATION AND REFUTATION OF THE RECENT COUNTER-  
PREMILLENNARY THEORIES.

IN revising this part of my Work for its 5th Edition, the important bearing of a right view of the Apocalyptic Millennium on the interpretation, not only of the future, but also of the past, seems to me to require that I should not close this Chapter without a notice of millenary views counter to my own, such as may have been set forth by writers more or less of eminence since the publication of my 4th Edition, notwithstanding the large space allotted to the discussion of it in the last chapter but one of my Commentary; in case perchance any new light may have been thrown by modern research on the subject. I propose, therefore, here to pass under review the millenary counter-explanations advocated respectively by *Dr. Wordsworth* in his Hulsean Lectures, by *Professor Hengstenberg* in his Apocalyptic Commentary, by *Dr. Fairbairn* in his work on Prophecy, and by *Bishop Waldegrave* in his Bampton Lectures on the Millennium. The two first of these writers, it will be seen, explain the millennium as an æra of the past, or in part of the present; the third, like Whitby, Vtringa, and Brown, as an æra of blessedness still future, but antecedent to Christ's 2nd advent; the last, like Hengstenberg, (after carefully weighing the evidence in favour of each and every one of the counter-solutions hitherto suggested,) as an æra wholly past, though not the same æra as Hengstenberg's.—Proceed we to consider them in succession.

And, as regards both *Wordsworth* and *Hengstenberg*, though the one point of Apocalyptic Interpretation on which I have proposed to exhibit their views is the millenary question, yet, as their names have a certain literary prestige attached to them in the minds of many, as names of authority, I think it may be interesting to all such if I briefly sketch their *general* views of the prophecy in the first instance. The rather as it will be not interesting only, but most useful to my present object. For, if I mistake not, the fact will then in either case be sufficiently apparent that, whatever their prestige and authority on other literary subjects, there attaches to them little indeed in their character as expositors of the Apocalypse.

1. *Dr. Wordsworth.*

As regards this expositor, he states at the beginning of his commentary, (and this I doubt not most justly,) that St. John in the Apocalypse "lays open a long avenue of events rising up, one after another, in clear perspective, through the whole interval of time from that Lord's day in which he was in the Spirit upon the shores of the Isle of Patmos even to the day of doom." But how does he make good and illustrate the thus asserted clear prophetic perspective of the future in his actual commentary? how prove it to have clearly prefigured the grand and most characteristic events such as have been subsequently in fact unfolded in the now far advanced history of the Church and of the world? Says he; "Alike the *seven Epistles*, *seven Seals*, *seven Trumpets*, and *seven Vials*, foreshow in parallel chronological lines, though in different points of view, the whole history of the Church and world from St. John's time to the consummation. The *seven Epistles* indeed are not orderly in respect of succession; but only vaguely anticipatory in their church-picturings of certain points more fully illustrated in the other three series. The *seven Seals* depict respectively, and in chronological succession, Christ's gospel-progress, the Pagan Roman Emperors' persecution of Christians, the outbreak of heresies, the ravages of barbarian invaders, (such as of Goths, Saracens, etc.,) the martyrdoms of Christians, the convulsions of the last judgment, and finally, in the half-hour's silence in heaven, the promised everlasting sabbath. The *seven Trumpets* "contain a rapid view of the conflicts and sufferings of the Church, and of the judgments inflicted from heaven on its enemies:"—the first, (designated as one of judgment on the *earth*,) symbolizing the chastisement on heathen Rome for its persecution of the Church, as inflicted in the 2nd, 3rd, and 4th centuries; the 2nd, the judgments on the Roman world in the 5th century; the 3rd, heresies such as of the Arians, Nestorians, Monophysites, &c.; the 4th, errors, confusions, and defections, such as were prevalent in the 5th, 6th, and 7th centuries; the 5th, Mahometanism; the 6th, the binding of the gospel (under figure of the four angels bound) in the great river of the mystical Babylon, or Church of Rome; which gospel is prepared for *the hour* of retribution, *the day* of wrath, *the month* of God's harvest, *the year* of His visitation, in the contest of the mystical Armageddon. But how all these things prefigured? With any definiteness of etching? Any pointedness in the prophetic symbols

such as to admit of application to the thing supposed to be fore-shown, and nothing else? By no means. All is vague, both in the figures and the things prefigured, according to Dr. W. Take here a notable example. Between what is said in Apoc. ix. of the *four Angels bound in the Euphrates*, and what is said in chap. xi. of the *two Witnesses*, (signifying the *two Testaments* of the Law and the Gospel,) “there is (says our Expositor) a wonderful resemblance.” For, as fire came out of the mouth of the Euphratean horses, so fire came out of the mouth of the Witnesses; as the four angels were imprisoned in the river of Babylon, so the two Witnesses are said to be killed, and lie unburied in the great city, Babylon; as “the Angels were accompanied with the heavenly host, and endued with tremendous power,” so the two slain Witnesses rise again, and “ascend in the clouds of Christ’s glory to heaven,” to the terror of their foes. In fine, both “the loosing of the four Angels is called *the second woe*; and the preaching of the two Witnesses is also expressly called the *second woe*.” (!) Yes, says Dr. W. again, p. 251, “this is alike the 2nd woe, the 6th trumpet, the 6th seal, the eve of the end.”—And so we are brought to the 7th and last trumpet, under which the proclamation is made that the kingdoms of this world have become the kingdom of our Lord and of his Christ; and that the time has arrived in which the saints are to be rewarded, and the dead judged at the tribunal of Christ, “*without any intervening millennium*.”<sup>1</sup>

Yet, once more, as regards the seven *Vials*, they “represent spiritual benefits converted into banes to the faithless, means of grace into plagues;” the 1st, or that of a grievous sore on those who have the mark of the Beast, indicating a corrupt profession of faith such as that of the Church of Rome; the 2nd, by which the sea became blood, the outpouring of God’s judgments on the waters on which the harlot sate, signifying peoples, and multitudes, and nations, and tongues; the 3rd, which turned the rivers and fountains into blood, the poisoning by Rome of the Holy Scripture and sacraments; the 4th, under which the sun scorched men with fire, so that they blasphemed God, Christ the Sun of Righteousness, made to all who disobey him a consuming fire; the 5th, poured on the throne of the Beast, the “perplexity, panic, anguish, and despair,” caused in the

<sup>1</sup> Dr. W. here takes for granted what he should have proved; viz. that the 7th Trumpet, in what it says of the judgments on the world, contained under it, and the reward of the saints, does not include (besides the Vials) the millennium, and judgment of the great white throne after it.



very heart of the mystical Babylon ; the 6th, under which the water of the Euphrates was dried up, the drying up of the glory and strength of the mystical Babylon, i. e. of Papal Rome ; and therewith a way opened for the kings from the East, i. e. for the faithful soldiers and servants of Christ.

Such is a sketch of the intent of the four septenary series of the Apocalyptic Epistles, Seals, Trumpets, and Vials according to Dr. Wordsworth ; such the “ *clear definite perspective,*” thereby exhibited to St. John in Patmos, of the grand mutations and events coming on the world and the Church, in the interval between the revelation shown to him in Patmos and the consummation. For these with the two important additions only, 1st, of the prophecy concerning the Beast and Babylon, (which Dr. W. rightly, ably, and at large explains, in accord with the great body of Protestant Interpreters, of Papal Rome,) 2ndly, of that concerning the millennium, make up the Apocalypse.

To refute all this is quite needless. It refutes itself. My readers will see that it was not without reason that I glanced at Dr. W.’s general Apocalyptic interpretation as sufficient to set aside all the prestige and authority of his otherwise respected name on any Apocalyptic subject expounded by him ; such e. g. as the *millenary question*.

Which premised, and being thus the better prepared for inquiring into his view of that question, we find that he explains the millennium of Satan’s being bound in the abyss, and the saints reigning with Christ, to have commenced with Christ’s triumph over Satan by his miracles and death ; and to have been perpetuated ever after to all baptized Christians, by the power over Satan imparted to them on their regeneration by baptism. This, in his view, is their *first resurrection*.—But how could Satan be truly said to be *bound* for the 1000 years, so as not to deceive baptized *individuals*, or baptized people *nationally*, consistently with the fact, also prominently put forth by Dr. Wordsworth, of the Papal Beast Antichrist, who was Satan’s grand agent for deceiving the nations, having reigned in power during much of the self-same 1000 years ? To this objection Dr. W.’s answer is curious, but certainly most untenable. It turns on the force of the Greek preposition *ινα*, in the clause *εσφραγισεν επανω αυτου ινα μη πλανηση τα εθνη επι* “ sealed him *in order that he should not* deceive the nations any more.” For here, argues Dr. W., the

*intended object* of the sealing is declared, but not the *actual result*. "The corruptions of Popish times and countries show that men have despised what Christ has done for them, and have loosed the enemy who was bound by Christ." (So pp. 50, 51.) How again could this consist with what is said of the time of Satan's being *loosed*, viz. as not to take place until the end of the 1000 years; so that to those who lived before the end of the 1000 years, or end (so Dr. W.) of the present dispensation, in Christendom, he could not be loosed.<sup>1</sup> Moreover, St. John's declaration, "I saw on the thrones . . . *whosoever* had not worshipped the Beast nor his image; and they (i. e. all of them) reigned with Christ 1000 years," implies obviously that the conflicts of all of the enthroned that had not worshipped the Beast must have preceded the 1000 years' reign: just in fact as in Dan. vii. 9 the time of the enthronization of the saints is fixed to the time of the destruction of the little horn; which little horn Dr. W., in common with most Protestant expositors, admits fully to symbolize the Popes of Rome, or Antichrist.

## 2. *Hengstenberg.*<sup>2</sup>

On the next page I have given a Tabular View of this expositor's Apocalyptic Scheme; from a mere glance at which it will be seen that of actual definite predictions of the future there is in the Apocalypse, according to him, very much as in the case of Dr. Wordsworth's exposition, really next to nothing. Three times indeed we find it stated that in the visions shown to St. John there was to be a *revelation* of the things which would shortly come to pass; in Apoc. i. 1, i. 19, and iv. 1. Yet, according to Hengstenberg's scheme, the whole amount of revelation concerning the then coming future contained in the symbolizations of all the seven Seals, seven Trumpets, and seven Vials, which make up full half of the prophetic chapters of the Book, and which are themselves both arranged with the most marked regard to order of succession, and often full of detail, as well as very varied, in their figurings, was this:—that Christ had gone forth conquering and to conquer; that in his train, and as means to that end, there would be a recurrence from time to time of the desolating judgments of war, scarcity, famine, and pestilence against his

<sup>1</sup> Indeed, at p. 75, Dr. W. speaks of Satan's loosing as of an event yet future.

<sup>2</sup> I use the Translation by Dr. Fairbairn; Edinb. 1852.

# HENGSTENBERG'S APOCALYPTIC SCHEME,

## IN SEVEN GROUPS.

<p>I. SEVEN EPISTLES. poc. ii., iii.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Instructions, Consolations, and Warnings to the Seven Asiatic Churches, (representative of the Church general in its varying phases,) to prepare them for the great events of the coming future, specially Christ's speedy coming.</p>									
<p>II. SEVEN SEALS.  poc. vi., vii.</p>	<table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <tr> <td style="width: 80%; border: none;"> <p>1. Christ's marching to Victory; with judgments of</p> </td> <td style="width: 10%; border: none; text-align: center;"> <p>{</p> </td> <td style="width: 10%; border: none;"> <p>2. Discord, 3. Scarcity, 4. War, famine, and pestilence, and 5. (on martyr's cry) 6. Great political convulsions; and finally 7. Silence of destroyed enemies.</p> </td> </tr> <tr> <td style="border: none;"></td> <td style="border: none; text-align: center;"> <p>}</p> </td> <td style="border: none;"> <p>ever recurring in his train:</p> </td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3" style="border: none; padding-top: 10px;"> <p>Synchronous Sealing Vision, figuring the elect Christian Israel as always preserved in life.</p> </td> </tr> </table>	<p>1. Christ's marching to Victory; with judgments of</p>	<p>{</p>	<p>2. Discord, 3. Scarcity, 4. War, famine, and pestilence, and 5. (on martyr's cry) 6. Great political convulsions; and finally 7. Silence of destroyed enemies.</p>		<p>}</p>	<p>ever recurring in his train:</p>	<p>Synchronous Sealing Vision, figuring the elect Christian Israel as always preserved in life.</p>		
<p>1. Christ's marching to Victory; with judgments of</p>	<p>{</p>	<p>2. Discord, 3. Scarcity, 4. War, famine, and pestilence, and 5. (on martyr's cry) 6. Great political convulsions; and finally 7. Silence of destroyed enemies.</p>								
	<p>}</p>	<p>ever recurring in his train:</p>								
<p>Synchronous Sealing Vision, figuring the elect Christian Israel as always preserved in life.</p>										
<p>III. SEVEN TRUMPETS.  poc. viii.—xi.</p>	<table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <tr> <td style="width: 80%; border: none;"> <p>Judgments of war, figured</p> </td> <td style="width: 10%; border: none; text-align: center;"> <p>{</p> </td> <td style="width: 10%; border: none;"> <p>1. as desolating hailstorm; 2. as volcanic mountain; 3. as river-poisoning meteor; 4. as light-eclipsing darkness; 5. as hell-emitted scorpion-locusts; 6. as lion-headed cavalry-hordes;</p> </td> </tr> <tr> <td style="border: none;"></td> <td style="border: none; text-align: center;"> <p>}</p> </td> <td style="border: none;"> <p>ever recurring.</p> </td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3" style="border: none; padding-top: 10px;"> <p>Synchronous witness-vision; showing that witnesses for Christ shall not fail amidst Church corruption; but, when killed, ever revive, and in fine triumph.</p> </td> </tr> </table>	<p>Judgments of war, figured</p>	<p>{</p>	<p>1. as desolating hailstorm; 2. as volcanic mountain; 3. as river-poisoning meteor; 4. as light-eclipsing darkness; 5. as hell-emitted scorpion-locusts; 6. as lion-headed cavalry-hordes;</p>		<p>}</p>	<p>ever recurring.</p>	<p>Synchronous witness-vision; showing that witnesses for Christ shall not fail amidst Church corruption; but, when killed, ever revive, and in fine triumph.</p>		
<p>Judgments of war, figured</p>	<p>{</p>	<p>1. as desolating hailstorm; 2. as volcanic mountain; 3. as river-poisoning meteor; 4. as light-eclipsing darkness; 5. as hell-emitted scorpion-locusts; 6. as lion-headed cavalry-hordes;</p>								
	<p>}</p>	<p>ever recurring.</p>								
<p>Synchronous witness-vision; showing that witnesses for Christ shall not fail amidst Church corruption; but, when killed, ever revive, and in fine triumph.</p>										
<p>IV.  DRAGON and BEASTS.  poc. xi.—xiii.</p>	<p>DRAGON = SATAN, as Prince of this world; and therefore impersonated with heads and horns, after the Beast's type.</p> <p>GREATER BEAST = World power, under seven successive heads; 1. Egyptian, 2. Assyrian, 3. Babylonian, 4. Medo-Persian, 5. Grecian, 6. Roman; after destruction of which by the ten-horns (= Gothico-Germanic hordes), those horns constitute collectively the 7th head. Then, after the Millennium thereupon following, the Beast revives under the afresh heathenized Germanic horns; = Gog and Magog of Apoc. xx.</p> <p>SMALLER BEAST = earthly, sensual, devilish wisdom.—Name and number of Beast = Adonikam.</p>									
<p>V. SEVEN VIALS. poc. xv., xvi.</p>	<p>Plagues ever recurring, chiefly of war; which, throughout its whole course, ever accompany the ungodly world's power.</p>									
<p>VI. JUDGMENT on BEASTS and DRAGON.  poc. xvii.—xx.</p>	<p>Beast's 6th or Roman head, and Babylon = heathen Rome, prophesied of as to be destroyed by the ten horns, or kings; i. e. the Germano-Gothic hordes of the 5th century.</p> <p>These hordes, at first Antichristian, wage war against the Lamb; then are overcome by the Lamb, or converted. On which the Beast, or Heathendom, is for the time destroyed: and MILLENNIUM of Church supremacy begins; this being literally 1000 years from about 800 to 1800 A. D.</p> <p>The Beast is <i>just now</i> reviving (i. e. A. D. 1848), after type of Gog and Magog. It is doomed to speedy destruction; &amp;c. Then Satan's or the Dragon's end.</p>									
<p>VII. NEW JERUSALEM. poc. xxi., xxii.</p>	<p>NEW JERUSALEM symbolizes reign and bliss of redeemed saints on the renewed earth.</p>									

enemies; and that meanwhile neither should the Church of the faithful ever fail, nor witnesses for Christ's truth be ever wanting, whatever the visible Church's corruption: the latter, wheresoever destroyed in appearance, soon reviving and springing up again. Did it need a new Apocalypse to assure the disciples of this? Had not Christ himself, and his apostles, already again and again declared as much? <sup>1</sup>—In order to reduce the visions to this nothingness of meaning it needed of course that the Apocalyptic *numeral terms*, like the visible symbols, should be frittered away by some generalizing process, so as to signify nothing definite or specific. And so accordingly it is in H.'s exposition. The 4th part of the earth in the 4th Seal simply "points to this, that fearful judgments were still to come."<sup>2</sup> The 3rd part of the earth in the Trumpets shows that "it is still not the final judgment."<sup>3</sup> The "hour, day, month, and year," at which (or after which) the third part of the men were to be slain, means simply that the exact time is fixed in God's councils.<sup>4</sup> The 5 months of the scorpion-locusts of the 5th Trumpet denote "a *very long* period, though still not the longest."<sup>5</sup> The 3½ years of the Church in the wilderness, (which is "the world's signature,") though eight times as long as the 5 months, denote "a broken and *short* period."<sup>6</sup> Alone the thousand years of the millennium are to be understood in a definite and chronological sense, to signify literally one thousand years: a singularity in his exposition of the prophetic numerals the reason of which, as we shall see at the end of our critique, is not difficult of conjecture.

As to Professor H.'s view of the Apocalyptic *Beast* as the ruling *world-power*, and of its *heads* as denoting the various kingdoms to which the world's chief supremacy has successively belonged, viz. the Egyptian, Assyrian, Babylonian, Persian, Greek, and 6thly Roman,—there is this obvious and fatal objection against it, that the *Beast's* seven heads were declared to symbolize those seven hills on which the woman Babylon in Apoc. xvii., that is Rome, sate:—a definition infinitely important to the right understanding of this symbol; and which ties down the *Beast*, under all its successive heads and phases, from first to last, to that self-same well-known site

<sup>1</sup> E. g. in Matt. xxiv. 6—11, xvi. 18, and xxviii. 20, we find as much, or more, told of the future.

<sup>2</sup> Vol. i. p. 259.

<sup>3</sup> i. 343.

<sup>4</sup> i. 368.

<sup>5</sup> i. 359.

<sup>6</sup> i. 464, 477, 396.



of Rome's seven hills.<sup>1</sup> So that the only debateable question is the meaning of those several successive heads, in relation to the one *Roman State*: and whether to be confined to the times and rulers of *heathen* Rome, or to admit of application also to the times and rulers of *Papal* Rome. And really it does seem to me monstrous to suppose the Apocalyptic symbol of Babylon, with the Beast under its last head sustaining her, (Apoc. xvii.) to be restricted in its meaning to *heathen*, or rather *imperial* Rome; <sup>2</sup> and Babylon's destruction, as immediately after figured, (Apoc. xviii.) to be by consequence imperial Rome's temporary desolation by the Goths in the 5th and 6th centuries, when the very strongest conceivable language is Apocalyptically used to express the eternity of that desolation; "Her smoke rose up *εις τος αιωνας των αιωνων*, *for ever and ever.*"<sup>3</sup> Let but the inquirer look for himself; and he will find that this phrase is never used in Scripture but of that which is absolutely and in the strongest sense of the word, eternal.<sup>4</sup> Hengstenberg's justificatory reason for explaining it in reference to imperial Rome's destruction is given in the Note below in its entirety.<sup>5</sup> And surely

<sup>1</sup> Let me beg to refer the inquirer on this most important point of indication to my H. A. Vol. iii. pp. 111—114.

<sup>2</sup> I have already urged the truth of the case, as here hinted, in my Review of *Bossuet's* Apocalyptic Scheme, p. 592 *suprà*. "Was it really Rome *Pagan* that was desolated by the Goths? Surely, if there be a fact clear in history it is this, that it was Rome *Christianized in profession*,—I might almost say *Rome Papal*,—that was the subject of these desolations." This fact is there further illustrated from history; as the reader will see. It constitutes of itself a fatal objection to Hengstenberg's view.

He notes, and attempts to reply to, this objection, Vol. ii. pp. 243—245. But how?—1st, he says, When the judgment *first began* to be executed, Rome was heathen: referring, I suppose, to the times of the Germanic irruptions into the empire in the 3rd century, before Constantine. But whence does he himself date the rise of the ten horns? Just like other expositors, from the times of Alarie, &c., at the end of the 4th and beginning of the 5th century. See his p. 205.—2ndly, he says that Rome was very corrupt, even "*after its formal conversion to Christianity.*" No doubt; and on this corruption the Papacy was founded. But herein Hengstenberg's argument is against himself. It is in favour of the Apocalyptic Babylon in Apoc. xvii. meaning Rome *Papal*, not Rome *Pagan*.—On re-considering all this, and also my argument, as drawn out p. 650 *suprà*, on the hypothesis of reading *και* in Apoc. xvii. 16, I find myself forced back to my original conviction that Tertullian's and Jerome's reading of *εις* is the true one.

<sup>3</sup> Apoc. xix. 3.

<sup>4</sup> It occurs Gal. i. 5, Phil. iv. 20, 1 Tim. i. 17, 2 Tim. iv. 18, Heb. xiii. 21, 1 Peter iv. 11, v. 11; and in all these passages with reference to the glory ascribed to God *everlastingly*. In the Apocalypse it is used Apoc. i. 6, 18, iv. 9, 10, v. 13, 14, vii. 12, x. 6, xv. 7, xxii. 5, with reference to the everlasting glory, existence, or kingdom of Christ. The only other passages where the phrase occurs in this book are the three cognate ones of Apoc. xiv. 11, xix. 3, xx. 10: where the devil's eternal torment is spoken of, in the lake of fire; as also that of Babylon, the Beast, and the Beast's worshippers.

<sup>5</sup> "In Isa. xxxiv. 9, 10 it is said of Edom, the type of the ungodly heathen world,

the citation will be thought by each discerning reader to illustrate the foolishness, and on sacred subjects worse than foolishness, of attempting an impossibility.

As to his view of the Apocalyptic *millennium*, as the thousand years of Church rule (Papal Church rule) from about 800 to 1800 A.D., there needs to justify it that something be shown from history before the commencement of that period, not only answering to Babylon's everlasting destruction, but also that may answer to the Lamb's predicted victory over the kings of the earth, or ten horns of the Beast,<sup>1</sup> Rome's destined temporary desolators. For the latter, as well as the former, is set forth as a premillenary event in Apoc. xvii. 14, xix. 19, compared with Dan. vii. Now the obviousness of a consistent historic explanation of this particular, as well as of all other particulars in the visions, on the usual Protestant anti-Papal view of Babylon and its ten-horned supporting Beast, has been long since shown by me. The Germano-Gothic horns, before receiving their kingdoms, did, we know from history, tear, burn, and desolate *imperial* Rome:<sup>2</sup> then, so soon as Rome became *Papal*, (in which form she is depicted in the vision of Apoc. xvii.,<sup>3</sup> not the *imperial*,) having just succeeded in portioning out among themselves in different kingdoms the old Roman empire, they combined to acknowledge Christ's Vicar, the Pope, as their common father and head. And so they did thenceforth not only give their power to the Roman Popes, the Beast's new head, (called the Beast by the interpreting Angel,<sup>4</sup>) but also afterwards, except during a brief interval in the French revolutionary wars, foreshadowed I suppose in the Apocalyptic Vials,<sup>5</sup>

'Her land shall be burning pitch: day and night it shall not be extinguished; its smoke shall go up for ever and ever.' This fundamental passage shows that here (viz. on Apoc. xix. 3, about Babylon's destruction) Apoc. xviii. 9, 18 is to be compared! and not Apoc. xiv. 11, where everlasting fire is used as an image of the torments of hell.' Hengstenberg, ii. 242.—But who told the Professor that Edom, in this passage of Isaiah, was only meant as a type of the ungodly heathen world? Such was not the general notion of either Jewish or Christian expositors.

<sup>1</sup> "These *ten kings* are the only powers in amity with the Beast, and in hostility to Christ, which still remain on the field; the only ones therefore which can be understood here by the *kings of the earth*." So Hengstenberg on Apoc. xix. 10, ii. 258.

<sup>2</sup> As the Angel's explanation in Apoc. xvii. included the Beast's history, prior to his existence under that 8th head under which the vision represents him as upholding the cup-bearing or Papal Rome, (see my H. A. iv. 31, and the Papal medal there given illustrative of this,) so it included also the history of the woman, or Rome, prior to her existence in the Papal form depicted in the vision.

<sup>3</sup> The cupbearing form, referred to in my preceding Note.

<sup>4</sup> Apoc. xvii. 11.

<sup>5</sup> Especially the 5th Vial. See my H. A. ad loc.

furnished its real sustaining support to Papal Rome.—As to their final predicted conflict with the Lamb, and the Lamb's victory over them, it is surely to be regarded as an event yet future, which will accompany, or immediately follow after, Papal Rome's everlasting destruction, introductorily to the world's millenary Jubilee.—But since in Hengstenberg's scheme, as I said, the Lamb's victory over the ten horns must precede A.D. 800, he seeks to explain it by reference to the Gothic kings' conversion to orthodox Christianity, resulting, he says, from their desolating wars with each other in the 5th, 6th, and 7th centuries.<sup>1</sup> But could their fighting with *each other*, before their conversion to orthodox Christianity, be figured as fighting with the *Lamb*? Again, could their conversion to Christianity, which he designates (not very correctly) as the result of these wars, answer to the terrible Apocalyptic figuring of the end of the ten horns' conflict with the Lamb; viz. a slaughter like as for the supper of the great God, in which all the fowls of the heaven are to fill themselves with their flesh; and one in which the Lamb will tread the winepress of the wrath of God?—Once more, as to Hengstenberg's *millennium* itself, and his theory of its answering, with its prefigured rule of the saints and binding of Satan, to the Christian Church's (mainly the Papal Church's) supremacy throughout the middle ages, and after it, let not his own admission be forgotten that at times "the Papacy did indeed look very like the Beast."<sup>2</sup> So that the saints' rule, and the rule of that which was very like the Beast, were then, according to him, not only coexistent but identical.

Most assuredly Hengstenberg has no more succeeded than Mr. W. H. Scott, or others of the Millennario-Præteristic school before him, in making out even a *locus standi* for the theory of a past millennium. As little has he succeeded in making out a case against the old Protestant view of the Apocalyptic Babylon, and Beast that upheld her, as symbols of Papal Rome, and the Popes, or Popedom.<sup>3</sup> One mar-

<sup>1</sup> Hengst. ii. 259.

<sup>2</sup> ii. 67.

<sup>3</sup> The Popes being the ruling head, as I conceive, of the Beast in his last form; the Popedom, or Papal European empire, the body of the Beast.

Hengstenberg's argument on this head against Bengel and others occupies in his 2nd Volume from p. 56 to p. 67; and is as follows:—

1st, he says, the Papal application of the prophecy does not square with *his own view* of the meaning of Apoc. xiii., of the Seals and Trumpets, or moreover of Dan. vii., where he makes the Beast the *world-power*, as in the Apocalypse.—But is *his own view* on these points right? Those he argues against would say not.

2. There is, says he, nothing *pseudo-Christian, ecclesiastical, or hypocritical* in the

vels how a man of his literary attainments and reputation could have deluded himself into the scheme of belief exprest in this Book. I incline to infer from certain passages in it that the revolutionary outbreaks of the year 1848, amidst which he wrote much of it,<sup>1</sup> acted with a kind of bewildering effect on his mind; and impelled him, coûte qui coûte, to regard those outbreaks round him as signs of Satan's predicted outbreak from his prison. Nor, in this state of feeling, could he fail to look with more sympathy and even favour on the Papacy than his great predecessors in Apocalyptic interpretation, whom he so often refers to, Vitranga and Bengel; seeing that the Papal authorities, as well as the kingly and social, were objects of the then prevalent revolutionary hatred and violence.<sup>2</sup>

### 3. *Fairbairn.*

Preliminarily to speaking of Dr. F.'s view of the millennium, and Christ's promised second coming and kingdom, I must observe, just as in the cases of Wordsworth and Hengstenberg, on the utter nothingness of meaning to which his exposition would reduce the glorious Apocalyptic prophecy. It was given, as the interpreting Angel

characteristics either of the Beast in Apoc. xiii., of the cognate Man of Sin in 2 Thesalonians, or of Babylon in Apoc. xviii.; but only open profest impiety and blasphemy.—Yet he admits that the *temple of God*, in which the Man of Sin was to sit, must mean the Christian professing Church; though he would have the predicted enemy to press in upon it ab extrâ. But, if he *sits in it* afterwards, he must needs have left it standing; which H. conceives the Man of Sin and Beast will not do. Moreover, he admits that the lamb-like False Prophet, attendant on the Beast in Apoc. xiii., *may* mean pseudo-Christian teachers. He only argues (not correctly if we rest ourselves on the fundamental passage Matt. vii. 15) that the symbol *may* also mean other false teachers.—On this point not only are the Patristic expositors, such as Irenæus, Hippolytus, Chrysostom, Jerome, Augustine, &c. &c., against Hengstenberg, but also the mass of Papal expositors. Says Bossuet on Apoc. xx. 14, about his expected future Antichrist; “On doit attendre sous l'Antichrist les signes les plus trompeurs qu'on ait jamais vues; avec la malice la plus cachée, l'hypocrisie la plus fine, et la peau du loup la mieux couverte de celle des brebis.”—As regards *Babylon* with its pictured *expbearing* in Apoc. xvii., the medals of Papal Rome, already alluded to, do themselves illustrate the propriety of such its application.

3. The unsatisfactoriness of the explanations by Protestant expositors, on this theory of the *Beast's heads* and *Beast's image*, is urged by Hengstenberg. In reply I must beg to say that I have nowhere seen, though the matter has been well sifted by hostile critics, any argument of the least strength against the explanations given by myself in the H. A. of these symbols:—the *Beast's 7th head* being, according to it, the *diademed* quadripartite Diocletianic form of government, the *8th* the Papal government, or Popes; and the *Beast's image* the Papal General Councils.

<sup>1</sup> See the Preface; also ii. 67, &c.

<sup>2</sup> The chief and almost only really valuable part of Hengstenberg's Commentary seems to me to be his elaborate argument for the Domitianic date of the Apocalypse.



said, to reveal to God's servants the things that were to happen afterwards ; meaning of course the chief grand mutations and events in the coming future of the Church and of the world, from St. John's time until the consummation ; and this with sufficient precision and definiteness in the figurations to fix such its application in each case when rightly understood. But what did it reveal according to Fairbairn ? Just thus much ;—that there were to be wars, famines, and pestilences, from time to time, more or less,<sup>1</sup> in consequence of the world's refusing to receive the preached gospel, and persecuting its preachers and witnesses : “ that all the departments of nature, or rather what might then correspond to them in the political or social sphere,” would be visited successively as by hail, fire, burning mountains, and darkness : moreover that an apostasy would at length arise in the Church, as St. Paul had before predicted ; and Daniel's prediction also be realized that the 4th of the four great worldly empires, that is the Roman, would change into a professedly Christian, but really anti-christian power, made up of ten kingdoms, and with its central seat on Rome's seven hills, so constituting the last phase of the worldly power opposed to God :—that the witness for Christ however would still be maintained, and at length rise to ascendancy ; so that, as Daniel, Christ, and Paul had before predicted, the saints would in fine possess the kingdom.—This, I believe, is pretty nearly all that Dr. F. would suppose foreshown in the Apocalypse, or Book of Divine Revelation, down to its prediction of the millennium ; so that in fact it might seem to be called the Book of Revelation in burlesque, from its revealing nothing new, or at the most next to nothing.

Alike in regard of the prophetic indications of *time*, and the prophetic *geographical and topographical* indications, Dr. F. would *on principle* reduce what seems most definite into indefiniteness. The 1260 days he explains as a period reaching from the Church's first institution even to our own times ; the Beast's number 666 as “ six highly potentialized,” in contrast with seven, the sacred number of Divinity. My explanation of the 1st Seal's rider as designating the Cretico-imperial line of Nerva, Trajan, and the Antonines, he sets aside, not because of any failure in my asserted and very remarkable fittings between the prophecy so explained in the history ; but “ be-

<sup>1</sup> Very much as in Moore's old Almanack ; that at such a time there would be rain or stormy weather, more or less, two or three days before, or two or three days after.

cause a Scripture image ought to be contemplated in its broader aspects, such as would present itself to persons acquainted with the works and ways of God.”<sup>1</sup> The common Protestant reference of the four first trumpets to the Gothic, Vandal, Hunnic, and Ostro-Gothic invasions of the Western Roman Empire he sets aside as out of the question, however otherwise suitable, because of the land, sea, rivers, &c., being treated as *literal* localities. He denies the application of the Euphrates of the 6th Trumpet to the Turks who from that Euphratean locality invaded Greek Christendom, because the Euphrates, according to him, must not be treated as a *literal* river, notwithstanding the well-known parallel in Isa. viii. 7.—And even in the one notable case in which he does defer to the Apocalyptic definition of locality as to be taken literally, I mean the case of the *seven-hilled* Babylon as signifying Rome, he cannot allow himself to do this without qualification. For he makes this Babylon to comprehend “all that is worldly in the Protestant churches of England, Scotland, and America, (his own Scotch Free Church, I presume, inclusive,) as well as in the Papal Church; and similarly the Apocalyptic Beast connected with Babylon to be not distinctively the Popedom, or kingdoms united by their common blasphemous recognition of the Roman Pope as Christ’s Vicegerent on earth, but generally the worldly power opposed to God throughout European Christendom.

The origin of all this may be traced, I think, to Dr. F.’s strong prejudice against the admission of any measure of *literal explanation* in a *symbolic* prophecy like the Apocalypse; that “intermingling of the literal with the symbolical which (he says) has so greatly retarded the proper understanding of the prophetic Scriptures.” A prejudice this which may have resulted from his long typological researches: but which, if applied to the many definite *Messianic* prophecies indicative of the time, place, family, character, and history of the true Messiah, would surely justify a Jewish Rabbi in denying the Messiahship of the Lord Jesus Christ. *Extreme spiritualism* would, on this vital point of the evidence for an historical Messiah already come, be just as fatal as *extreme literalism*.

As to Dr. Fairbairn’s views respecting the *Millennium*, and Christ’s second coming to take the kingdom, he is thus far clear and

<sup>1</sup> Another example of the loose and (as I judge) wrong principle of Apocalyptic interpretation which I noticed, in contrast with my own, pp. 557, 558 *suprà*.

decided in the expression of his judgment that *that* coming is to be *post*-millennial, not *pre*-millennial. In his arguments however as justificatory of this opinion, he is, I must say, not only most inconclusive, but most inconsistent. Thus, as regards two out of the many extra-Apocalyptic passages urged by myself and others as strongly pre-millennial in their bearing, viz. the prophecy in 2 Thess. ii. 2, respecting the man of sin, and St. Peter's statement in Acts iii. 19—21 about Christ's coming at the epoch of the restitution of all things, he slurs over the former, and its declaration that the destruction of the Man of Sin is to synchronize with Christ's second personal coming, and gathering of his saints to him, in a manner quite unworthy of himself and of the subject. On the other hand he presents us with a long criticism of five or six pages on the passage in the Acts, in order to rescue it from the pre-millennial construction. He admits indeed that the correct rendering of the passage is beyond doubt that for which I have contended in my book; "Repent ye therefore and be converted, for the blotting out of your sins, in order that seasons of refreshing may come from the presence of the Lord, and that he may send Jesus; whom the heavens must receive till those times of the restitution of all things of which God hath spoken by the mouth of his holy Prophets from the beginning of the world." Which translation admitted, the Jews' conversion, times of refreshing from God's presence, and his sending Jesus Christ to them, seem connected together in the first part of the passage as events synchronous, or immediately consequent the one on the other: while what is said in the latter part of the passage seems to be but a more direct and explanatory statement to the same effect; viz. that it was God's fixed purpose that Jesus should not return personally from the heavens to which he had ascended till those refreshing times of the restitution of all things which had been the theme of all prophecy from the beginning of the world. On which construction of the passage Christ's second coming would be fixed as synchronizing with the Jews' conversion, and so (according to Fairbairn's own views) with the commencement and introduction of the Millennium. How then does he escape from this inference? While admitting that the *times of refreshing* might very naturally be identified with the *times of restitution*, he supposes them to be here in fact quite distinct from each other: the refreshing times being such, says he, as

already had occurred at the Pentecost, (Dr. F. forgets that this was the time then actually present,) and might often again occur afterwards, so as we know it to have done at the Reformation, and may expect it to do again yet more at the Jews' conversion; while the refreshing at the restitution of all things can be but once, and this post-millennially at Christ's second coming. But mark how this exposition confutes itself. According to it St. Peter would have said to the Jews: "Repent, that now your sins may be blotted out; and moreover that, at the interval of some thousands of years, the Father may send Jesus Christ again from heaven!"

Then, reverting to the Apocalypse, need it be said that the time of Christ's entering on his kingdom and inheritance must needs be the time of his second coming? Yet observe how confused and self-contradictory Dr. F. is on this point, and consequently on the position of the millennium which is so closely connected with it. Respecting the *saints' inheritance* we find him at p. 261 referring to St. Peter's description of it as an inheritance incorruptible, unfading, reserved in heaven for those who should be kept by the power of faith unto salvation; and consequently as that which would *really* be entered on by them *personally* at the time of the creation of the new heavens and the new earth, which Dr. F. makes *post-millennial*. On the other hand, in his Apocalyptic comment, he makes the seven-sealed Book in Christ's hand to be the *book of the inheritance*; and the difficulties to entering on it as surmounted at the *opening of the seventh Seal*, synchronic in his view with the millennium. Similarly, at p. 395, he notes, as the two great works of which the prosecution was to be foreshadowed in the Apocalypse, "the gathering out and preparing a people to inherit, and then the preparing of the earth for their inheritance, by dispossessing of the powers of evil:" (p. 396:) also "how the mystery of God (thus Apocalyptically unfolded) would be ended (i. e. at the 7th Trumpet) by the installation of *the Church*, with regal power and glory, in the possession of the inheritance." Again at p. 303 this is made to synchronize with "the Beast's destruction,<sup>1</sup> and the saints living and reigning with Christ

<sup>1</sup> As Dr. F. resolves what is said in Apoc. xviii. of the destined destruction of the Apocalyptic Babylon, with all its accompanying terrors, into the simple fact of its conversion to Christ, so, it might be presumed, in regard of what is predicted concerning the Beast's destruction. Very much as what is said in Dan. ii. about the stone cut out without hands *smiting* the great image on its feet is explained elsewhere by Dr.



upon the earth, in other words, possessing the kingdom." Is not this the distinctive character of the millennial state? At pp. 301, 302, to the same effect, he refers to what is said in Dan. vii. 27 of the saints taking the kingdom on the little horn's destruction. But all this only in the sense of the saints' and church's *cause*, not of the departed saints *themselves*.

Where, what, and when, we have then still to ask, is the saints'—the risen, living, perfected saints—actual own inheritance, in Dr. Fairbairn's view? I am myself quite at a loss to answer. Amidst these self-contradicting statements, and arguments, I shall best perhaps approximate to a true judgment by saying that, whereas the Doctor's directly exprest voice is *post-millennial*, his reasoning voice is quite as decidedly *pre-millennial*.<sup>1</sup>

#### 4. *Dr.* (now Bishop) *Waldegrave*.

Beautiful is the spirit in which these Bampton Lectures of Dr. Waldegrave are written; so affectionate, so earnest, so thoroughly spiritual and evangelical! But, though professedly intended as a refutation of the pre-millennial doctrine generally, I know not that there is anything very new in his arguments against my own; or which has not been replied to in my long chapter on the Millennium. Much of his reasoning is pointed against what may be called *Judaizing* pre-millennarianism; such, for example, as would suppose that the old Jewish ritual and animal sacrifices are to be restored during the millennium at Jerusalem; in the which I heartily agree with him. For it seems to me that in the Epistle to the Hebrews all such ideas are decisively set aside. Moreover in the two fundamental principles of prophetic interpretation early laid down by him as what should guide us on this subject I quite agree with him: viz. "1st, that, in the settling of controversy, those passages of God's word which are literal, dogmatic, and clear take precedence of those which

F. (pp. 292, 293,) as the *gentle pressure* of the gospel against it, begun in Christ's time, and to have its full effect at the consummation!

<sup>1</sup> There is the same confusedness in Dr. F.'s views respecting the Apocalyptic New Jerusalem. At pp. 483-4, he speaks of the New Jerusalem, the Lamb's bride, as St. John speaks of it; i. e. as constituted of God's elect alone, whose names are in the Book of Life. At p. 445, on the other hand, he speaks of the early Christian professing Church (including tares of course as well as wheat, false as well as true) as "the New Jerusalem in its commencement." Again at p. 411 he speaks of "the great apostasy converting the New Jerusalem into Babylon." How does our Professor reconcile these statements?

are figurative, mysterious, and obscure :” 2ndly, “that in all points on which the New Testament gives us instruction, it is, as containing the full, clear, and final manifestation of the divine will, our rightful guide in the interpretation of the Old.” It is in the *application* only of these rules that I differ. Not so, however, in regard of the two propositions which constitute the heading of his second and third Lectures: viz. “that the kingdom of heaven *as now existing* is the *proper* kingdom of Christ;” and, “that the kingdom of Christ *as now existing* is in the view of ancient prophecy the true kingdom of his father David.” Instead of using the adjective *proper* in the one proposition, and of the apparent limitation of Christ’s kingdom to its *present* state of existence, according to the wording of both, I should rather speak of its present state as but the *incipient* and *imperfect* state of the kingdom; the *proper* and *perfect* state being when Christ comes again at his *appearing* and *kingdom*. These differences have in fact a direct and strong bearing on our respective and discrepant conclusions as to the time and nature of the Apocalyptic millennium.

Reverting to Dr. W.’s two fundamental interpretative principles, and his *application* of them, as what I should here alone demur to, it may be well that I a little illustrate. Instead then of my pre-millennial view resting altogether, so as Dr. W. seems to imply, on what is said in Apoc. xx. concerning the millennium, it was (as abundantly appears in the millennial argument in my book) by other statements in the unsymbolic parts of the New Testament Scripture, which seemed to me clear and all but decisive on the point, that my judgment was swayed in that direction in the first instance:—such passages, for example, as the clause in the Lord’s Prayer taught by Christ to His disciples, “May thy kingdom come, may thy will be done *on earth* even as it is done in heaven:”—that in Acts iii. 19—21, (dwelt on a little while since in my review of Fairbairn,) where St. Peter speaks of that 2nd coming of Christ from heaven at which is to be the restitution of all things predicted by the Old Testament prophets, as what would follow the conversion of the Jews to Christianity:—that in Rom. viii. 19—23, where the visible creation is spoken of as looking for its emancipation from the bondage of corruption at the epoch of the manifestation in glory of the completed body of the saints of God:—that, finally, in the prophecy in 2 Thess.

ii., which marks the epoch of the destruction of the man of sin, or Apocalyptic Beast, as that of the personal coming of Christ, and gathering to Him of His saints, both dead and living. It was under the influence of these and other such like clear and distinct statements, let me repeat, in the unsymbolic books of the New Testament, respecting the time, circumstances, and consequences of Christ's 2nd coming, that I came to my conclusion, contrary to all my early notions, as to Christ's coming being antecedent and introductory to the Apocalyptic millennium, not its consequent. Nor does Dr. W. appear to me to have at all shaken the force of these SS. to the effect I ascribed to them. Some, I think, he decidedly misconstrues.<sup>1</sup> Of others, however unconsciously, he evades the natural sense in its bearing against him; while of the last of the four just enumerated (2 Thess. ii.) he takes pretty much the same view with myself; as (conjointly with one or two others) decisive against the theory of a *yet future* spiritual millennium before Christ's second coming.

With regard to the difficulties attendant on the pre-millennial theory, such as he sets forth very much at large after Faber, Gipps, and above all Dr. Brown, it is not my intention here to dwell on them. I have sufficiently expressed myself respecting them elsewhere. They are difficulties as regards the final future which, if my view of it be Scriptural, we may trust to God Himself to solve, even though we may be unable to solve them. What remains for me to do in this notice of Dr. W.'s lectures is simply to state his own counter-view, as given in Lecture vii., respecting the millennium; and therewith to show my readers how evidently Dr. Waldegrave is at a loss to satisfy himself respecting it as to what may be rested on as clearly the truth. His plan is to enumerate all the counter-premillennial theories that have ever been broached. So, 1st, he sets forth the post-millennial view of Christ's advent, or *spiritual* view of a millennium *still future*, such as we have seen advocated by Whitby and Vitranga. But, after doing so, and stating not only very fully, but also with apparent approbation, the arguments in its favour, he confesses (as just before noted by me) that the prophecy in 2 Thess. ii., to the effect that the Man of Sin, or Papal Antichrist,<sup>2</sup> is to be de-

<sup>1</sup> So in his adoption of the versions of Acts iii. 19—21 in our English authorized New Testament; not that which I have shown, and, as Dr. Fairbairn admits in common with most critical expositors, fairly, to be the correct version.

<sup>2</sup> Dr. W. is quite decided as to the *Papal* reference of this prophecy.

destroyed by the brightness of Christ's coming,—a coming which he cannot but admit to be *personal*,—taken in conjunction with what is said in the parable of the tares and wheat as mixt together until the harvest, so seems to render it probable that Popery, among other delusions, will survive to the coming of the Lord, that he feels obliged to set that solution aside.—Which being so, the only alternative solution that remains to him in his anti-premillennial character, is that of a millennium *past*, or in part *present*. Accordingly he just passes before the eye of his readers (over and above the Augustinian view) Dr. Wordsworth's *ecclesiastical* solution explaining Satan's binding in reference to the privileges of baptism, during the whole mystical millennial period from Christ's first to his second coming ;—that of Fox, Brightman, Grotius, &c., explaining the binding of Satan *nationally*, as begun on the theatre of Christendom with the overthrow of Paganism in the 4th century, and ending with the irruption of the Turks in the 14th ;—that of Hengstenberg, just noted by me, also *national* in its character, but measured from the conversion of the northern nations in the time of Charlemagne to “the outbreak in modern times of the spirit of unbridled infidelity and licentiousness ;”—and that of Mr. Gipps, which, as stated by me long since, in my chapter on the millennial subject, makes the prophecy of the *first resurrection* to have had its fulfilment in the *rising up of witnesses for Christ*, such as the followers of Claude of Turin, Waldenses, Lollards, &c. ; the *second resurrection* being intended of the yet future national conversion of the Jews ; that event which Ezekiel prophesied of under the figure of the *resurrection of the dry bones*, and which St. Paul speaks of as what would prove to the world as *life from the dead*. Unsatisfied, however, with any of these solutions, Dr. W. suggests, as perhaps a preferable solution, the idea of its meaning that Satan is for the 1000 years “forbidden to invent and propagate any *new* religious imposture among nominal Christians ;” the ten centuries intended being those preceding the blessed Reformation. But how so, since at the beginning of those ten centuries there was the outbreak of both the Papal and Mahomedan delusions? In part by making the ten centuries to be only nine ; and the millennial period to have begun with the outbreak of those delusions. But did not those Satanic delusions reign in power *all through that period* ; and is not this fact prominent in the Apocalyptic



prefigurations of that æra of the coming future? Assuredly, Dr. W. denies it not. And so no wonder at his evidently feeling his theory to be open, like the rest, to grave objection. Like Mede, he knows not where to find a place for a past millennium.<sup>1</sup> And so he finally rests on the idea that there is no need for him, in support of his strong anti-premillennianism, to do more than to show that other solutions than the pre-millennarian have been suggested, and “are possible.” A conclusion surely most lame and impotent: and which, taken in conjunction with what has been here, and much more fully elsewhere, urged in favour of the pre-millennial view, may well leave on the mind of candid readers of Dr. W.’s book a feeling in its favour; and so constitute him *effectively* a helper, instead of a destroyer, of the pre-millennial theory.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See p. 495 *suprà*.

<sup>2</sup> Though overprest with matter I must not close this Chapter without a notice, however brief, of a late little publication “on the Millennium,” by “A Barrister;” feeling bound not to omit this alike from a sense of the very warm and kindly sentiments expressed by the writer respecting my Commentary generally, and also on account of the earnestness and thoughtfulness manifest in it.

Basing his views of the Apocalyptic Millennium all but entirely on the Apocalyptic description itself, he notices how there are throughout this prophetic Book references from time to time to things enacted in the *heavenly spiritual world*, as well as things *on earth*, distinct, though connected closely together. Thus, advancing towards the consummation, after the destruction of Babylon or Papal Rome *on earth*, Alleluias, he observes, are described as heard in *heaven*, a song in which the 24 elders and four living creatures are said to participate: then, next, after the further destruction on earth of the Beast and False Prophet, thrones are spoken of as placed, (*thrones* being a word of *heavenly* reference,) \* and a sitting said to take place upon them, not he thinks by the souls of the martyrs, but by the 24 elders previously referred to; and the souls of martyrs said to reign with Christ a thousand years. All this, he judges, in *heaven*; while *on earth* Satan is spoken of as bound, so as not any more to deceive the nations, during the same millennial period. In which latter statement our Author calls attention to the fact of the nations (*τα εθνη*) meaning elsewhere in the Apocalypse distinctively the nations of the Roman earth; † and also infers from other SS. that Satan’s binding may simply mean the loss of his former power and influence over man’s evil propensities. Thus, on the whole, he concludes that the force of the Apocalyptic Millennial Prophecy is to this effect:—that within the limits of *the old Roman earth* the Papal and Mahometan apostasies will be succeeded by a Christianity pure, though still imperfect: (nothing being said to designate the religious state of other parts of the world:) while in *heaven* there will be the reigning and rejoicing at the earthly triumph of the Christian cause, on the grand arena of its long conflicts.

The fact of this reigning being in *heaven* sets aside the idea of any earthly visible reign of Christ and the saints, such as pre-millennianism supposes; nor indeed does the expression “they lived and reigned with Christ” imply more than that they had the enjoyment of a higher spiritual life than their former earthly life, with the happy consciousness of Christ’s spiritual presence surrounding them.—Such is the Barrister’s millennial theory, drawn, as was said, exclusively from the Apocalypse.

\* The Barrister forgets, in thus speaking, Apoc. xiii. 2, “the Dragon gave him his throne, &c.”

† So e. g. Apoc. xii. 5.

There is sufficient similarity in all this to Mr. Brown's theory in part, and in part to Bishop Waldegrave's, to make much of what I have said in reply to them applicable to the Barrister. But one thing peculiar to his argument calls for particular notice. Turning to certain extra-Apocalyptic N. T. passages, referred to largely by me in my millennial argument, he thinks me wrong for giving them the weight I have; and fashioning my view of the Apocalyptic Millennium very much by them, instead of construing *them* by the fuller light of the later and fuller prophecy of the Apocalypse.\* For he considers the knowledge possessed by the apostles to have been *progressive*. And, more especially, applying this principle of interpretation to St. Paul's ever memorable prophecy about the Man of Sin in 2 Thess. ii.,—which, as I have elsewhere stated, forced me perhaps more than any other scriptural passage to the pre-millennial view of Christ's second advent,—he admits fully and altogether the correctness of my explanation of the controverted points in the prophecy; and the justice, indeed necessity, of my inference from it (*considered by itself*) as to Christ's second advent synchronizing with the destruction of the Man of Sin, and so being pre-millennial. But, like Professor Jowett, (though unconscious I imagine of the companionship,) he judges on the principle above-mentioned, that Paul, being not sufficiently advanced in knowledge on these points, was mistaken in the idea here exprest by him; the Apocalypse alone giving us full and true information on the subject. A theory this which I cannot but think as dangerous as unfounded. And so I still adhere to my view of the Thessalonian prophecy as, conjointly with the many other extra-Apocalyptic passages of Scripture argued from by me as to the same effect, determining Christ's advent to be pre-millennial.

Had I space and time I should feel it right to observe more fully on the doubt the Barrister seems to entertain of the possibility of a bodily resurrection. As it is let me only say that St. Paul's most beautiful comparison of the grain of corn sown in the earth, which, though dying, yet springs up again in material form,—the same, and yet not the same,†—furnishes all the analogy necessary to solve his difficulties. Here too the Barrister is in sceptical companionship, such as I think he would little approve.

---

\* Compare Bishop Waldegrave's directly contrary statement about me p. 697 *suprà*. He is wrong on this point; the Barrister right.

† Let me beg to suggest on this subject a reference to the Introductory Chapter of Bishop Butler's Analogy.

# APPENDIX.

## PART III.

### CHAPTER I.

#### THE ADAMIC WORLD'S CHRONOLOGY, ACCORDING TO THE HEBREW SCRIPTURES, AND PROBABLE NEARNESS TO ITS SEVENTH MILLENNARY.

THE fact of the Jewish pre-Christian church having long and fixedly entertained the opinion that Messiah's kingdom of blessedness would occupy the seventh millennium of the world, agreeably with the type of the seventh day's sabbatism of rest after the six days of creation, is well known.<sup>1</sup> And, as I have observed in a preceding part

<sup>1</sup> So the *Rabbi Eliezer*, cap. xxviii. p. 41:—"The blessed Lord created seven worlds; (i. e. *αιωνας*, *ages*;) but one of them is all *sabbath* and rest in life eternal." "Where," observes Dr. Whitby on Heb. iv. 9, "he refers to their (the Jews') common opinion that the world should continue 6000 years, and then a perpetual sabbath begin, typified by God's resting the seventh day, and blessing it." (For *perpetual* Whitby should have perhaps said a *millennial* sabbath; it being *αιωνιος* in the sense in which the *αιωνες*, *ages*, before mentioned, were each *millennial*. So in the Midras Till. p. 4, the same Rabbi Eliezer says, "The days of Messiah are 1000 years."\*)—Similarly the *Bereschith Rabba*, quoted also by Whitby; "If we expound the seventh day of the seventh thousand of years, which is *the world to come*, the exposition is, '*He blessed it*,' because that in the seventh thousand and all souls shall be bound in the bundle of life. . . So our Rabbins of blessed memory have said in their Commentaries on '*God blessed the seventh day*,' that the Holy Ghost blessed the *world to come*, which beginneth in the *seventh thousand of years*."—Again, *Philo* is copious on the same subject: stating that the *sabbaths* of the law were *allegories*, or *figurative expressions*. With which view we may compare St. Paul's declaration in Col. ii. 16, 17; "in respect of the *sabbath-days*, which are a *shadow of things to come*:" σκια των μελλοντων.

The general opinion of the Jews was, that the world was to be 2000 years *without the law*, 2000 *under the law*, and 2000 *under the Messiah*. This is still called by the Jews "a tradition of the house of Elias," an eminent Rabbi that lived before the birth of Christ:—who also taught that in the *seventh millennium* the earth would be renewed, and the righteous dead raised, no more again to be turned to dust: and that the just then alive should mount up with wings as eagles: so that in that day they would not need to fear, though the mountains (Psalm xlvi. 2) should be cast into the midst of the sea. Mede, Book iv.

\* So Hancock, Feast of Tabernacles, p. 53.

of my Book, St. Paul's use of the word *σαββατισμος*, *sabbatism*, to designate the saints' expected glorious time of *rest* with Christ, might also perhaps be construed as his approbatory recognition of it: especially considering that it was *Hebrew* Christians whom he was then addressing; and that by them the word thus chosen could not but be almost necessarily associated, from long national usage, with some chronological septenary.<sup>1</sup> In fact among the Christian fathers that succeeded on the apostolic age, this view of the matter was universally received and promulgated.<sup>2</sup>—Which being so, the chrono-

<sup>1</sup> So Whitby says on Heb. iv. 9, that "the apostle by changing the word *αναπαυσις*, *rest*, into *sabbatism*, clearly leads us . . . to the *spiritual sabbath* of which the Jewish doctors speak so generally as the great thing signified by their sabbath." Similarly Oslander, about the time of the Reformation. "De quâ requie sempiternâ ad Hebræos, cap. 4, ita loquitur Apostolus, ut hoc ipsum mysterium nobis, veluti digito, commonstrare videatur."

Mr. Brown disputes this from the *etymology* of the word *sabbath*, as simply meaning *rest*: (see p. 190, Note 4, *suprà* :) but the meaning conveyed to the Hebrew mind by the word cannot surely be with reason overlooked. So much were *sabbath* and *septenary* associated together in it that, as Schleusner observes on the word *Σαββατον*, the Septuagint translators sometimes render the word *πενή* by *ἑβδομας*.

It is a word applied to the seventh *year* of the rest in the Mosaic law, as well as to the seventh *day* of rest. See Lev. xxv. 4, &c.

<sup>2</sup> I may sabbatify more particularly the *pseudo-Barnabas*, a writer of unquestionably a very early age in the Church;\* also *Irenæus*, *Cyprian*, *Lactantius*.

1. *Barnabas*. Και ἐποίησεν ὁ Θεὸς ἐν ἑξ ἡμέραις τὰ ἔργα τῶν χειρῶν αὐτοῦ, καὶ συνετέλεσεν ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἑβδόμῃ, καὶ κατέπαυσεν ἐν αὐτῇ, καὶ ἡγιασεν αὐτὴν. Προσεχετε, τέκνα, τί λέγει τὸ συνετέλεσεν ἐν ἑξ ἡμέραις; τοῦτο λέγει ὅτι συνετελεῖ ὁ Θεὸς Κύριος ἐν ἑξακισχιλίοις ἐτεσὶ τὰ πάντα. Ἡ γὰρ ἡμέρα παρ' αὐτῷ χίλια ἐστὶν· αὐτὸς δὲ μαρτυρεῖ λέγων, Ἰδοὺ σημεῖον ἡμέρα ἐστὶν ὡς χίλια ἐτη. Οὐκ οὖν τέκνα ἐν ἑξ ἡμέραις ἐν ἑξακισχιλίοις ἐτεσὶ, συντελεσθήσεται τὰ πάντα. Καὶ κατέπαυσε τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἑβδόμῃ. Τοῦτο λέγει, ὅταν ἐλθῶν ὁ Υἱὸς αὐτοῦ, καὶ καταργῆσιν τὸν καιρὸν ἀνομοῦ, καὶ κρινεῖ τοὺς ἀσεβεῖς, καὶ ἀλλάξῃ τὸν ἥλιον, καὶ τὴν σελήνην, καὶ τοὺς ἀστερας, τότε κἀλως καταπαύσεται ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἑβδόμῃ. c. 15.

2. *Irenæus*. Ὅσαις ἡμέραις ἐγενετο ὁ κόσμος, τοσούτοις χιλιοντασι συντελεῖται· Καὶ διὰ τοῦτο φησὶν ἡ γραφή, Καὶ συνετελεσθησαν ὁ οὐρανὸς καὶ ἡ γῆ, καὶ πᾶς ὁ κόσμος αὐτῶν· καὶ συνετέλεσεν ὁ Θεὸς ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ε' τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ ἃ ἐποίησε, καὶ κατέπαυσεν ὁ Θεὸς ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ζ' ἀπο πάντων τῶν ἔργων αὐτοῦ. Τοῦτο δ' ἐστὶ τῶν προγεγονότων διηγήσεις, καὶ τῶν ἐσομένων προφητεία: ἡ γὰρ ἡμέρα Κυρίου ὡς χίλια ἐτη. Adv. Hæc. v. ad fin.

3. *Quest. et Respons.* which go under the name of Justin Martyr, No. 71: Ἐνεστί δια πολλῶν γραφικῶν φωνῶν τεκμηρασθαι ἀληθευεῖν τοὺς λεγόντας ἑξακισχίλια ἐτη εἶναι τὸν χρόνον τῆς παρουσίας τοῦ κόσμου συστάσεως.

4. *Cyprian*. "Ut primi in dispositione divinâ septem dies, annorum septem millia continentes." De Exh. Mart. 11.

5. *Lactantius*. "Quoniam sex diebus cuncta Dei opera perfecta sunt, per secula sex, id est annorum sex millia, manere in hoc statu mundum necesse est. . . Et rursus quoniam perfectis operibus requievit die septimo, eumque benedixit, necesse est in

\* Referred to also in the History of Apocalyptic Interpretation in my Appendix, ad init.



logical question as to *what may be the world's present age*, dated from Adam's creation, and *when the termination of its sixth millennium* becomes one of real interest. Nor is there wanting the evidence requisite for our attaining a near probable approximation to this notable epoch; and finding, as the result of our inquiries, that according to the chronology of our *Hebrew* copies of the Old Testament, which cannot but be looked to *à priori* as our most authoritative guide on the subject, we are at this present time fast (perhaps very fast) approximating to it. Mr. Fynes Clinton, in his *Essay on Hebrew Chronology*, appended to the third volume of his late learned work entitled *Fasti Hellenici*, has greatly elucidated the subject. For, setting aside the many comparatively leaseless mundane chronologies, such as Hales has enumerated, he lays down as indisputable the opinion just expressed that our appeal on the question must be to *Holy Scripture*, and primarily to the *Hebrew* text of Scripture: then proceeds thus to illustrate and argue out the point; including at the commencement in his review a notice of the chronological differences of the Samaritan Pentateuch and Greek Septuagint translation from the Hebrew.

It is on the *Patriarchal chronologies* that the differences (and great they are) first occur. And, on the disputed question, whether it be the *Hebrew* text with its shorter chronology that has by fraud been robbed of *eleven centuries*, or the *Septuagint* with its longer, that has had them fraudulently added,<sup>1</sup> (for that the difference is the result of design is a thing evident, and long since noted by August-

fine sexti millesimi anni malitia omnis aboleatur è terrâ, et regnet per annos mille justitia." vii. 14.

6. *Ambrose*. "Quia cum septimo die requieverit Deus ab omnibus operibus suis, post hebdomadam istius mundi quies diuturna promittitur." In *Luc.* viii. 23.

For notices to the same effect from *Jerome* and *Augustine* see my *Vol. i.* p. 396, 397. Besides the passage there cited *Augustine* speaks of it also in his *C. D.* xx. 7. 1.

7. So too, as *Feuardentius* observes in his *Note* on the passage quoted above from *Irenæus*, *Hilary* on *Matt.* xviii.

It is to be observed that the anti-premillennarian fathers of the fourth and fifth centuries explained the *sabbatical* seventh day as typical, not of a *seventh sabbatical Millennium* of rest, but an *eternal sabbath*:—a view generally adopted afterwards. In the *pseudo-Barnabas'* view (*ibid.*) it seems to have been rather the *Christian sabbath* on the "*eighth*" day that typified the saints' *eternal rest*; the *Jewish seventh-day sabbath* the *millennial*.

<sup>1</sup> The following tabular schemes exhibit the variations: the numbers expressing the parent's age at the son's birth, except in the cases of Noah and Shem; and Abraham's birth being assigned to Terah's 130th year, the true date. (See *Note* † p. 709 *infra*.)

tine,<sup>1</sup>) as also whether its authority is to be set aside from respect to the Samaritan text, and<sup>2</sup> its smaller variations, the answer seems on every account to be in favour of the Hebrew text:—considering, *first*, the superior reverence and almost superstitious care with which the Hebrew text was watched over, as compared with the Septuagint; <sup>2</sup>—*next*, the wonderful uniformity of the numerals of the Hebrew text, in all its multitudes of manuscripts existing in different parts of the world, contrasted with the varieties and uncertainty of the numerals in the Septuagint and Samaritan; <sup>3</sup>—considering, *fur-*

*Antediluvian Patriarchs.**Postdiluvian Patriarchs.*

	Heb.	Sam.	lxx.	Joseph.			Heb.	Sam.	lxx.	Joseph.
1. <i>Adam</i> . . . . .	130	130	230	230	* 105 is doubtless the correct reading.	11. <i>Shem</i> (aged 100 at the Flood) . . . . .				
2. <i>Seth</i> . . . . .	105	105	205	205		12. <i>Arphaxad</i> . . . . .	2	2	2	12
3. <i>Enos</i> . . . . .	90	90	190	190		[ <i>Arphaxad</i> spurious . . . . .	35	135	135	135
4. <i>Cainan</i> . . . . .	70	70	170	170		13. <i>Salah</i> . . . . .	30	130	130	130
5. <i>Mahalaleel</i> . . . . .	65	65	165	165		14. <i>Heber</i> . . . . .	34	134	134	134
6. <i>Jared</i> . . . . .	162	62	162	162		15. <i>Peleg</i> . . . . .	30	130	130	130
7. <i>Enoch</i> . . . . .	65	65	165	(165)*		16. <i>Reu</i> . . . . .	32	132	132	130
8. <i>Methuselah</i> . . . . .	187	65	187	187		17. <i>Serug</i> . . . . .	30	130	130	132
9. <i>Lamech</i> . . . . .	182	53	188	182		18. <i>Nahor</i> . . . . .	29	79	79	120
10. <i>Noah</i> (at the Flood)	600	600	600	600		19. <i>Terah</i> (Gen. xi. 32, xii. 4)	130	130	130	130
Total	1656	1307	2262	2256	So to Abraham	352	1002	1002	1053	

Jerome (Vol. ii. p. 573), in his Letter to Evangelinus about Melchisedek, thus gives and reasons on the numerals.

They say that Shem was 390 years when Abram was born. For  
 Shem at 100 begat Arphaxad, and lived 100 years after.  
 Arphaxad . . . . . Salem.  
 Salem . . . . . 30 . . . . . Eber.  
 Eber . . . . . 34 . . . . . Phaleg.  
 Phaleg . . . . . 30 . . . . . Rehu.  
 Rehu . . . . . 32 . . . . . Saleg.  
 Saleg . . . . . 30 . . . . . Nahor.  
 Nahor . . . . . 70 . . . . . Abram, Nahor, and Haran.

And Abraham died at 175. Therefore Shem overlived him 35 years.

<sup>1</sup> In the Antediluvian Table (where the question is between the Hebrew and Josephus), the years before the son's birth and the residues agree in all cases with the totals of the lives; except that in the Samaritan the residues in the sixth, eighth, and ninth are shortened, to adapt them to the shorter period between Jared and the Flood. Thus,

in the Hebrew and Samaritan *Adam* has 130 + 800 = 930.  
 . . . . . Septuagint and Josephus 230 + 700 = 930.  
 Again in the Hebrew and Samaritan *Seth* has 105 + 807 = 912.  
 . . . . . Septuagint and Josephus 205 + 707 = 912.

This can only have been by design. So Augustine Civ. Dei, xv. 13. 1; "Videtur habere quamdam, si dici potest, error ipse constantiam; nec casum redolet, sed industriam." And so Mr. Clinton.

<sup>2</sup> The Jews even counted the letters of their Bible.

<sup>3</sup> Professor Baumgarten, of Halle, in his Remarks on Universal History, observes; "Both the Samaritan copy and the Greek version abound in various readings, with respect to their different chronologies, and frequently contradict themselves: whereas the Hebrew is uniform and consistent in all its copies." And Mr. Kennedy, in his Chronology of the World, says, that in examining the Hebrew Text he "was not able

ther, the general agreement of the Samaritan with the Hebrew in the chronology of the *antediluvian* Patriarchs,<sup>1</sup> and its thus fixing the fraud in that table at least, and by probable consequence in the *postdiluvian* table also, on the Septuagint:—considering *moreover* the better agreement of historical fact with the Hebrew than with the Septuagint;<sup>2</sup> and the more easily supposable object with the

to discover one various reading in that multitude of numeral words and letters which constitute the scriptural series of years from the Creation to the death of Nebuchadnezzar."

I quote this from a Paper on the subject in the Christian Observer for May, 1802, p. 287; and, in further illustration of the uniformity of the Hebrew copies in respect of their numerals, may add from it that the *Chaldee Paraphrase of Onkelos*, written probably near about the time of Christ, agrees with the Hebrew chronologies, and that the same are recognized in the *two Talmuds*;—also that Dr. Wolff informs me that "in the ancient manuscripts which he saw at *Bokhara*, the chronological notices of the length of lives both of the antediluvian and the postdiluvian patriarchs were exactly according to the received Hebrew text, though the letters of the manuscripts resembled Samaritan."

As regards the *Samaritan*, it is to be observed that the manuscript from which our *Samaritan* Pentateuch was published, being written about A.D. 1400, was consequently not nearly so old as many Hebrew manuscripts. And in *earlier* existing copies of it we know that there were certain variations to the numerals, more accordant with the Hebrew. So the English Universal History, referred to in the Christian Observer. See Note <sup>1</sup> *infra*.

Of the errors of the *Septuagint* numerals in many copies a notable example is given by Augustine, C. D. xv. 11. For it seems that in almost all the copies then extant *Methuselah* was made to have begotten Lamech at the age of 167, and to have lived 802 years after: that is, *fourteen years after the Flood*, according to the Septuagint chronology itself; though we know that no man but Noah, and his three sons Shem, Ham, and Japhet, were preserved alive through it.

<sup>1</sup> Viz. in the cases of all but the sixth, eighth, and ninth Patriarchs. Here the Samaritan *residues* are shortened to adapt them to the shorter period, made by the shorter *genealogies* corresponding between Jared and the Flood; to the intent that these Patriarchs might not be thought to have been involved in it. But we are told by Jerome (so the compilers of our English Universal History have remarked) that in his time there were some Samaritan copies which made *Methuselah's* and *Lamech's* ages, at the birth of their sons, the same as the Hebrew.

<sup>2</sup> On the two points alleged in their own favour by the advocates of the Septuagint Chronology, Mr. Clinton quite turns the tables against them.—1. As to the age of the *παιδογονια*, which these writers have placed after the lapse of one third of life, Mr. C. says that it appears from Scripture to have been in the Patriarchal age as early as it is now; Judah being at forty-eight a great-grandfather,—Benjamin having, under thirty, ten sons, &c.—2. As to the *Dispersion at Babel*, which the Septuagintarians say implies a mundane population such as could not have been according to the *Hebrew* postdiluvian chronology, Mr. C. answers, that under favourable circumstances, even now, it has been calculated that population may be doubled in *ten* years; that cases are known where it has doubled for short periods in less than *thirteen* years; and that in the older case of the Israelites in Egypt, and later of certain parts of the North American colonies, the population doubled itself in *fifteen* years:—that the circumstances of the first families after the Flood were precisely the most favourable to increase of population, with all the arts of the antediluvian world, unoccupied land to a boundless extent before them, and lives extended to 500, 400, and 200 years:—that thus we may reasonably assume twelve years, at the most, as

Septuagint translators<sup>1</sup> than with the keepers of the Hebrew text, as well as better opportunity,<sup>2</sup> for falsifying in the matter.

This point settled,<sup>3</sup> there remain but *two small chasms* in the Hebrew chronology to fill up, and *one doubtful point* to settle, arising from a difference between an Old Testament statement and one in the New Testament, in order to the completion of our chronological table. The *chasms* are, 1st, that from Moses' death to the first

that of the population doubling itself: on which assumption the population of the earth, derived from the stock of six parents, would in 276 years amount to above fifty millions, and in 300 years to two hundred millions. Even at the rate of fifteen years it would have reached two hundred millions in 373 years from the Flood; i. e. in the twenty-fourth year of Abraham.—Now at the time of the Dispersion, had the world's population *then* amounted to many millions, men would have been *forced* by their wants to disperse; whereas the Sacred History tells us that it took place *contrary to the wishes of men*, who desired all to dwell together. A population of about 50,000 would just answer the probabilities of the case. And *this* number must have been reached within 160 years from the Flood; i. e. about the thirtieth year of Peleg (according to the Hebrew chronology); in whose days it is said, Gen. x. 25, that the Dispersion occurred.

<sup>1</sup> Jackson allows that it is difficult to see the motives of the Jews in shortening the patriarchal genealogies. On the other hand the Septuagint translators had an obvious motive for enlarging the chronology. The Chaldeans and Egyptians (whose histories were about this time published by Berosus and Manetho) laid claim to a remote antiquity. Hence these translators of the Pentateuch might have been led in a spirit of rivalry to augment the amount of the generations of their ancestors, alike by the centenary additions, and by the interpolation (as Hales himself allows it is) of the second *Canaan*.

<sup>2</sup> Augustine, whose four chapters on this subject (C. D. xv. 10—14) well deserve attentive perusal, has put this point very strongly. Which, says he, is most credible,—that the Jews, dispersed over all the world, should have conspired together to defraud their scriptures and themselves of *truth*, the exclusive possession of which is so much their boast; or that the seventy Greek translators, united together in conclave by King Ptolemy, should have managed to falsify the numerals? He adds, (13. 2,) as his own solution of the matter, that it was after all probably not the *translators*, but the *first transcriber* of the manuscript from the original in the royal library, that introduced the error; “*Scriptoris tribuatur errori qui de Bibliothecâ supradicti Regis codicem describendum primus accepit:*” and concludes thus; “*Ei linguæ potiùs credatur unde est in aliam per interpretes facta translatio.*”—Augustine's testimony is the more valuable and remarkable because he was himself originally (see my Note Vol. i. p. 397) a Septuagintarian in chronology. At the conclusion of the C. D. however he measures the six periods of the world preceding its septenary period, or sabbath, by *eras*, not *millennaries*; the 1st to the Flood, 2nd to Abraham, 3rd to David, 4th to the Babylonish Captivity, 5th to Christ, and 6th that after Christ. C. D. xxii. 30. 5.

<sup>3</sup> It is to be observed, as Clinton remarks, p. 293, that the question is not an *indefinite* one, from want of testimony, so as in the case of the early chronology of Greece. The uncertainty is one arising from two different distinct testimonies. We have only to decide which is the genuine and authentic copy. Either the space *before the Flood* was 1656 years, or it was 2256. Either the period from the Flood to the call of Abraham was 352 years, or it was 1002. “These periods could not be greater than the highest of these numbers, or less than the lowest.”



servitude;<sup>1</sup> 2ndly, that between Samson's death and Saul's election to the kingdom:<sup>2</sup> of neither of which could the length be *much* longer or shorter than thirty or forty years.<sup>3</sup>—The *doubtful point* alluded to concerns the same period of the Judges: it being whether the reckoning given in 1 Kings vi. 1, of the interval from the Exodus to the building of Solomon's temple at 480 years be the correct one,<sup>4</sup> or that by St. Paul, in Acts xiii. 18—22, at about 580.<sup>5</sup> Mr. Clinton (but here Usher and other eminent chronologists, as I shall have soon to observe again, who take the Hebrew text of SS. as the basis of their chronology, differ from him) prefers the latter.<sup>6</sup> And thus, completing his table, he makes the date of the Creation to be about 4138 B.C.; and consequently the end of the 6000 years of the world, and opening of the seventh Millennium, *by approximation*, about A.D. 1862:—the same year, very nearly, that we before fixed

<sup>1</sup> This period is that comprehended in Josh. xxiv. 31; "And Israel served the Lord all the days of Joshua, and all the days of the elders that overlived Joshua, and which had known all the works of the Lord that he had done for Israel."

<sup>2</sup> Compare Judg. xv. 20, xvi. 31, and 1 Sam. iv. 1, vii. 13, xii. 2.

<sup>3</sup> Mr. Brooks, in the Preface to his late history of the Jews, p. xiii., argues that the interval from Moses' death to Joshua's must probably have been longer, because of Joshua being called יָנוֹחַ, *a young man*, in Exod. xxxiii. 11, and Numb. xi. 28, with reference to the second year after the Exodus. But this Hebrew word is used to designate *servants* also (compare Gen. xxii. 3, &c.); and Joshua is so called in the places above cited as the servant of Moses. (So Kimchi explains this appellation of Joshua, in Zech. ii. 7: and so, I may add, Ambrose comments on Gen. xxiv. 2; "Etiam senioris ætatis servuli *pueri* dicantur à dominis.") Thus the appellation can no more be argued from than the French word *garçon* or English *postboy*.—Moreover, at the time of the division of the land, seven years after Moses' death, (Josh. xiv. 10,) Joshua is said (ibid. xiii. 1) to have been "old and stricken in years."—Thus Mr. Clinton seems fairly to have estimated Joshua's age at the time of the spies at about forty; it being the then age of his associate Caleb also, who overlived him. See Judg. i. 1, 9—12. If so, as Joshua was 110 years at his death, (see Josh. xxiv. 29,) the interval must have been 110—(38 + 40)=32.

<sup>4</sup> 1 Kings vi. 1; "It came to pass in the 480th year after the children of Israel were come out of the land of Egypt, in the fourth year of Solomon's reign over Israel, that he began to build the house of the Lord."

<sup>5</sup> Acts xiii. 18; "Forty years suffered he their manners in the wilderness: and when he had destroyed seven nations in Canaan, he divided their land to them by lot: and after that, he gave unto them judges about the space of 450 years, until Samuel the prophet. And afterwards they desired a king: and God gave them Saul."

<sup>6</sup> Because, argues he, the *servitudes* must be included in the periods of *rest*, on the shorter system; which inclusion seems directly contrary to the tenor of the Scripture statements.

So Mr. Fynes Clinton. On the other hand, as before observed, the Hebrew Chronology about the time of the building of the temple may by many not unreasonably be deemed of the greater weight.—Mr. C.'s chronological table of this period, formed from the express declarations in the Book of Judges, is given below:—it being premised that *Chushan's* oppression followed (Judg. iii. 7) on Israel's *first* apostasy to the worship

on as the epoch of the full end of the 1260 years, on quite different data, and so the commencement at least of the *time of the end*. I subjoin a precis of his Mundane Chronology, from the Creation to Christ.

B. C.	A. M.		Years.
4138		Adam . . . . .	
2482	1656	The Deluge . . . . .	1656
2130	2008	Birth of Abraham . . . . .	352
2055	2083	The Call . . . . .	75
1625	2513	The Exode . . . . .	430
1585	2553	Death of Moses . . . . .	40
1558	2580	First Servitude (by conjecture) . . . . .	27
1128	3010	Death of Eli . . . . .	430
1096	3042	Election of Saul (by conjecture) . . . . .	32
1056	3082	David . . . . .	40
1016	3122	Solomon . . . . .	40
976	3162	Rehoboam . . . . .	40
587	3551	Zedekiah's Captivity . . . . .	389

of Baalim, on the death of the elders that overlived Joshua.\* This last Philistinian servitude of forty years appears to have included the judgships of both *Samson* and *Eli*: the former being said (xv. 20, xvi. 31) to have judged Israel "in the days of the *Philistines*;" and the latter to have died from grief at their defeat of Israel, and capture of the ark. Their supremacy continued until Samuel's defeat of them near Mizpeh, of which the stone Ebenezer was the record, 1 Sam. vii. 12: after which Israel had rest "all the days of Samuel;" (ib. 13;) until he was *old*, (viii. 1, xii. 2,) and anointed Saul king.

Thus the *time of the Judges*, exclusive of *Joshua* and *Samuel*, appears from these numbers to have been 390 years: and, if we add 30 years for Joshua and the Egypt-born elders that overlived Joshua, reckoned from after the time of the conquest and division of Canaan, (about 7 years having intervened between that event and Moses' death,) and 30 years more for Samuel's judgship after the Philistine's defeat, it exactly makes up St. Paul's "about the space of 450 years." Add 7 for the conquest of Canaan, 40 for the wilderness, 40 for Saul, and 40 for David: and then the 4th year of Solomon comes to about the 580th year from the Exode; instead of the 480th, as the Hebrew text defines it in 1 Kings vi. 1.—Taking this view of the chronology, therefore, the only solution of the difficulty from 1 Kings vi. 1 that I see is by supposing a mistaken reading in our Hebrew copies of 480 for 580.

* Servitudes.	Years.	Rests and Judges.	Years.
1st. Chushan (Judg. iii. 8.)	8	1st Rest (Judg. iii. 11.) . . . . .	40
2nd. Eglon (iii. 14.) . . . .	18	2nd . . . . (iii. 30.) . . . . .	80
3rd. Jabin (iv. 3.) . . . . .	20	3rd . . . . (v. 31.) . . . . .	40
4th. Midian (vi. 1.) . . . . .	7	4th ("the days of Gideon," viii. 28.)	40
		Abimelech's judging (ix. 22.) . . . .	3
		Tola's do. (x. 2.) . . . . .	23
		Jair's do. (x. 3.) . . . . .	22
5th. Ammon (x. 8.) . . . . .	18	Jephthah's do. (xii. 7.) . . . . .	6
		Ibzan, Elon, Abdon, (xii. 8—14.) . .	25
6th. Philistines (xiii. 1.) . .	40	[Samson 20 years, and Eli.]	
	111		279



## THE SCRIPTURE CHRONOLOGY OF THE WORLD.

A. M.									
1	Creation of Adam	to the birth of Seth	130 years	Gen. v. 3.	"Adam lived 130 years and begat a son, and called his name Seth."				
130	Seth born	Enos	105	v. 6.	"Seth lived 105 years, and begat Enos."				
235	Enos born	Cainan	90	v. 9.	"Enos lived 90 years, and begat Cainan."				
325	Cainan born	Mahalehel	70	v. 12.	"Cainan lived 70 years, and begat Mahalehel."				
395	Mahalehel born	Jared	65	v. 15.	"Mahalehel lived 65 years, and begat Jared."				
460	Jared born	Enoch	162	v. 18.	"Jared lived 162 years, and begat Enoch."				
622	Enoch born	Methuselah	65	v. 21.	"Enoch lived 65 years, and begat Methuselah."				
687	Methuselah born	Lamech	187	v. 25.	"Methuselah lived 187 years, and begat Lamech."				
874	Lamech born	Noah	182	v. 28, 29.	"Lamech lived 182 years, and begat a son, and he called his name Noah."				
1056	Noah born	to the Flood	600	vii. 6.	"Noah was 600 years old when the flood of waters was upon the earth."				
1656	The Flood	to the birth of Arphaxad	2	xi. 10.	"Shem begat Arphaxad 2 years after the Flood."				
1658	Arphaxad born	Salah	35	xii. 12.	"Arphaxad lived 35 years, and begat Salah."				
1693	Salah born	Eber	30	xii. 14.	"Salah lived 30 years, and begat Eber."				
1723	Eber born	Peleg	34	xii. 16.	"Eber lived 34 years, and begat Peleg."				
1757	Peleg born	Reu	39	xii. 18.	"Peleg lived 39 years, and begat Reu."				
1797	Reu born	Serug	32	xii. 20.	"Reu lived 32 years, and begat Serug."				
1810	Serug born	Nahor	30	xii. 22.	"Serug lived 30 years, and begat Nahor."				
1840	Nahor born	Terah	29	xii. 24.	"Nahor lived 29 years, and begat Terah."				
1878	Terah born	to his death	205	xii. 32.	"The days of Terah were 205 years, and Terah died." (xii. 1.)				
2083	The Covenant made with Abram	to the giving of the Law	430	Gal. iii. 17.	"The Covenant . . . the Law, which was 430 years after, cannot disannul."				
2513	The giving of the Law	to the return of the Spies	1	Num. x. 11.	(Compare Exod. xiv. 1.)				
2514	The promise of Calah on return of Spies	to the division of the Land	45	Josh. xiv. 10.	"These 45 years, ever since the Lord spake this word unto Moses."				
2559	The division of the Land	to Samuel the Prophet	450	Acts xiii. 20.	"After that, he gave unto them Judges, about the space of 450 years, unto Samuel."				
3009	Saul anointed	to the death of Saul	40	xiii. 21.	"Afterward . . . God gave unto them Saul . . . by the space of 40 years."				
3049	David began to reign	to his death	40	1 Kings ii. 11.	"The days that David reigned over all Israel were 40 years."				
3089	Solomon	ditto	40	2 Chr. x. 20.	"Solomon reigned in Jerusalem over all Israel 40 years."				
3129	Rehoboam ditto	ditto	17	xiii. 13.	"He reigned 17 years in Jerusalem."				
3146	Abijah ditto	ditto	3	xiii. 2.	"He reigned 3 years in Jerusalem."				
3149	Asa ditto	ditto	41	xv. 13.	"Asa . . . died in the 41st year of his reign."				
3190	Jehoshaphat ditto	ditto	25	xx. 31.	"He reigned 25 years in Jerusalem."				
3215	Jehoram ditto	ditto	8	xxi. 20.	"He reigned in Jerusalem 8 years."				
3223	Ahaziah ditto	ditto	1	xiii. 2.	"He reigned 1 year in Jerusalem."				
3224	Athaliah's usurpation	to her death	6	xxi. 12.	"He (Joash) was with them hid in the house of God 6 years: and Athaliah reigned."				
3250	Joash began to reign	to his death	40	xxiv. 1.	"He reigned 40 years in Jerusalem."				
3270	Amaziah ditto	ditto	29	xxv. 1.	"He reigned 29 years in Jerusalem."				
3299	Uzziah ditto	ditto	52	xxvi. 3.	"He reigned 52 years in Jerusalem."				
3351	Jotham ditto	ditto	16	xxvii. 1.	"He reigned 16 years in Jerusalem."				
3367	Ahaz ditto	ditto	16	xxviii. 1.	"He reigned 16 years in Jerusalem."				
3383	Hezekiah ditto	ditto	29	xxix. 1.	"He reigned 29 years in Jerusalem."				
3412	Manasseh ditto	ditto	55	xxxiii. 1.	"He reigned 55 years in Jerusalem."				
3467	Amon ditto	ditto	2	xxxvii. 21.	"(Amon) reigned 2 years in Jerusalem."				
3469	Josiah ditto	ditto	31	xxxiv. 1.	"He reigned in Jerusalem 31 years."				
3500	Jehoaiah ditto	to his deposition	0	xxxvi. 2.	"He reigned 3 months in Jerusalem."				
3500	Jehoiakim ditto	to his death	11	xxxvi. 5.	"He reigned 11 years in Jerusalem."				
3511	Jehoiachin ditto	to his deposition	0	xxxvi. 9.	"He reigned 3 months and 10 days in Jerusalem."				
3511	Zedekiah ditto	to the Captivity	11	xxxvii. 11.	"(Zedekiah) reigned 11 years in Jerusalem."				
3522	The Captivity	to the proclamation of Cyrus	70	Jer. xxi. 11.	"These nations shall serve the king of Babylon 70 years." (See 2 Chr. xxxvi. 22.)				
3592	The Decree of Cyrus	to the birth of Christ	526						
4128	The Christiana Era	to the present year	1851						
6679	The present year A. D. 1851.								



On the other hand, if we adopt the Hebrew numeral in 1 Kings vi. 1, St. Paul's 450 years will have to be explained either, as Whitby prefers, by reference to the then current Septuagint chronology; or possibly, as Archbishop Usher, by supposing it the measure of the time from Abraham to the division of the lands, not from the division of the lands to Samuel.<sup>1</sup> Then, of course, the world's chronology will be near 100 years less advanced than on Clinton's hypothesis; and we have yet to wait near that time (not very different from the 75 years of Daniel's time of the end) for the end of the world's sixth millenary, according to the Hebrew Scriptural data, and beginning of the world's sabbatism.<sup>2</sup>

On the fly-leaf is appended a Tabular Scheme of this Scripture Chronology, with the Scriptural authorities in brief; drawn up by the Rev. C. Bowen, Rector of St. Thomas, Winchester.

<sup>1</sup> So too Calmet, quoted to that effect by Dr. A. Clarke.—In order to this construction of the passage, from near the beginning of verse 17 to the end of verse 19, in Acts xiii. must be construed parenthetically thus:—

Ὁ Θεὸς τοῦ λαοῦ τούτου Ἰσραὴλ ἐξελέξατο τοὺς πατέρας ἡμῶν. (Καὶ τοῦ λαοῦ ὑψώσεν ἐν τῇ παροικίᾳ ἐν γῇ Αἰγυπτῶ, καὶ μετὰ βραχίονος ὑψηλοῦ ἐξηγάγεον αὐτοὺς ἐξ αὐτῆς. Καὶ ὡς τεσσαρακοῦταετη χρόνον ἐτροποφόρησεν αὐτοὺς ἐν τῇ ἐρημῶ. Καὶ, καθέλων ἐθνη ἑπτα ἐν γῇ Χανααν, κατέκληρονομήσεν αὐτοῖς τὴν γῆν αὐτῶν.) Καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα, ὡς ἐτεσι τετρακοσίοις καὶ πεντηκοῦτα, ἔδωκε κριτὰς ἕως Σαμουὴλ τοῦ προφήτου.

In order to make out the 450 years on this view, the chronological epoch of God's choosing the fathers of the Jewish people, referred to in verse 17, is fixed at the birth of Isaac; from which to the division of the land by lot is by some chronologists (not by Mr. Clinton) made 452 years. No doubt with many the necessity of dating from Isaac's birth, instead of Abraham's call, in order on any chronological system to make out the time from the "choosing of the fathers" to the division of Canaan not more than 450 years, constitutes a primary objection to this solution of the passage. Besides that the *μετὰ ταῦτα*, "after these things," in the plural, seems to make it most natural that we should date the 450 years from the end of *the succession of events* that the apostle had just been particularizing, not from the *one* event of the choice of the fathers first mentioned.—Thus the case is one in which we have to make a choice of difficulties.

<sup>2</sup> In the *Jewish Calendar*, as lately edited by Mr. Lindo, (a publication replete with Jewish learning, and sanctioned by the Chief Rabbi in London, Solomon Hirschell,) there appear several most material variations from the above Chronological Table; involving a difference from Mr. Clinton's in the *Æra of the World* altogether of 340 years. The following are the points of variation.

1. Agreeing with Mr. C. in dating the Deluge, A.M. 1656, it makes the birth, and consequently the call too, of Abraham sixty years earlier. This arises from the supposition of Abraham's being the *eldest* of Terah's three sons, born when Terah was seventy years old, Gen. xi. 26:—a supposition quite unnecessary: as Abraham's *first mention* among the three sons no more implies his *primogeniture* than Solomon's *last mention* among Bathsheba's four sons, 1 Chron. iii. 5, his being the *youngest*; or Shem's *first mention*, Gen. x. 1, among Noah's three sons, his being *eldest*; (for Japhet is in Gen. x. 21 expressly declared eldest;) and which is directly contradicted by the statement, Gen. xii. 4, that Abraham was 75 years old when he left Haran; compared with Acts vii. 4, which says that it was at Terah's death that Abraham left that country, and with Gen. xi. 32, which says that Terah died in Haran at the age of 205 years.—2. There is in it the further difference of 100 years less between

## CHAPTER II.

PROPHETIC GROUNDS FOR EXPECTING MESSIAH'S SECOND COMING AT NO GREAT DISTANCE OF TIME FROM THE PRESENT, COMPARED WITH THE PROPHETIC GROUNDS THAT EXISTED FOR EXPECTING MESSIAH'S FIRST PROMISED COMING AND MANIFESTATION IN HUMAN FLESH ABOUT THE TIME OF JESUS OF NAZARETH'S BIRTH AND LIFE, IN THE REIGNS OF THE ROMAN EMPERORS AUGUSTUS AND TIBERIUS.<sup>1</sup>

THE question often and often recurs to my mind; Is there really reason for supposing, as many do, that the Lord's second coming is not probably very far off:—that coming at the brightness of which, according to the concurrent prophecies of Daniel, St. Paul, and St. John,<sup>1</sup> the Man of Sin, or Antichrist, is to be destroyed and Christ's own glorious kingdom to supervene?

And, in answer to this question, when I retrace the prophetic evidence on which such expectations have been grounded, it appears to me certainly very strong and consistent. Yet, notwithstanding, I must confess to experiencing the greatest difficulty when I try to realize the fact. In part this may arise from the evident want of sympathy in the feeling on the part of men in general, and even of Christian men: in part to the great differences of opinion among prophetic students, respecting much of that prophetic evidence which to my own judgment appears the strongest of all to the point in this event and Solomon's completion of the Temple; a difference grounded mainly on the circumstance of the Jews calculating by the chronological statement in 1 Kings vi. 1, noted by me in the text.—3. The Jewish Calendar shortens the interval between Solomon and Zedekiah's captivity 15 years:—and, 4thly, that between Zedekiah and the Christian Æra yet 165 years. By the latter most gross and extraordinary falsification of a period as well ascertained as that between our Richard the First and the time now present, the Jewish Rabbis make the interval between the first destruction of Jerusalem by the Babylonians, and second by the Romans, just about 490 years.

Let me add that the early Reformers noticed, and were struck with, the last mentioned strange error in the Jewish chronology: and referred it to the Jews' identification of *Darius Hystaspis* (father to Xerxes) with the *later Darius* conquered by Alexander; and the obliteration from their calendar of all the Persian Kings intervening. So Melanethon on Dan. ix., and Osiander, De Ult. Temp. ch. i.

But why this abbreviation? I have nowhere seen a reason stated. Since however by it the interval between the first destruction of the temple and the second is reduced to about 490 years, the equivalent of the period of Daniel's 70 hebdomads, in the prophecy which speaks of the Jewish temple's desolation, it may have been the abbreviator's object to make those two periods correspond; and in fact, as I have been told by a Jew, the interval is spoken of by Jews as one of 70 hebdomads, by a kind of *memoria technica*.

<sup>1</sup> This Paper was drawn up originally, and delivered in the Hanover Square Rooms as a Lecture, at the request of a London Prophetic Association.

<sup>2</sup> Dan. vii. 11—13, 2 Thess. ii. 8, Rev. xix. 11—20.

question, and most convincing. But, doubtless, yet more the surpassingly great and wonderful nature of the event to be expected, excites and strengthens my instinctive scepticism on the matter. "Can it really be the fact," I say again and again to myself, "that that glorious consummation is probably near at hand, for which the whole creation has been groaning and travailing ever since the fall?" So that the present generation, or the next following, may see it?

But is scepticism reasonable on these accounts? May I not so fall under somewhat of the same condemnation for unbelief with them of whom St. Peter tells us, asking in the latter day, "Where is the promise of his coming? for, since the fathers fell asleep, all things continue as they were since the beginning of the creation?"<sup>1</sup> It becomes me, surely, well to take heed against this. And, in order to satisfy my mind as to the truth on this great question, and to direct and confirm my faith, as well as that of others who find themselves stumbling at similar doubts and difficulties, I know not what I can do better than what the present Essay proposes:—viz. to turn their thoughts, and my own, to that æra and event in the world's past history, which beyond all others offers the nearest parallel to that which we look for in the coming future,—I mean the æra and event of Christ's *first* coming: and to compare the prophetic evidence which in those earlier times led the Jews very correctly, as well as generally, to suppose it near at hand, with that which leads not a few in our own day to look for Christ's *second* coming as now not very far distant; consideration being had of the objections and difficulties, as well as of the evidence, in the one case and in the other. A fairer standard of comparison cannot, I think, be imagined; nor one better fitted to guide the judgment aright, amidst the conflicting opinions of these latter times.

#### § 1. PREMONITORY INDICATIONS ABOUT THE TIMES OF AUGUSTUS AND TIBERIUS OF THE NEAR APPROACH OF MESSIAH'S FIRST COMING.

It is to be remembered, then, as a fact notorious in history, and one moreover very remarkable, that expectations of Messiah's speedy coming and manifestation were wide spread among the Jews, both in Palestine and elsewhere, near about those times when Jesus of Nazareth lived and died, in the reigns of the Roman Emperors Augustus and Tiberius.

<sup>1</sup> 2 Peter iii. 4.

Evidence of this abounds in the contemporary Gospel narratives of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John; and we must well take heed that our familiarity with it do not cause us to overlook, or to forget, the very remarkable nature of the fact.

Thus about the time of Jesus Christ's birth, in the 27th year of the sole reign of Augustus,<sup>1</sup> we read of Simcon, that "he was a just man and devout, waiting for the consolation of Israel;"<sup>2</sup> the last a well-known Hebraic phrase among the Jews for the Messiah;<sup>3</sup> and of Anna the prophetess, that she spoke of the child Jesus in the temple, "to all those that were looking for redemption in Jerusalem."<sup>4</sup> Nor as regards the angelic revelation made to Zachariah about a son to be born to him in his old age, who was to be Messiah's immediate forerunner, or that which was made to the Virgin Mary about Messiah's own birth into this world, do we find any wonderment expressed in reference to the declared imminence of his coming; whatever wonderment, and in Zachariah's case unbelief, there might have been respecting other points in the statements of the revealing Angel. The same, pretty much, as regards the shepherds at Bethlehem, when it was told them by the leader of the angelic choir, "Unto you is born this day, in the city of David, a Saviour, which is Messiah the Lord." And, when the wise men came to Jerusalem shortly after, under some supernatural guidance, to make inquiry after one just born, who was in fact, they affirmed, no other than the great predicted King of the Jews, Messiah, we read that all Jerusalem, both priests and people, was stirred from its depths at the news and the inquiry: not, clearly, as if they considered it a suggestion absurd or incredible; but rather, as may be inferred from the priest's answer to Herod about the destined place of Messiah's birth, (and mark hence that it was an actual incarnation of Messiah in true human flesh which they then expected,) because it was one on which the general expectation was intensely alive and excited.—Such was at that time the general state of expectancy, as depicted in the Gospel narratives.

And, passing on with them from this epoch to one some 30 years later, corresponding with the 15th year of the reign of the Roman Emperor Tiberius,<sup>5</sup> when in the land of Judæa John the Baptist

<sup>1</sup> Dated from the defeat of Antony at Actium, see Note <sup>3</sup> below.    <sup>2</sup> Luke ii. 25.

<sup>3</sup> So, says Whitby ad loc., the Targum on Isaiah iv. 3.

<sup>4</sup> Luke ii. 38.

<sup>5</sup> Luke iii. 1. He seems in this to have dated from Tiberius' association in the Em-



began his public ministry; the fact of the same general expectancy of Messiah's manifestation at that time, on the part of the Jewish people, is stated or implied in the sacred history just as strikingly. Thus, concerning John, we read how all the people mused in their hearts whether he were the Christ or not; and, moreover, how they sent priests and Levites from Jerusalem expressly to question him on the subject.<sup>1</sup> The same shortly after, in the history of the ministry of Jesus himself. "We have found the Messiah," said Andrew to Peter, after converse with Jesus.<sup>2</sup> And Nathanael, on hearing from him those words of supernatural knowledge about himself "When thou wast under the fig-tree I saw thee," addressed him not as a mere prophet, but as Israel's Divine expected King, the Messiah; "Rabbi, thou art the Son of God; thou art the King of Israel."<sup>3</sup> After this, and as the wonderful drama of the life of Jesus was advancing, we read again and again of the Jews speculating and asking questions, on the disputed fact of his being the very Messiah. "How long makest thou us to doubt? If thou be the Christ, tell us plainly."<sup>4</sup> "And some said, This is the Christ. But others said, Shall Christ come out of Galilee? So there was a division among the people because of him."<sup>5</sup>—And as among the Jews, so too among the Samaritans. "We know that the Messiah cometh," said the woman of Sychem. And her townsmen's ready acknowledgment of Jesus shortly after, in that character, showed that the time then present was that at which they were quite pre-disposed to expect his coming.<sup>6</sup>

And this further is to be well observed, especially, because of its being an index, as we shall hereafter see, to the source of the expectation, that it seems to have been always in connexion with the introduction on this earth of some kingdom, called the *kingdom of God*, or *kingdom of heaven*, that the Messiah was looked for. John Baptist spoke language that was evidently familiar to the Jewish mind, when he preached that "the kingdom of heaven was at hand:" and it was with the same language that Jesus himself opened his ministry; as also the 70 disciples whom he sent forth to preach in

pire with Augustus, which was two years before Augustus' death, and the beginning of Tiberius' sole reign. See the authorities in my Warburton Lectures, Appendix, p. 458.

<sup>2</sup> John i. 41.

<sup>3</sup> Ib. 49.

<sup>1</sup> Luke iii. 15; John i. 19.

<sup>4</sup> Ib. x. 24.

<sup>5</sup> Ib. vii. 41, 43; also verse 26.

<sup>6</sup> John iv. 25, 29, 42.

his name.<sup>1</sup> The question was asked him afterwards by the Pharisees, as St. Luke tells us,<sup>2</sup> “when the kingdom of heaven should come.” But this not as respecting an event which in their opinion might be far distant. For we read shortly after, in the same Evangelist, that Jesus Christ spoke a parable in correction of the expectation then generally prevalent, “that the kingdom of God would *immediately* appear;”<sup>3</sup> that is, appear (as was evidently meant) in the glory of its triumphant establishment.

The expectation of Messiah continued rife and strong among the Jews, after their rejection of Jesus of Nazareth’s claims to the Messiahship, down to the Jewish war, some 30 or 40 years later, and consequent destruction of Jerusalem. It was this evidently which led them so readily to give credence to the pretensions of one and another false Christ that rose up in the interim;<sup>4</sup> this too which armed them in fine with such desperate fanaticism of confidence and courage in their war against the Romans. So Josephus, their national historian, expressly tells us. “What did most encourage them to the war was an oracle, ambiguous indeed, but which was nevertheless found in the sacred books, that *about that time* some one from their country should obtain the empire of the world. This they understood to belong to themselves, and many of their wise men were mistaken in their judgment of it.”<sup>5</sup> The same fact is mentioned in their notices of the breaking out of the Jewish war by the Roman historians Tacitus and Suetonius. Says the former; “The persuasion was entertained by very many (i. e. of the Jews), that in the ancient books of the priests it was predicted that at that very time the East would prevail, and that some one going forth from Judæa would gain the empire of the world.”<sup>6</sup> Suetonius adds, that “the rumour was an old and abiding one, and that it prevailed throughout the whole East.”<sup>7</sup>

Let me, ere passing onward to trace this expectation to its source, add an illustration of the fact of the expectation from the writings

<sup>1</sup> Matt. iii. 2; iv. 17; x. 7, &c.

<sup>2</sup> Luke xvii. 20.

<sup>3</sup> Luke xix. 11.

<sup>4</sup> See Josephus on this point.

<sup>5</sup> Joseph. de Bel. vi. 5. 4. Ὁ δὲ ἐπ' αὐτῆς μαλιστα πρὸς τὸν πόλεμον ἢ χρησμός ἀμφίβολος, ὁμοίως ἐν τοῖς ἱεροῖς εὐρημένος γραμμασί, ὡς κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν ἐκεῖνον ἀπο τῆς χώρας τις αὐτῶν ἀρξέι τῆς οἰκουμένης.

<sup>6</sup> “Pluribus persuasio inerat antiquis sacerdotum literis contineri eo ipso tempore fore ut valesceret Oriens, profectique Judæa rerum potirentur.” Tacit. Hist. v. 13.

<sup>7</sup> “Pererebuarat Oriente toto vetus et constans opinio esse in fatis ut eo tempore Judæa profecti rerum potirentur.” Suet. in Vespas. c. 4.

of the greatest of the Roman poets, in the reign of Augustus;—a quarter where, *à priori*, one might least have expected to find it. I allude to Virgil's famous 4th Eclogue. It is inscribed, as its title imports, to a Roman nobleman named Pollio, and makes reference to the year of his consulship, B.C. 40,<sup>1</sup> as one marked by the birth of a child of most extraordinary and felicitous destinies. He speaks of him in glowing prophetic strain, as of heavenly origin, and born to be the introducer of the world's final golden age, so as had long previously been foretold by the Cumæan Sibyl:<sup>2</sup>—a golden age which was to have its dawn and partial beginnings with his childhood, but only to come to its perfectness as he rose into manhood.<sup>3</sup> He goes on to describe how that then would be the reign of universal justice and universal peace; wars rage no longer, the lions and the flocks feed together, and the venomous serpent no more exist: how that the uncultivated earth would then bring forth abundance; human toil be no more needed, and corn and wine and oil grow spontaneously:—moreover, that men would then live the life of heroes; heaven and earth be reunited, as in primeval times; and men and gods again mix in intercourse together.<sup>4</sup>

There can be little doubt, I think, that the child intended by Virgil was Marcellus, son to Claudius and Octavia, Augustus' sister;<sup>5</sup> whose birth occurred in Pollio's consulship, just after the peace of Brundisium between Augustus and Antony; and who, on marriage, at the age of 18, to Augustus' daughter Julia, was destined to be Augustus' successor in the empire; a destiny the realization of which was only prevented by his sudden and premature death shortly afterwards. For we know the high expectations entertained

<sup>1</sup> i. e. 40 years before the vulgar Christian æra. Jesus Christ's actual birth, as is well known, may be proved to have been some 4 years before it.

<sup>2</sup> The poem opens thus:—

Ultima Cumæi venit jam carminis ætas :  
Magnus ab integro sæclorum nascitur ordo,  
Jam redit et Virgo ; redeunt Saturnia regna ;  
Jam nova progenies cælo demittitur alto,  
Tu modo nascenti puero, quo ferrea primum  
Desinet, ac toto surget gens aurea mundo,  
Casta eave Lucina.

<sup>3</sup> . . . ubi jam firmata virum te fecerit ætas.

Hence the poet speaks of the necessity of his own life being prolonged to old age, in order to his participation in the coming golden age, v. 54.

<sup>4</sup> Ille Deûm vitam accipiet, divisque videbit  
Permixtos heroas, et ipse videbitur illis.

<sup>5</sup> So Heyne and other commentators.

of him by the Roman people; especially from those exquisite lines of funeral eulogy on him, written soon after his death by Virgil, in the 6th Book of the *Æneid*.<sup>1</sup> And probably the various, and in some points rather difficult, chronological conditions of the *Eclogue* will be found best satisfied by supposing it to have been composed by Virgil after Marcellus had been adopted by Augustus, and when all those fond expectations were entertained respecting him; the reference to the child's birth, and to Pollio's year of consulship, being by a not very uncommon poetic licence retrospective.<sup>2</sup>—But, however this may be, what at present concerns us is the fact of Virgil's having sung of the destined coming of the world's golden age within some 20 or 30 years from the date of Pollio's consulship, as the subject of one of the Cumæan Sibyl's prophecies, and this in strains singularly similar to those of Isaiah, respecting the blessings of the reign of Messiah. And, as we know that about those times multitudinous verses were widely circulated and read at Rome as the Sibyl's, which were in fact of Eastern, and many of Hebrew, origin,<sup>3</sup> there seems reason in Bishop Lowth's opinion that it is to such an original that we are to refer this prophecy: and that consequently we may regard it as an echo of the expectation of Messiah, and Messiah's blessed kingdom, then prevalent in Judæa and the far East; though reproduced by Virgil in Roman form, and with the intermixture of courtly flattery to the family of Augustus.

<sup>1</sup> Si quæ fata aspera rumpas  
Tu Marcellus eris.

<sup>2</sup> Various things predicated of the child's youth and early manhood might seem sufficiently accordant with certain events in the correspondent part of Augustus' reign, allowing for the adornment of a poet's and a courtier's fancy. The particular *Eclogue* may have been inserted in the long previously published book of Virgil's *Eclogues*, on a new edition of the book.

<sup>3</sup> It is mentioned among the reforming acts of Augustus, on entering upon the office of Pontifex Maximus, B.C. 12, that he caused multitudes of prophetic books to be collected, which were then widely circulated and read at Rome, and excited much vain hope or fear in the minds of the people respecting the coming future; and had most of them burnt, to the number of 2000 volumes; reserving those only which bore the names of some of the Sibyls as their authors. Suetonius in Octav. c. 31.

Now the Sibylline verses then known at Rome had been chiefly collected at Erythræ in Ionia, by order of the Senate, in the year B.C. 83; after the burning of the Capitol, and the old books then kept there, in the civil wars of Sylla and Marius. Thus they had almost altogether an Eastern origin. See on this, Prideaux, Part ii. B. 9.

It is observed by Heyne in his Preface to this *Eclogue*, that we are not to wonder at the similarity of much that we find in it to the sacred Hebrew prophecies; seeing that “in magno illo *Sibyllinorum oraculorum* numero multa esse debuisse à *Syris* et *Judæis* hominibus propagata.”



2. And now then I revert to the question, Whence may we suppose that the Jews' expectation of Messiah and Messiah's kingdom about this time came to prevail?—And in a general way it is obvious, alike from what we read in the Gospel narratives, and from the agreeing testimonies of Josephus, Tacitus, and Suetonius, that it arose from prophecies in the Jews' sacred books; <sup>1</sup> i. e. as compared, of course, with the existing signs of the times. Nor can we well err in chiefly referring it to Daniel's prophecy of the 70 weeks; that in the same prophet, respecting the four great mundane empires, figured in the quadripartite image seen by Nebuchadnezzar; and further, the more ancient prediction respecting Shiloh's coming delivered by the patriarch Jacob.

I ought not indeed here wholly to omit notice of the famous tradition, as it is called, of the house of Elias, founded on a typical view of the six days of creation, and seventh of rest, as related in the Book of Genesis: to the effect that the world was to be 2000 years before the law; (the law, I presume, of the Abrahamic covenant;) 2000 under the law; and then 2000 under Messiah, prior to the sabbatism of the 7th millennium.<sup>2</sup> For Elias is said to have been a Rabbi, that lived shortly before the time of Jesus Christ. And it is likely that this notion, whether the type were at all really intended or not, may have had a certain influence, when the 2000 years from Abraham were in the Jewish chronology drawing to a close, to increase expectation in the minds of some at least amongst the Jews, on the subject of the probably speedy coming of Messiah.<sup>3</sup>

But doubtless far more influential to this effect, and with better reason, were the three direct inspired prophecies that I have just before particularized.

Thus first, and specially, as to the *seventy weeks' prophecy* in Daniel. "Seventy weeks" (or hebdomads), said the angel Gabriel, "are determined upon thy people to finish the transgression, and to make an end of sin, and to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to anoint the most holy." But measured from that epoch or event? "Know that *from the going forth of the commandment to restore and rebuild Jerusalem* unto Messiah, the Prince, shall be 7 hebdomads and 62 hebdomads: the street shall be built again, and the wall,

<sup>1</sup> See the citations, p. 714, *suprà*.

<sup>2</sup> See the citation from the Gemara in Mede's Works, B. iv. Ep. 22.

<sup>3</sup> So the ancient Universal History, Vol. x. p. 459, Note 3.

even in troublous times. And after 62 hebdomads shall Messiah be cut off, though not for himself. . . . And he shall confirm the covenant with many for one hebdomad; and in the midst of the hebdomad (or in the half part, the last half part, of the hebdomad) he shall cause the sacrifice and oblation to cease.”

Now, without entering very particularly into the details of this prophecy, thus much seemed clear enough as to its purport:—that, measured from some notable decree for the Jews’ restoration from Babylon, and Jerusalem’s rebuilding, (and we all know there were several such decrees,) 69 and 70 chronological hebdomads would elapse respectively unto Messiah’s manifestation and the term of his earthly ministry; these being hebdomads of *years* apparently, (whether in imitation of Ezekiel’s year-day precedent,<sup>1</sup> or otherwise,) because 70 times 7 *days* would seem far too small a space of time for all that was predicated as to take place within its range. Accordingly, when the periods of 69 times and 70 times 7, i. e. of 481 or 490 years, measured from *Cyrus’* decree for the Jews’ restoration from Babylon (the earliest of all such decrees), were now about to reach their endings, then, and on this account, learned Jews seem to have begun to think it time for looking and lifting up their heads, in expectancy of Messiah’s manifestation. And, when nothing then happened in Judæa correspondently, they would naturally measure from Darius’s decree of similar purport to that of Cyrus, but some seventeen or eighteen years later:—and, when disappointment again ensued, then from one or other of the 60 or 70 years still later decrees of the 7th and 20th of Artaxerxes; the former, I doubt not, the decree really intended in the prediction.<sup>2</sup> For it is to be observed that, with all the numeral definiteness of the prophecy, there was yet, from the circumstance of its various possible commencing dates, a considerable range of time within which expectation might doubtfully speculate.

In proof that it was very mainly from calculation of Daniel’s 490 years’ prophetic period that that strong expectancy of Messiah arose among the Jews which was shown at the time spoken of, I might refer to what the Talmud reports, as a tradition of the olden times, that “in Daniel is delivered to us the end of Messiah,” i. e. as R. Jarchi

<sup>1</sup> Ezek. iv. 5, 6. See on this my *Horæ Apocalyptiæ*, Vol. iii. p. 268 (5th edition).

<sup>2</sup> The dates of the four decrees were B.C. 536, 519, 457, and 441, respectively.

interprets the phrase, the time when Messiah ought to appear.<sup>1</sup> Yet more this will appear, I think, from the fact that in such historic records as we have of the Jews in times somewhat preceding the earliest possible epoch of the 69 or 70 hebdomads; for example, the Maccabean Books, which carry down that history from about 174 to 135 B.C., no such lively expectation of Messiah's speedy coming is at all discernible. I pray the reader to run through those books (the First Book of Maccabees more especially, as being the most authentic) with the special object of noting the state of Jewish feeling there indicated on the point referred to.<sup>2</sup> It will be well worth his while to do so.—On the other hand, so soon as 490 years had elapsed from Cyrus's decree, so soon, as before said, the expectation seems to have begun. We are told by Grotius<sup>3</sup> of a learned Rabbi, named Nehemiah, who lived 50 years before Jesus Christ, or near about the time of the expiration of the 490 years calculated from the decree of Cyrus; by whom it was declared that the time fixed by Daniel for Messiah could hardly go beyond 50 years further.<sup>4</sup> And we have seen from the Gospel histories, alike at the birth of Jesus Christ, and to the end of the 30 or 35 years of his subsequent life, how general, strong, and continuous was then the Jews' expectation of the Messiah; all which period was comprehended, as is evident, between the end of the 490 years, as measured from the 1st of Darius, and that from the 7th of Artaxerxes.—If the same feeling of expectation continued after their rejection of Jesus Christ's claims to the Messiahship, this might have seemed for a while warranted on the ground of this same prophecy, by measuring from the fourth and latest of the Persian king's decrees for Jerusalem's restoration,

<sup>1</sup> So the article on *Messiah* in Kitto's Biblical Cyclopædia.

<sup>2</sup> 1 Macc. xiv. 41, says that in gratitude to Simon, brother to Judas Maccabeus, they appointed him their governor and High Priest for ever; (i. e. himself and his posterity; Lowth on Zech. vi. 13); until there should arise a faithful prophet, or till *the faithful prophet* should arise; meaning *the Messiah*. Lowth.

<sup>3</sup> De Ver. Christ. Rel. v. 14.—“In Jesum tempus (sc. of the 70 weeks) tam bene convenit, ut magister Hebræus Nehumias, qui annis quinquaginta eum præcessit, apertè jam tum dixerit non posse ultrà eos quinquaginta annos protrahi tempus Messie à Daniele significatum.”—One cannot but regret with Le Clerc that Grotius did not give his authority for this statement. But both his well-known extensive and accurate learning, and the fact of his having made Jewish religious opinions and writings a special subject of investigation, as he himself tells us at the opening of his book i. 1, furnish a guarantee to us of its trustworthiness.

<sup>4</sup> It was shortly after this, viz. B.C. 40, that the birth of Octavia's son Marcellus occurred: to whose youth and riper manhood, as I have before stated, the so-called Sibyl had assigned the world's coming golden age.

that of the 20th of Artaxerxes, the same that was signalized by Nehemiah's return. Nor is it inconsistent with my hypothesis, or to be wondered at, that it should have remained yet later, even down to the Jewish war and destruction of Jerusalem, considering the Jews' unwillingness to abandon their long fondly cherished hopes of a Messiah, who in his here predicted character of Prince and King would lead them on to triumph and dominion, especially against their Roman oppressors. And this indeed the rather, as the two other prophecies that I have referred to, compared with the signs of the times, might have seemed still to favour such expectancy.

For, as regarded the one, viz. *Daniel's prefigurative image of the four great empires*, thus much was clear from it:—that it was whilst under the fourth, or last empire of iron, that the image was to be broken to shivers by the stone cut out of the mountain without hands: itself evidently an emblem of Messiah's kingdom; and which was thereupon to become a great mountain, and to fill the whole earth. Now who in those times, that was at all acquainted with history, could doubt but that the Roman Empire was the fourth empire; it being that which had taken the supremacy from the Greeks, as the Greeks had taken it from the Persians, and they from the Babylonians; which Babylonians, and their then reigning king, the Angel declared to be the head of gold? And well indeed did the very iron of the symbol suit the Romans, so as it had suited no other conquering people; and, as such, was adopted in a manner by the Roman poets themselves for a national emblem.<sup>1</sup> No doubt the prophetic symbol represented the fourth empire as a ten-divided state, correspondingly with the image's ten toes of mixed iron and clay, at the time of the stone's smashing it to pieces. But might not some such division occur any day to the Roman Empire, even though for the present united under Augustus' rule, from some great internal or external revolution?

And then, further, as to that ancient prediction by Jacob, that "the sceptre should not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet, until Shiloh came," it might well serve to strengthen the expectation. For Shiloh was expounded in the Targum of Onkelos, and by Jonathan Ben Uzziel,<sup>2</sup> and other Rabbis of the age,

<sup>1</sup> Atque omnis Latio quæ servit purpura ferro. So Lucan vii. 228.

<sup>2</sup> Jonathan Ben Uzziel is generally said to have been one of the most distinguished of the eighty disciples of Hillel, and Onkelos another: Hillel himself being grand-



pretty consistently to be the Messiah. And, though it might seem difficult absolutely and precisely to fix the time when the power of the sceptre and the law departed from Judah, yet was it evident that from the time of the domination of Herod the Idumæan, Augustus' protégé,<sup>1</sup> and during the subsequent encroachments by Roman procurators on the independent rule of High Priest and Sanhedrim, there was more and more an approximation to the state so described in Jacob's prophecy; and consequently a sign that, according to it, Messiah must either have come ere the end of Augustus' reign, or at that time not be very far off.<sup>2</sup> It is to be observed that the two prophecies last referred to well harmonized together, from the circumstance that it was by the fourth or Roman Empire that not other nations' freedom alone, but also Judah's self-governing power of the sceptre and the law was taken away. And hence indeed that bitter feeling of the Jews against the Romans, which quickened their general interest in the prophecies referred to; and longing for the Messiah, in whom they erroneously expected to find their earthly triumphant chief and avenger.

On the whole so rooted, it appears, was this expectation among the Jews of the first and second centuries, and as derived from their Scripture prophecies, that after rejecting Jesus of Nazareth, and when no one else came that could really support his pretensions to the Messiahship, they fell into two opinions:—either that the Messiah had come, but was concealed, so as we find it stated in the Targum on Mic. 4; or else that the time of his coming had been deferred on account of their sins. Both of these opinions will be found

father to Gamaliel at whose feet sat Saul of Tarsus. This fixes the date to a short time before Jesus Christ's birth.

Onkelos' Targum (or Interpretation) on the Pentateuch is considered the best of all the Targums.

The Targum of Jerusalem thus paraphrases the passage:—"Kings shall not cease from the house of Judah, nor doctors that teach the law from his children, until that King Messiah do come, whose the kingdom is; and all nations of the earth shall be subject unto him."

<sup>1</sup> In Kitto's article on Messiah it is stated that, on Herod the Idumæan setting aside the Maccabees and the Sanhedrim, the Jews were said to have shaved their heads, put on sackcloth, and cried, "Woe to us, because the sceptre is departed from Judah, and a law-giver from between his feet."—It is added that other later Jews date the fulfilment of that predicted fact not till the time when Vespasian and Titus destroyed Jerusalem."

<sup>2</sup> Let me refer on this point to Mede's eighth discourse, the subject of which is this prophecy of Jacob.

hinted in Justin Martyr's Dialogue with Trypho in the second century.<sup>1</sup>

3. But let not the reader think that the Jews were altogether unanimous in this expectancy of a personal Messiah, or this interpretation of the prophecies. *Objections* and *objectors* we have reason to suppose there were even then, on various grounds, and with various counterviews, to each and every particular of the above-mentioned prophetic evidence; and *difficulties* too raised against one and another of the prophetic arguments, such as were hard sometimes to answer.

Thus, first, as regarded *Jacob's prophecy*, (for *Elias' tradition* would hardly be much insisted on,) besides those Rabbis who affirmed that the sceptre had departed from Judah on Herod the Great's supersession of the Maccabees and Sanhedrim, it was open to others to argue, and not without much plausibility, that the sceptre had departed from Judah long previously, at the time of the Babylonish captivity, however it might have been restored afterwards: and that the circumstance of no Messiah, in the highest sense of the word, having come previous to that overthrow of its self-government, nor indeed previous to Herod's supersession of the Sanhedrim, was sufficient to weaken all argument for expecting Messiah's speedy coming on the establishment of Augustus' or Tiberius' dominion over Judæa, drawn from that prophecy by Jacob.

Again, as regarded *Daniel's prefigurative image of the four empires*, a question might have been raised whether it was so certain that the fourth empire prefigured was the Roman: seeing that this could hardly but be the same with the fourth empire figured in the vision of the four wild beasts; and that then the fourth empire would seem to be that of the Seleucidæ, *if*, as many Jews thought, the little horn out of it, that domineered over the ten horns, was a symbol of the blaspheming tyrant Antiochus Epiphanes.<sup>2</sup> In which case all argument for speedy expectation of the Messiah after the establishment of Roman domination over the Jews, drawn from this prophecy, would also be a delusion; and indeed doubt thrown on the Messianic

<sup>1</sup> Whitby remarks on this in the General Preface to his New Testament Commentary.

<sup>2</sup> See the diverse interpretations of this prophecy of Dan. vii. in Pole's Synopsis. And compare Dr. S. R. Maitland's doubts (strange doubts surely) as to the fourth empire figured being the Roman.

exposition itself of the symbol of the stone cut out of the mountain without hands. Nowhere was learning more cultivated by the Jews of the first century than in the Jewish Alexandrian school. And Philo, the most famous of the Rabbis of that rationalistic school, taught that all such prophecy should be understood allegorically, and a golden age looked for in the general ascendancy of Jewish ideas, and the Jewish religion; independent of the coming of any such heaven-sent personal king and saviour.<sup>1</sup>

Yet again as regarded *Daniel's seventy weeks' prophecy*, various and many may be supposed to have been the objections made by certain of the learned Jews against the exposition generally received among the people at the opening of the Christian æra; especially when urged a little later by the apostles and early disciples of Jesus of Nazareth.

A Jewish Scripture literalist might tauntingly have asked for some precedent in the sacred Hebrew Books, where the word *Shabua* used by itself, and without any genitive of specific measure of time following, was meant of a septenary of *years*, or any other than a septenary of *days*.<sup>2</sup> And, in the confessed want of this, he might have denounced the *year-day* principle, whereby alone it could be made a prophecy of 490 *years* from Cyrus, or Artaxerxes, to Messiah: and sought some solution of it as a prophecy of 490 *days*; whether in Jewish anointed chiefs, like Ezra and Nehemiah, of the distant *past*; or in the indefinite possibilities of some new Jewish captivity, and new royal decrees for the captivity's return in the distant *future*.<sup>3</sup> In which exception against the *year* value, generally attached to the hebdomads, the Jewish objector might have been joined by some casually intervening Roman philosopher;—"Why but to suit a purpose is the prophecy construed of *years*, not *days*?"<sup>4</sup>—Another, of a different school, might have argued with later Jews<sup>5</sup> for septenaries

<sup>1</sup> See Neander's Church History (Clark's Edition), Vol. i. pp. 88, 89, on Philo's views on this matter; also pp. 78, 79, about Philo generally.

<sup>2</sup> Besides the instances in this chapter of Daniel, on which the question arises, there are some 19 passages in other parts of Scripture where the noun is used either in its singular or other forms, and always in the sense of a hebdomad of *days*. See the Paper on this point by the Rev. C. J. Elliott, in my Vol. iii. pp. 601 to 608.

<sup>3</sup> So, even now, Drs. Todd and Burgh.

<sup>4</sup> Says Gibbon, in a Note near the conclusion of his fifteenth chapter:—"If the famous prophecy of the seventy weeks had been alleged to a Roman philosopher, would he not have replied in the words of Cicero, 'Quæ tandem ista auguratio est, annorum potius quàm aut mensium aut dierum?'"<sup>5</sup> See Pole's Synopsis on Dan. ix. p. 155.

of Jubilees; so putting off the time for Messiah's first coming to a future far distant date: and yet another have urged that the prophetic numbers were simply symbolic; the sevenfold multiples of septenaries in Daniel being only meant to signify a sacred but indefinite number.—While Rabbis fresh from the Pharisaist school of Hillel<sup>1</sup> might have protested against all appeal to profane heathen learning, and all the intricate chronological calculations based on it, in order to make out the fulfilment of the prophetic period (even though admitted to be 490 *years*) as reaching from Artaxerxes' decree to Tiberius.<sup>2</sup> “Ought not a devout Scripture student entirely unacquainted with the details of profane history, or the vicissitudes of political and ecclesiastical affairs, during the five or six preceding centuries, to be expected to understand Scripture prophecy, in so far as it concerned Messiah in his relations to Israel, equally with the most learned?”<sup>3</sup>

And what as to sceptical critics of the Sadducean school? How might they, before Jesus Christ's birth, have noted sarcastically the proved failure of calculations of the prophetic period, as made first from Cyrus' decree, and then from that of Darius, as its commencing epoch; no Messiah having appeared at the end of 490 years, so calculated! Whence an inference as to the folly of all such calculations, whatever the ephemeral popularity of the expositors propounding them; and the anticipated necessity, when calculations from the 7th of Artaxerxes should have been similarly falsified by the event, of a new exposition, reckoning from some later decree, for the silly believers in such comments.—Moreover, even after Jesus Christ's coming, and the fulfilment in him of the prophecy in respect of its chronological period, measured from the 7th Artaxerxes, they might have pointed sneeringly to the differences of the calculations made by Christian writers, in order to suit its application to Jesus of Nazareth;<sup>4</sup> and, with a view to giving greater effect to their sarcasm, have drawn out tables, like our modern Tysos, exhibiting to the eye

<sup>1</sup> Hillel is said to have been the grandfather of Gamaliel, at whose feet sate Paul of Tarsus.

<sup>2</sup> See a statement and discussion of all the various opinions and calculations on this point in Pole's *Synopsis*, Vol. iii. col. 1537 to 1559.

<sup>3</sup> I have here used the language of the writer of *Plain Papers on Prophecy*: a volume lately published, on the futurist scheme of prophetic exposition.

<sup>4</sup> See Pole's *Synopsis*, ubi *suprà*.



those multitudinous differences. "Would it not be better, instead of such fanciful and mutually inconsistent calculations, to wait till *Elijah* come, before urging on the people Messiah's first coming as imminent or fulfilled? That is, till *Elijah* the great prophet of Ahab's time comes *in person*, as predicted by the prophet Malachi? For as to any such spiritualizing sense as that by which the Christians made the prophecy to have been fulfilled in John the Baptist, as being a man of *Elijah's* spirit and character, it was but an explaining away of Scripture, and mere subterfuge."

---

So, I say, might the Jewish objectors, one and another, have argued against the more generally received meaning of those prophecies on which the expectancy of Messiah by the Jews of the time of Augustus and Tiberius was mainly founded. And probably, had I lived at that time, the objections would not have been without their influence to deaden my own expectation.—But much more, I suspect, would such sceptical tendency have fixed itself in my mind from the marvellous nature of the fact which I was called to look for; it being nothing less than the *incarnation of Jehovah Himself*, the ETERNAL SELF-EXISTENT ONE, in human flesh and blood: an event not only without parallel in the whole history of the world, but in itself astounding, even so as to seem to faith itself all but incredible.—And this the rather because of the total want of thought and interest about it on the part of mankind in general; alike among the rich and poor, the statesmen, merchants, military men, philosophers, in every part of the great Roman Empire, Judæa alone excepted. Mark, for instance, in Rome itself, the metropolis of the empire, the absorption of all that rushing tide of population in the common earthly pursuits and interests of life; alike at the time of the birth of Jesus of Nazareth, and afterwards during the whole progress of his eventful life in the Judæan province! Listen to their eager talk about the politics, pleasures, or commerce of the day, the games of the circus, the monthly dole of bread to the citizens, the every-day fresh tales of vice and scandal, the rising or falling of the markets, the news from the frontier camps, whether of victory or disaster; anything, everything, but what was then passing in Judæa. Is it possible, I might then have thought within myself, that in a world

so utterly thoughtless, and indifferent to the mighty fact, the Creator God can either be just on the point of becoming incarnate, or else already born into and ministering in it, in fulfilment of the grand work of man's redemption, as predicted in the old Hebrew prophecies?—Yes! though the groans of all nature without me, and the groans of my own soul within me, in its conscious and sad sense of separation from its Maker, might have been felt as absolutely crying out for the coming of the promised Redeemer, again to reconcile together fallen man and God, yet, do I suspect that scepticism, under all these wrong influences, would have sorely battled against the better feelings of faith at that eventful epoch, and not only have shut my mind against all realizing expectancy of Him prior to His coming, but, even after it, except through a miracle of God's interposing and enlightening grace, have prevented my recognition of him in the humble form of Jesus of Nazareth.

But, however that might have been, and whatever the indifference of the world in general, and the counter-speculations and many objections of sceptical or philosophizing Jewish Rabbis, yet did the prophecies about Messiah's first coming in human form have their fulfilment, in respect of the time of that great event, as well as of all else: albeit not so clearly or definitely as absolutely to exclude all controversy, or difference of opinion, on that point. As the sceptre was passing out of the hand of Judah into that of the great fourth or Roman Empire, and as the 490 years of Daniel, measured from the decree of the seventh of Artaxerxes, whereby first the Jewish restored remnant from Babylon was reconstituted into a nation, were advancing *near* towards their term,—just, I say, at that time Jesus, the true Messiah, was *born* into our world. And, when the period of 490 years, so calculated, had actually reached its *completion*, in that self-same month of April, as well as in that self-same year, according to the most authentic historic evidence,<sup>1</sup> Jesus Christ, after about some four years of public ministry, *expired* on the cross at Golgotha: thereby completing the work of redemption for which he had come into our world; fulfilling, and so abrogating, the types of the Jewish ceremonial law; making reconciliation for iniquity, and bringing in for all that should believe on him, just as Daniel had predicted he would, everlasting righteousness.

<sup>1</sup> On this let me refer to the notice of the subject in the Appendix to my volume of Warburton Lectures.

§ 2. PREMONITORY INDICATIONS AT THE PRESENT TIME OF THE  
NEARNESS OF CHRIST'S SECOND COMING.

And now, *secondly*, I turn from the Scriptural prophetic evidence, which in the times of Augustus and Tiberius seemed to warrant the Jews' general expectancy of MESSIAH'S *first* coming and manifestation in human flesh, to the prophetic evidence which has been judged by many to point to his *second* coming as even now not very distant:—that coming at the brightness of which the Antichrist, or Man of Sin, of Daniel, St. Paul, and St. John, is to be destroyed, and Messiah's own glorious kingdom thereupon to have its establishment in this our fallen world.

And certainly I think that very strong prophetic evidence does exist to this effect; though not, however, without objections and objectors as before.

I. As to the *evidence*, we shall find it to be of substantially the same character with that which was considered under my former head; only more copious, clear, and strong.

1st, then, and as the very alphabet of prophetic knowledge on the great subject of inquiry, there stands before us for contemplation that same wonderful prefigurative image of the four great successive empires of the world, which was seen by Nebuchadnezzar, and interpreted by Daniel. And, whereas the fourth or Roman Empire, answering to the statue's legs of iron, had not in the times of Augustus and Tiberius split into its ten toes of the mixed material of iron and clay, we have in the subsequent history of the Gothic invasions of the empire in the fifth and sixth centuries of the Christian æra, and the several Romano-Gothic kingdoms supervening, seen the accomplishment of that great revolution: and consequently seen the image brought into that decem-partited state, (a state which has continued ever since,) in which the stone cut out of the mountain without hands, the emblem of Messiah's church or kingdom, was at some time or other to smite and shiver the image to atoms, and itself to become a great mountain, and fill the whole earth.

2ndly, and in inseparable connexion with that primary prophecy of Daniel, there is to be considered the prefiguration of the same four great successive empires of the world, recorded in his seventh chapter, under the symbol of four great wild beasts, (an indication

of their being one and all persecutors of the truth,) the lion, bear, leopard, and ten-horned deino-therium: the last answering evidently to the iron or Roman Empire of the previously seen statue, and its ten horns to the statue's ten toes; but with these two most important additional intimations respecting the later decem-regal form of the Roman Empire; first, that the ten kingdoms would be connected together by the common domination over them of a little horn, with eyes like the eyes of a man; and, secondly, that the term of allotted duration to the supremacy of that little horn was to be a time, times, and half a time, or three and a half years, according to the well-known force of the phrase in the Hebrew language. And, taking these three and a half *years*, or 1260 *days*, as the period is elsewhere expressed, to symbolize 1260 *years*, on somewhat of the same principle, *Scripturally considered*,<sup>1</sup> as Daniel's 70 weeks, (and let me observe in passing, as I shall hereafter have to show,<sup>2</sup> that the unbroken continuity of the legs and ten-toed feet of the image will be found absolutely, and of itself, to forbid our explaining the period as meant of simple days,) I say, taking the little horn's destined time of supremacy to be 1260 years, there will appear in regard of it, on comparison of the prophecy and the later Roman history, the two facts following:—first, that a Roman power, singularly answering to the characteristics of the little horn, came, after the dissolution of the old Roman Empire, to hold supremacy over the Romano-Gothic kingdoms of Western Europe, in the usurped and most extraordinary character of *Christ's Vicar on Earth*; in which character, moreover, it has, beyond all preceding powers of the world, been a persecutor of God's truth and people:—secondly, that as measured (not indeed from its first possible epoch of commencement, but) from an epoch of all others apparently the most fit and probable, viz. that of the ten Western kingdoms completed subjecting of themselves to the Pope, as Christ's Vicegerent on Earth, whereby was constituted the Papal Empire,<sup>3</sup> and that too of the Eastern Roman emperor's admission of this his claim,<sup>4</sup> both which events date near about the close of the 6th century,—I say that, as measured from this epoch, the Papal domination must have now very nearly fulfilled its destined course of 1260

<sup>1</sup> See p 723 *suprà*.

<sup>2</sup> See pp. 735, 736.

<sup>3</sup> In the Apocalypse the Beast's existence in domineering power, to which the duration of 1260 days is assigned by the prophecy, dates from his rise with the ten horns attached to him.

<sup>4</sup> See on this my Vol. iii. pp. 302—304 (5th Edition).



years. In which case the time must also have nearly come for the Beast's being given, together with its little horn, to the burning flame, according to the sequel of the prophetic imagery; and (even though the 75 additional days, or years, of Dan. xii. be added as still supervening) for Messiah's triumphant establishment of his glorious kingdom, then solemnly to be committed to him by the hand of the Ancient of Days.<sup>1</sup>

3rdly, We have in St. John's Apocalyptic prophecy a yet additional and most strong confirmation of this inference from the Old Testament prophetic evidence. Seeing that that revelation of the coming future was given to St. John in Domitian's reign, while the fourth or Roman Empire still existed under its imperial régime, and when its only great remaining revolution, as foreshown by Daniel, was that whereby it was to be broken up into ten kingdoms, under the dominion of the little horn, it might *à priori* have been anticipated as probable that that particular revolution, and both what would happen after Domitian, introductorily to it, and what would happen subsequently under the little horn's régime, would constitute its special subjects of prefiguration. Nor do I doubt that such was actually the case. After the most elaborate investigation of history, as compared with the Apocalyptic prophecy, the result is this: (a result which hostile criticism, the most determined, careful, and particular, has been unable to gainsay:)—that there is found in it the most wonderfully exact, succinct, comprehensive, philosophic sketch of the fortunes of the Roman Empire, previous to its predicted division into ten kingdoms; and also of the character and chief changes of the Roman Papal empire, after that division, including the Christian witness against it, even to the present time;<sup>2</sup> to which Papal empire, it is to be observed, there is attached by it the same period of three and a half times, or 1260 days, as was before attached by Daniel to the little horn.—Thus does our reason for belief in the inferences from Daniel's prophecies seem to be strengthened and confirmed; to the effect that we are indeed now approaching very rapidly to the end of the 1260 years of Papal domination, and (whether the additional 75 years be still supervening or not) to the time

<sup>1</sup> Dan. vii. 9—13.

<sup>2</sup> On all this I must beg my readers carefully to consider the argument as drawn out in the *Home Apocalypticæ*. Without such a *careful, thoughtful* consideration it will be impossible for them to do justice to it.

of Messiah's destroying the anti-christian monster with the brightness of His own second coming.

4thly, and once more, there are various *signs of the times*, all which, various as they are, Scripture prophecy speaks of in one or another place as signs of the closing days of the present dispensation. Thus, first of all, in the last days of this dispensation, and towards the close of the destined time, times, and half a time of the man of sin's abomination standing in God's church or sanctuary; it is intimated by Daniel that "*many shall run to and fro, and knowledge shall be increased:*"<sup>1</sup>—increased, doubtless, with a view to the better preparation of the whole world for understanding God's judgment in the great coming catastrophe. Let me ask then, Do not many run to and fro *now*? Is not knowledge of every kind increased and increasing *now*? Who knows not, if at all adequately acquainted with history, that there has never been anything like such an answering to the prophetic language in the whole course of the world's history as at the present time?

Again, it is foretold that at no great distance of time before the great catastrophe *the everlasting Gospel* is to be sent forth and preached, for the completion of the witness, to every nation under heaven.<sup>2</sup> Look, then, at what is now done, done altogether within the present century, by our Bible Societies and Evangelic Missionary Societies; and say whether this sign of the approaching consummation seems not to be fulfilling.

Further, it seems clearly intimated in Holy Scripture, that shortly before the time of the end the Lord's people are to have their hearts turned in special feelings of compassionate interest to the *Jew*. "The time, yea the set time is come," says the Psalmist, that is, for the Jews' conversion and restoration: "for thy servants think on Zion's stones, and it pitieth them to see her in the dust."<sup>3</sup> Is not this very markedly the state of feeling with Christians now, after near 1800 years of neglect, contempt, and hardness of heart towards the Jew? If so, then remember that this, too, is a premonitory sign of Jesus Christ's speedy second coming and manifestation. For, in the throes of their national repenting for the rejection of Jesus, the Jews, we know, are "to look on Him whom they have pierced;"<sup>4</sup> and

<sup>1</sup> Dan. xii. 4, also verses 9, 11.

<sup>3</sup> Psalm cii. 13, 14.

<sup>2</sup> Apoc. xiv. 6. Compare Matt. xxiv. 14.

<sup>4</sup> Zech. xii. 10.

that when, thereupon, the Lord again builds Zion, "He will appear in His glory."<sup>1</sup>—A prophecy this remembered probably, as well as confirmed, by St. Peter in his first sermon to the Jews after the day of Pentecost; saying, "Repent and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out; and that the times of refreshing may come from the presence of the Lord, and he may send Jesus Christ, whom the heavens must receive until the times of the restitution of all things, spoken of by all the prophets."<sup>2</sup> And what shall I say of *the Euphrates drying up*?—the drying up not of political power alone, but of the very heart, spirit, and life-blood of Mohammedanism itself in the great Turkish Empire; especially as accelerated, just of late, by means and in a manner so unexpected and wonderful?—The object in God's providence of this its drying up, is stated to be "that the way of the kings from the East (not *of* the East, as many wrongly state it) may be prepared:"<sup>3</sup> whether meant of the light-bearing beams of Christ's coming with His saints,<sup>4</sup> or perhaps of the converted Jews' re-establishment in their own country. For there is a way, I think, though as yet unnoticed by expositors, in which the expression, *kings from the East*, may be applicable to them; albeit that their gathering at the latter day is to be not from the East alone, but alike from the East, and from the West, and from the North, and from the South. I mean by reference to their Eastern first original in Abraham; "the righteous man raised up and called *from the East*," as Isaiah emphatically designates him.<sup>5</sup>

Nor if it be thought, as many think, that our Lord's prophecy on the Mount of Olives refers at its close to the ending of the present dispensation, does that statement, "This generation (*αὐτῆ ἡ γενεα*) shall not pass away till all these things be fulfilled," (Luke xxi. 32,) present any necessary obstacle to its application to the present age. For *αὐτῆ ἡ γενεα* may mean *that generation* which witnesses the signs in the sun and moon, &c.; those convulsions which may have had their accomplishment in the French Revolution, agreeably with the use of similar imagery in the Apocalypse and other Scripture. Then the force of the saying will be, that ere a century or so elapse from

<sup>1</sup> Psalm cii. 16.

<sup>2</sup> Acts iii. 19, 20. See on this most important passage the critical remarks in my *Horæ Apocalypticæ*, Vol. iv. pp. 175—180.

<sup>3</sup> *ἵνα ετοιμασθῆ ἡ ὁδὸς τῶν βασιλείων τῶν ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν ἡλίου.* Apoc. xvi. 12.

<sup>4</sup> Compare the figure in Apoc. vii. 2: also Luke i. 78 and 2 Thess. ii. 1, 8; Apoc. xx. 4.

<sup>5</sup> Isaiah xli. 2. Compare Gen. xvii. 6, 16; Josh. xxiv. 2, 3.

that event, all having perished that were alive at the time of its first outbreak, the end and his second advent shall have taken place.<sup>1</sup>

Nor can I altogether omit the fact that, according to the elaborate tables of one of the most judicious and learned of our modern chronologists, the late Mr. Fynes Clinton, the world's 6000 years would seem to be very near their ending; and this, most remarkably, just about the self-same time as the ending of the 1260 years of the Papal Antichrist, so calculated, as I have stated before.<sup>2</sup> Nor if we take Usher's somewhat more protracted Scripture chronology, and moreover consider that Daniel's 75 years of the time of the end have to be added on to the completed 1260 years ere the consummation, will the further postponement of the ending of the 6th millenary be very long. And with the world's 6000 years ending, the world's *sabbatism* may be drawing on?

In fine, and on summing up, the more I consider it the more strong and convincing does the prophetic evidence appear to me, in indication that Messiah's promised second coming,—that coming at which Antichrist is to be destroyed,—is near at hand. In order at all to realize its strength, it will be well to consider separately and distinctly alike that evidence which results from the demonstrated long and continuous agreement of historic fact and prophetic figuration, respecting the four great successive empires of the world, from certain known epochs of commencement, viz. that of the reign of the Babylonian monarch Nebuchadnezzar, and time of St. John's seeing the visions in Patmos; a parallelism whereby we are brought down in John's prophecy quite near to its close in the consummation;—that

<sup>1</sup> My impression is, that the saying may have had a double reference, 1st, to the fulfilment of the judgments on *Jerusalem*, ere the generation then alive should have past away; 2nd, to the final judgment of *the consummation*, ere the generation should have wholly past away that had witnessed the signs in the sun and moon, &c. (verse 25, &c.), which signs I suppose to have begun at the French Revolution. See my Vol. iii. p. 361, Note 1; also my Paper in the Investigator, Vol. iv. p. 341.

It is to be observed that the word *αὐτῆ*, *this*, in the clause *ἡ γενεα αὐτῆ*, needs not necessarily to be aspirated: as there were no aspirates in the uncial characters of the older Greek MSS. And if without the aspirate, then *αὐτῆ* would mean *that*;—"that generation shall not have passed away, &c.;" with reference distinctly to the generation that was alive at the time of the signs in the sun and moon, &c., appearing. But the view I advocate does not depend on the absence of the aspirate. Because our Lord might mean by "*this* generation," the generation of the time he was then speaking of: just as in Luke xvii. 34, where, speaking of the time of his second coming, he says, *ταυτῆ τη νυκτι*, "On *this* night shall two be in one bed; one shall be taken, &c.:" meaning thereby the night of his coming; and so rendered in our English version, "In *that* night."

<sup>2</sup> See my abstract of Mr. Clinton's chronological argument and tables in the Chapter immediately preceding the present; and also my pp. 238, 239 *suprà*.



which results from the near ending of long prophetic chronological periods, dated from a commencing epoch which, within certain narrow limits, may be fixed almost certainly;—and then again, that which arises from what I have designated as the signs of the times; signs very various, very marked, very peculiar to the present æra, and each independent of the rest. Then let the cumulative force of the whole taken together be considered; all tending, as it does, to one and the same result;—that namely, as I have before said, of the nearness of Messiah's second coming. It seems impossible to deny that it is evidence immensely stronger than that which, in the reigns of Augustus and Tiberius, warranted the Jews of those days in their conviction of the time for Messiah's *first* coming having then arrived.<sup>1</sup>

II. But now, as to *objections* and objectors.

And, no doubt, there are learned Rabbis now, even as then, who with various views, and on various grounds, deny, and seek to invalidate, more or less of the prophetic evidence on which our inference has been grounded.—By some it is said that the whole of the

<sup>1</sup> I must quote a remarkable passage to the same effect, from the late lamented *Dr. Arnold's Lectures on Modern History*,\* which is the more interesting from its consideration of the subject quite in a new point of view.

“Modern history appears to be not only a step in advance of ancient history, but *the last step*: it appears to bear marks of the *fulness of time*, as if there would be no future history beyond it. For the last eighteen hundred years Greece has fed the human intellect: Rome, taught by Greece and improving upon her teacher, has been the source of law and government and social civilization: and, what neither Greece nor Rome could furnish, the perfection of moral and spiritual truth has been given by Christianity. The changes which have been wrought have arisen out of the reception of these elements by new races;—races endowed with such force of character, that what was old in itself, when exhibited in them, seemed to become something new. But races so gifted are, and have been from the beginning of the world, few in number: the mass of mankind have no such power. . . . Now, looking anxiously round the world for any new races, which may receive the seed (so to speak) of our present history into a kindly yet vigorous soil, and may reproduce it, the same and yet new, for a future period, we know not where such are to be found. Some appear exhausted, others incapable; and yet the whole surface of the globe is known to us. . . . Everywhere the search has been made, and the report has been received. We have the full amount of earth's resources before us; and they seem inadequate to supply life for a third period of human history. I am well aware that to state this as a matter of positive belief, would be the extreme of presumption. There may be nations reserved hereafter for great purposes of God's providence, whose fitness for their appointed work will not betray itself till the work and the time for doing it be come. . . . But, without any presumptuous confidence, if there be any signs, however uncertain, that we are living in the latest periods of the world's history, that no other races remain behind to perform what we have neglected, or to restore what we have ruined, then indeed the interest of modern history becomes intense.”

Apocalypse, and all too of Daniel's prophecies which I have expounded as reaching in its range down to the present time, and yet beyond it, was fulfilled centuries ago.<sup>1</sup> By others, on the contrary, it is contended that all the Apocalypse, and whatever in Daniel's two prophecies concerns the ten-toed division of the iron legs of the image, or ten-horned division, and synchronic rise and dominancy of the little horn of the fourth Beast, still waits its fulfilment in the future;<sup>2</sup> the 1260 days of the little horn's duration in power meaning simply, say both, 1260 literal days.<sup>3</sup> And thus, though the present signs of the times may be admitted by some of them as evidence tending to the conclusion I have stated, yet that most convincing portion of the prophetic evidence,—the same substantially in kind with some that greatly tended, doubtless, to excite expectation among the Jews of Messiah's first coming as imminent in the days of Augustus,—I mean that of a long-continued parallelism of prophecy and history, reaching from a known commencing epoch, down nearly to the event expected,—is set aside.

It is my settled conviction, after much and careful thought, that each and either of these prophetic counter-theories, the præteristic and that of the futurists, in any of the multitudinous and mutually contradictory forms of either, may be shown to be self-refuting. Thus as regards the latter, and its fundamental dogma of the Man of Sin being an individual yet future, who is to sit as God, and have his image placed for worship, in some new-built Jewish temple at Jerusalem, which they would have to be called *God's* temple in St. Paul's prophecy,<sup>4</sup> though built in direct opposition to himself and

<sup>1</sup> So first the Jesuit Alcasar, then with their various modifications the Germans Eichhorn, Ewald, &c.; also Bossuet, and the American Moses Stuart. The latest Apocalyptic expositor of this class that I have seen is Mr. Desprez of Wolverhampton. I have noticed his work in a critique in the Appendix to my Warburton Lectures, p. 518. The others are reviewed in the Appendix to this fourth volume of my *Horæ Apocalyptiæ*.

<sup>2</sup> e. g. Drs. S. R. Maitland and Todd, Mr. Molyneux, &c. &c. Mr. Molyneux's book is critically noticed in my Warburton Lectures, p. 512: the others in the Appendix to the present fourth volume of the *Horæ Apocalyptiæ*. The Jesuit Ribera was, I believe, the first author, after the breaking up of the old Roman Empire, of this system of prophetic exposition.

<sup>3</sup> 2 Thess. ii. 4.

<sup>4</sup> I have vainly asked from advocates of these sentiments for any Scripture warrant for such a designation of such a temple.

The distinction is ever to be remembered between a temple *originally* founded in opposition to God's will, and one *originally* founded in accordance with it, but which may have become afterwards apostate. Even under Manasseh the old *Jewish* temple might be called God's temple, though corrupted to heathen worship, (2 Kings xxi.

the Son of His love,<sup>1</sup>—I say as regards this theory of the futurists, construct but the time-table of their Antichrist's 1260 days, and you will have there what will of itself suffice to refute it. It is during the whole of these 1260 days, or  $3\frac{1}{2}$  years, that he is, according to their interpretation of Daniel, to have his abomination standing in the Jewish temple,<sup>2</sup> (these being the  $3\frac{1}{2}$  years, observe, which end in his destruction by Christ's appearing,) and during the whole of them that the Gentiles, in subjection to Him, are to occupy the Holy City.<sup>3</sup> Yet meanwhile he is, during part at least of the self-same  $3\frac{1}{2}$  years, to be occupied in besieging Jerusalem from without, according to these self-same theorists; <sup>4</sup> and, moreover, during part to be busied sundry ways, in connexion with, and on the site of, the Roman seven-hilled city, or Apocalyptic Babylon.<sup>5</sup> For vainly do they seek Scripture warrant for assigning more than  $3\frac{1}{2}$  years, or 1260 days, (whether construed *literally*, or on the *year-day* principle,) to his duration in power.<sup>6</sup>—Again, admitting the iron legs of Daniel's image to signify the old Roman Empire, as most of them do, they must, in order to the ten-toed feet being yet future in their significance, suppose the iron legs to have appeared broken off at the ankle, and a vacuum, indicating some twelve or fourteen unrepresent-

4, 5; 2 Chron. xxxiii. 4, 5, 7,) because originally instituted by him. And similarly the symbolic temple of the Christian visible and professing Church (compare 1 Tim. iii. 15) might still be so called under the Popes, though then apostatized, because originally founded in his name, and according to his will. This distinction is perpetually overlooked by futurist expositors.

<sup>1</sup> Some futurist expositors, while disclaiming the *year-day* principle with reference to the 1260 days' prophetic period, seem to admit and adopt it with reference to the smaller Apocalyptic period of the  $3\frac{1}{2}$  days of the two witnesses lying dead. Apoc. xi. 9, 11. So "Eight Lectures on Prophecy," p. 154 (Dublin, 1853, 3rd Edition): "May not these  $3\frac{1}{2}$  days be the very period of the time, times, and half a time?" i. e.  $3\frac{1}{2}$  years, or 1260 days. So, also, many of the patristic expositors.

<sup>2</sup> Dan. xi. 31, xii. 11, compared with 2 Thess. ii. 4. This has been asserted not long since, as a certain fact, by two Christian ministers to large congregations in London churches.

<sup>3</sup> Apoc. xi. 2. "During Antichrist's reign Jerusalem will be occupied by his followers; for they will tread under-foot the holy city forty-two months. There he will slay the two witnesses; and set up the abomination in the holy place. All prophecy agrees in pointing out Jerusalem as the seat of Antichrist's kingdom." So the Rev. C. Maitland at p. 14 of his so-called Apostolic School of Prophetic Interpretation: though with Apoc. xvii. before him.

<sup>4</sup> Zech. xiv. 2. This is an essential part of the futurist theory.

<sup>5</sup> Apoc. xvii. 3, 4, 5, 18.

<sup>6</sup> This duration is fixed alike by Dan. vii. 25, and Apoc. xiii. 5; and it is at the end of the three and a half years of his sitting in the temple to receive worship and oppressing the saints, that, according to Dan. vii., Apoc. xiii., and 2 Thess. ii., he is to be destroyed by the brightness of Christ's coming.

ed centuries, (unrepresented through the all-important times of the Papacy!) to have separated in the vision between those imperial legs of iron, and the feet and ten toes of mixed iron and clay.<sup>1</sup>—No; the evidence of *continuous* prophecy as fulfilled in *continuous* history remains, I am well persuaded, to us. Coincidences, great and small, running all down the line, even to the present time, establish the connexion between the one and the other. And as, when travelling down by rail, as I have often done, to the westward, I may feel sure that I am at length approaching the terminus at Torquay, not simply because of seeing the fair valley of King's-Kerswell between Newton and Torquay on either side of me, (for valleys similarly fair there are elsewhere that resemble it,) but because I have seen past in succession all the several intervening places along the line of route,—the towers of Windsor, the red-brick buildings of Reading, the Didcot and the Swindon stations, the cities of Bath, Bristol, and Exeter, and in fine the towns of Teymouth and Newton, each and every one with its own peculiar and distinguishing characteristics,—just such is the convincing effect to my own judgment of the evidence of continuously fulfilled prophecy from Daniel's time even to the present; and the fact of the time now present being thereby shown, as well as by other signs of the times, to be in very truth near the termination of the 1260 years, and close consequently at least to the time of the end. Signs of the times, such as we now see around us, furnish a powerful corroboration to our conclusion as to the world's present position in the prophetic calendar. But they will not do by themselves. By one well-known futurist expositor it has been confessed that, on the evidence *he* has to offer, the destruction of Babylon and so Christ's second coming, coincidently, may either be close at hand or ages distant.<sup>2</sup> And here he speaks *on his theory* reasonably.

<sup>1</sup> Drs. S. R. Maitland and Todd, as I have stated earlier in this work, Vol. iii. p. 298, would have the *whole of the iron legs* future, as the symbol of a supposed future Antichrist's future kingdom. They thus would have the gap in the statue between the bottom of the brazen thighs, and the beginning of the iron legs; in symbolization of some thirteen or twenty unrepresented centuries, according as the third empire is made by them the Greek, or the Roman. I have ventured to suggest that it might, perhaps, suffice to disabuse them of their hallucinations on this point, if they would simply publish a lithograph of the statue sketched according to this view of it; with the iron legs separated at a distance by some empty void from the thighs of brass; or dangling suspended from above the knee-joints by a long thin thread.

<sup>2</sup> The Rev. C. Maitland in his so-called "Apostolic School of Prophetic Interpreta-



Nor, indeed, are other objectors wanting. There are some so-called expositors who, explaining the numerals of the great prophetic periods as simply typical, would make them all but meaningless; and thus set aside all argument as to the world's present position in the prophetic calendar drawn from them.<sup>1</sup> And some there are who indulge themselves further in sneers at the disappointments of one and another of earlier or more recent Protestant interpreters, who, having calculated the 1260 years from some too early a commencing epoch,<sup>2</sup> have had their expectations of Messiah's then coming to judgment falsified by the event:—whence a suggestion as to the folly of such calculations altogether.

About such objectors, however, I little trouble myself: remembering the similar mistake of dating the 70 weeks' commencing epoch from too early a decree, into which some of the Jews, as we saw, may have probably fallen shortly before the time of Jesus Christ's birth; and yet how, calculated from a later decree as the commencing epoch, that famous prophecy was found to have its fulfilment in respect of time, as well as in respect of all other particulars, in the coming, life, and death of Jesus.—Nor, yet again, is my mind affected, nor are my convictions of judgment disturbed, by the allegorizing system of our modern Philos;<sup>3</sup> who would explain away the promised second coming itself of our blessed Lord, with all its glorious accompaniments, as nothing personal, and almost nothing real. The thing is too absurd, except on principles of direct infidelity, which is disclaimed.—But there is another kind of difficulty in the way of realizing its probable nearness (one to which I made allusion at the opening of this Paper) which I confess does exercise on me, almost in spite of myself, a most powerful influence towards the deadening of my faith in the fact: i. e. the generally thoughtlessness, scepticism, and indifference of the mass of men around me on

tion," p. 101. "Of the yet remaining length of Rome's career we know nothing certain from prophecy. It may be that the sorceress has before her long ages of iniquity; it may be that we are now resisting her latest arts." I have heard other futurists make the same confession.

<sup>1</sup> e. g. very lately Hengstenberg. See p. 687 *suprà*.

<sup>2</sup> Mede, Brightman, Cuninghame, &c. The sneering at such mistaken calculations of prophetic times is very common.

<sup>3</sup> The Rev. B. Jowett, Greek Professor at Oxford, seems almost to aspire to this character by his late publication on St. Paul's Epistles. See my brief notice of his speculations on St. Paul's prophecy 2 Thess. ii. in the Appendix to my Volume of Warburton Lectures.

the subject. Is it possible, I think with myself, that so unparalleled an event in the world's history can be near at hand with all its infinitely important results, and yet the world be so utterly unaware and thoughtless about it? Then, however, I again resort to the parallel sketched in this Paper. I bethink me of the world's general unpreparedness and thoughtlessness about Messiah's *first* coming, when quite near at hand, and how, mighty as may be that coming which we have now to expect, it cannot be an event mightier, or more wonderful, than Messiah's first coming; seeing that that was in truth nothing less than the *incarnation in human flesh and blood* of the INFINITE SELF-EXISTENT ONE, THE CREATOR, the INHABITER OF ETERNITY. Moreover, I remember our Lord's own premonitory warning, to the effect that in the last days the general careless state of the world before His coming would be just such as that we see around us: that like as it was in the days of Noah, and like as it was in the days of Lot, so should it then be with men:—eating and drinking, marrying and giving in marriage, immersed in worldly business, worldly politics, worldly pleasures; and with all going on just as usual. Just agreeable with which, too, is St. Peter's prophecy; "There shall come in the last days scoffers, walking after their own lusts, and saying, Where is the promise of His coming? for, since the fathers fell asleep, all things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation." It becomes me evidently, and all who are conscious of similar weakness of faith, very earnestly to battle against such scepticism. And, in order to this, after the most careful consideration of Scripture prophetic evidence on this subject, and when the judgment has been sufficiently satisfied with its consistency and strength, then to ask the teaching of that Holy Spirit, who can alone savingly impress upon the soul Scripture verities:—Him who effectually taught Jesus Christ's early disciples to recognize Messiah on his first coming, when the Jews generally, in spite even of their previous expectancy, failed to recognize Him: and who, on the subject of Messiah's promised *second* coming, is able now also to lead the sincere inquirer into all truth.

# INDICES.

## I.

### GENERAL INDEX.

- Abassides, the, A. D. 750, supplant the Omniades, i. 461
- Abdalahman, i. 455.
- Abomination of desolation, (Dan. xi. 31,) that set up by Romans on destruction of Jerusalem, i. 56, 632; iv. 80—85, 661; —another different one the commencing epoch of Daniel's 1260 days, iv. 111, 112; Jews' view of, iii. 262.
- Abraham, double covenant with, the spiritual and the national, iv. 159—162; to have their final fulfilment together, 219
- Αβυσσος*, abyss, meaning of, i. 440, 441; scorpion locusts from, 412, 443; Beast originates from, iii. 83; consistent with rising out of sea, *ibid.*; Devil shut up in, iv. 132
- Accommodation, German neological theory of, iii. 319.
- "Accuser of the brethren," iii. 35
- Acts of the Apostles, chronology of, iii. 561—580
- Adoption, Roman law of, i. 145; united the five emperors from Nerva to M. Aurelius, 144, 145
- Advents, Christ's 1st and 2nd, signs of nearness compared, iv. 709
- Ælfric, Archbishop, A. D. 957, his injunction on priests to explain the gospel and teach the people, ii. 169
- Æneas Sylvius, Pope, ii. 36
- Æra of Martyrs, i. 209, 222
- Africa, Portuguese discoveries in, guaranteed to Portugal by the Pope, ii. 73
- Age, probable, of the Adamic world, iv. 701—709
- "Ages to come," interested in our earth's history, iv. 223
- Agobard (Archbishop of Lyons, A. D. 810), an opponent of image and saint-worship, and witness for gospel-truth, ii. 232; a chorepiscopus, 231
- Air, vial poured out upon the, iv. 19
- Alaric and Rhadagaisus, invasions of Italy by, i. 375—378
- Albigenses, the (or Cathari), amalgamated with the Waldenses, ii. 294, 357, 371, 403
- Aleasar, iv. 484, 565
- Alcuin, his homilies, ii. 159; extract from his works, on reading the Scriptures, ii. 230
- Aleander, Cardinal, his fears in 1521 at Luther's progress, ii. 461
- Alexander the Great, the he-goat's notable horn of Dan. viii., iii. 427; the mighty King of Dan. xi. 3, iv. 60; quadri-partition of empire at his death, iii. 438
- Alexander VI, (Pope,) his Bull decreeing worship to departed saints, ii. 26
- Alfred, his attempts at reviving Scripture teaching among the people, ii. 160
- Algiers, French invasion of, iii. 451
- Ali, first Vizir of Mahomet, i. 458
- "All," limitation of sense to the words, i. 58, 59, 245; iii. 190; iv. 620
- Alleluia on the fall of Babylon, and on the marriage of the Lamb, iv. 46, 49
- Allemani, or Alleman-Franks, a horn of the Beast, iii. 140
- All Saints' day, A. D. 1517, the Saxon Elector's dream on, ii. 189; the epoch of the Reformation, 100, 458
- Allusive contrast, principle of, in the Apocalypse, i. 113; illustrated, 272—274; first application of, to the vision of the sealed ones by Christ in the sealing vision, contrasted with the mere baptismal sealed ones, 274—286:—second application to the vision of the incense-offering saints of God, contrasted with those who forsook Christ's mediatorship for the saints' in the 4th century, 330—341: third application to the rainbow-vested Angel, with one foot on land, one on sea, ii. 49, 55—59, 61, 62—89:—also in Apocalyptic notices of power given to the two Witnesses, *ib.* 407, 408; of Papal Rome's title as the Christ-crucifying Jerusalem, &c., just before the Reformation, ii. 442—445; iii. 309, 310; and of the cup of Babylon's fornication, about the time of the 7th Vial, iv. 31
- Alogi, i. 24
- Alp Arslan, "the valiant lion," invades Greek empire, i. 498
- Altar, *brazen*, cry of souls of the martyrs under, i. 207; figure illustrated from histories of early Christian martyrs, 222—224; incense received at, 328—330; ii. 515, 516
- Altar, *golden*, incense offered on, i. 327, voice from, 480—485
- Altar, "*the*," discussion on, with reference to Apoc. xi. 1, as always meaning the *brazen*, ii. 509—519; voice from, in 3rd Vial, iii. 381, 382, 388
- Altar-court, use of the, in the Apocalyptic

- scenery, i. 206; symbolic meaning of "the altar and them which worship at it," Apoc. xi. 1, ii. 183—185
- Altars, Christian primitive *wooden tables* changed into *altars*, i. 294
- Ambrose, prophetic views respecting Antichrist, and the consummation, i. 389, 391
- America, discovery of, by Columbus, ii. 72; alluded to in the prophecy, 73; enfeoffed to Spain by different Popes, 73, 74
- American revolution, date of, after end of the Turkish woe, iii. 343
- Angel, (divine,) sealing from the East (Christ), i. 274, 275, 283; the incense-offering, 326—329; the rainbow-circled, ii. 40, 41, 128, &c.; identical with the "man" who appeared to Daniel, (Dan. x. 5,) 130
- Angel (created) woe-denouncing, i. 387; of the bottomless pit, 451; of the waters, iii. 386; from the altar, 382, 388; iv. 14; first flying, with the everlasting gospel, iii. 462—464, 490; second flying, 461; third flying, iv. 2; revealer of the judgment of the whore of Babylon, 42; standing in the sun, 53; binder of Satan, 131
- Angels, a portion of the heavenly company, i. 94; agency of, 109. The four tempest-angels, 253; identified with the four Euphratean, 490—495; A. of the seven trumpets, 367; of the seven vials, iii. 338, 353. Worship of, forbidden by the Council of Laodicea, i. 339; not to be worshipped, iv. 52
- of the Churches, meaning of the phrase, i. 74
- Angelic days for years, ii. 140; iii. 284; iv. 441
- Anger of the nations, on seventh Trumpet's sounding, iii. 335
- Anglo-Saxon Church of the 7th century, opposed to images, ii. 227
- Anglo-Saxons a horn of the Beast, iii. 135, 138
- Animals, appropriateness of, as emblems in Scripture, i. 423—426
- Ansbertus (Ambrosius). See *Apocalyptic Interpretation*, 3rd Period.
- Antichrist, strict meaning of the term a *Vice-Christ* or *Counter-Christ*, i. 64, 65; iii. 105; probable time of his appearance, St. John's speculations respecting, i. 66—69; iii. 614; early patristic anticipations of, 229, 230, 359—394; iii. 108; iv. 654—660; Gregory the Great's anticipations of, i. 401—403; early resemblance of the Roman Popes to, 411—415
- epoch of his triumph under Leo X, ii. 48—89; his face as the sun, 62—70; his feet on land and sea, 70—75; his cry as a lion roaring, 75—86
- allusion to, forbidden by Leo X, ii. 84; Luther's discovery and recognition of, 117—124
- Vaudois creed respecting, ii. 370, 371, 394—397; Popes not suspected to be Antichrist before the 12th century, 424; identity of, with the Apocalyptic Beast, iii. 104—108; the Roman Popes' development as, in the 5th and 6th centuries, 152—159; (see generally *Beast and Popes*;) coming with signs and lying wonders, 166, 167; final judgment of, iv. 53, 131
- Antichristianism, Gregory the 1st's views as to nature of, i. 401, 402
- Antigods, heathen, iii. 614
- Antiochus Epiphaneus, iv. 75—77, 82—84.
- Anti-popes, iii. 105
- Antonines, the prosperous æra of, i. 130—134, 152, 172; Antoninus Aurelius not a persecutor of the Christians, i. 217
- Apocalypse, the genuineness of, i. 1—31; parallelism of, with other of St. John's writings, 5, 6; early testimonials to its genuineness as St. John's, 9—30; received into the canon of Scripture at the Council of Carthage (A.D. 397), 31
- date of, i. 32—47; written A.D. 95 or 96 under Domitian, 47, 533—548
- its opening vision, i. 82—96; its symbolic scenery, 97—104; its plan, 104—107, 114, 115; its pre-eminent grandeur, 106—110; character and principles of present exposition of, 110—117; its six main parts, 114, 115; mixture of literal and symbolic in, 355—358
- Apocalyptic interpretation, sketch of the history of, iv. 275—563
1. From St. John to Constantine:—including the *Pseudo-Sibyl*, *Justin Martyr*, *Irenæus*, *Tertullian*, *Hippolytus*, *Victorinus*, *Methodius*, *Lactantius*, 276—310
  2. From Constantine to Fall of Roman empire:—including *Athanasius*, *Hilary*, *Eusebius*, *Cyril of Jerusalem*, *Ephrem Syrus*, *Chrysostom*, *Jerome*, *Augustine*, *Tichonius*, 310—336
  3. From Fall of Roman empire, A.D. 500 to A.D. 1100:—including *Primasius*, *Bede*, *Ambrosius Ansbertus*, *Haymo*, *Andreas*, *Arethas*, *Berenguud*, *Adso*, 336—381
  4. From A.D. 1100 to the Reformation:—including *Anselm of Havelburg*, *Joachim Abbas*, *T. Aquinas*, *Pierre d'Olive*, *the Waldenses*, *Walter Brute*, 381—436
  5. Æra and Century of Reformation:—including the reforming fathers *Luther*, *Osiander*, *Bullinger*, *Bale*, *Chytræus*, *Marlorat*, *Foze*, *Brightman*, *Pareus*; also the Romanists *Ribera*, *Alcasar*, *Bellarmino*; also *Cressener*, 436—484
  6. From end of Æra and Century of Reformation to French Revolution; including *Mede*, *Jurieu*, *Bossuet*, *Vtringa*, *Daubuz*, *Sir I. Newton*, *Whiston*, *Bengel*, *Bishop Newton*, *Firmin Abauzit*, *Senler*, *Herder*, *Hernschneider*, *Eichhorn*, *Hug*, 485—529



7. From French Revolution to present time : including *Pere Lambert*, *Lacunza*, *Galloway*, *Bicheno*, *Faber*, *Cunninghame*, *Frere*; *S. R. Maitland*, *Burgh*, and the *Futurists*, down to the "*Horæ Apoc.*," 529—563
- Apocalyptic chief general Counter-Schemes to that in the *Horæ*, examined and refuted, iv. 564—700
1. That of *Præterists* : including, 1. the *Neronic* solution, as propounded by *Eichhorn*, *M. Stuart*, &c. 565—584; 2. the *Diocletianic* solution, propounded by *Bossuet*, *Mylie*, and other Romanists, 585—594
  2. That of the *Futurists*; especially as advocated by *Maitland*, *Burgh*, and the *Oxford Tractator* on Antichrist, 596—631
  3. Futurist modified Counter-Schemes of Mr. Barker and W. Kelly, 630—653
  4. Dr. Arnold's general prophetic scheme, 664—679
- Counter *Church-Scheme of Seals*; especially as advocated by *Cunninghame* and *Bickersteth*, i. 549—568
- Counter-*Millenary* schemes of, by *Wordsworth*, *Hengstenberg*, *Fairbairn*, *Waldegrave*, iv. 680—699
- Apocalyptic Prophecy, Patristic views of non-futurist, iv. 653—664
- Practical application of. See *Application*.
- Apollonius, i. 23
- Apologies, Christian (under persecution), i. 217—219
- Apostasy, *αποστασία*, two different meanings of, *political* and *religious*, iii. 93; the apostasy of 2 Thess. ii. *religious*, and *within* the professing Church, *ibid.*; "The man of the apostasy," 95
- St. John's anticipations of, in Patmos, i. 64; Patristic views respecting, see *Prophecy*.
- first general intimation of, as preparing in the Church, i. 264, 265; historically realized in 4th century, 266—268; *first* form and principles of it hinted in the Sealing Vision, as antichristian and baptismal, 270—287; mixt incipient Judaic and heathen elements of, 296; antidote to, in the revelation of the doctrines of electing grace, and of the distinctive Church of the elect, 296—319.
- saint-worship the *second* great step of, i. 330—341.
- almost brought to perfection by the close of the 6th century, 405—415; Mahomet's mission against the, 467
- Apostate king, the, of Dan. ix. 36 (called inaptly the *Wifful King*), iv. 91—100
- Apostolic succession, on Romish or Tractarian principles, not to be proved, ii. 177, 178, iii. 527
- Application of the Apocalyptic subject, iv. 255—274; to the nation, 255; to the Church of England, 256; to other Churches, 264; to Romanists, 271; to individuals, 272
- Appropriateness of Scripture symbols, i. 420—431
- Arabia, Rev. H. Foster's view of its colonization, i. 446, 447
- Arabs, description of the, by Pliny, Jerome, &c., i. 433—439. See *Saracens*.
- Arch of Trajan, i. 134; of Hadrian, *ibid.*; of Constantine, i. 242
- Arefaste, ii. 270
- Argas, near Melitene, a refuge place of the Paulikians in the 9th century, ii. 261
- Arius and Arianism, iii. 26, 44; Arianism destroyed in the Roman empire, 56.
- Ark of God appearing, iii. 463, 488
- Armada, destruction of, ii. 485
- Armageddon, origin of the name, iii. 532, 553, iv. 16, 19—21
- Arm (Dan. xi.), iv. 64
- Arndt, iii. 321
- Arnobius receives the Apocalypse, i. 28
- Arnold of Brescia, ii. 247
- Arnold, Dr. i. 287, iii. 529, iv. 654
- Arnulph of Orleans, A.D. 991; his reference of the *Antichrist sitting in God's temple*, and showing himself as if God, to the Pope of Rome, iii. 285
- Arras, Council of, A.D. 1025, examination of certain heretics at, ii. 275—277
- Artillery, Turkish, allusion to, under the 6th Trumpet, i. 509—512; of Buona-parte, iii. 392
- Asia, the word used by the Romans in four senses, i. 52; Epistles to the seven Churches of, 75—81
- Assembly, French National Legislative, and Convention, at commencement of French Revolution, iii. 349, 360
- Assumption, the Pope's, ii. 60, 61
- Astulphus, Alaric's successor, iii. 63
- Athanasius, often quotes the Apocalypse, i. 28; champion of the Trinitarian faith, and persecuted by the Arians, iii. 44.
- Athanasian Creed, i. 274, 418
- Atheism of the Papal priesthood before the Reformation, ii. 37, 38, 54 :—that in France previously to the Revolution, the consequence of the Papal system, iii. 364—366
- Athingani (*Αθιγγανοί*), an appellation of Paulikians, explained, ii. 309
- Atmospheric phenomena of 1818, (Vial poured on the *air*), iv. 26, 27
- Atonement, three Jewish rites of, i. 482—484; continued departure from true doctrine of, by Greek Christendom in 11th century, 484—486
- Attila, the scourge of God, i. 380—382.
- Atto, Bishop of Vercelli, A.D. 945, ii. 243
- Augsburg, 1st Diet of, A.D. 1525, Apology by Melanethon at, ii. 197 :—2nd Diet of,

- A.D. 1530, Protestant Confession at, 198; anti-protestant decree of, 465
- Augusti, by Dioeletian's constitution, the two senior emperors, i. 199, iii. 17, 123—126
- Augustine, sketch of his life, i. 305, 306; his conversion before baptism, 307, 308; his doctrines of election, grace, and final perseverance of the saints, 308—310; especially in his "City of God," 309, 318; fulfilment in these his views of the sealing and palm-bearing visions shown to St. John, 309—316; his rejection of saint-worship, 342—344; views respecting Antichrist, 391; witness for the Church of the election of grace, contradistinctively to the visible corporate Church, ii. 219; his witness perpetuated afterwards, i. 316; ii. 221—224
- Augustinianism, an antidote to the first principles of the apostasy, i. 319
- Rome's aversion to, 316;
- English Church characterized by it, 317; iv. 263
- Auricular confession fostered by Popes in 5th century, i. 409; enjoined by 4th Lateran Council, ii. 14. See *Confession*.
- Auvergne, volcanic eruptions in, A.D. 458, i. 378
- Avar Tartars, their invasion of Roman empire in 6th century, i. 398

## B

- Babylon, the Woman (Apoc. xvii.), meant of Rome Papal, iv. 30—38; fall of, announced, iv. 42—44
- , Papal, call of God's people out of her, immediately before her destruction, iv. 44; judgment on, by volcanic fire, 44—49
- Bacon, Lord, on prophecy, Pref.; on Ps. cxxvi., iv. 129
- Bagdad, i. 461, 462, 495; the place where the four tempest-angels were bound and loosed, 495—498; the site of ancient Seleucia, iii. 441, 442; religious capital of Turkish Sultan, i. 505; the plague at, and depopulation of, A.D. 1821—1831, iii. 452, 453
- Bajazet, i. 531
- Balance of deceit, i. 188
- Balances, Roman Governors' emblem of equity, i. 170; on their coins, 185
- Bale, Bishop, his prophetic views, ii. 143; iv. 450—457
- Baptism, magical virtues ascribed to, on and after Constantine's time, in 4th century, i. 278—282, 286, 288, 289; delay of it to deathbed, 290, 291; doctrine of its ex opere operato efficacy allusively condemned in the Apocalypse, 286; became an inveterate anti-christian error in the visible Church, 287, 409
- Baptized, multitudes of, after Constantine's establishment of Christianity, i. 255
- Barley, article of Roman taxation, i. 175; its price at different times, in proportion to that of wheat, 183
- Barnabas—pseudo, iv. 276
- Bartholomew's (St.) day, massacre of, ii. 488, iii. 191; retribution of, 371, 372
- Basil (the 2nd), A.D. 1020, his long reign, and view of state of the world during it, i. 474—479; his conquest of the Bulgarians, 475
- Basil, St., receives the Apocalypse, i. 30
- Βασιλευς*, used in sense of chief ruling magistrates, iii. 78
- Bathkol, ii. 103
- Bavarians, a horn of the Beast, iii. 140
- Baxter, the Rev. R., iii. 321
- Beard, various mode of wearing among the ancients, i. 435
- Beast from the sea, with seven heads and ten horns (the first Apocalyptic Beast), the Dragon's substitute and successor, iii. 70, 83. See *Antichrist, Man of Sin, Popes*.
- identical with Beast from abyss, iii. 70—86, 548—559
- the principal of the two Apocalyptic Beasts, iii. 109; and not the Western secular empire, 112—114
- Beast's eighth or last head identical with Daniel's 4th Beast's little horn, iii. 87—91; also identical with St. Paul's Man of Sin, iii. 91—103; also identical with St. John's Antichrist, 104—108, 612
- seven heads figure, 1st, Rome's seven hills, iii. 111—114; 2ly, figure also seven classes or lines of Roman supreme governors, viz. kings, consuls, &c., 114; of which the several badges given, 125.
- 7th and 8th heads, former expositors' opinions about, unsatisfactory, iii. 120, 121; Christian emperors no head to it, 114, 120
- explanation of, proposed in the Hore: viz. that of first seven are same with Dragon's seven heads, and 8th or last head same with Dragon's 7th revived head in Apoc. xiii., iii. 115, 116; which last head *one of the seven*, as the seventh *visible* on the Beast in vision, iii. 121
- explanation of, *historically*. The original 7th head shown by the diadems on the Dragon's heads (or Rome's hills) to be Dioeletian's tetrarchy of the Roman empire, iii. 122—127; which 7th head wounded to death by Roman Christian Emperors, 127—129
- 8th head realized in the Roman Popes, iii. 130, 131
- ten horns, or Romano-Gothic kingdoms, list of, for the year 486, iii. 135—137; list for 532 A.D., 138—140; diademed, 142—147; their connection with the Roman Popes (i. e. the Beast's 8th head) as their common spiritual head, iii. 148, 164—166
- ten horns not kingly democracies, hostile to the Harlot after 7th Trumpet, iii. 79, 551

- Beast, development of the Papal head in the precise character of Antichrist, iii. 152—159
- imperial legalization as Antichrist, iii. 159—163
  - early supremacy over the ten kings, iii. 164—166.
  - in his maturity, from Charlemagne to French Revolution, iii. 174; his pride, 174—178; and blasphemies, 178—186; his recognized supremacy as Christ's Vice-gerent over kings and people, 186—190
  - his oppression of the saints, iii. 190—192; ii. 423—427. See *Witnesses*.
  - eyes as eyes of a man, iii. 173; mouth as lion, 174
  - mark, name, and number, iii. 239—260; figure derived from slaves', soldiers', and devotees' marks, 240, 241; number of name illustrated, 241—245; name *Λατρευτος*, 247—254; list of other solutions, 254—256
  - his mark, meaning *profession of devotion to Pope and Romish Church*, imposed on all by Romish Priesthood, iii. 257—259; recusants interdicted from buying and selling, 259, 260
  - in xiith Century makes war upon Christ's Witnesses, ii. 423—427; succeeds in defeating and killing them, 427—456. See *Witnesses*.
  - throne of, the subject of the 5th Vial's outpouring, iii. 395—408
  - final judgment on the, iv. 52—54
  - the *second* or *two-horned*, like a *lamb*, the chief minister of the first Beast, figures the Romish Clergy, iii. 195; reduced into a body united in subjection to the Roman Patriarch, as its head, by acts of Gregory I and Wilfrid, 201—209; its two lamb-like horns, (episcopal and monastic,) and the pallium, 205—209; its power and acts, 210—219. See *Clergy, Papal*.
  - final destruction of, iv. 53
  - of the earth, (Apoc. vi. 8,) plague of, alluded to by Arnobius, i. 194, 200
- Becket, (Thomas a'), pilgrimages to, and riches of, his shrine at Canterbury, ii. 18
- "*Before him*," force of the expression, as referred to Antichrist, iii. 194, 208, 212, 213; to Christ, 208, 311
- Beghards, an appellation given to the Bohemian United Brethren, ii. 571, 572
- Believers, *πιστοι* (Apoc. xvii. 14), difference of Apocalyptic and early-received ecclesiastical view of the, i. 282, 286, &c. See *Saints*.
- "*Beloved City*," the, what? iv. 218
- Benedict founds, in 529, the Benedictine Order, iii. 204
- Berengaud, his list of the ten kings, iii. 141
- Berenger, some account of, ii. 278—280; his notable statement respecting the Romish Church, 281, 424
- Bernard (St.) an exalter of Papal authority, iii, 218; his testimony to corruptions of Romish Church, ii. 24
- Beveridge, Bishop, iii. 321
- Bible, ignorance of, in the middle ages, ii. 14, 15; price of, in England, in 1274, ii. 21; P. Valdes' translation of, 21, 374—379; finding of one by Luther, 91; the then general ignorance of, by Romanists, 91, 92; Luther's translation of, 168; significant use of, at ordinations in the Church of England, 179, 180
- Bibles, forbidden to laity in Greek Church in the 9th century, ii. 257; forbidden in middle ages by Popes and Councils, 21, 22; want of, in France at time of Buonaparte's Consulship, iii. 414
- Bible Societies, institution of, iii. 484; Papal Bulls against them, 419
- Βιβλιαριδίου (Apoc. x.), Mede's grand error in interpreting, ii. 45; St. John's taking it from the Angel significant of what, 179, 180
- Biley, Mr., his view of the birth of the man-child in Apoc. xii., iii. 25—27
- Bishop, universal, Gregory the 1st's declaration about, as the fitting title of Antichrist, i. 401; Roman Pope's assumption of the title, immediately after Gregory, 412
- Bitthis, Greek epigram on, i. 142
- Blasphemy, the name of, Gregory the 1st's opinion about, i. 402; a characteristic of Antichrist, iii. 102; what? iii. 185; characteristic of the Pope, *ibid.*; rife in time of the vials, or French Revolution, 410—422
- "*Blessed the dead that die in the Lord*," iv. 5—7
- he that keepeth his garments," iv. 19
- Blessedness of the world to come, promise of, iv. 175—184; contemporaneous with the first resurrection, 184
- Blondus (Flavio) cited, iii. 131
- Blood, martyrs', remains of, in vases in the Roman catacombs, i. 225
- Bohemian Hussites and Taborites, persecuted by Popes, ii. 29
- United Brethren, rise of, A.D. 1457, ii. 29; mission of in 1497, in search of witnesses for Christ, *vain*, 39, 429, 430; their witnessing nearly suppressed soon after, 431, 446—449
- Bonaventura, his blasphemous Psalter, ii. 26
- Bondari. See *Emadeddin*.
- Boniface, St. See *Wilfrid*.
- Boni Homines; heretics so called condemned at the Council of Lombers (A.D. 1165), ii. 294—297
- Book, the seven-sealed (Apoc. v.), opening of, by the Lamb, i. 95, 96; form of, 104—106
- of gospels, or New Testament, delivered into hand of Reader, or Deacon, in the early forms of ordination, ii. 163, 164; Bossuet on the Church in the wilderness, iii. 46, 66
- Bourbons expelled from France, iii. 504

- Bow, a Cretan symbol, i. 139—143  
 Bozrah, winepress trodden in, iv. 53  
 Bread, deified, ii. 11. See *Transubstantiation*.  
 Breastplates, iron, of Arabs, i. 435, 439  
 Bride, the, arrayed in fine linen, iv. 51, 52  
 British early Church, i. 60  
 Brown, Rev. David, iii. 487  
 Bulgarian irruption into Illyricum in 6th century, i. 418; successes A.D. 903, 476; subdued by Basil, A.D. 1017, 477  
 Bull, Unam Sanctam. See *Unam Sanctam*.  
 Bulls, Papal, transcribed in order to publication, ii. 119  
 Bullinger the Reformer, ii. 142, iv. 442  
 Buonaparte, his first campaign, iii. 384; his disposal of kingdoms, 390; his artillery, 392; despoils the Papacy and Rome, 399—405; his concordat with the Pope, re-establishing Romanism, 413  
 Burgundians, or Burgundio-Franks, a horn of the Beast, iii. 136, 138  
 Burial, denial of, by Papal Councils to heretics, ii. 452, 453; figuratively predicated of Christ's two slain witnesses, 454—456  
 Burke on the French Revolution, iii. 350, 366, 371, 373  
 Byss, iv. 203  
 Byzantine Greek dynasties,—the *Heracelian*, *Isaurian*, *Phrygian*, *Macedonian*, *Comnenian*, from A.D. 600 to 1057, i. 474; *Comnenian* and *Palæologian*, 486, 487
- C
- Caaba, keys of, i. 446  
 Cabul, i. 478  
 Cæsars, title of the two junior emperors, under Diocletian, i. 199, iii. 17, 126  
 Cæsarius, Bishop of Arles, ii. 222  
 Caietan, the Cardinal's sermon in the 5th Lateran Council, ii. 80, 442; intrusted with brief against Luther, 120  
 Caius, his doubts about author of Apocalypse, i. 25  
 Calendar, the prophetic, our present place in, iv. 224—243  
 Caliph, i. e. *Vicar* of Mahomet, i. 452  
 Caliphate, first division into two, i. 461; split into three, 478; transferred to, and concentrated in, the Turkish Sultan in 1517, i. 504  
 Calixtines, ii. 447, 448, 567—572  
 "Called and chosen and faithful," contrast of the ecclesiastical and the true view of, i. 282—285. See *Saints*.  
 Campagna, Roman, iii. 552; iv. 32, 36—40  
 Cancellieri, his "Solenni Possessi" cited, ii. 111, 112, iii. 184, &c.  
 Candia conquered by the Turks in 1669, ii. 491  
 Candlesticks, the seven, St. John's primary vision of, i. 72  
 ——— the two (Apoc. xi. 4), meaning of, ii. 209, 210:—the Waldensian, 406  
 Canary Isles, grant of by the Pope to Portugal, ii. 72  
 Canonization of saints, Popes' prerogative, iii. 180; examples and expenses of, ii. 16, 26, 27; continued after French Revolution, iii. 420  
 Canon Law, Papal, iii. 175  
 ——— Frumentarius, Roman, imperial, i. 176  
 Canonical hours, ii. 157  
 Caracalla, famous edict of, i. 172; Provincial oppression through it, 177  
 Carbeas, a Paulikian leader, ii. 264  
 Carcassone, disputation held near, at Montreuil, (A.D. 1207,) between Albigenses and Romanists, ii. 371  
 Cardinals, the supporters of the Papal throne, compared to the Cherubim full of eyes in letter to Council of Vienne, A.D. 1312, iii. 184  
 Carlowitz, Peace of, A.D. 1698, ii. 491  
 Catacombs at Rome, i. 225, 254  
 Cathari, a title of certain reputed heretics, ii. 289  
 Catholicity, one of the characteristics of the Beast's kingdom, iii. 214  
 Catholic Emancipation Bill, A.D. 1829, iii. 504  
 Cavalry, Turkish, Apocalyptically figured dress of, i. 508  
 Cecil, Rev. R., iii. 70, 482  
 Celestine III, Pope, kicks the imperial crown, on occasion of crowning the Emperor Henry VI, iii. 176, 177  
 Celibacy, forced, of Clergy, begun in 6th Century, i. 410; impurity resulting, ii. 13, 14, iv. 628  
 Chanting of Psalms early begun in Churches, ii. 157, 158  
 Charlemagne's donation to the Popes, iii. 170; his Pope-favouring decree, 205  
 Charles V. Emperor, his providential embroilments with divers nations, ii. 467, 468; attempts the subjugation of the Protestants, 468, 469  
 Charroux, Council of, heretics condemned at, in 1028, ii. 277  
 Cherubim, the angelic nature of, i. 87—91  
 Chiliads, seven, of the great city (Apoc. xi. 13), meaning of the phrase, ii. 475—477; fall of, fulfilled in the Protestantizing of the seven Dutch Provinces, 478—481  
 Χιλιαρχοι, Septuagint use of the word, ii. 477  
 Chittim, ships from (Dan. xi. 30), iv. 77  
 Chœnix, various kinds of, i. 161—163; the Attic intended in Apoc. vi. 6, 164. See *Διλειτρον*.  
 Cholera, A.D. 1820—1830, wastes the Turkish dominions, iii. 452, 453  
 Chorepiscopi, what, and ordination by, ii. 174—176, iii. 527  
 Christ, his ascension, i. 53; said to be present in Leo X's procession, ii. 59—61; discovery of, as the Saviour, at the Reformation, 90—102; his divine commission to the ministers of the Reformation, 180; crucified afresh in the Romish system, 438, 439, 445:—Christ's coming



- spoken of in 2 Thess. ii. is his second coming, iii. 95. See *Coming*.
- Christ, superseded in the professing Church as *life-giver*, i. 287; as *mediator and intercessor*, 336
- Christ's Vicar, assumption of the title by the Pope, i. 412, iii. 157, 158
- Christendom, *Eastern*, apparent security of, at the beginning of the xiii century, i. 474—479; Turkish invasion of, 497—532
- *Western*, retrospective view of its political history during the former half (from 1057 to 1453) of second woe, ii. 1—8; of its corruptions, 8—32; its dæmonolatry and idolatry, 8—11, 25, 26; its corruption of morals, 12—14, 28; sorceries, 15—17, 26; thefts, 17—20, 27; murders, 20—23, 28—30; continued impenitence, after fall of Constantinople, 25—32; its hopeless state before the Reformation as to religion, 38, 39; its present position, iv. 210—212
- Christianity, paganized, i. 341; establishment of, in Roman Empire, i. 251, iii. 23, 24
- Christians, persecution of, under Diocletian, i. 209, 210; persecutions prior to Diocletian, 210—221
- Chronological prophetic periods, iv. 237; convergency of, 238—240
- Chronology of the world, Septuagint, i. 395—397, 471; in the middle age superseded in Western Christendom, *ibid.*
- Clinton's Hebrew, iv. 701—709
- Usher's, *ibid.* 709
- Jewish Calendar's, *ibid.*
- of the 1260 years, iv. 238. See *Days, Justinian, Phocas.*
- Church, the *worshipping, in Paradise*, represented by the 24 elders and 4 *ζωα*, in the Apocalyptic temple's most holy place, i. 93, 94; that on *earth* by the temple-court and its worshippers, 101
- contrast of Church *visible* and *invisible*, i. 301, 316, iii. 66—68, iv. 257—262; Traetarian errors about this, iii. 67, iv. 262
- the *true professing catholic*, figured by the sun-clothed woman, iii. 7, 8, 19; after Julian becoming more and more invisible, 41—45; Bossuet's view of, 46, 66
- *fragmentary Churches, or individuals*, of her children left thenceforward to keep up the witness for Christ, iii. 69, ii. 207—212; of these various bodies traced as Witnesses through middle age to the Reformation, ii. 215—462; French Hugonot branch afterwards called "the Church of the desert," iii. 409; other chief bodies during the Vials, 477—488
- the *invisible, or spiritual*, = the 144,000, i. 270, &c. See *Hundred and Forty-four Thousand.*
- *British*, early, i. 60
- *English*, Protestant, its formation, ii. 474, 475; its Augustinianism, i. 317, 318; iv. 263; its view of baptism, i. 287, view of Church visible and invisible, iii. 66; and of Antichrist, 592—603; its ordinations, ii. 179, 180; its present duty, iv. 256
- *Romish, or Papal*, meant by the woman Babylon, in the wilderness, Apoc. xvii., iv. 30—38; spoiled in the times of the French Revolution, iii. 397—405
- property of, in France, its confiscation at French Revolution, iii. 398
- or *kirk*, origin of the word, iv. 251
- Churches, *early Christian*, state of, in St. John's time, i. 59—64; early heresies in, 61—64; the seven of Asia, epistles to, 75—81; Vitrunga's and Girdlestone's schemes of the epistles to, as prefigurative, 77, 78; promises made to faithful in, 80, 81
- *Reformed Protestant*, establishment and constitution of, ii. 181—199; subsequent general corruption of, iii. 317—321
- Cicisbeism, characteristic of immorality of Papal Italy in times of Napoleon, iii. 415
- City, the great (Apoc. xi. 8), answers to Roman-Antichristendom, ii. 433—437; fall of its tenth part, and of seven chiliads of it, 472—482; tripartition of, under 7th Vial, iv. 25
- Claude of Turin (A.D. 820—840), the Protestant of the West, ii. 234; falsely charged with Arianism, *ibid.*; his witness in the spirit of Augustine and Vigilantius, 235—237; large effects of his protestations, 239; his sackcloth-robed witness, 238; his corpse insulted and exhumed, *ibid.*
- Clement, cousin to Domitian, a Christian martyr, i. 61, 214
- Jaques, the assassin, iii. 370
- Clement of Rome, his view of God's true Israel, or Church, i. 267
- Clement of Alexandria, quotes the Apocalypse as St. John's, i. 24; on its date, 33, 34
- Clergy and laity, early distinction of, iii. 196
- Clergy, celibacy of, in 6th century, i. 410; unscriptural power of, 410, 411; prepared already for a heading Antichrist, i. 408—411, iii. 197
- sketch of Papal Priesthood's formation:—1st, subjection by Councils and imperial law of clergy to Bishops, then of Bishops to Metropolitanans, and of Metropolitanans to Patriarchs, iii. 198—200: 2ndly, special subjection by imperial law of all Western clergy and hierarchy to the Pope, in his character of Western Patriarch, 200—203; and yet more by Gregory's plan of the pallium, and Wilfrid's introduction of the clerical vow, as vassals to their lord, and with oath of allegiance, 204, 205; au-

- swers to the second Apocalyptic Beast, 210; the Jesuit Lacunza's testimony to this, *ibid.*
- Clergy Papal, like 2nd Beast with horns as lamb, speaks as dragon, iii. 210, 211; exercises Pope's authority "*before him,*" 212, 213; including that of miracles, 213, 214; transubstantiation, 214; excommunication, 216; enforces worship of the Pope as Christ's vicar, 218
- Clinton, Fynes, his chronology of sacred Scripture, and of the world, iv. 703—709
- Cloud, investiture with, a proper ensign of Deity, ii. 41; Angel's descent in, *ibid.*; ascent of the witnesses in the same, 453; white cloud, iv. 11, 12
- Clovis, eldest son of the Romish Church, iii. 138
- Cena Domini, at feast of, a general excommunication of heretics, iii. 216
- Coinage, Roman, notice of, i. 569—598
- Coincidence of time, between Israel's conversion and the saints' resurrection, iv. 163—175; also between the blessedness of the world and the saints' resurrection, 175—184
- Coleridge on the paganized Christianity of the 6th century, i. 341; on the signs of a Spirit's going forth, iii. 499
- Collyridians, ii. 508
- Cologne, account of the heretics burnt at, A. D. 1147, ii. 285—291; other heretics burnt at, 1163, 291
- Colonies, trans-marine, of the Papal European powers at French Revolution, iii. 380; first English Protestant, under Elizabeth, ii. 485; late advances of Popery in the English Colonies, iii. 508
- Colossæ, earthquake at, and date of Paul's Epistle to, i. 45, 547
- Colours of horse, *white, red, black, livid, pale*, realized in the successive tæras of Roman empire from St. John to Diocletian, i. 205
- Comenius, his history of the Bohemian persecutions, ii. 449
- Comet, at time of Attila's irruptions, i. 380; great comet A. D. 1066, at time of first Turkish invasion of Greek empire, i. 498
- Coming of Christ, signification of the phrase in 2 Thess. ii. 1, 8, iv. 186; its suddenness, 199, 200
- Communion of saints, iii. 68
- Compostella, shrine of St. James at, ii. 18
- Concluding applicatory remarks to the Horæ, iv. 255—274
- Concordat, Buonaparte's, with the Pope, iii. 413
- Concubinage, clerical, license of, ii. 28
- Confession, private, begun in 5th century, i. 409; its evil and abuses, ii. 14, 28
- Confessions of the Reformed Churches, ii. 197—199; harmony of, iii. 315, 316
- Confessors, Christian, restored by Constantine, i. 254, iii. 35
- Confirmation, R. C., iii. 258
- Conflagration, the mundane (2 Pet. iii. 10), difficulty from it as to the pre-millennial view, iv. 192, 193
- Constantine, raised up by God for the destruction of Paganism, i. 239; his vision of the cross, 240, 241; repeated victories over Pagan emperors, 242; establishes Christianity, 246, 254, 255; his baptism and death, 291, 292; trisection of the Roman world under, 362—364; other notice of, iii. 18
- Constantine Copronymus the Byzantine iconoclastic emperor, i. 468
- Constantine (the Armenian), originator of the Paulikian sect, ii. 250—255
- Constantinople, curious prophecy respecting its conquest by the Russians, i. 473; besieged by the Turks, 504; taken by Turkish artillery, 510—512, 531; late conflagrations in, iii. 453
- Constantius I, iii. 17
- Constantius II, patron of Arianism, iii. 44
- Consummation, the, early patristic expectations of, i. 228—231; probable physical changes attending, 249; impression of its nearness towards the close of the 6th century, 391—403; again in the 10th century, 470—472; among the Reformers, ii. 134—146; near approaching under the 7th Trumpet, 491—494
- Consummation, notices of its crisis by various Old Testament prophets, iv. 113—129
- Contrast, allusive. See *Allusive*.
- Convents, profligacy of the, in 9th century, i. 473; in 13th, 14th, and 15th, ii. 14, 28; Papal fortresses, iv. 629
- Convention, National, of France, iii. 361
- Conversion of Israel promised, iv. 163
- Convocation of the States-General of France, iii. 349
- Corrie, Bishop, iii. 487
- Corvey, Chronicle of the Abbey of, ii. 384
- Cottian Alps, ii. 221, 244
- Councils, early institution of, in 2nd century, iii. 198; Metropolitan's presidency in, from 4th century, 198, 199
- General, early history of, traced; (first eight in Eastern Christendom under the Emperors; twelve next in Western Christendom under Popes;) "representation totius nominis Christiani," iii. 221—224; the members Bishops, with a few Presbyters, 222; anciently represented in *images* or *pictures*, 226; originally convened by emperors, 231; this power reclaimed for the reigning emperor from the Popes, by Protestants at time of Council of Trent, 232, 233
- Papal General answer to *Beast's Image*, as representing Papal Christendom and the Popes, iii. 227; convened by Roman Pope as *Western Patriarch*, 227—229; inspired and made to speak by him, 229—233; to laity attendant in, no voice allowed, 229, 230; unscriptural dogmas enjoined by, 235, 236;

- pronounced death on all that would not worship the Pope, 238, 239; *Trentine Council* compared by one of the attendant Bishops to an *image speaking by priest's jugglery*, 233; canons of, sworn to by every Romish priest on taking a benefice, iii. 237
- Councils General, vain hopes of reformation from, at end of middle age, ii. 35, 36
- General, 1st of Nice, i. 255, iii. 35; of Constantinople, iii. 57; of Ephesus against Nestorius and Chalcedon against Eutyches, i. 418; 2nd of Nice, i. 468; also of Constance, Ferrara, Florence, ii. 35, 36. For Lateran Councils see *Lateran*.
- Provincial, of Toledo, Chalons, Aquis Granum, Paris, Trosly, from 655 to 909 A. D., i. 473; of Arras, Toulouse, Oxford, &c., 1025—1165, A. D., ii. 268, 426
- anti-heretical decrees of, in middle age, ii. 424—426
- evangelic, A. D. 529, of Orange and Vaison, ii. 222; of Chantilly A. D. 766, 228, 229; of Valence A. D. 855, 240
- Covenant Angel, intervention of, at Reformation, prefigured in vision of Apoc. x., ii. 40—48
- prince of the, Dan. xi. 22, iv. 73, 74
- Cowper, the poet, his anticipations immediately before the French Revolution, iii. 344, 345; on Whitfield, 323; on the Millennium, iv. 221
- Creation, the, its waiting for the manifestation of the sons of God, iv. 180
- Crescent, a Turkish ensign, i. 501, 502
- Crespy, peace of, in 1544, ii. 468
- Crete, famous for archers and bows, i. 139—142; Nerva's family came from, 146
- conquered by Turks in 1669, ii. 491
- Cross, Constantine's vision of the, i. 240, 241
- worship of the, resisted by the Paulicians, ii. 299
- Crown, Roman, distinction from diadem, i. 135—137
- the Pope's imperial, account of. See *Papal Crown*, and *Triregno*.
- Crucified, Papal Rome the city where Christ crucified, ii. 433—439
- Cruelties against Protestants in France, retaliated on Papists at the Revolution, iii. 371, 372
- Crusades, the anti-Turkish, the 1st, i. 507; others, 500, 501
- against heretics, ii. 22, 23, 29, 30; proclaimed by Innocent III, 425; succeeded by others sanctioned by 4th Lateran Council, 426; against saints, enjoined by Popes, iii. 191
- Chrysostom alludes, though but rarely, to the Apocalypse as Scripture, i. 30; his prophetic views about the Apostasy and Antichrist, i. 389, iii. 99
- Cyprian received Apocalypse, i. 27; his martyrdom, 221; on martyr-intercession, 343; on the year-day, iii. 281
- Cyril, of Jerusalem, the doubtful testimony about Apocalypse, i. 29; his prophetic views about Antichrist, 389, iii. 99
- of Alexandria receives the Apocalypse, i. 30

## D

- Demonolatry of Western Christendom, ii. 8—11, 25, 26
- Δαιμονιον*, discussion of the term as used in Scripture, ii. 497—504; as used by writers of the early Church, 504—508
- Damasus (Pope), his ode to St. Felix, i. 333
- Daniel's prophecy of the little horn of the he-goat (Dan. viii.), iii. 427—447. See *He-goat*.
- last prophecy (Dan. xi. xii.), iv. 55—112; occasion of, 55—58; first half of, to xi. 30, fulfilled in the contests of the Ptolemies and the Seleucidae, 59—79; second half of, to end of Dan. xii., 79—112
- Daniel, prophetic periods of, iv. 109—112; also ii. 129, 131
- Dante, ii. 37
- Date of Apocalypse. See *Apocalypse*.
- Days, (year-days,) the 280 to Constantine, iii. 19; the 1260 of woman in wilderness, 68; and of Gentiles treading the Holy City, and Beast's reign, ii. 215, iii. 160—163, 298—305; also of the 1260, 1290, and 1335 of Dan. xii., 279, iv. 109—112
- Death of Witnesses. See *Witnesses*.
- Death, rider of 4th Apocalyptic horse, i. 191; desolator of Roman empire in 4th century, 203
- Decius, the emperor, determines to crush Christianity, i. 220
- Deliverance of God's people, as "written in the book," iv. 109
- Democratic principles of French Revolution, iii. 349, 350; previously those of the Jesuits, 368—370; dissemination of, 375; infect the symbolic sea, 377, 378; united with spirit of infidelity, &c., 497
- Denarius, Roman adulteration of, in the 3rd century, i. 181, 182
- "Desert place," the characteristic locality of the Papal Harlot, iv. 36—40, iii. 552
- "Desire of Women" (Dan. xi. 37), what? iv. 92
- Desolation, abomination of, applied to Saracens, i. 449. See *Abomination*.
- Διαβολος*, scriptural use of the word, as contrasted with *δαιμονιον*, ii. 497—508
- Diadem, *διαδημα*, first adopted by the Roman emperors, not till Diocletian, in lieu of the crown, or *στυφανος*, i. 136, iii. 535—517
- Diadems on the Dragon's heads, iii. 15; of the ten Romano-Gothic kings, 144

- Διαθηκη, in the sense of *covenant*, Sir L. Shadwell on, ii. 573—576  
 Διλειτρον of Alexander Severus, i. 184; also ib. Appendix, 594 (= weight of *chaenic* of wheat).  
 Dioceses, 13 ecclesiastical, under Constantine, iii. 22  
 Diocletian, founder of a new empire, i. 199, 208; his change of Roman government, iii. 124, 125; persecution of Christians under, i. 209, 210; his death, i. 244; further noticed, iii. 17  
 Diognetus, epistle to, i. 102  
 Dionysius of Alexandria, an impugner of the genuineness of the Apocalypse, i. 3—7, 26  
 Disciplina arcana, i. 294  
 Divisions of Roman empire at different times, i. 361  
 “Doctrines of dæmons” (1 Tim. iv. I), ii. 508, iii. 103  
 Doddridge, Dr., iii. 321  
 Domingo, St., its revolt from, and war with France, from 1792 to 1804, iii. 378  
 Dominicans, the rise of, and vain hopes from, ii. 34; their corruption, 35  
 Domitian, the Apocalypse written under, i. 32—40, 44—48; persecution of Christians by, 213, 214  
 Dove over Pope in Papal medals, in sign of Holy Ghost, iii. 182; over General Councils, 234  
 Draconic spirit of modern infidelity, iii. 616—631  
 Dragon, a Roman standard, iii. 14, 15  
 — the great red, or devil acting in Roman Heathen power, iii. 13, 14, 20, 21  
 — Constantine’s picture of dragon under cross, iii. 31; medals with similar device, *ibid.*; triumphant songs over, 34—38  
 — Spirit from mouth of, under 6th Vial, iii. 497; bound 1000 years, iv. 132  
 — ejected from heaven, persecutes the woman the Church, iii. 42—45  
 Drought, spiritual, of Christendom, ii. 161, 407  
 Drying up of the Euphrates, a sign of the times. See *Euphrates*.  
 Duff, Dr., iii. 502  
 Dutch United Provinces, seven, answering to the seven chiliads of the city (Apoc. xi. 13), ii. 478—481
- E
- Eagle, the great, applied to Theodosius the Great, iii. 52, 55—57  
 Earth, the Roman, in the Apocalyptic scenery, i. 103; literally meant in Apoc. viii. 7, i. 359. See *Sea*.  
 — to be burned up, iv. 201; stored with fire, 202  
 — swallowed the flood, iii. 63.  
 Earthquake, *symbolic*, of 6th Seal, i. 237; fulfilment of, 243—246; the symbol illustrated from other Scriptures, 247, 248  
 — previous to the 1st Trumpet sounding, i. 367, 373; of the Reforma-
- tion, ii. 471, 472; of the French Revolution, iii. 349, 350  
 Earthquake *physical*, before destruction of Jerusalem, iii. 347; in Roman empire before the Gothic Woe, i. 374; in Syria in 1822, iii. 452, 453; to precede the Millennium, iv. 201  
 East, Angel rising from, i. 274  
 — kings from the, iii. 455—460  
 Easter-day, the Lord’s day, κατ’ ἔξοχον, i. 69  
 Eck, his disputation with Luther, ii. 120; his fears soon after, 461  
 Eclipses at the destruction of Jerusalem, i. 55, iii. 347, 348  
 Edicts against German Pietists, iii. 323  
 Edward the 6th’s Catechism, iv. 260  
 Egbert, Archbishop, of 8th century, his attempt to revive preaching, ii. 160  
 Egypt subdued by the Turks in 1517, iv. 105  
 — its late contest with the Turks, iii. 451  
 — a figurative appellation of Papal Rome, ii. 435—440  
 Ηκουσα, the true reading in Apoc. xi. 12, ii. 463  
 Elders, the twenty-four (Apoc. iv. 4), i. 86, 87; their last act, iv. 46, 50  
 Elect, Church of, iii. 309  
 Election by grace, Augustinian doctrine of, i. 306, 314; its contrariety to an ecclesiastical system of salvation, 314—316; its accordance with the doctrine of the Jansenists, 316, 317; and of the Anglican Church, 317  
 Elephant made to do homage to Leo X, ii. 70  
 Elias, tradition of house of, iv. 701  
 Elizabeth, Queen of England, gives God glory, ii. 484  
 Emadeddin, extract from, on Thogrul Beg’s investiture, i. 525  
 Emancipation Act, Roman Catholic, iii. 504, iv. 255, 256  
 Emperor, Christian, no head to Dragon or Beast, iii. 120  
 Emperor, Roman, or Imperator, its meaning, i. 135. See *Rome*.  
 — his Profectio, or Expectatio, i. 137  
 Emperors humbled before Popes, iii. 175—178, 186—188  
 Emperors, badges of, presented to Roman Emperor, iii. 127  
 Empires, the four great, iii. 88; heathen and patristic testimonies respecting, i. 229, 389, 429, iii. 88  
 England, the tenth part of “the city” (Apoc. xi. 13), ii. 472—475; establishment of Protestant Church in, 475; the bulwark of Protestantism, 485; her escape from revolutionary principles, iii. 477—479; her duty as the promulgator of the true evangelical Protestant faith, iv. 255, 256  
 Ενναντος, prophetic value of, as a measure of time, i. 521



ΕΠΙΦΑΝΙΟΥ of Christians on establishment of Christianity, iii. 32—39; significant notice of martyrs in it, 39

Epiphanius receives the Apocalypse, i. 30; on date of, 38; worthless character of his testimony, 38, 39

Epistles to the seven Churches. See *Churches*.

Erasmus, ii. 37

Erastianism, iv. 267

Ερημια, or desert of the Roman Campaign, iii. 552, iv. 32—36

Eunapius the Sophist, his charge of relic-worship against the Christians of the 4th century, i. 335

Euphrates river, the four angels bound in, i. 495; and loosed from, 496—498, 505, 506; drying up of, iii. 447—454; the drying of, a sign now visible of the last times, iv. 240

Eusebius, questioned the apostolic authorship of the Apocalypse, i. 28; gives it a Domitianic date, 35; his glowing anticipations of the future on Constantine's establishment of Christianity, i. 256

Evangelic missions, æra of, iii. 461, 476—490

Evangelist, Luther's title of. See *Luther*.

Events, origin of all, in the Apocalypse, from the throne of God, i. 107

Everlasting gospel, Angel flying with, iii. 461; fulfilled, 483, 484, 490

Evervinus, his letter to St. Bernard respecting the heretics burnt in 1147 at Cologne, ii. 285—290

Evidence of the Horæ, review of, in proof of our nearness to the end, iv. 226—234, 735

Evil spirits, present locality of, i. 440

Excommunication, early form of, ii. 187, 188

————— Papal, iii. 180, 216

————— of Papists by Protestants at Reformation, ii. 187, 199

Exhumation of heretics' bodies by Papal law, ii. 453, 454

Exorcisms in baptism in the 4th century, i. 280

Expectation of Christ's speedy coming, with the apostles, i. 54; with the early Fathers, 230; at the end of 6th century, 400; in 10th century, 470; at the Reformation, ii. 134—145

Exposure of Papal Rome, iv. 28—35

Extortion, ancient Roman laws against, i. 178

Extreme unction, iii. 259

"Eyes as of a man," iii. 89, 173

Ezekiel's 390 days' lying on his side, iii. 268

F

Fairbairn on Prophecy, iv. 691

"Faithful and True," title of Christ, iv. 53

False Prophet, or two-horned lamb-like Beast, see *Beast*; the judgment of, iv. 53

Famine, great, under Gallienus, i. 192

Fathers, the ancient Christian; for their views on Prophecy, see *Prophecy* and *Apocalyptic Interpretation*.

Fatimites, the, i. 465

Felix, patron saint of Paulinus, i. 334

Fenelon, iii. 70

Feuerbach, his narrative of the trial of the Priest Reinbauer, iii. 507

Firmament, Apocalyptic, symbol of, i. 103; dissolution of Pagan, under 6th Seal, i. 237, 246—248

Firstborn and Firstfruits, iii. 282

Flood, the symbolic, out of dragon's mouth, iii. 59, 60; fulfilled in Pagan and Arian Goths' invasion, 60, 61; actual, at the time of the Gothic irruption, 348

Flying Angels, the three. See *Angels*.

Forewarnings (near end of 6th century) of the first coming Woe, i. 386—416; from fall of Rome's ancient empire, 387—395; from supposed end, or near ending of the world's 6000 years, 395—398; from the afflictions of the times, 398—401

Foster, Rev. H., his "Mahomedanism Unveiled," i. 442; his *Geography of Arabia*, 446

"Four parts" of the earth the true reading in 4th Seal, i. 201, 202

Foxe, John, the Reformer, his expectation of Christ's speedy coming, ii. 144, 145

Franciscan friars, rise of, and hopes from, ii. 34; corruption of, 35

Franke, iii. 321

Frankfort, great council of, against image-worship (A.D. 794), ii. 229

Frederic, Emperor, persecuting edict of, A.D. 1225, ii. 386

French wars of the Revolution on the Rhine, Po, and Danube, iii. 381—388

French Revolution. See *Revolution*.

Frogs, the three, out of the mouth of Dragon, of Beast, and of False Prophet, or spirits of *infidelity, popery, and priestcraft*, let loose ere the close of the 6th Vial, iii. 492—495;—that of the Dragon, 497—503; of the Beast, 503—516; of the False Prophet, 516—532

———— three, the "old arms of France," iii. 533, iv. 653

"From henceforth" the dead blessed, iv. 7

Fruit-trees not cut down by Saracens, contrasted with Gothic ravages, i. 453

Fulgentius, an Augustinian, ii. 223

Furlongs, the 1600, iv. 17

Future, Apocalyptic pèfigurations of, iv. 54, 55

Futurist counter-scheme *à priori* inadmissible, examined and refuted. See *Apocalyptic Counter-Schemes*.

## G

Gabriel, perhaps the "strong Angel" of Apoc. v. 2, i. 95; in Dan. x., iv. 57

Galerius, his persecution of Christians, i. 209; his edict of toleration, 235, 244, iii. 17; his remorse and death, i. 244

Gathering of saints to Christ, iii. 92

Generic, his conquests in the Mediterranean, i. 378—380, 619, 620, iii. 137

Gentiles, symbolic court of the (Apoc. xi.), meaning of, ii. 185

Geological structure of the earth illustrative of its predicted destruction by fire, iv. 202

Gerbert of Rheims, his saying about the Pope, ii. 78

Germanic empire of the middle age, ii. 5  
 ——— emperor, sun of, eclipsed under the 4th Vial, iii. 390, 391

Germanus, St. (Bishop of the 7th century), specimen of his Mariolatry, ii. 330—332

Gibbon, an excellent illustrator of the Apocalyptic prophecy, i. 116, 117

Gieseler's Paulikian Marcionitic theory refuted, ii. 543—550

Glassy sea, or crystal firmament, before the throne, i. 84, 85  
 ——— mixt with fire, harpers' song by, iii. 336; what the sea, 468—472; the harpers' song by it, 472—475; fulfilment of song, 488—490

Glory, primary vision of the heavenly, i. 82—86

Gnostic heresy, two branches of, i. 62, 63

Gnostics, antichristian, i. 64—66, iii. 107, 185

Goat. See *He-goat*.

Gobet, constitutional bishop of Paris, at time of French Revolution, iii. 362

God, "all that is so called" (2 Thess. ii. 4), iii. 98

God, a, "whom his fathers knew not" (Dan. xi. 38), iv. 98, 99, iii. 185

Gog and Magog, prophecy of, iv. 119—124

Gorres, his incorrect view of the spiritual progression of Christendom, ii. 23, 24; his sketch of the Gothic inundation, iii. 62

Gospel-preaching, duty of, enforced in Scripture, ii. 155, 156; progressive neglect of, in the Christian Church, 157—162; revival of, at the Reformation, 163—173

Goths, ravages of the, under the first four Trumpets, i. 373—385

Gottschale, A.D. 846—868, ii. 240, 241

Grace, Augustinian doctrines of, i. 306—313

Greck insurrection against Turks, iii. 448—450; remarkable chronological parallelism concerning, 448, 449

Gregory I, or the Great, i. 386, iii. 169; his belief in the nearness of the judgment, i. 399—401; his expectation of Antichrist's coming as close at hand, and views respecting Antichrist, 401—404, iii. 197  
 ——— his patronage of images in Churches, ii. 224, 225  
 ——— his asserted miracles, iii. 166  
 ——— II, Pope, patron of image-worship, anathematizes the iconoclastic emperor Leo, ii. 226  
 ——— III, do., *ibid*.

Gregory VII, keeps the Emperor Henry IV three days and three nights in penance outside walls of Canossa, iii. 188

Gregory Nazianzen, his opinion respecting the Apocalypse doubtful, i. 29; his *επιδικιον* on Julian's fall, iii. 37  
 ——— Nyssen, inclined to saint and relic-worship, i. 333  
 ——— Thaumaturgus, i. 334

Gustavus Adolphus, fell at Lutzen, A.D. 1632, ii. 482

## H

Hades, i. 191—194

Hail, symbol of, in 1st Trumpet, i. 368, 375—378; and at the 7th Trumpet's sounding, iii. 337

Hailstorm in France, just before French Revolution, iii. 346; of 7th Vial, iv. 24

Hair, Arab woman-like way of wearing, i. 435—438

Hall, Bishop, iii. 321

Hallelujah on Babylon's fall, iv. 49

Harlot, Papal Rome represented by the, iv. 28—35

Harmony of the Reformed Confessions, iii. 316

Haroun al Raschid, i. 469

Harpers by the glassy sea, iii. 477. See *Glassy Sea*.

Harpings, in Apocalyptic temple, of "a new song" (sc. at the Reformation), iii. 311—315  
 ——— in old Jewish temple, at its dedication or reformation, 313, 314

Harvest of the earth, iv. 7; emblematic of judgment, 8—10; reaped by the Son of man, 11

Heads, seven, of Beast. See *Beast*.

Heathen testimonies about the four empires, i. 429, iii. 88

Heaven, the firmamental, of the Apocalyptic scenery, i. 103; figurations in, 237; half-hour's silence in, 322—326; dragon and woman existent in, simultaneously, iii. 11, 15, 16

Heber, Bishop, iii. 487

Hegel, Pantheism, iii. 631

Hegira, æra of, i. 447

He-goat, of Dan. viii. the Macedonian power, iii. 427; his great horn broken into four lesser horns, 428; little horn of, 428—432; historical application to Antiochus Epiphanes or the Popedom inadmissible, 432—436; meant of the Turks, 437—442; the time of the cleansing of the temple from it to begin at the end of 2300 year-days from the epoch of the ram's supremacy, iii. 443—447; fulfilled in drying up of Turkish power, begun A.D. 1820, under the 6th Vial, 447—454

Hengstenberg, Professor, iv. 684—690

Henriciani, followers of Henry, condemned at Council of Lombers in 1165, ii. 294

Henry of Lausanne and Thoulouse, seized

- and imprisoned as a heretic, A.D. 1147, ii. 285
- Henry III of France assassinated, under Jesuit influence, by the monk Clement; and Henry IV by Ravaillac, iii. 370
- Heptarchy, Anglo-Saxon, a kind of monarchy, iii. 135, 136
- Heresy, Papal definition of, at 5th Lateran Council, ii. 446
- Heretics, Theodosian and Justinian laws respecting, iii. 166
- (so called in the middle age by the Romanists) adjudged to the flames, ii. 427; tongues of those spared to be ent out, *ibid.*; *priests* first degraded, ii. 164; denied Christian burial, 452—454; supposed total extinction of at the opening of the 16th century, 429—432, 450; rejoicings at Rome on their supposed extinction, 454—456. See *Witnesses.*
- Hermas, book of, i. 9—11
- Heruli, iii. 137. See *Odoacer.*
- High Churchmen, who are the true? iv. 257
- Hippolytus, his Commentary on the Apocalypse, i. 26; his martyrdom, 219; his views of the prophecies of the future, 229; ii. 85, 420; iii. 131; iv. 283
- "Holiness, His," the Pope's self-appropriated blasphemous appellation, iii. 178
- Holland, Protestant republic of, its rise, ii. 481
- Homilies, after 6th century, substituted for preaching, ii. 159
- Hooker, iii. 321
- on non-episcopal ordination, ii. 178; on the Pope as the *Man of Sin*, iii. 600
- Hopkins, Bishop, iii. 321
- "Horæ Apoc.," general character of the exposition in, i. 110—115; summary of its historic exposition, iv. 225—234
- Horn, little, of Daniel's 4th Beast (see *Antichrist*); identical with the 8th head of Apocalyptic Beast, iii. 88—91
- of He-goat of Dan, viii. See *He-goat.*
- Horns, ten, of the Beast, iii. 132—147; three plucked up before the Popes, 167—172
- of golden altar connected with rites of atonement, i. 482—484
- Horse, Roman, symbol in four first Seals, i. 125, 126, 582—588. See *Colours.*
- Horse, white, Apoc. vi. 2; symbol of Roman emperors in triumph, i. 135
- white, of Apoc. xix., iv. 53
- Horse-tails, Turkish badge of, i. 512—516
- Hosanna, i. 349
- Hour, day, month, and year, the prophetic period, fulfilment of, i. 516—532; illustrated from the time of Richard and Saladin's truce, 528, 529
- Howe, iii. 321
- Hugonots, persecution of, in France, iii. 369, 371, 409
- Humiliati. See *Waldenses.*
- Hundred and forty four thousand, their mystic number and sealing, i. 263—266; character and history, 274—277;
- their square number compared with the cube of the New Jerusalem, 297, iv. 210; seen with Lamb on Mount Zion, iii. 305; observation of, and as contrasted with the followers of Antichrist, 306—309; their character, 320—324
- Hungarian irruption into European Christendom, A.D. 889—955, i. 474; repelled by Henry the Fowler and Otho, 477; Christianized and settled in Hungary in 10th century, *ibid.*
- Hunkiar, the slayer of men, a title of the Turkish Sultan, i. 504
- Hunne, the Wieliflite, burnt, ii. 454
- Huns, ravages of, under Attila, i. 380—382
- Hurricane, in the West Indies, before French Revolution, iii. 345
- Huss, his dream at Constance, ii. 459; his prophecy and death, 459; revived in Luther, 460
- Hussites, Bohemian, ii. 29, 428, 447—450

## I

Iconoclastic Greek emperors, in 8th and after centuries, i. 468; their embassy to Paris, and its results, ii. 228, 229

Idolatry, vain disclaimer of, by Papal Rome, ii. 11

Idols, heathen, vain distinction of from Roman Catholic images of saints, iii. 235

Ignatius, possible allusions to the Apocalypse in his writings, i. 11—17; Cureton's Translation from Syriac copy, i. 16; Bishop of Antioch while St. John in Patmos, 60; his martyrdom, 216, 223

Illyricum, one of the thirds of the Roman empire in 4th century, i. 362—365

Image, Nebuchadnezzar's, i. 428—431, iii. 297

—— of Beast, iii. 219—239; various former unsatisfactory interpretations of, 220, 221; means *Papal General Councils as representations of the Beast*, i. e. of *Papal Christendom*, and its head the *Pope*, 221—226; (Council of Trent actually likened to speaking image, 233;) which convened by Pope as Western Patriarch, through the Papal Bishops, 227, 228; inspired by him, 229—233; made to denounce death to whoever would not worship the Beast, or Popes, 233, 239. See *Councils.*

Imagery of 6th Seal, sun darkened, stars falling, &c., i. 247

Images the first *αχειροποιητοι*, A.D. 589, i. 414; talking ditto, winking, ii. 16

Image-worship, begun at beginning of 5th century, i. 414; firmly established in the 6th century, ii. 216; object of Satan in, 225; a popular passion in the 7th century, 226; enjoined by the 7th General Council, i. 472, ii. 9, 11, 228; protest of 300 bishops against, in A.D. 791, ii. 229; warmly fostered by the then Popes of Rome, 226

Immaculate conception, feast of, ii. 25

Immorality of Papal Christendom in middle age, ii. 12—14, 28

- Immorality, progress of, during the Vials of French Revolution, iii. 415
- Incense-offering, vision of (Apoc. viii. 3), i. 326—330
- Indies, East, English empire over, iii. 486
- Indulgence, original meaning of, i. 280
- Indulgences, Papal, ii. 17; tax of, 13; immense sale of, in 1507, 27; issued by Leo X, 66—69; specimen of, sold by Tetzel, 68; bought and trusted in, *ibid.* and iii. 189; facsimile of one, iii. 179
- Infanticide in Roman empire, Constantine's humane law to check, i. 189
- Intidility of Papal priesthood before the Reformation. See *Atheism*.
- French, of 18th century, the natural produce of Popery, iii. 344, 364—366
- spirit of, answering to the first of the three frogs, iii. 497—503
- Inquisition, the, prepared A.D. 1183, first institution of, A.D. 1233, ii. 22; completer re-organization of, in 1478, 30; cruelties practised by, prior to Reformation, 30; re-instituted in the present century, iii. 503
- Interdict, Papal, iii. 188, 217
- Interrex, Roman, no separate form of government, iii. 117
- Interim, Decree, May 1548, ii. 469
- Investitures, battle of, between Popes and Emperors, ii. 423
- Ireland, Pope Adrian's grant of, in 1155, to the English King Henry, ii. 72
- Irene, the image-worshipping empress, i. 468, 469
- Irenæus, his testimony to St. John's writing the Apoc., i. 22; as to the Domitiane date of the Apocalypse decisive, i. 32, 47, 534, 541; his prophetic views, i. 231, iii. 98, iv. 278. See *Apocalyptic Interpretation*.
- Iron age, so called, of tenth century, i. 473
- Isaiah, apocryphal vision of, i. 68
- Israel, the twelve tribes of (Apoc. vii.), mystical sense of, i. 259—263; appellative of, and promises to, assumed by the Church corporate established under Constantine, 266, 268; God's Israel, the 141,000 elected out of, 263, 264
- Ivo (near Treves), heretics found at in A.D. 1101, ii. 281
- of Narbonne, a profest Valdencic sectary, his visits to Valdencic congregations in Lombardy, at Como, Milan, Cremona, A.D. 1243, and account of them, ii. 402, 403
- J
- Jacobins of French Revolution, iii. 370, 374
- James, king, not the discoverer of meaning of Roman Beast's seven governing heads, iii. 116, iv. 478
- Janizaries, massacre of the, iii. 450
- Jansen, certain of his propositions condemned by the Pope, i. 316, 317
- Jehoshaphat, the valley of, prophecy concerning, iv. 126
- Jericho, the mystical, of the New Testament, i. e. Papal Rome, i. 349, 350
- Jerome, biographical sketch of, iv. 316—318
- his virtual defence of saint-worship, i. 335, 336; his view of the prophecies respecting Antichrist and the consummation, 389—391, 393, 396, 397, iv. 316—324; his list of the ten kings, iii. 141
- Jerome of Prague, ii. 459, 460
- Jerusalem, the literal destruction of, by Titus, i. 54—58
- Anglican Bishoprick of, iii. 488
- the Patriarch of, on Saracens taking it, i. 449
- on Jews' restoration, to be a cup of trembling to the enemy, iv. 124, 128; afterwards the Mother Church of the Christian universe, 219; its connexion with the new or heavenly Jerusalem, *ibid.*
- the *new* and *heavenly*, self-applied by the Romish Church, ii. 80, 444
- *new*, iv. 204—214; not identical with that of restored Israel, 209; inclusively millennial, 210—214; chief objection regarding it answered by regarding the setting of the *great white throne*, passing away of old heaven and earth, and appearance of the new heaven and earth, as synchronic with the millennial thrones setting, 215—218; also as to that of there being then "no more sea, no more death, no more curse," 217
- the *symbolic*, on the Apocalyptic scene, i. 101, 109, 110; called the Mount Zion, iii. 307—311
- Jesuits, institution of, A.D. 1540, ii. 468; its missions, 485; Pope-worshippers, iii. 218; restoration of, 503
- Jesuitism in France, the preparation of the French Revolution, iii. 364—373
- Jewel on Antichrist, iii. 596
- Jews' destruction and scattering, i. 56; Roman tax on, 57
- mystical meaning of the term in the Apocalypse, i. 73, 259—263. See *Israel*.
- missions to the, iii. 488; probable time of their conversion, iv. 49, 50; restoration, 128, 129; interest in, a sign of the nearness of the end, 240
- Jewish Chronology, errors of, iv. 238, 701—709
- testimonies to the *year-day* principle, iii. 284—286; views of first resurrection, iv. 168, 169
- Joachim Abbas. See *Apocalyptic Interpretation*.
- Joan, Pope, i. 473
- John the Faster, Patriarch of Constantinople, assumes title of Universal Bishop, i. 401
- St., the Evangelist, the writer of the Apocalypse, i. 31; banished to P'atmos,



- 51—53; his probable reflections there, 53—69
- John, St., his representative character and acting on the Apocalyptic scene, i. 95, 102, 300—305, 485, 507, ii. 114, 131, 153, iii. 308, iv. 212
- Josephus, History of Jewish War, i. 55, 56
- Jovinian, i. 345
- Jubilees, the papal middle age institution of, ii. 18, 19, 27; last in 1825, iii. 419; Papal medal of, iv. 34
- Judgment, on Papal Rome, iv. 42—50  
— the final, iv. 222
- Judgment-day, mention of time of, forbidden to the Romish doctors, ii. 84
- Judson, the Missionary, iii. 487
- Julian the Apostate, iii. 30
- Julius, Pope, ii. 446
- Justification by faith alone, held by all the reformed Churches, ii. 197—199; strenuously maintained by Claude of Turin, 237; and, substantially, by Augustine before him, 422
- Justification, public, of Christian martyrs, signified by martyrs' white robes in 5th Seal, i. 233
- Justin Martyr, a witness to the genuineness of the Apocalypse, i. 22; his prophetic views. See *Prophecy*.
- Justinian's decree in favour of Popes, iii. 160, 204; authorities for it as beginning of the 1260 years, 299—301  
— civil law, iii. 203; its abrogation at the French Revolution, 409  
— public afflictions at the close of his reign, i. 398
- K
- Kadan, Treaty of, A.D. 1531, ii. 468
- Kalamos, a reed, (Apoc. xi. 1,) meaning of, ii. 189—191
- Kelly, W., his Apocalyptic Commentary, iv. 639
- Key, Mahomet's, i. 446
- Keys, Papal, iii. 154, 179; three on an ancient mosaic, 170
- King, the apostate self-deifying (wrongly called wilful king), iv. 81, 91—97; applied to the Pope, 93—100; comes to his end, 107
- Kingdom, Christ's, not of this world, iv. 264
- Kings, often humbled before Popes, iii. 187, 188  
— of the north and south, iv. 61, &c.  
"Kings from the East, or sun-rising," hardly to be explained of the Jews, iii. 455, 456; who, probably, 458—460  
"Kingdom of God is within you," Luke xvii. 21; how meant, iv. 198, 199
- Knight, Mr. J. C., on the genuineness of the Apocalypse, i. 13
- Koran, its spirit, i. 453
- Koreish, i. 446. See *Mahomet*.
- L
- Labarum, the description of, i. 240, 243
- Lactantius receives the Apocalypse, i. 28;
- author of *De Mort Persecutorum*, i. 233, 234
- Lake of fire, in which Papal Rome and the Papal Antichrist to be destroyed, iv. 47, 48, 51
- Lamb, upon Mount Zion, iii. 308; the marriage of, iv. 51, 52, 211  
— passant, not the Papal flag, iii. 211
- Lament over Babylon, iv. 42
- Lamps, the seven (Apoc. iv. 5), i. 85
- Land, "the pleasant," iv. 68
- Landulf, his account of Turin heretics, ii. 521—523
- Laodicea, earthquake at, under Nero, i. 45, 547, iii. 573
- Largesses, Roman, of corn, wine, and oil, i. 175
- Lateran Baptistery, ii. 77  
— Church, the, at Rome, ii. 60; description of, ii. 76—78  
— Council, the 4th, sanctions excommunications against heretics, ii. 426; transubstantiation, 11; auricular confession, 14  
— (5th), description of, ii. 77—85; alluded to in Apoc. xi. 9, 441, 442, 446, 449; complete Papal triumph at, 450; its insults to, and rejoicing over, the dead body of Christ's witnesses, 451—456
- Lateran piazza, ii. 451
- Latimer, Bishop, his expectation of Christ's speedy coming, ii. 142, 143
- Latin, public worship ordered by Pope Vitalian, in A.D. 666, to be in Latin, iii. 256
- Latinus, Λατεινος, the Beast's name and number, iii. 247—256
- Λατρεία and προσκυνησις, ii. 10
- Lavalette cited, iii. 409
- Law, equitable, origin of from God, i. 179, 180  
— of Gratian and Valentinian, subjecting Western Clergy to Popes, iii. 200  
— of Valentinian and Theodosius, iii. 202; subjecting the universal Clergy to the Popes. See *Justinian*.
- Lawless One, the, iii. 95, 102; characteristic of the Popes, 175
- Legends of saints begun to be read in the 6th century, ii. 157
- Leighton, Archbishop, iii. 321
- Leo, the Byzantine iconoclastic emperor, i. 468
- Leo I, Pope, iii. 154—156.  
— X, his assumption to the Papal throne, and splendid ceremony, ii. 49—59; ascription of Christ's honours and offices to, 54, 55, 78—82; lordship of the world acted out by him, 71—75; his voice as a lion roaring, 82—86; his congratulatory bull on the Lateran Council's close, 451—456; excommunicated by Luther, 200, 201; his death, *ibid*.  
— Juda, the Reformer, ii. 141
- Lepanto, battle of, A.D. 1571, ii. 490
- Lesson, the Noble, of the Waldenses, in inquiry into its date, ii. 362—379; its pro-

- bable author, 379; extracts from, 390—394; given in full, 554—566
- Let, the, or hindrance, to the Roman Antichrist's development, iii. 97, 101; its removal, 167—169, 172; effect of the let illustrated by comparison of Greek Patriarch of Constantinople, 151; and that of its removal, 172, 173
- Levitical priesthood, type of, shown Apocalyptically to be fulfilled in Christ, i. 74, 75
- Libellatici, i. 220
- Licentiousness in France, the result of the Papal system, and preparative to the Revolution, iii. 366—368
- of clergy and monks in 10th century, i. 473
- Licences of fornication, Papal, ii. 20
- Licinius the emperor awhile supports the Christian cause, iii. 21; and then heads the Pagan cause, and defeated, i. 242—244, iii. 23; diademed, 546
- Lightning-struck altar, with its sacrifice, a mark of favour from heaven, iii. 215; other places anciently deemed accursed, iii. 217. So as to Papal transubstantiation and anathemas, 215—217
- Litanies, Oriental and Roman, of 5th, 6th, and 7th centuries, i. 405
- Literal and symbolic mixt, i. 356—358
- Literature, revival of, in the 15th century, vain to any moral reformation, ii. 35—37
- Living creatures, the four, of Ezekiel, i. 88—91; the Apocalyptic, 91—94; Romish application of, iii. 184
- Locusts, the Apocalyptic (Apoc. ix.), i. 432—452; commission to, 452—463; era of their settlement, 461
- Lollards, the witnessing of, and their persecution by the Roman Pontiffs, ii. 427, 428
- Lombards, a horn of the Beast, iii. 140; plucked up, 170
- Lombers, Council of, heretics condemned at, in 1165, ii. 294—297
- Lord's day, i. 69, iv. 603, 604
- Loretto, our Lady of, ii. 18, iii. 400, 417
- Louis XIV of France, disastrous results of his character and reign, iii. 366—368; also those of Louis XV, *ibid.*
- Lücke's counter-Papal views of Antichrist refuted, iii. 608—615
- Luther, the master-spirit of the Reformation, ii. 89; his early struggles and convictions, 90, 91; enters a monastery, 91; distress of mind in, 91—94; comforted by Staupitz, 94, 95; his discovery of Christ the Saviour, 95, 96; visits Rome, 97; appointed a Doctor of Divinity at Wittenberg, 97; publishes his Theses against indulgences, 98—100; his original awe of the Pope, as Vice-Christ, 118, 119; discovers the Pope to be Antichrist, 120—123; burns the Papal Bull that excommunicates him, 122; his impression as to the nearness of Christ's kingdom, 132—137; takes the title and fulfils the functions of Evangelist, 162—173; and Preacher, 176; his death, 469
- Lutzen, Gustavus Adolphus falls victorious at, A. D. 1633, ii. 482
- Lyonnese Martyrs, the Epistle about them cites the Apocalypse, i. 22; their martyrdom, 218
- Lyranus, or de Lyra, Apoc. exposition, iv. 429, 430
- M
- Madonnas, tricks about images of, iii. 417
- Mahmoud of Ghizni, i. 478, 496
- Mahomet, his birth and family, i. 446—448; origin of his imposture, 447; his key, 446
- II, Sultan, takes Constantinople, i. 531; his witness to the idol and dæmon-worship of Papal Christendom of 15th century, ii. 31, 32
- Mahommedism, rise of, i. 447; progress of, during the first woe, 448—451
- Mahuzzim, meaning of, iv. 94, 95, 98, 99
- Malek Shah, his mighty empire, i. 499
- Man of Sin, identical with the Apocalyptic Beast's eighth head, iii. 91—103; apparently a succession or class, 95; to be manifested with lying miracles, 101. See *Beast* and *Pope*.
- Manchild, the sun-clothed Woman's, born, &c., iii. 10, 11; what, 20
- Manicheism, false charge of, against the Paulikians, ii. 314, 315, 524—542; more applicable to the Church of Rome, 316
- Manifestation of the sons of God, iv. 183
- Marianus, the African martyr, i. 223
- Mariolatrous coins of Greek Byzantine empire, in the 10th, 11th, and 13th centuries, i. 486
- Mariolatry, specimens of, by St. Germanus, ii. 330—332
- Marozia, i. 473
- Marriage of the Lamb, iv. 51, 52
- Mars, the Roman god, horse sacred to, i. 125, 582—588
- Martel, Charles, i. 460
- Martin, a Carthusian monk at Basle, memorial of his Christian faith, iii. 68
- of Tours, superstitious reverence of, i. 333; his notion about Antichrist, 392
- Martyn, Henry, iii. 487
- Μαρτυρία, sense of the word (Apoc. xi. 7), ii. 415—419; completion of, by the Witnesses, 419—423, iii. 558
- Martyrium, or Martyr-Church, i. 339
- Martyrs, era of, i. 209, 222; cry for vengeance under 5th Seal, 222—226; memorials of early Christian martyrs in the catacombs at Rome, 225; investiture of them with white robes, 233—235
- further notice of honours paid them, iii. 35, 39; worship of, begun in 4th century, i. 330—337
- Mary, Virgin, worship of, in Greek empire, i. 486, ii. 320, 331; in Italy and Rome in 9th century, iv. 99; in era of

- the wars of the Revolution, iii. 418; after Peace of Paris, 421. See *Mariolatry* and *Virgin*.
- Massillon's testimony to the "Man of Sin" being a godless priest in God's Church, iii. 212
- Maxentius, iii. 17; defeated by Constantine, and drowned, i. 242
- Maximian, boasts of having destroyed Christianity, i. 210  
 — his medal of Christianity as a seven-headed hydra destroyed by Hercules, iii. 17; his death, i. 244
- Maximin, his persecution of Christianity, i. 243; confession, 244; impersonated in the red dragon, iii. 20
- Mecca, i. 447
- Medal, Roman, sketches of. See *Coinage*, *Horse*.  
 — evidence of Nerva's family Cretensic origin, i. 588—594
- Megiddo, derivation of the name, iv. 21
- Mehemet Ali, his revolt against the Turkish Sultan, iii. 451
- Melanethon joins Luther, ii. 123; his opinion as to the nearness of the second Advent, ii. 139—141
- Melchisedekiani, sectarians so called, ii. 309, 310
- Melito, Bishop of Sardis, his testimony to the Apocalypse, i. 23
- Mendicant orders, origin of, ii. 34; their vices and hypocrisy, 35
- Messiah's kingdom predicted by David, iv. 164
- Μετα ταυτα, i. 82, 111
- Methodius receives the Apocalypse, i. 28
- Metropolitan Bishops, iii. 198—203
- Michael, ii. 130, iii. 29
- Michaelis, an impugner of the genuineness of the Apocalypse, i. 3—8
- Middle age, licentiousness of the Clergy in the earlier half of, i. 473; historical sketch of its second half, ii. 4—7; its universities and cathedrals, ii. 7; its religious corruptions and apostasy, 8—38
- Milan, edict of, by Constantine, iii. 18, 22
- Millenary, termination of the sixth, iv. 238; the seventh, *ibid*.
- Millennium, the, iv. 131—133  
 — chief theories respecting: 1. that of the earlier Fathers, iv. 134, 135; 2. of Augustine, 136, 137; 3. of Grotius and Hammond, 138, 139; 4. of Whitby, Vitringa, and Faber, 140, 141; 5. those of Gippa and Professor Bush, 142; and Waldegrave, 695  
 — after Christ, its epoch a time of alarm to Christendom, as supposed epoch of Satan's loosing, i. 470—472  
 — the 2nd, 3rd, and 5th theories *prima facie* inadmissible, iv. 143—146; the 4th, or Whitby's, also inadmissible, first from Apocalyptic evidence, 146—157; secondly from general evidence, 156—196. See *Whitby*.  
 — introductory events to, iv. 196—204; the glorious state of, 219—222; sequel to, 222, 223
- Milner, Rev. J., iii. 482
- Missionary action of the Church prefigured, iii. 461; fulfilled, 488—490; societies, 483, 484; interest in, a sign of the times, iv. 241
- Missions, Romish, iii. 510, 515
- Mistakes in former times about nearness of end, whence originating, iv. 234—237
- Miracles, lying, of Antichrist: manifestation, iii. 97, 130, 166  
 — false, of Romish priests, ii. 15—17
- Mitred turban of Arabs, i. 435—438
- Mitre of Pope, ii. 52, 53  
 — Latin episcopal, with its two horns, iii. 210
- Monks, subject to the Pope, with their abbots, as vassals, iii. 204, 205; the Pope's great supporters, 218
- Monstranz, or tabernacle, of the consecrated host, iii. 185, iv. 99
- Monteforte, near Turin, heretics (so called) discovered there, ii. 245
- Months, the five, of second Woe, i. 456—463
- Moon, symbol in the Apocalyptic heaven, i. 103. See *Sun*.  
 — a sandal to the travailing woman, iii. 8
- Moorish Saracens in Spain, ground gained on, by Christians, i. 466
- Mortality under the 4th Seal, i. 191—193, 203
- "Mother and Mistress," the title of Rome, iv. 32
- "Mother of God," title of Virgin Mary, i. 406, 419
- Mouth, the Beast's great, iii. 89, 174
- Muezzin, heard at Jerusalem, i. 449
- Muhlburg, defeat of Protestants at, in A. D. 1547, ii. 469
- Myriads of myriads, i. 505, 506
- "Mystery of Iniquity," iii. 96; contrasted with the "Mystery of Godliness," iii. 185, 186
- "Mystery," the superscription of Papal Rome, iv. 34
- מִסְתֵּרֵי meaning of the word, i. 300; *representative of figurative men*, exemplified from Old Testament prophets, 300—302, ii. 115—119

## N

- Name and number of the Beast. See *Beast*
- Nantes, edict of, its revocation, ii. 482, 488; iii. 364, 408
- Naples, kingdom of, from A. D. 1053, held as fief from the Pope, iii. 171; a white horse its annual token of homage, *ibid*.
- Napoleon. See *Buonaparte*.
- National French Assembly and Convention. See *Assembly* and *Convention*.
- Nations, the, "angry," iii. 335; restlessness of, a sign of the times, iv. 242
- Naval victories of England, in wars of the French Revolution, iii. 378—381
- Navarino, battle of, iii. 449

- Nearness of the consummation, iv. 234; causes of former errors about it, *ibid.*
- Nebuchadnezzar, his seven times, iv. 239
- Neology in the German churches, iii. 318, 319
- Neophytes, white dress of, under Constantine, i. 255
- Nero, the first imperial persecutor of Christianity, i. 44, 61
- Nerva, the Emperor, of Cretan extraction, and founder of the Roman-Cretico imperial line, i. 146
- Nestorius, opposed to the Virgin Mary's title of *θεοτοκος*, i. 419, ii. 333
- Nestorian Syrians, in China, ancient monument of, i. 31
- New heaven and earth, iv. 192, 214, 217, 220
- New Jerusalem, iv. 205—217
- New Song, the, of the Reformation, that of justification by faith, iii. 315, 316; understood by none but the 144,000, 316, 317; fulfilment of this in Protestant Germany, 318, 319, and in England, 320; at end of 18th century, except in England, almost forgotten, 324
- Newman, (Rev. J.) Professor, his mistakes respecting a passage in Isaiah, ii. 205; his perversion to Popery, iii. 530
- Mr. F., his Phases of Faith, iii. 501, 617
- Newton, Sir I., erroneous opinions of, respecting the date of the Apocalypse, i. 40—42
- Rev. J., of Olney, iii. 482
- Nice, Council of. See *Councils*.
- Notarii, Paulikian, transcribers of the Scriptures, ii. 303, 304
- Nunneries of later half of middle age, ii. 14
- Number. See *Beast*.
- Nuremberg, Pacification of, in force from 1532 to 1546, in favour of Protestants, ii. 468
- O
- Oath, the, of the Angel (Apoc. x.), ii. 124—147
- Observation, "the kingdom of God not coming with," Luke xvii. 24; how meant, iv. 198
- Odoacer, abolishes the office of Emperor of Rome, i. 383, 384; his kingdom, iii. 137; does not wear the diadem, 142
- Oil, article of Roman taxation, i. 175
- Olga, Russian Princess, baptized, A. D. 995, i. 478
- Olive-trees, the two (Apoc. xi. 4), meaning of the symbol, ii. 209, 210
- Ominous presentiments of the French Revolution, iii. 344
- Omniades Caliphs supplanted in the East by the Abassides, A. D. 750, i. 461
- "One hour" (or at same time) with Beast, iii. 81, iv. 651
- Opisthographism of Apocalypse, i. 105, iii. 4
- Oracles, Pope's decrees so called, ii. 110, iii. 189
- Orange, Evangelic Council of, A. D. 529, ii. 222
- William of, settled as King of Protestant England, A. D. 1688, ii. 482
- Ordination, clerical, early ceremonial of the *traditio instrumenti*, ii. 164; the papal form of *priestly* ordination from 12th century, 164, 165
- power of, rightly assumed by the Reformed non-episcopal Churches, ii. 175—179; and recognized by the Church of England, 179, 180
- often anciently conferred by Chorepiscopi, ii. 174, 175
- Origen, received the Apocalypse, i. 27; martyr-cry, 220; his Hexapla, 222; his hermeneutic principle of *αναγωγη*, iv. 309
- Orleans, Council of, A. D. 1022, account of certain heretics condemned by, ii. 269—275; their noble testimony, 274
- Orleans, Philip Duke of, his example of immorality, iii. 367
- Ostrogoths, a horn of the Beast, iii. 139; plucked up, 168
- 'Οταν τελεσῶσι, in Apoc. xi. 7. See *Τελεω*.
- Othmans, the Turkman power revived under them, i. 501. See *Turks*.
- Our present chronological position, iv. 224
- Oxford, Council of (A. D. 1160), account of the *Publicani* condemned by, ii. 292
- Tractarianism, a voice of the false prophet, iii. 516, 517; its character and doctrine, 517—524; epoch and circumstantial of its advances, 525—531
- P
- Paganism in Roman empire, so first called at end of 4th century, i. 246, 266; gradually suppress by edicts of the Constantinian family and Theodosius, *ibid.*; its last conflict with Christianity, iii. 20—22; dejection of, from supremacy, 30, 31
- the invincible, of Rome and Italy in xvth century, ii. 54, 55
- Paintings exhibited at the festival of Leo Xth's enthronization, ii. 55—59; allusive reference to, in Apocalypse, 61
- the Apocalyptic counter-painting, fulfilled quickly after the enthronization of Leo X, ii. 86—89
- Pale horse, *χλωρος*, i. 190
- Pallium from Popes, necessary to the Metropolitan bishops of Western Christendom, iii. 204; formed of the fleece of lambs blest at St. Agnese, 209; expense of, ii. 20
- Palm-branches, use of, among Romans, as signs of victory, i. 298; so too in early Church, *ibid.*, 284, 285; sculptured on early Christian martyrs' tombs, 298, 557
- Palm-bearers (Apoc. vii.) of same body as the sealed ones, i. 276



- Palm-bearing vision (Apoc. vii. 9) prospective, i. 297—300; its doctrinal force and meaning, 300, 301; realized in Augustine's doctrinal views, 305—313
- Pantheon, at Rome, granted by Phocas to the Pope, ii. 217
- Papal anti-witness war. See *Witnesses*.
- triple crown and mitre, ii. 52, 53, iii. 170, 193, 207
- Papal supremacy, its falsehood, iii. 560—591. See *Pope*.
- Papias, a believer in the genuineness of the Apocalypse, i. 18—21
- Parallelism of the two Apocalyptic series of visions, with and without, iii. 2, 3, 329. See *Writing within and without*.
- Parker, Theodore, iii. 617, &c.
- Paronomasia in Scripture, i. 433
- Passagini, appellation of Paulikians, explained as probably meaning *pilgrims*, ii. 342
- Passau, Peace of, A.D. 1552, ii. 469
- Paterini, an appellation of the Cathari and Waldenses, ii. 310, 353, 386
- Patmos, Isle of, scene of John's banishment, and of the Apocalyptic visions, i. 51—71
- Patriarchs, Constantinopolitan, their dependent position contrasted with the Roman Popes' independence, iii. 151
- Patristic views of prophecy *non-futurist*, iv. 653—664. See *Prophecies and Apocalyptic Interpretation*.
- Paulikians, sketch of their earlier eastern history, ii. 248—268; synchronic Table of Greek emperors, 251
- origin of the name, ii. 252; its changes, 266, 267; first teacher, Constantine, 250; subsequent chief teachers, Symeon, 254; Paul and Gegnæsius, 255; Epaphroditus, Baanes, and Sergius surnamed Tychicus, 255, 256. See *Sergius*.
- in 8th, 9th, and 10th centuries transferred to Thrace and Bulgaria, and thence to different parts of Western Europe, ii. 265—267
- continued line of, throughout the middle ages, ii. 265—297
- their protest against prevailing superstitions, ii. 298, 299; view of the Churches established as apostate, 299, 300; conversancy with Scripture, 300—304; moral excellence of, 304—307; fortitude in suffering, 308—313; self-denying zeal in witnessing, and concluding presumption of their being true witnesses for Christ, 313, 314; in all these points corresponding to the figured Apocalyptic Witnesses.
- sundry charges of heresy against, examined and refuted, ii. 314—340
- confirmed presumption of their being true Witnesses for Christ, 340—344
- direct charge of Manicheism against, examined and refuted, ii. 524—542; charge of Marcionitism do., 543—550
- Paulinus of Nola, end of 4th century, early advocate of patron-saints, i. 333, 334
- of Aquileia, A.D. 787, protester against image and saint-worship, ii. 231
- Pause before 6th Trumpet, i. 469—479
- Peace, temple of, at Rome, burnt shortly before Commodus' assassination, i. 160
- interval of, in Europe, before the French Revolution, or 7th Trumpet's sounding, iii. 313,
- Peckham, Bishop, his lament over priests' neglect of religious teaching, ii. 161
- Pennis the physician's narrative of Leo Xth's processional, ii. 51
- Pepin's donation to the Popes, A.D. 755, iii. 170; confirmed in 774 by Charlemagne, *ibid.*
- Perdition, son of, iii. 96
- Persecution of Christians by Roman Pagan populace, i. 210—213; by emperor Nero, 213; Domitian, 213, 214; under Trajan partially, 214, 215; under M. Aurelius, 217; S. Severus, 218; Maximin the Goth, 219; Decius, 220; Valerian, 221; Diocletian and Galerius, 208, 209, 222
- Persian kings, Dan. xi. 2, iv. 59
- Pestilence, noted in 4th Seal, i. 191; great, A.D. 250—265, in the Roman empire, 193; under Justinian, 398
- Peter, Christ's promise to, *Συ εἰ Πέτρος*, &c., its meaning, iii. 149, 560—590
- its perversion the foundation-stone of the Papal claims to supremacy, as Antichrist, iii. 150
- why rejected by the Paulikians. The Peter meant by them was probably the Roman Pope so called, ii. 321, 322
- the name often assumed by Roman Popes, as Peter's representative, iii. 169; "the sacerdotal monarchy of" (so Gibbon) begun by Gregory I, *ibid.*
- bronze statue of, in St. Peter's at Rome, once a statue of Jupiter, iii. 180
- Peter de Bruys burnt, A.D. 1126, ii. 282; tenets of, and of the Petrobrussians, his followers, 282—284
- Waldo, or Valdes. See *Waldo*.
- Peter's and the Pope's pretended vicegerency of Christ, a wholly unscriptural theory, iii. 560—581; and contrary to the early Fathers, 581—590
- patrimony, iii. 170
- pence, iii. 165
- "Petro coram," iii. 208, 209
- Petrus Siculus, his mission to, and charges against, the Paulikians, ii. 264, 265
- Phenomena, physical, before the French Revolution, iii. 344—349; on the consummation, 201—203
- Philosophy of history, Romish iv. 244—249; Apocalyptic, 250—255
- Phocas's pillar, iii. 304
- decree, acknowledging Roman Rome to be head of all Churches, i. 404, iii. 162; a commencing date to the 1260 years, 302—304

- Phoenix, on the Constantinian coins, in symbol of the empire's happy revival with Christianity, i. 256
- Phylactery, baptismal, i. 279, 280; true, 276, 283
- Pictures of saints introduced, i. 333, 334
- Pilate staircase at Rome, Luther at the, ii. 97
- Pilgrimages to saints' tombs, begun in the 4th century, i. 332, 333; in the middle ages, ii. 13, 18, 27
- Pitt, Mr., his death, iii. 479
- Pius VI, Pope, seized by French in 1798, imprisoned and exiled, iii. 400, 401; Pius VII brought to Paris to crown Napoleon, 402; in 1815, restored to Rome, 418
- Plague-boil of Egypt, iii. 356—358
- Plants, instances of the appropriate use of, emblematically in Scripture, i. 422, 423
- Πλατεια of the great Babylon, scene of Witnesses' death (Apoc. xi. 8), answers to Rome, ii. 433, 440, 441
- general council (A.D. 1512—17) assembled in it, ii. 442
- scene of the Witnesses' exposure as dead, ii. 451
- Podiebrad, George, Bohemian king from A.D. 1458—1471, ii. 568
- Poitiers, battle of, against Saracens, A.D. 732, i. 460
- Political ascendancy of European Christendom, a sign of the times, iv. 241
- Poliwka, Andreas, last Bohemian martyr, A.D. 1511, before the Reformation, ii. 571
- Polycarp, Irenæus' reminiscence of, i. 2; his testimony to the Apocalypse, 17; Bishop of Smyrna in St. John's time, 59; his martyrdom, 223
- Poor Men of Lyons, ii. 344, &c. See *Waldenses*.
- Pope, or Πάπας, in Bulgaria, ii. 289, 290
- previously a general title of Bishops, but appropriated exclusively by Bishop of Rome, from time of Gregory I, i. 412, iii. 165
- Pope, double headship in Western Christendom; over clergy (or second Apocalyptic Beast) as *Patriarch*; over kings and people (the first Beast) as *Christ's Vicar* or *Antichrist*, iii. 206, 207; signified respectively by Papal *mitre* and *triple crown*, 207
- Vice-God, and so as God, iii. 182; the God-maker, 185; sits once on the high altar to be adored, 185; sits in God's temple to hold his court, 183, 184; his travesty of Christ, 182; his god-like state, 184. See *Leo X.*
- only head to Church, iii. 190
- king's submission to, in matters of religion, iii. 164—166, 185—188; people's submission to, 188—190; address him as "Lamb of God that takes away sins of world," 189
- imperial sanction to his claims, iii. 159—163
- Pope, his cherubim full of eyes, iii. 184; Bulls called oracles, 189, ii. 110
- Pope of Rome's claim, as *Vice-Christ*, to be above law (*ὁ ἀνωμος*), iii. 158, 159, 175
- claim of supremacy over kingdoms, iii. 175—178; also ii. 71
- claim to Christ's honours, titles, and offices, iii. 178—185; also ii. 53—56
- husband to Church, iii. 179; also ii. 52
- blasphemies against saints, and persecution of them, iii. 190, 191
- Roman, independence of, compared with subjection of Patriarch of Constantinople to his emperor, iii. 151
- Popes, answer to the Beast's eighth, or revived seventh, head, iii. 130, 131. See *Beast*.
- progress of their ecclesiastical and spiritual power, iii. 151, &c.; primacy over clergy, first as bishops of the imperial metropolis, 152, 153; next, over both clergy and laity, as Peter's successors, with power of the keys, 154—156; then as Vice-Christ, or Antichrist, 156—159; also ii. 53, 54
- above Scripture, iii. 178; with power over heaven, purgatory, and hell, 179, 180; power to decree apotheosis, and command angels, 180, ii. 19
- as Patriarchs of the West, recognition of absolute power over clergy, first by Wilfrid, called Boniface, then by all the Western Clergy, iii. 204, 205
- Pope of Rome, testimony of the Anglican reforming fathers to his being the very Antichrist, iii. 593—603
- Popedom and Rome, the subjects of the 5th Vial's judgments, iii. 395
- Popery, revival of, after wars of French Revolution, iii. 418—422; also recently, yet more, 503—516. See *Frogs*.
- Portents preceding the destruction of Jerusalem, i. 55
- in the age of Justinian, i. 398, 399
- Port Royal, destruction of its Jansenist convent by Louis XIV, iii. 365
- Portugal, king of, his mission and presents to Leo X, ii. 70, 71; Papal grants to, 72—74
- Pradt, De, notices from, respecting Buonaparte's dealings with the Papacy, iii. 400, 402—405, 413
- Prefecti annone at Rome, i. 186
- Præterist Apocalyptic counter-scheme inadmissible, i. Pref. xxi, iv. 564—594
- Prætorian guards, revolutionary license of, at Rome, i. 152; Prefects of, 152, 156, 157
- Pragmatic sanction, meaning of the term, ii. 82
- Prayers for the dead, origin of, i. 407
- Preachers of gospel, multiplied at Reformation, ii. 172, 173
- Preaching of gospel, Christ's injunction to, ii. 155; nearly confined, in 5th century, to bishops, ii. 159; enjoined to

- follow the tradition of the Fathers, 160; in middle age almost obsolete, 162. See *Prophecy*.
- Preparation, proper personal, for the imminent future, iv. 243
- Presbyters transmuted into the sense of *priests*, i. 279, ii. 198
- Present position, our, in the prophetic calendar, iv. 224
- Priestcraft, spirit of, iii. 495. See *Frogs*.
- Priesthood, power of the, in 6th century, i. 408—411; same under the Romish system, iii. 212—217
- corruption of, in the earlier half of middle age, i. 473; and in later half, ii. 9—28; their open heathenism immediately before Reformation, ii. 37, 38
- Primasius, an eminent early commentator on the Apocalypse, i. 36, iv. 337—343. See *Apocalyptic Interpretation*.
- Principles (*αρχαί*), the two, the Scriptural sense of, as taught by the Paulikians, ii. 322—328
- Printing, invention of, ii. 7; restrictions imposed upon, by Leo X, ii. 83
- Priscillianists, of the 4th century, compared with the Paulikians, ii. 314
- Prochorus, Pseudo-, on date of the Apocalypse, i. 41
- Pro-consuls, provincial, i. 156; their profession of equity, 185; their oppressive administration, 187, 188; and its consequences to the empire, 188, 189
- Procuratores Caesaris, Roman provincial authorities, i. 186
- Pro-dictators, Roman, no separate form of government, iii. 117
- Promises to the world of a time of recovery from the curse, and restored blessedness, traced from Adam's fall downwards, iv. 157—184
- Propaganda, Papal, revenue of, and proceedings, iii. 514, 515
- Prophecies of the Antichrist in Daniel, St. Paul, and St. John, the *Patristic* views respecting them; of Justin M., Irenæus, Tertullian, Hippolytus, Cyprian, i. 229, 230, 231; Lactantius, 234; of Cyril, Chrysostom, Ambrose, Jerome, Augustine, Sulp. Severus, 389—394. See also *Apocalyptic Interpretation*.
- Prophecy, *προφητεῖα*, scriptural meaning of the verb, to preach God's word, ii. 149—153
- Prophecy, Christ's injunction on his disciples so to preach, ii. 155; in 6th century begun to be neglected; afterwards still more so, till in middle age almost unknown, 157—162
- “Prophecy again,” St. John's being commanded to, fulfilled in Luther's and other reforming Fathers' renewed gospel-preaching at the Reformation, ii. 155—181
- Προσκύβω, the term applied to the worship of saints by the Romish Church, ii. 10—12
- Prosopopeia, Scripture symbols founded on, i. 427, 428
- Protestants, meaning of word same as *Witnesses*, ii. 462; union of, at Smalcald, 465
- attempted subjugation of, by Charles Vth, ii. 469
- political elevation of, in Germany, ii. 469, 470; and in England, 474, 475
- decline into lukewarmness, ii. 487, iii. 316—321
- Ptolemies, their contests with the Seleucide, as predicted in Dan. xi., iv. 61—79
- Publikiani, a name given to the Paulikians, ii. 291
- Purgatory, sketch of establishment of the doctrine in the Romish Church, i. 406—408; souls delivered from it by Pope, especially on Jubilees, ii. 19, iii. 179; reference to, in the words of the Romish ordination of priests, ii. 163—166
- Q
- Quadrupartition of Roman empire under Diocletian, i. 208
- “Quod semper, quod ubique, &c.,” practical absurdity of the rule, iii. 528
- R
- Ῥαβδος, rod, meaning of *reed like to rod* in Apoc. xi. 1, ii. 188—191, iv. 263
- Rainbow round about the throne, i. 85
- symbol of, in Apoc. x., ii. 41, 95
- in pictures at Leo Xth's inauguration, ii. 61
- Ram of Dan. viii., or Persian kingdom, iii. 426
- Ravallae, assassin of Henry the 4th, iii. 370
- Ravenna, Exarchate of, formed in 6th century, iii. 134, 168; its subversion, 169, 170
- Reason, goddess of, at French Revolution, iii. 362
- Reared, king of Spain, becomes a Catholic, iii. 64
- Red Sea, red appearance of the, iii. 470
- Reed like to a rod, *Ῥαβδος*. See *Ῥαβδος*.
- Reformation, Leo Xth's *mock* reformation, ii. 84
- the, commencement of, in Luther's discovery of Christ the Saviour, ii. 89—102; progress in discovery of Antichrist the usurper, 117—124; chronological æra of, recognized by the Reformers, as before the 7th Trumpet, 131—147; ecclesiastical establishment of, with aid of secular princes, 183—201; political consolidation of, 470, 474, 475, 482
- three Apocalyptic æras of, ii. 199
- new song of the, ii. 98, iii. 315
- Reformations by Hezekiah and Josiah, after the apostasies of Ahaz and Manasseh, a precedent for Christian princes taking part in the Lutheran Reformation, ii. 192, iii. 313, 314

- Reformed Churches, history of their declension in France, Germany, and England, iii. 317—321
- Regeneration, individual spiritual, Mr. Wilberforce's view of, iii. 480, 481
- the world's, iv. 175. See *Restitution*.
- Regno, or imperial crown of the Pope, its three coronets, when assumed, ii. 52. See *Papal Crown* and *Triregno*.
- Reign, the saints' millennial, commencement of, but the reign to continue afterwards for ever, iv. 133, 223
- Reimbauer, the German Popish priest, his trial for murder, illustrative of the influence of Popish principles, iii. 507
- Relics, early worship and sale of, i. 333, 334; sale of, farmed in 15th century, ii. 27
- Religion, revival of, at Reformation, ii. 98—102; again in England at time of French Revolution, iii. 477—490
- Repentance, not effected by the judgments of the Vials, iii. 394, 410—422
- Repetundis, De, Roman laws so entitled, i. 178
- Restitution edict, A.D. 1629, ii. 482
- Restitution of all things, times of (Acts iii. 19), iv. 175—180
- “Rest of the dead,” Apoc. xx. 5, signification of the phrase, iv. 148, 149
- Resurrection, the first, or of the just, discussion on, iv. 134—196
- arguments to prove it pre-millennial, iv. 146—196
- the order of (1 Cor. xv. 23), iv. 192. See *Millennium*.
- of the Witnesses, ii. 457—460. See *Witnesses*.
- Retributive character of the judgments of the French Revolutionary wars, iii. 387
- Retregression in Apocalyptic visions, i. 114, iii. 2, 329
- Revolution, Constantino-Theodosian, of 6th Seal, i. 235—252, 605—610
- French, its general correspondence with the symbols of the 7th Trumpet, iii. 338—340
- the epoch introductory of its outbreak, iii. 341—349; its outbreak in 1789, 349—351
- its spirit and acts a “noisome ulcer,” as in 1st Vial, originating from Popery, iii. 363—373; atrocities of, paralleled with those of earlier French Papists against Protestants, 370—372
- Rhadagaisus, i. 376, 377
- Rheims, Council of, heretics condemned at, in 1049, ii. 277
- Rhine, Confederation of the, iii. 385, 390
- Ribera, his Apocalyptic Commentary, iv. 481
- Ring, the Pontifical marriage-ring of the Pope, ii. 52, iii. 179
- Rivers and fountains, signification of the figure, i. 355—358, iii. 355, 382—386
- Robinson, Rev. T., iii. 482
- Rod, iron, of Roman Christian emperors against Pagans, iii. 25
- Rodolph of St. Trudon, notices in his Chronicle of A.D. 1125 mistaken, ii. 247
- Rogation days, institution of, i. 378
- Roman empire, prophecies of its disruption into ten, and removal as a preventing let, introductorily to Antichrist's coming. See *Let*, and *Prophecies*.
- Romanists, concluding appeal to, iv. 271
- Romanists in Rome, but not of Rome, iii. 68, 69, 295
- Rome, derivation of the name, i. 429
- state of early Christian Church at, i. 60
- *Pagan*, state of its empire under Domitian, i. 67; subject of four first Seals, 125; prosperity and triumph in the 1st Seal's æra, A.D. 96—189, from Nerva to M. Aurelius, 130—134; oppression by, and civil bloodshed under, military domination, from 2nd Seal's opening, A.D. 185, i. 147—160; oppression by taxation, from after Caracalla's edict, A.D. 215, and opening of 3rd Seal, 171—177; ravage and depopulation of, under 4th Seal, beginning A.D. 248, 192—201; Paganism overthrown in, 242—245, iii. 128, 129; quitted as capital by Christian emperors, iii. 128
- *Christian*, extinction by Goths of its imperial sun, i. 382—385; desolation of, in 6th century, iii. 129—131, iv. 39
- revived as *Papal* Rome, under *Popes*, primarily Gregory 1st, iii. 129—131
- *Papal*, profligacy of, in 9th and 10th centuries, i. 473
- early venality of, ii. 17—20, 26, 27
- identified with the *πλατεια* of Apoc. xi. 8, ii. 440, 441
- ring of espousal with the Church of, worn by the Pope, ii. 52
- Apocalyptic Beast, or Antichrist, prophetically tied to it, iii. 112, 113
- subject of judgments of 5th Vial, iii. 395—408; its power revived, 418
- its destined tripartition, iv. 25
- its exposure as mother and mistress, shortly before destruction, as woman riding on Beast Antichrist, iv. 28—35; its final destruction, 44—50
- Rosary, invented by Dominic, ii. 25; revival of A.D. 1460, *ibid*.
- Russia, its last war with Turks, iii. 449
- Russians, their marauding incursions into Greek empire in 9th and 10th centuries, and first Christianization, i. 477, 478; prophecy about, *ibid*.

## S

- Sabbath, desecration of, in France, at time of French Revolutionary wars, iii. 414
- Sabbatism, millenary, iv. 190, 238
- Sacramentary of Gregory I, i. 406
- Sacraments, early unscriptural notion of, i. 288, 289



- Sacraments, Paulikian doctrine respecting, ii. 336—340
- Sackcloth, sign of mourning, ii. 212; the witnessing in it, *ibid.* See *Witnesses*.
- Saints, synonymous with the 144,000 or sealed ones, i. 263—265, 275—277; contrast of, with mere baptized, 282—285; and with Antichrist's followers, iii. 321, iv. 254
- blasphemed and made war on by Popes, ii. 20—23, 28, 29, 423—427, iii. 190—192. See *Witnesses*.
- relics of, hawked for gain, i. 333, ii. 27; churches built over them, i. 339
- Saints' everlasting kingdom to begin from Antichrist's destruction, iv. 168
- Saint-worship, prevalence of, in the 5th century, i. 330—341; Gibbon's sketch of it, i. 331; in 10th century and Greek empire, i. 486, 487
- sanctioned by Gregory Thaumaturgos, and Pope Gregory 1st, i. 334, 406
- denounced by Vigilantius, i. 345
- Saints, canonized Romish, the character of, often immoral, ii. 10
- Saladin, time of truce with Richard Cœur de Lion, i. 529
- Salvation, Papal decree declaring it impossible without subjection to the Roman Pontiff, ii. 85
- Sand of the sea, or flood, iii. 71
- Saracens, invasion of Christendom by, i. 440, 441—445, 448—452; restriction as to effect, 453; as to time, 456—463; aggression on, by Christian kings, 465; decline of their power, 464—467
- Sardinia, once Vandalic, then Saracenic, finally a Papal fief, iii. 168, 171
- Satan, meaning of, ii. 498
- bound 1000 years, iv. 132; loosed afterwards for short time to deceive the nations, 222; then finally cast into lake of fire, 223
- Savonarola, his martyrdom, ii. 28, 29
- Scene, symbolic, of primary Apocalyptic vision of "the things that are," i. 71—75
- Scenery, standing Apocalyptic, of the visions of the *future*, i. 97—100
- Schlegel's Philosophy of History, iv. 244—249
- Schoenbrunn and Vienna, Napoleon's decrees of, in 1809, abolishing the Pope's temporal authority, iii. 395, 403
- Schwartz, iii. 484
- Sclavonizing of Macedonia and Greece in 8th and 9th centuries, i. 476
- Scorpion-locusts of 5th Trumpet, i. 433, 441
- Scripture, reading and preaching of, in primitive Christian worship, ii. 155, 166
- Scriptures, reading of, by laics, forbidden in 8th century by the Greek Church, ii. 257; also by the Romish Church, 22, 91, 92, 426; only to be explained in conformity with the recognized Fathers of the Romish Church, 83, 84
- Scriptures, Paulikians' conversancy with, both in the East and West, ii. 301—304
- translation of, into vulgar tongue, by P. Valdes, ii. 21, 22, 374—379; and other translations at the Reformation, 170, 172
- Sea, the, included the islands and maritime coasts, i. 369; the third part of, in 2nd Trumpet, 369, 378—380; in 2nd Vial, iii. 377—381
- used for overflow of river, iii. 71; such as Beast emerged from, 83, 84
- the glassy, before the throne, i. 84, 85
- the glassy, of the vial harpers, iii. 468—472; harpers by, 465—467, 488—490
- Seal of the living God (Apoc. vii. 2), i. 274, 275
- to a Papal Bull, meaning of the term, ii. 119, 120
- Sealing vision, the (Apoc. vii.), explanation of, i. 259—319; realized in Augustine, 365—319
- Seals, the seven Apocalyptic, i. 104; the 7th subdivided into the seven Trumpets, 105
- Seals, the first<sup>4</sup> four, general view of, i. 125—128
- Seal 1, explanation of, i. 129—146
- 2, ————— i. 147—160
- 3, ————— i. 160—190
- 4, ————— i. 190—203
- 5, ————— i. 203—235
- 6, primary figuration, i. 235—252; second, of sealing and palm-bearing visions, 252—319
- 7, opening of, i. 321, 322
- Seals, Church Scheme of, reviewed, i. 549—568
- the 6th, Notice of criticisms on my view of it, 605—610
- Sealed ones (Apoc. vii.) of the same body as the Palmbearers, i. 276, 277; the incense-offering saints, 329, 330. See *Saints*, and *Hundred and Forty-four Thousand*
- Σεβασμα, Σεβαστος, iii. 98, 176
- Secession, Scotch, iv. 266
- Secular Western Empire, not the first Beast, iii. 112, 113, 192
- "Seed of the Woman," promise of, the germ of all the promises, i. 158
- Sclueia, the site of Bagdad, iii. 441
- Sclucidæ, their contests with the Ptolemies, iv. 61—79; tabular sketch of, 62
- Seljuk, and rise of the Seljukian Turks, i. 497; perpetuated as rulers of the Sultany of Roum through the Crusades, 500, 501; broken by Zenghis Khan, but resuscitated and continued under Othman, *ibid.* See *Turks*.
- Semler, the German Neologist, iii. 319
- Semlerian Apocalyptic controversy, iv. 525
- Septuagint, translation, iv. 62; chronology of, 703, &c. See *Chronology*.
- Serampore mission, iii. 485
- Sergius, the Paulikian, account of his con-

- version, ii. 257—259; extracts by enemies from his writings, 262, 263
- Serenus (of Marcellis), a protester against image-worship, ii. 224, 225
- Seven hills, Rome's, iii. 111, explain the seven thunders, ii. 111; the seat of the Beast, iii. 112; and Harlot, iv. 34
- Seven Seals, &c. See *Seals, Trumpets, and Vials*.
- Seven thousands. See *Chiliads*.
- Seventy Weeks, Daniel's prophecy of, views respecting them of *Tatian, Clemens Alexandrinus, Tertullian, Julius Africanus, Irenæus, Apollinarius*, iv. 304—307; of *Eusebius*, 310, 311; and of the *Jews* in Jerome's time, 322
- Seventy years of Babylonish captivity; the period's two several beginnings with two correspondent endings applied to the 1260 years' period, iii. 163, 299
- Shadwell, Sir L., i. Pref. xiii; ii. 573—576
- Sibyl, pseudo-, i. 230, 231
- Sign, *σημεῖον*, meaning of, iii. 6
- Signs of the times, iv. 240—242
- Silence, the half-hour's, in heaven, i. 321—326
- Simeon, Rev. C., iii. 482
- Simon Magus, i. 63, iii. 105
- Sistine Chapel of the Vatican, iii. 401
- Six thousand years, idea of the six days of creation figuring it: so *Irenæus, Hippolytus, Cyprian, Lactantius*, i. 231—234; *Pseudo-Barnabas*, iv. 276; *Eustathius, Hilarion, Jerome, Augustine*, i. 396—398; *Melanethon*, ii. 141
- Slaves, distinctive dress of, under imperial Rome, i. 237
- Smalcald, title of *Protestants* first assumed at, A.D. 1530, ii. 462
- Small pox at time of outbreak of French Revolution prevalent, iii. 358, 373; emblematic (as ulcer of 1st Vial) of the revolutionary principles, 478
- Societies, Missionary and Bible, iii. 483, 484
- Sodom, figurative appellation of Rome, ii. 437, 443—445
- Solyman, Seljukian Sultan, i. 499
- Turkish Sultan, his Providential intervention, in favour of the Protestant Reformers, ii. 467
- "Son of," the Hebraism illustrated, ii. 209, iii. 95, 96
- Son of perdition, iii. 95, 96
- Souls under the altar, i. 207, 224, 225
- of the martyrs enthroned at the Millennium, iv. 132
- Song on the Lamb's opening the book, i. 95, 96
- Song of the temple-harpers, iii. 315, 316
- of Moses and the Lamb, iii. 472—475
- Spain conquered by Saracens, i. 455, 460; progress of Christian remnant in repelling them, 477, 478; the Christians' completed success in subjugating and expelling them, ii. 4
- Spanish colonies, revolt of, iii. 380
- Spener, iii. 321
- Spirit, being in the, what? i. 70, iv. 41
- Star, the fallen (Apoc. ix. 1), explained of Satan, as fallen from his supremacy in Roman Heathendom, i. 443—446
- Stars, symbol of, explained, i. 70, 245—249
- the twelve, of the Woman's coronal (Apoc. xii.), iii. 9—22
- Staupitz, ii. 94
- Stercoraceæ, the seats so called at the Lateran, ii. 60
- Στεφανος, Roman imperial badge, i. 135—137; contrasted with *διαδημα*, 136, iii. 125
- Stephen, Sir James, his testimony to the sufficiency of evidence in the "Horæ Apoc." Pref. xiii.
- Stechus, Augustin, cited, iii. 131
- Structure of Apocalypse, i. 104—106, iii. 1—5; of the millennial and New Jerusalem visions, relatively to each other, iv. 205—218
- Suevi a horn of the Beast, iii. 137, 138, 140
- Suleiman founds the Turkish Princedom of Roum, i. 499
- Sulpicius Severus, inclined to saint worship, i. 333; his expectations of Antichrist, 391, 392
- Sun, symbolic of rulers in the Apocalyptic heaven, i. 103; in 6th Seal darkened, 237; in 4th Trumpet, its third part eclipsed, 371, 383, 384; in 5th Trumpet darkened by the smoke of the pit, 441, 449; 4th Vial on the, iii. 389
- of righteousness, Christ, as revealed to Luther, ii. 41, 95, 98
- Angel standing in, iv. 53
- Sun-clothed woman, iii. 6—10
- Συνεκδημοί, in sense of "missionary fellow-pilgrims," an appellation of the Paulikian ministers, ii. 342
- Superstition, advances towards. See *Sacrament, Saint worship, Purgatory, &c.*
- Symbolic character, St. John's. See *John*.
- and literal intermixed in Scripture prophecy, i. 356—358
- Symbols, Scripture, appropriateness of, i. 420—431, iii. 15; the principle applied in explanation of the 5th Trumpet, i. 431—439
- Symbols, defence of my interpretation of, i. 623—638
- Sword, the Roman military badge, i. 150, 151, 155—157; judgment of, on Roman empire in the 3rd century, 192

## T

- Tabernacle of testimony, Apocalyptic, i. 98
- Tabernacle, or monstranz, of the Romish consecrated host, with its enviroing glory of gold and silver and precious stones, iii. 185, iv. 99
- Tabernacles, Jewish feast of, i. 350; anti-typical feast of, *ibid.*
- Tabor, Hussite refuge-fortress, ii. 567
- Taborites, ii. 447
- Tamerlane, his defeat of Bajazet, i. 531

- Taurus, statue in the square of, at Constantinople, with prophetic inscription about the Russians, i. 478
- Taxation, aggravated oppressiveness of Roman, from Caracalla's edict, i. 171—177, 188, 189; continued after Alex. Severus, 597—605
- Τελειω, ὅταν τελειωσῶν, Apoc. xi. 7, difficulties about, ii. 411—414; explained, 416—420.
- Telonarii, one of the titles of the Publicani, or Paulikiani, ii. 291
- Temple, the symbolic, i. 98—100; (see *Altar*;) its opening in Heaven, ii. 495, iii. 336, 338, 463, 464; fulfilled, 485, 489  
— of God which Antichrist was to sit in, the professing Church, iii. 98—100
- Ten horns of the Beast, iii. 140; (see *Beasts*;) hate the whore, iv. 30
- Tephric, Mount, Paulikian refuge-place, ii. 264
- Tertullian, his testimony to the Apocalypse, i. 24; on its date, 33, 40; his Apology, 216; his views of the Apocalyptic prophecy, 229—231, iv. 280—283
- Tetrapartition of Roman empire under Diocletian, i. 199
- Tetzel, ii. 67—70, 99, 461
- Thefts, Papal and clerical, in middle age, ii. 17—20, 26, 27
- Theodora the Empress's persecution of the Paulikians, ii. 264
- Theodorie, iii. 139, 175
- Theodosius I, or the Great, Gothic tempests hushed during his reign, i. 258; "the great eagle," iii. 55; he destroys Paganism and Arianism, 56, 57
- Theodosius' Edict, A.D. 380, in favour of the Roman Bishop, iii. 160
- Theodosius II, similar edict of, A.D. 445, *ibid.*
- Theodosian code, ii. 217, iii. 160
- Theophilus, Bishop of Antioch, his testimony to the Apocalypse, i. 23
- Theses, Luther's, ii. 99
- "Third part," the Apocalyptic, i. 358—365, iii. 16—18; critical discussion of, i. 610—622
- "This generation shall not have passed," &c., iv. 732
- Thogrul Beg, chief of the Seljukian Turks, made Lieutenant of Caliph of Bagdad, i. 497; his invasion of Eastern Christendom, 523—527; ceremony of his investment at Bagdad, 525, 526
- Thousand, the 144. See *Hundred*, and *Saints*.
- Throne set in heaven, i. 82; the sensorium, and origin, of all that past on earth, 107, 108  
— of God, man-child caught up to, iii. 11; historically explained, 23—25  
— of the Beast, or Rome, yielded to Beast by Dragon, iii. 111—113, 115; fifth Vial poured out on, 395—408
- Thunders and lightnings from the throne, i. 107; before first Trumpet, 316, 367; on seventh Trumpet's sounding, ii. 495, iii. 337; on seventh Vial, iv. 19, 24
- Thunders, the seven (Apoc. x.), explained as the Papal thunders, ii. 102—114
- Thunderbolts, the Papal, of anathema and excommunication, iii. 180, 216, 217; form and example of, *ibid.*
- Thyestean banquets, &c., charged alike on early Christians and middle-age witnesses for Christ, ii. 304, 305
- Tiara, Papal. See *Triregno*.
- Tilloch, Dr., on date of the Apocalypse, i. 41—43
- "Time shall no more be" (Apoc. x. 5), ii. 125, 126  
— of Papal anti-witness' war, ii. 416—423  
— of the end, iv. 100, 101, 103, 106, 110  
— of final trouble, iv. 108, 109
- Times, the seven, of Nebuchadnezzar, iii. 270, iv. 239  
— Daniel's 3½, iv. 109, &c. See *Year-day*.
- Titles of address, from office, &c., Your Majesty, Your Grace, introduced in 3rd and 4th centuries, iii. 178, 179
- Tolerance, Gallienus' the 1st edict of, for Christians, i. 221; Galerius' do., iii. 18
- Tractarianism, Oxford, identified with the spirit of priestcraft out of the mouth of the False Prophet under the 6th Vial, iii. 516—531
- Tracts, religious, scattering of, one means of spreading gospel-truth used by Waldenses in 1230, ii. 401
- Traditio instrumenti. See *Ordination*.
- Trajan, his conquests, i. 132; his rescript concerning Christians, i. 215, 216
- Transubstantiation, advance towards, in 4th and 5th centuries, i. 405; authoritatively enjoined in 13th century, ii. 11; effect in superseding *preaching*, 160, 161; *ibid.* 439; iii. 185, 214, iv. 99  
— protest against, by Berenger, &c., ii. 271, 276, 278, 281—283, 285, 336, 570
- Transubstantiated wafer, recognized by Papists as Christ, made part of the Pope's processional, ii. 59
- Trent, Council of, A.D. 1546, ii. 469
- Tribulation, the great (Apoc. vii. 14), i. 285
- Tributes, the Roman, i. 171, 172
- Trinitarian faith adopted by all the Romano-Gothic kings, iii. 63, 64
- Tripartition of Roman empire, i. 358—365, iii. 18  
— of the great Papal city under 7th Vial, alarm bell of coming consummation, iv. 25, 26, 28
- Triregno, the Papal super-imperial crown, ii. 52, 53, iii. 170, 193, 207; meaning of its triple coronet, iii. 170
- Triumvirs, no proper head to Roman Beast, iii. 118, 119
- Trumpet-soundings, Apocalyptic, the two meanings of, *time-measuring*, *war-denouncing*, i. 346—349

- Trumpet-soundings, the *first four*, general interpretative principles of, i. 350—365  
 ———— imagery of, sketched, i. 365—371  
 ———— Gothic fulfilment of, i. 372—385  
 ———— the *fifth*, epoch of its sounding, i. 416—420; its symbols analyzed, i. 431—439  
 ———— fulfilled in Mahometanism and the Saracens, i. 442—452, 464  
 ———— the *sixth*, occasion of, i. 480—486; fulfilled in the Turks, 487—532  
 ———— the *seventh*, sounding of, ii. 492; importance of, 492—496; general view of its synchronisms, iii. 328—332; its development in the seven Vials, 333; general character of its symbolized events and results, 333—338; their general agreement with those of the French Revolution, 338—340
- Turks, executors of the second Woe, i. 496—532  
 ———— the Seljukians commissioned from the Euphrates, i. 499; (local origin of *Seleucian*, as in Dan. viii., iii. 410, 411;) continued in the Othmans, i. 501—505; numbered by “myriads,” 505—508; Apocalyptic colouring of their dress, 508, 509; their artillery answering to the fire, smoke, and sulphur, 509—512; the horse-tail standards of their Pashas, 512—516; their Pashas’ oppressive rule, 515, 516; Constantinople taken by them after “the hour, day, month, and year,” i. 526—532. See too 629—638.
- Turkish Woe in 1790 ended, ii. 491  
 ———— no longer a Woe, made evident just before the French Revolution, iii. 338; rapid wasting of Turkish power, begun A. D. 1820 (at the end of the 2300 year-days of Dan. viii.), 447—454. See *He-goat*.  
 ———— contest with Pasha of Egypt, iii. 451
- Tyrants, the 30 of the Roman world, in the 3rd century, i. 195
- U
- Ubert, lord of Milan in 1259, a favourer of the Waldenses, ii. 403
- Ulcer, noisome, of 1st Vial. See *Vials*.
- Ulphilas, preacher of Arianism to Goths, iii. 61
- “Unam Sanctam,” the famous Bull of Boniface VIII. adopted by Pope Leo X., ii. 85, iii. 190
- United Brethren, formation of, in 1457, ii. 568; Papal persecution of, ii. 29, 447, 569  
 ———— their apologies to King Wladislas, ii. 569—571
- Universal preaching of the Gospel, a sign of the times, iv. 240
- Unity of the Church, early Romish unscriptural view of, iii. 165; continued at epoch of the Reformation, ii. 84; scriptural, when to take place, iv. 195, 196
- Usher, Archbishop, iii. 321; his collection of Waldensian MSS., ii. 362. See *Chronology*.
- Utraquists, Bohemian, or Calixtines, ii. 567
- V
- Vail, absence of, in the Apocalyptic temple, i. 99
- Val Louise, extirpation of its Christian inhabitants, ii. 30
- Valentinian I, delayed baptism till death-bed, i. 292  
 ———— II’s decree, A. D. 445, in favour of the Pope, iii. 160
- Valerian the emperor taken by Sapor, i. 195, 221
- Vandals, conquests of the, under Genseric, i. 378—380. See *Genseric*.  
 ———— a horn of the Beast, iii. 137, 138; plucked up, 168
- Vectigales, or produce-paying Roman provinces, i. 171, 172
- Venn, Rev. H., ii. 227, iii. 321
- Veronica, St., imposture about, ii. 15
- Vezelai, reputed heretics found and burnt at, in 1167, ii. 291
- Vials, the seven, development of the 7th Trumpet, i. 105, iii. 332, 333; signification of the symbol, 353; general remarks on, 354—356
- Vial 1, ulcer of, explained, iii. 356—359; fulfilled at outbreak of the French Revolution, 359—363; originated from Popery, 364—375; spreads over European kingdoms, 374  
 ———— 2, on the sea, explained, iii. 377; fulfilled, 377—381  
 ———— 3, on the rivers, explained, iii. 381—383; fulfilled, 383, 389  
 ———— 4, on the sun, explained, iii. 389; fulfilled, 390, 391  
 ———— 5, on the throne of the Beast, or Pappal Rome, iii. 395—410  
 ———— 6, on the Mahommedan Turk, 422  
 ———— its destined time, iii. 423—447; its outpouring, 447—460  
 ———— 7, outpouring of, iv. 19—28
- Vials fail to produce repentance, iii. 394, 410—422
- Victorinus, his Commentary on the Apocalypse, i. 28, 34, 35, iv. 287—293
- Vigilantius, witness against errors of the apostasy (5th century), i. 345, 346, ii. 219—221
- Vigilius, Pope, A. D. 546, ill treated by Justinian, iii. 169
- Vintage of the earth, iv. 12—18
- Virgin Mary, image and worship of, in 10th century, i. 486  
 ———— immaculate conception of, ii. 27  
 ———— undue exaltation of, resisted by the Paulikians, ii. 328—333  
 ———— weeping and winking images of, iii. 416, 418, 419  
 ———— undue veneration of, affected



- by the Oxford Tractarians, iii. 519. See *Mariolatry*.
- Visigoths, a horn of the Beast, iii. 136, 138, 140
- Viventius, Archbishop of Lyons in 8th century, ii. 231
- Voice from heaven, "Blessed are the dead," &c., iv. 5-7
- from the throne, iv. 50
- Voices as of many waters (Apoc. xiv. 2), iii. 312, 315
- in heaven proclaim the kingdom of Christ, iii. 327
- Volcanic fire, symbol of the Vandal desolations, i. 369, 378-380, 620
- eruption of, in Auvergne (A.D. 458), i. 378
- eruptions, before French Revolution, iii. 345, 346; figurative in Apoc. xv. of revolutionary eruptions, 470, 471, 476-478
- destruction of Papal Rome, iv. 47, 48
- eruption, as predicted to break up the earth's crust, like that of Sodom, iv. 201-203
- Voltaire and his associated infidel philosophers, iii. 344; his anticipations of the French Revolution, *ibid.*
- Vox populi, whether vox Dei or Diaboli, iii. 499
- W
- Waking, "some to everlasting life, &c.," Dan. xii. 2; how to be explained, iv. 194
- Waldegrave on the Millennium, iv. 695
- Waldenses, the epoch and origin of, ii. 344-381
- Peter Valdes of Lyons the founder of the Lyonese branch, about 1170, ii. 346
- that Waldenses existed before him, probable argument from Peter's Valdic appellative, though whence derived and in what sense doubtful, 346-352
- Lyonese branch of, scattered, after Pope Lucius' anathema, A.D. 1183, in every direction, and of them some to the Dauphinese Alps and Piedmont, 353, 354; first arrival in Piedmont probably about 1200, 354; then spread over Piedmont and Lombardy, there uniting freely with other kindred heretics, 355-357; probable colonization of the present Vaudois valleys by the united sectaries about middle of 13th century, 357, 358
- assertions by the Waldenses themselves, as early as opening of 13th century, of the high antiquity of sectaries of their tenets, (not of their present locality,) 359; hostile admissions of the same, 359, 360
- "Noble Lesson," its date from internal evidence somewhere between 1183 and 1215 A.D., 363-372; its dialect same as that of the Valdencian translation of the New Testament in the Romaunt, still extant; that both New Testament translated and Noble Lesson written probably by Missionaries of the Lyonese band travelling southward, while in the subalpine districts of Dauphine, ere conclusion of 12th century; then carried into Piedmont, where was a cognate dialect, and preserved by the colony afterwards under Monte Viso, 372-379
- Waldenses, antiquity of the sect proved from Noble Lesson, 380, 381; the sect embracing both Piedmontese descendents of Claude of Turin, and Petrobrusians and Paulikians, 381-385
- true witnesses for Christ, 385-403
- their Christian doctrine, 390-397; morals, 397, 398; and missionary zeal and activity, 399-402
- sackcloth-dress, and symbolic candlestick, 405, 406
- their "Noble Lesson" cited, 390-394, 554-566; their treatise on Antichrist, 394-397
- Papal bloody persecutions of, 21-23, 29, 30, 425-427; all but exterminated, 446
- Waldensian Romaunt version of Bible, specimens of, 551-553
- Waldo, Peter, rather *Valdes*, or *Valdensis*, origin of the name, ii. 318, 349; history of his conversion, 387, 388; translation of Scriptures into vulgar Romaunt, 21, 388; his missionary journeys, labours, and death, 389
- Walker, Rev. S., iii. 321
- War, Papal, against Christ's witnesses and people, ii. 21-23, 28-30, 423-427
- European, against the Turks, ii. 491
- ravages of, in the French Revolutionary campaigns, iii. 392, 393
- in heaven (Apoc. xii.), iii. 29-31
- Warburton, Bishop, that belief of Pope being Antichrist constituted the justification of the Reformers' separation from Rome, iv. 436
- Wartburg Castle, Luther's Patmos, ii. 167
- Watchfulness, peculiar duty of, at the present time, iv. 20
- Waters on which the Harlot sate, iii. 83, 84
- Waterworth, Rev. J., ii. 26, iii. 67
- Watts, Dr., iii. 321
- Waugh, Dr., his sketch of the ruined state of the Churches in France, in 1802, iii. 399
- Weeks, Daniel's seventy, iii. 267, 274
- Wesley, iii. 321, 483
- Westphalia, Peace of, A.D. 1648, ii. 482
- Wheat, price of, in St. John's time, and at various epochs of Roman history, i. 180-183
- Whitby's theory of the Millennium, iv. 140, 141; refuted, l. from Apocalyptic

- evidence respecting both *death* of the millennially raised saints, 146—151; and from their *resurrection* itself, 151—157; 1. from general Scriptural evidence; viz. 1. of the synchronism of Christ's coming in glory, and the spiritual Israel's resurrection from the dead, with the restoration of the natural Israel to their own land, 157—175; 2. the synchronism of Christ's coming with the world's promised blessedness, 175—184; 3. its synchronism with the time of the Man of Sin's destruction, 184—187; 4. from the parable of the tares and wheat, 188, 189; 5. from the fact of a suffering state being depicted as preceding that of the saints' glorification with Christ, 189, 190; 6. from the saints' sabbatism being probably that of the world's 7th millenary from the Creation, 190
- Whitby's theory of Millennium refuted, iv. 146—192
- White robes, of symbolic martyrs, i. 233—235, iii. 35
- of neophytes, i. 255, 284; of Christ's saints, 277
- White horse, i. 135—138, iv. 53
- Whitefield, iii. 321
- Wickliff, his translation of Bible, ii. 21; preaching, 162; probable connexion with the Waldenses, ii. 428
- Wickliffite preachers excommunicated, ii. 162
- Wilberforce, his life, iii. 480—490; his death, 491
- Wilderness, the Woman (or Church) disappearing in. See *Woman*.
- Wilfrid, or Boniface, iii. 204, 205
- Winds, four Angels of the, i. 253
- silence of the, i. 324, 325
- Wine, article of Roman taxation, i. 175, 176
- Wine-press trodden without the city, iv. 15, 16, 53
- Wings, two, of great eagle, iii. 52—55
- Wiseman, Cardinal, on the Papal supremacy, iii. 560—590
- Witnesses, the two (Apoc. xi.), retrospective view of, in the Apocalypse, ii. 201—462; the Reformers' retrospective view of it in Foxe and the Catalogus Testium, 204
- described in prophecy, ii. 207—215; their personality, 207; official character, 208; emblems, 208—210; number, (why only two,) 210, 211; condition, 212; avenging power, 212—214; commencement of their 1260 years' testimony in sackcloth, 215, 216; its completion in regard of subject matter, not time, 416—423
- earlier Western, ii. 215—248
- earlier Eastern, (or Paulikian,) ii. 248—268
- joint middle age, ii. 268—297
- the Paulikians true Witnesses for Christ, ii. 297—344
- the Waldenses, epoch and origin of, ii. 344—385; true Witnesses for Christ, 385—403
- Witnesses, view of, summed up, ii. 403—408
- Papal war against, time of, ii. 411—423; the war, 423—427
- defeat and death of, ii. 427—456; and Papal exultation thereupon, 454—457
- resurrection of, 3½ years afterwards, ii. 457—462; fear of the beholders, 460, 461
- ascent of, with fall of tenth part of Papal city accompanying, ii. 463—472; and slaying of 7 chiliads, 472—481; to the terror of their enemies, ii. 483
- they give God glory, ii. 483—485
- still in sackcloth, ii. 486—488.
- See *Paulikians*, *Waldenses*, *Hussites*, *United Brethren*, &c.
- Wittenberg, University at, ii. 97; Luther established and ministers at, 98, 166, 170, 172
- Wladislas, Bohemian king from A. D. 1471—1516, iv. 568
- Woe, cry denouncing it to inhabitants of the earth, iii. 40, 41
- forewarnings of first woe (Apoc. viii. 23), i. 386—416
- the first (or *Saracenic*), origin of, i. 432—446; progress of, 446—452; chronology of, and limits to, 452—463; total termination of, 469, 470. See *Saracens*.
- the second (or *Turco-Moslem*), occasion of, i. 481—486; origin of, 496; chronology of its first great era of conquest, 516—532; decline and cessation of, ii. 490—492, iii. 338. See *Turks*.
- Woman, the faithful Church-Catholic travelling, iii. 7—12; the crisis immediately after the Diocletianic persecution, 17—20; brings forth manchild, i. e. baptized Christian Emperor, 23—25; persecuted by Dragon, 42—45; flight to wilderness, 45—52; helped by two eagle-wings, 52—55; sojourn in wilderness for 3½ times, 65—68
- Woman, the harlot Church, holding out cup of her apostasy, iv. 33
- World, Apocalyptic. See *Eorth*.
- Worship, heathenized Christian, of the 5th century, i. 331, 332
- object of, or *σεβασμα*, iii. 97
- "Wound, deadly, with the sword" (Apoc. xiii. 3), iii. 128, 129
- "Write" and "write not" (Apoc. x.), meaning of, ii. 107, 117—121
- Writing within and without, i. 105, iii. 4, 330—332, iv. 3, 18, 19
- Wormwood, the star, i. 370, 382, iii. 382

## Y

Year-days, the 280, period of the Christian Church's travelling, from Christ's ascension to Constantine, iii. 19  
 — the 1260 of Woman in the wilderness, iii. 65; the Beast's 1260, *primary* beginning of, on Justinian's decree, A.D. 530, with primary ending, A.D. 1790, 161, 296—302; fulfilled at French Revolution, 396—410: *secondary* beginning from Phocas's decree, A.D. 606, to end A.D. 1866, 162, 163, 302—305  
 — Daniel's 2300, their beginning and ending, iii. 443—447  
 Year-day principle discussed, iii. 260—298  
 — general *à priori* evidence for;  
 1. from fitness of miniature time of miniature symbol in figure of longer time of thing symbolized, 262—264; 2. from union of intimated definiteness near time of end, and veil of times and seasons till then, 264—267; 3. specific *year-day* scale probable from analogy of Daniel's hebdomads, and actually laid down by God in Ezekiel's case, 267—271; 4. and from historic fact of the Papal supremacy having now lasted near about 1260 years, 274  
 — objections to, answered, iii. 271—297; 1. prophetic days symbolic like rest of symbol, 272; 2. year-days specific though mystical; 3. The 70 hebdomads rightly viewed as parallel; 4. chain of authorities recognizing it, Cyprian, Prosper, Tichonius, Theodo-

ret, Primasius, Ambrose, Ansbert, Berengaud, Bruno, Joachim, Albertus Magnus, 275—283; also Jewish Rabbin, ancient and of middle ages, 284, 285. Discrepancies of year-day expositors equalled by those of the literal days, 286—291; unsatisfactoriness of the former answered, 291; objection of Christ's saints not having known Antichrist, (if the Popes,) when manifested, answered, 292—295; objection of all Papists having perished answered, 295—297; impossibility of fitting on the day-day theory to Nebuchadnezzar's prefigurative image, 297

Years, the 70, of Judah's captivity, double commencement and double ending of, iii. 299  
 — the 75, between end of Daniel's 1260 and 1335, iii. 304

## Z

Zimiscees, the Emperor John, his victories, i. 475, 476; transports the Paulikians into Bulgaria, ii. 266  
 Zion, Mount, on the Apocalyptic scene, i. 99, 102  
 — the 144,000 seen on it, symbolizing Christ's polity on earth, or true Church, iii. 306—309  
 Zisca, ii. 567  
 Ζυγος, means a balance in the 3rd Seal, i. 160  
 Ζωα, the four, (Apoc. iv. 8, 9,) i. 89—94  
 — representatives of the Church in Paradise, i. 93  
 Zwingle, ii. 101

## II.

### CHIEF TEXTS IN OTHER BOOKS OF SCRIPTURE ILLUSTRATED.

- Gen. iii. 15; "The seed of the woman shall bruise the serpent's head;" iv. 158  
 — xii. 3; "In thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed;" compared with  
 Gen. xvi. 13; "Thy seed shall be a stranger," &c.; iv. 159, 160  
 Psalm cxxxvi. 4; "Turn our captivity as the rivers in the south;" iv. 129  
 Isaiah viii. 18; "I and my children are for signs from the Lord;" (also Zech. iii. 8;  
 "Men wondered at;") i. 300; also iv. 669, 670  
 — ix. 5; "This shall be with burning and fuel of fire," &c.; iv. 11, 12  
 — liv. 9; "This is as the waters of Noah unto me," &c.; ii. 96  
 — lix. 21; "My spirit that is upon thee, and my words that are in thy mouth,  
 shall not depart out of thy mouth, nor out of the mouth of thy seed, &c., for  
 ever;" ii. 204, 205  
 Jer. li. 25; "I am against thee, O destroying mountain, and will make thee a burnt  
 mountain," &c.; iv. 47  
 Dan. ii. 40; "The fourth shall be strong as iron;" i. 428—430  
 — vii. 8; "In the horn were eyes like the eyes of a man;" iii. 89, 173  
 — xi. 38; "A God whom his fathers knew not shall he glorify with gold, and silver,  
 and precious stones;" iii. 184—186, iv. 98, 99  
 Matt. xvi. 18; "Thou art Peter, and on this rock will I build my church," &c.; iii.  
 148, 149, 560—590, iv. 258  
 — xxi. 42, 44, Luke xx. 17, 18; "Whosoever falleth on this stone (the stone which  
 the builders rejected) shall be broken; but on whomsoever it shall fall it shall  
 grind him to powder;" (or, *reduce him to dust, like the chaff of the thresh-  
 ing-floor*: Greek *λικμησει αυτου*;) compared with Dan. ii. 35; "The stone  
 smote the image upon his feet of iron and clay: and then was the iron, the  
 clay, the brass, the silver, and the gold broken to pieces together, and became  
 like the chaff of the summer threshing-floor:" 44, "and the stone shall break  
 in pieces all those kingdoms;" Sept. *λικμησει και λεπτυνει πιασας τας βασι-  
 λειας*, iv. 264, 265  
 — xxv. 31; "When the Son of Man shall have come in his glory," &c.; iv. 200  
 Luke xvii. 20; "The kingdom of God cometh not with observation; neither shall  
 they say, Lo here, or lo there; for lo! the kingdom of God is within you;"  
 iv. 198, 199  
 — xxi. 32; "This generation shall not have passed away," &c.; iv. 732  
 John v. 17; "My Father worketh hitherto, and I work;" iv. 221  
 — xvii. 9, 21—23; "That they all may be one,—that the world may believe that  
 thou hast sent me;" iv. 184, 196  
 — xviii. 36; "My kingdom is not of this world;" iv. 264—266  
 Acts i. 7; "It is not for you to know the times and the seasons," &c.; iii. 264  
 — iii. 21; "Whom the heaven must receive until the times of the restitution of all  
 things;" iv. 175—180  
 Rom. viii. 19; "The creation waiteth for the manifestation of the sons of God;" iv.  
 181—184  
 — xi. 25; "Till the Gentile *πληρωμα* be brought in," &c.; iv. 204  
 2 Thess. ii. 1; "The coming of Jesus Christ, and our gathering unto him;" iv. 184  
 — 187  
 — 3; "Till there come the apostasy first," &c.; iii. 91—101  
 — 4; "He as God sitteth in the temple of God;" iii. 183—185  
 Heb. ii. 12, 13; "Saying, I will declare thy name unto my brethren," &c.; iv. 669  
 — xii. 22; "Ye are come unto Mount Zion," &c.; i. 110  
 2 Peter iii. 7; "The heavens and earth which are now are *τεθησανρισμενοι πυρι*,"  
 &c.; iv. 201, 202  
 — 13; "We, according to his promise, look for new heavens and a new  
 earth," &c., compared with Isa. lxxv. 17, lxxvi. 22; iv. 192, 193, 214, 215  
 1 John v. 20; "We know that the Son of God is come, and hath given us understand-  
 ing to know him that is true," &c.; i. 273,



### III.

#### AUTHORS CHIEFLY REFERRED TO ON MATTERS OF CONTROVERSY.\*

- Arnold, Dr.*, on Prophetic Interpretation, iv. 665—680  
*Arnold, Rev. T. K.*, on the Roman horse, i. 582—588; on the three first Seals, see *the Chapters on those Seals*; on the 6th Trumpet, i. 629—638; on the Antichrist, iv. 630, 631  
*Barker, Rev. W. G.*, on the Roman horse, i. 583—588; on the 6th Seal, i. 609; on the Apocalyptic temple, ii. 519; on his "moderate Futurism," iv. 632—640  
*Birks, Rev. T. R.*, on the Seals, i. 549, 550—567; on the Apocalyptic "third part," i. 610—622  
*Bossuet* on Apocalyptic Interpretation, iv. 501—506, 585—594  
*Burgh, Rev. W.*, on the Futurist Apocalyptic Scheme, iv. 597—630  
*Cwingham, Mr.*, on the Seals, i. 549—567; on the little book, ii. 47; on the death of the Witnesses, ii. 432; on the Beast, his seventh head, and his image, iii. 109, 120, 121, 220  
*Daubuz* about the 144,000, i. 269  
*Davidson, Dr.*, on the Apocalyptic date, and Apocalyptic Scheme of interpretation. i. 533—548, iv. 565—585  
*Dowling, Rev. G.*, on the charge of Manicheism against the Paulikians, ii. 314—344, 524—542  
*Faber, Rev. G. S.*, on the four first Seals, i. 122; on the four Angels loosed from the Euphrates, i. 489, 517; on the little book, ii. 47; on the death of the Witnesses, ii. 433; on the Beast and his image, iii. 113, 220; on Acts iii. 19, as bearing on the millenary question, iv. 177—180  
*Gieseler, Professor*, on his Marcionitic theory of the Paulikian system, ii. 543—550  
*Gresley, Rev. R.*, on the Church, iv. 262  
*Hengstenberg, Dr.*, his view of Antichrist, iv. 684—690  
*Hislop, Rev. Mr.*, on the Apocalyptic altar, ii. 509—519; on the identity of the Beast from the sea and the Beast from the abyss, iii. 549—559  
*Hook, Dr.*, on the Apostolic succession, iii. 527  
*Keith, Rev. Dr.*, on the continued aggravation of taxation in the Roman empire after Alexander Severus, i. 599—605; on the witness-character of the Bohemian United Brethren, ii. 567—572; on the Beast's image, iii. 219  
*Lee, Professor*, on Apocalyptic interpretation, iv. 594—596  
*Lord, Rev. Mr.*, on the symbols of the Seals, i. 625—629  
*Lücke, Professor*, his view of Antichrist, iii. 608—615  
*Maitland, Dr. S. R.*, on the 6th Seal, i. 605—610; on the dark ages, i. 473, ii. 10; on the Council of Orleans, ii. 269; on demon-worship, ii. 497—508; on the Paulikians, ii. 314—344, 524—542; on the year-day question, iii. 261—298; on Antichrist, iv. 622—630; on Apocalyptic interpretation, iv. 598—622  
*Manning, ex-Archdeacon*, on the apostasy and mystery of iniquity, (2 Thess. ii. 3,) iii. 94  
*Mede* on the 144,000, i. 268; on the third part, and land, sea, and rivers of the three first Trumpets, i. 354, 355; on the little book, ii. 45—47; on the seven thunders, ii. 103; on the Beast's seventh head, iii. 121  
*Miley*, on Apocalyptic interpretation. See *Bossuet*.  
*Newman's, Rev. J.*, or *Father*, theory of development, iii. 590  
*Newton, Sir I.*, on the date of the Apocalypse, i. 33, 34, 40—44  
*Newton, Bishop*, on the 144,000, i. 269; on the seven thunders, ii. 103; on the Beast's seventh head, iii. 120

---

\* This Index of living Writers, or of such as have their living representatives on the points referred to, is added with a view to the Author's correction, if in any case he may inadvertently and unconsciously have mistaken and misrepresented those writers' opinions and arguments.

- Oxford Tractator*, on Antichrist, iv. 612—622  
*Stuart, Professor M.*, on the date of the Apocalypse, i. 532—537; on Apocalyptic interpretation, iv. 565—580  
*Tillock, Dr.*, on date of the Apocalypse, i. 34—37  
*Todd, Dr.* See *Maitland, Dr. R. M.*  
*Whately, Archbishop*, on Christ's kingdom, iv. 251  
*Whitby*, on the Millennium, iv. 140, 141; 146—196  
*Wiseman, Cardinal*, on the Papal supremacy, iii. 560—590










UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LIBRARY  
Los Angeles

This book is DUE on the last date stamped below.

DISCHARGE



CB



3 1158 00269 8354

UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY



AA 000 905 499 0

